

ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IN WAYNE  
COUNTY MICHIGAN, 1844

by

Lawrence Howard Sabbath

A THESIS

Submitted to the Office for Graduate Studies,  
Graduate Division of Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

1965

MAJOR: HISTORY

APPROVED BY:

J. Walter Parkblock / 3/3/65  
Adviser Date

ProQuest Number: 27782227

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 27782227

Published by ProQuest LLC (2020). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All Rights Reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

## PREFACE

The period of American history which has been identified by such names as the "Jacksonian Period" or the "Period of Jacksonian Democracy" has always been of great interest. During the past century numerous books have been written which deal with this era. The books can be classified into several broad categories. Many biographies have been written on Andrew Jackson. Several of these biographers have concentrated on the years that Jackson was president. Other historians have dealt with the legislative and political battles that took place during the years that Jackson was an active and important political figure. And, many writers have attempted to describe the political parties that existed during the Jacksonian period. This thesis is mainly concerned with the books in the last category.

All of the works on the Jacksonian period contain references to the two major political parties--the Democrats and the Whigs--that were in existence during these years. In most of the writings that were chosen to be used in this thesis, the two political parties were studied in great detail, but in others they were only briefly mentioned. Regardless of the degree to which

they were described, certain statements, both general and specific, can be found in each volume concerning basic facts about each of the two parties. In recent years there has developed a serious difference of opinion among certain historians as to the validity of the statements made in the books written before the 1940's.

The controversy centers around the questions: Who were the Democrats? Who were the Whigs? In order to answer these questions the historians have concerned themselves with the numerous factions and special interest groups which supported and provided the leadership for the two political parties.

In this thesis the questions will be examined in two ways. In the first five chapters, a representative number of books written on the Jacksonian period since 1900 will be surveyed. From these works certain specific passages will be cited in order to demonstrate how the historians have described the two parties. The books will be divided into three time periods: 1906-1929; 1935-1948; and 1948-1961. In this way the similarities in description will be easily noted and the point at which the controversy arose will be quite evident.

The next nine chapters will be concerned with presenting an analysis of the leadership of the two parties in Wayne County, Michigan in 1844. The data that were collected on the local Party leaders were concerned with the social and economic composition and the personality

characteristics of those men who had provided the leadership within each party in 1844. Wayne County was selected to be studied because it was the most populous and important county in the state at that time. The year 1844 was selected because it was a city, county and presidential election year; thus there was a great deal of political activity. By 1844, both political parties were well established in Michigan.

The final chapter will be devoted to a comparison between the statements made by the various historians and the analysis of the party leaders in Wayne County. The purpose of this comparison will be to see which of the statements made by the historians can be supported by the statistics on the local leaders.

I want to thank Dr. S. Walter Poulshock, History Department, Wayne State University, for his advice and guidance. Without his help this project never would have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| PREFACE . . . . .   | ii   |
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .  | vii  |
| <b>Chapter</b>  |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION TO THE SURVEY OF HISTORICAL<br>OPINION . . . . .                    | 1    |
| II. IMPORTANT EARLY STUDIES 1906-1929 . . . . .                                     | 4    |
| III. FROM TURNER TO SCHLESINGER 1935-1948 . . . . .                                 | 31   |
| IV. THE NEW STUDIES OF THE JACKSONIAN<br>PERIOD 1948-1961 . . . . .                 | 42   |
| V. CONCLUSIONS FROM SURVEY OF HISTORICAL<br>OPINION . . . . .                       | 67   |
| VI. INTRODUCTION TO ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL<br>LEADERSHIP IN WAYNE COUNTY . . . . .   | 69   |
| VII. COMPARISON OF PARTY LEADERS BASED UPON<br>OCCUPATION . . . . .                 | 75   |
| VIII. THE BIRTH PLACES OF THE PARTY LEADERS . . . . .                               | 88   |
| IX. AGE COMPARISONS OF THE PARTY LEADERS . . . . .                                  | 105  |
| X. COMPARISONS BASED UPON DATE OF ARRIVAL<br>IN WAYNE COUNTY AND RELIGION . . . . . | 111  |
| XI. COMPARISON ON THE BASIS OF ECONOMIC<br>STATUS . . . . .                         | 113  |
| XII. COMPARISON OF THE THIRTY MOST IMPORTANT<br>LEADERS IN EACH PARTY . . . . .     | 117  |
| XIII. COMPARISON OF THE TEN MOST IMPORTANT<br>LEADERS IN EACH PARTY . . . . .       | 123  |
| XIV. THE DATA VERSUS HISTORICAL OPINION . . . . .                                   | 126  |

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| APPENDIX A: NAMES OF THE TOP DEMOCRATIC AND WHIG<br>LEADERS IN WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN<br>IN 1844 . . . . .            | 136  |
| APPENDIX B: NAMES OF THE THIRTY MOST IMPORTANT<br>LEADERS IN EACH PARTY . . . . .                                     | 138  |
| APPENDIX C: BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR SURVEY OF HISTORICAL<br>OPINION . . . . .  | 143  |
| APPENDIX D: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCES<br>USED TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ON<br>INDIVIDUALS BEING STUDIED . . . . . | 146  |
| AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT . . . . .  | 153  |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table  | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Summary of Number of Statistics That<br>Could Be Obtained in Each Category . . . . .                        | 72   |
| 2. Comparison of Party Leaders Based Upon<br>Occupation . . . . .  | 75   |
| 3. Place of Birth of Lawyers . . . . .   | 76   |
| 4. Date of Birth of Lawyers . . . . .  | 78   |
| 5. Date of Arrival in Wayne County of Lawyers . .  | 78   |
| 6. Religion of Lawyers . . . . .   | 79   |
| 7. Place of Birth of Businessmen . . . . .   | 80   |
| 8. Summary of Statistics of Businessmen . . . . .  | 82   |
| 9. Comparison of Statistics of Businessmen Born<br>in New York, Eastern States, Foreign<br>Countries . . . . . | 85   |
| 10. Birthplace of the Party Leaders . . . . .  | 88   |
| 11. Birthplace of Leaders Born in New York . . . .   | 91   |
| 12. Comparison of Statistics of Leaders Born<br>in New York . . . . .  | 92   |
| 13. Comparison of Statistics of Leaders Born<br>in New England . . . . .                                       | 96   |
| 14. Age Comparison of the Party Leaders . . . . .  | 105  |
| 15. Comparison of Statistics of Leaders Born<br>Before 1800 . . . . .  | 106  |
| 16. Comparison of Statistics on Date of Arrival<br>in Wayne County and Religion of the Leaders.                | 112  |
| 17. Comparison on the Basis of Economic Status . .   | 114  |
| 18. Comparison of Statistics of the Thirty Most<br>Important Leaders in Each Party . . . . .                   | 118  |



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION TO THE SURVEY OF HISTORICAL OPINION

The purpose of this part of the thesis is to survey what has been stated by various historians on the subject of which groups provided the support and leadership for the Democratic and Whig parties during the Jacksonian period.

Because of the very large number of books that have been concerned with this segment of American history, it is impractical to include them all. Regardless of the central theme of the book--biography of Jackson or another important political figure of the time, or a history of the political parties in a state or region of the nation--only in a few of them is the answer to the question of "who really provided the main support and leadership for each party," a major consideration of the author. In most of the works, this point is handled superficially and briefly. However, a few of the books which will be presented in the survey do provide a systematic, intensive analysis of this topic.

In recent years, there has been an attempt to group the historians who have written on this era into several categories or schools. In an article entitled "Andrew

Jackson Versus The Historians," Charles Grier Sellers, Jr.<sup>1</sup> made an analysis of the various historians and their own personal backgrounds, viewpoints, and prejudices. Sellers then grouped them into several time periods based upon these characteristics.

A more recent work edited by James L. Bugg, Jr. called Jacksonian Democracy, Myth or Reality?<sup>2</sup> studied the statements of the various important historians of the period and then grouped the authors into several schools. The schools were given such names as "The Patrician School," "The New Critical School," "The Entrepreneurial School," and several others.

The basis for the classifications that were made by Sellers and Bugg were obtained by examining statements on such topics as Andrew Jackson the man, Jackson the president, or Jackson's policies and political battles. The study of which men provided the leadership in each party is not a central theme of any of the books considered by Sellers or Bugg. Therefore, the adoption of the classifications made by either man would not serve the purpose of this thesis. The works that were chosen to be used in this paper were of various types. Each was selected for

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles Grier Sellers, Jr., "Andrew Jackson Versus The Historians," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLIV (1958), 616.

<sup>2</sup>James L. Bugg, Jr., editor, Jacksonian Democracy, Myth or Reality? (New York, 1962).

a specific reason. Some demonstrate how the question of party leadership was ignored by the authors even though they did discuss the two political parties. Others were leading works on the Jacksonian period. Several were studies of the political parties in a particular state. Regardless of the type of book that was surveyed, in most cases the author failed in the attempt to discover who were the party leaders in any systematic manner.

## CHAPTER II

### IMPORTANT EARLY STUDIES 1906-1929

One of the early works on the Jacksonian Period was called Jacksonian Democracy 1829-1837 by William MacDonald (1906). In his book MacDonald arrived at two conclusions which are pertinent to this survey because they were basic concepts that have been accepted by all historians of the period. These ideas have been repeated in almost all of the subsequent works. The first statement was that the Whig party was basically an anti-Jackson party and only united in its opposition to Jackson.<sup>1</sup> The second was that the Whigs "drew to their ranks men of property and social position who naturally sought to curb the executive through the legislative."<sup>2</sup>

MacDonald did not offer any evidence to support either of his conclusions. Both were examples of the broad generalizations that have been passed down to us through the decades from one historian to another. Many times these statements have been made without the support of any accompanying evidence. Still they have been fully

---

<sup>1</sup> William MacDonald, Jacksonian Democracy 1829-1837 (New York, 1906), p. 294.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 295.

accepted by later writers without question and, what is more important, without checking the validity of the original concept.

In the first important work dealing with a history of either of the two political parties in the South during the Jacksonian period, the two concepts can be found among the author's statements. This book, The Whig Party in the South by Arthur Charles Cole, is included in this survey because since its publication in 1914 it has become widely accepted and often quoted by historians who write about the political parties in the South.

In his book, Cole was mainly concerned with the political battles in the Southern states as they applied to the national scene. He concentrated on those years in which there were presidential elections. Cole made a statement that was similar to the one made by MacDonald concerning the purpose of the Whig party. He stated that:

Early whiggery was, in the South especially, quite a different thing from an endorsement of the measures for which Henry Cidy stood. During the early years of the movement it never pretended to be more than an anti-Jackson-Van Buren or opposition party on a broad basis--a party hospitable to every faction that was willing to join the cause.<sup>1</sup>

Cole also agreed with MacDonald on the nature of the Whig party. He found that the parties in the South were

---

<sup>1</sup>Arthur Charles Cole, The Whig Party in the South (New York, 1914), p. 5.

distinguishable on the basis of economic and social classes.

The Whig party in the South, as will be shown later, drew largely upon those elements in the community which, by virtue of wealth and social position, were separated from the 'common people.' In other words, for one reason or another, it attracted to itself the aristocratic members of the planting and slave-owning class.<sup>1</sup>

In several other places in the book, Cole re-stated the same conclusions and expanded upon these statements. They were important because they were completely accepted and very frequently cited or quoted by later historians.

The economic and political interests of the Southern Whigs were the 'special interests' of the slaveocracy. During the early forties the Whig party was frequently denounced as the aristocratic party of the slaveholders, the democracy of Mississippi designating the local organization as 'the empire of Mississippi coondom.' Later, indeed, when the slavery question became the paramount issue in politics, the Whigs had no hesitancy in asserting that their party included the largest slaveowners and that a large majority of the slaves in the South was the property of the Whigs.<sup>2</sup>

Social distinctions served to confirm the lines which economic interests had already drawn.<sup>3</sup>

The line of social cleavage that separated the Whig planters from the toiling but prosperous hill farmers and from the indolent 'poor whites' was a severely distinct one, enough to engender political antagonism.<sup>4</sup>

The Whig party in the South, then, contrary to the prevailing notion that it drew its chief support

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 58.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 70.

\*  
Soc-Eco  
status

(w) rich

from the non-slave-holding whites above the 'mean white' class, was from its origin, and continued to be throughout its history, the party of the planter and slave-holder--the aristocrat of the fertile black belt. The Democratic party, on the other hand, drew upon the opposite side of the social scale--especially upon the small farmer of the back hill-country who could always be reached by the party's appeal to the agrarian spirit.<sup>1</sup>

But the Whig party of the South was preeminently, though not exclusively, the party of the slaveholder; in its ranks it included a considerable majority of the large cotton, tobacco, rice, and sugar planters.<sup>2</sup>

Cole reached these conclusions by studying the activities of the two parties during important presidential campaigns. He also considered the results of the elections. However, he did not really make a study of the true leadership of either party. He forces us to infer that the leadership came from these same groups that gave the Whig party its greatest support. In the quotations that have been cited when Cole said "the Whig party," he was referring to those who supported the Whig party, not to those who led the party. Upon closer study this assumption could prove to be erroneous. It is possible that the true leaders and even the candidates of the Whig party came from social and economic groups that differed from those groups that gave the party its chief support. \*

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 71-72.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 104.

Regardless of this possible error, the conclusions reached by such historians of the Jacksonian period as MacDonald and Cole were so well respected that they came to be accepted by those who wrote more general histories of the United States. An example of this point was the book called Division and Reunion 1829-1909 by Woodrow Wilson (1918). In his book, Wilson included both of the ideas that are under discussion. When speaking of the nature of the Whig party, Wilson stated:

Until 1834, when it had assumed its new name, Whig, of conveniently ambiguous significance, the National Republican Party of Clay and Adams had been too heterogeneous, too little united upon common principles, too little prepared to concert common measures to be able to make any headway against the popularity of Jackson and the efficient organization of Jackson's followers.<sup>1</sup>

Wilson also found that even as late as the 1840 election the Whig party "had not been homogeneous enough to venture upon a formulation of active principles before they won the election."<sup>2</sup> At another point in the narrative Wilson called the Whigs "the party of conservative tradition."<sup>3</sup>

The first two quotations from Wilson's book were similar to the ideas expressed by MacDonald on the composition

---

<sup>1</sup>Woodrow Wilson, Division and Reunion 1829-1909 (New York, 1918), p. 113.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 133.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 118.



of the Whig party. The last quote dealt with the political philosophy of the Whig party and the statement agreed with the second concept that was earlier quoted from MacDonald's book.

The most important study of Michigan politics was published in 1918. The book was Political Parties in Michigan 1837-1860 by Floyd Benjamin Streeter. In it, Streeter presented a great deal of evidence and detail to support his conclusions. He examined not only the policies of both parties, but, what is more important, the social, economic, and religious groups that supported \* each party. This book is important to this survey because the conclusions reached by Streeter will be the ones that are the most directly confronted by the evidence to be presented in the second part of this paper.

Streeter examined the two parties by using several social and economic classifications. A reader of the book could gain a complete understanding of each party by assembling the many conclusions stated by the author into a logical sequence. He found that during the Jacksonian period the Democratic party in Michigan "was composed mainly of the poor and uneducated people in the cities and the rural districts, though a number of well-to-do had also been attracted to it."<sup>1</sup> In his opinion,

---

<sup>1</sup>Floyd Benjamin Streeter, Political Parties in Michigan 1837-1860 (Lansing, 1918), p. 4.

the people who voted for the Democratic party did so because "most of the voters who had emigrated from Western New York were poor and inclined to be radical, there was a tendency for them to unite with the Democratic party."<sup>1</sup> They united with the Democratic party because the party fought for those ideas that these people believed in. The Democrats "were hostile to monopolies and vested interests and wished to breakdown the power of the monied men in politics."<sup>2</sup>

Earlier in this survey the statements from Cole showed that the two parties in the South could have been clearly divided along economic and social lines. Streeter did not find such a clear cut division in Michigan.

As has been stated, there were some well-to-do men in the Democratic party. An additional number settled in the state each year. This class consisted chiefly of merchants, large landowners and well-to-do lawyers. Most of them came from New England.<sup>3</sup> \*

During the Jacksonian period many people emigrated into Michigan. Although most of these people arrived from New England and the Middle Atlantic states, many came directly to Michigan from European countries. Some of the emigrants from the Eastern states were born in European countries and came to Michigan after spending a few years

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

in the older sections of the country. Streeter found that "practically all the naturalized citizens residing in the State in 1835, and the majority of those who came during the next twenty-five years, voted the Democratic ticket."<sup>1</sup> In the state of Michigan, and especially in Detroit, there were many families of French descent. Streeter stated that just as in the case of the other non-English ethnic groups "the majority of the French voters were Democrats, though they did not support this party in such large numbers as the Irish and German citizens in the early days."<sup>2</sup> He also found that the Democratic party attracted the minority religious groups as well as the minority ethnic groups. His statements were that "a large number of the Baptists, Quakers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church were Democrats in the early statehood period,"<sup>3</sup> and "practically all the Roman Catholics and most of the Lutherans were staunch Democrats throughout the ante-bellum period."<sup>4</sup> Streeter explained that the reason for this party division along religious as well as economic and social lines was because "the Presbyterians and Episcopalians represented

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 162.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 172.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 207.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 208.

the wealthy and conservative class, many of the voters in those churches were Whigs."<sup>1</sup> \*

Streeter made several conclusions in order to explain the economic distinctions between the supporters of each party. He found that "the vast majority of the Whigs were the well-to-do and conservative men or those who, for some reason, upheld the interest of this class,"<sup>2</sup> \* and "among them were many bankers, merchants and financiers in the cities, and large land owners in the country."<sup>3</sup> These statements are very similar to those made by Cole on the Whig party in the Southern states. Streeter found that the Whig party included many who had been raised in the New England states or in Eastern New York. Unlike those people from these areas who supported the Democratic party the Whig supporters came from wealthy homes<sup>4</sup> where they had acquired traits which "sharply distinguished them from the poor and uncultured people who were so numerous in the Democratic party."<sup>5</sup> \* Streeter restated this same basic concept several times.

Many of the active leaders [radical Whig leaders] had come from Western New York, while some of those

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 212.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

who were living in Detroit had formerly resided at Canandaigua, New York. The majority of them were ambitious young lawyers in the cities and country towns who aspired to office.<sup>1</sup> \*

The conservative faction in the Whig party was composed of monied men and large landowners who took relatively little part in politics.<sup>2</sup> \*

These men [conservative Whig leaders] represented the wealthiest class in the state. They regarded the citizens of foreign birth as a reckless and ignorant element whose votes were controlled by Democratic politicians.<sup>3</sup> \*

After studying these conclusions, it is obvious that Streeter believed that in Michigan the descriptions of the two parties coincided with the general characteristics applied to each party by the earlier historians. He completely agreed with the basic concept that "the amount of wealth which the voters possessed and their social position helped to determine their party predilections."<sup>4</sup> \*

Unlike most of the other authors, Streeter did specifically use the word "leaders" in some of his statements. However, the men to whom he was really referring were the party candidates and officials. It is always very possible that the party candidates and officials did not constitute the true leadership of the party. This possibility must always be kept in mind when political

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 37-38.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 38-39.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

parties are being studied.

Streeter was not the only author to confine his study to a single state and limit it to a definite period of time. His book was only one of several similar works which were published following World War I. Another state study was completed in Illinois at the time that Streeter was finishing his book. The book, The Frontier State 1818-1848, was written by Theodore Calvin Pease. The findings of this author were important because the development of the two neighboring states was very similar during the Jacksonian period.

The conclusions of Pease were in complete agreement with those reached by Streeter and Cole and repeated by many other authors. He found that the Whig party in Illinois was the party of the business and conservative interests. In his book Pease made such statements as:

Certainly the Whig party in its specific measures appeared as a businessman's party.<sup>1</sup>

In its measures--banks, protection, internal improvements--the Whig party was the party of the business classes and of those within their sphere of influence.<sup>2</sup>

More generally of course, they [Whigs] had to bear

---

<sup>1</sup>Theodore Calvin Pease, The Frontier State 1818-1848 (Springfield, 1918), p. 257.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 258.

the imputation of aristocracy and of being friends to the rich.<sup>1</sup>

The Whigs were inclined to be emphatically Protestant and were accused, in connection with Nativist attacks, of being anti-Catholic.<sup>2</sup>

In speaking of the Democratic party, Pease stated that the policies and actions of the party were "sufficient to cement the imminent alliance between Democrats and Germans."<sup>3</sup> All of these conclusions were similar to the conclusions that were reached by Streeter in Michigan and Cole in the South. They would indicate that the two parties were attracting and representing the same type of people in all areas of the nation. The next state study to be completed was for an Eastern state and the conclusions that were made in this book strengthen the impressions gained from the three studies that have been discussed already. Since its publication this work, called The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York by Dixon Ryan Fox, has enjoyed a reputation that was similar to the one earned by the volume by Cole. Passages from this book appear in many of the general histories of the United States.

In the last chapter, Fox tried to make an analysis of voting statistics in order to answer the question "Who

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 260.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 261.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 265.

Were the Whigs?" He found that there was a definite connection between the old Federalist party and the new Whig party:

As we have tried to show, the old group, though dwindling, had largely kept together in New York, and formed the core of the rechristened party of the 'thirties.<sup>1</sup>

A great majority of the Federalists of 1812 who had survived, were Whigs in 1840.<sup>2</sup>

These statements were intended to show that the Whig party in New York was a conservative party, just as it was in the South and West. Fox also showed that in New York, as in other states, the Whig party was composed of many groups which were united only in their opposition to Jackson.<sup>3</sup> Many of the conclusions in this book were based upon election results. However, the election results cannot be used to discover who were the real leaders in each party. They can only be utilized, under the proper circumstances, to show which groups had given their voting support to each political party. Fox used election results to show which sections of New York supported each party. In the following statements he indicated why these areas voted for the Whig party. His

---

<sup>1</sup>Dixon Ryan Fox, The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York (New York, 1919), p. 421.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 422.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 423.



conclusions were similar to the ones which have already been quoted from the studies by Cole, Streeter, and Pease on the same topic.

But our student, by constructing state election maps, will observe how constant was the western section in its loyalty to Whig principles. Here were farmers of New England stock who brought their grain and wool to the canal at places such as Buffalo, Lockport or Rochester, consigning it to the 'home market,' which they believed the American system was developing in the east. Here, too, were the wealthy and conservative communities like Canandaigua and Geneva and other towns like Warsaw, Batavia, Angelica, Fredonia and Geneseo, whose citizens apparently had brought with them a loyalty to the policies of the Adams family, and who had cherished gratitude to Clinton for opening their country to world commerce.<sup>1</sup>

Fox made a rather extensive study of the wards in New York City from the election of 1828 to the election of 1840. He included in the last chapter of the book and in the appendix a number of maps and charts of the voting trends in these areas. He also tried to present certain social and economic information concerning the inhabitants of the different wards. The importance of these conclusions lay in their similarity to the studies that had been conducted in other states. He found that in New York City "the reliable Whig wards, which showed as well the largest wealth per capita, were seen likewise to have contained the largest proportion of merchants, manufac-

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 424-425.

turers and members of the learned professions."<sup>1</sup> When the same type of analysis was conducted in the other large cities within the state "we discover, in general, a similar condition. Where the property per capita was relatively large, the ward was Whig."<sup>2</sup> From the results of his work in cities all over the state of New York, Fox was able to arrive at two basic conclusions:

It seems warrantable to conclude that, after due regard for other factors, there remains an 'economic interpretation' of the Whig party in New York state, as it was constituted in the early 'forties of the nineteenth century.<sup>3</sup>

Comparing the percentage of merchants, manufacturers and professional men with that of Whigs; we find a striking parallel. The apparent solidarity of this class was due to social tradition as well as continuity of economic interest.<sup>4</sup>

It is clear from these statements that Fox found that in New York the two political parties were divided along economic and social lines just as they were in the South. He also showed that the two parties were divided along occupational lines just as they were in Michigan and Illinois. If the studies of Cole, Streeter, Pease, and now Fox were placed side by side, a reader would be confident in the conclusions that he would make on the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 436.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 437.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 445.

nature of the Whig and Democratic parties in the late 1830's and the early 1840's.

In the next ten years other books were published which dealt with the political parties in a specific state. Three of these works will now be reviewed because they dealt with the states of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Virginia. Each of these states was important for several reasons. None of the works that have been considered in the survey up to this point dealt specifically with a New England state or with a Southern state. The book by Cole was concerned with the entire South. The study on the state of Pennsylvania can be used to check the results of Fox for both books were concerned with a large and well established Middle Atlantic state. All three of these states were of the thirteen original states and could not be considered frontier states in the 1840's in the same sense as Michigan or Illinois.

The work on the state of Pennsylvania was conducted by Henry R. Mueller. He generally followed the methods of his predecessors. He discussed the elections of state officials giving little attention or personalities at the local level; he was more concerned with political issues than with political leaders, and he based most of his conclusions on voting statistics. Mueller identified those groups within the state that supported the Whig party,

but failed to identify those persons who constituted the real leadership of the party.

With this approach, Mueller was able to reach conclusions that were identical to those reached by the authors of the earlier studies. He found that the Whig party began in Pennsylvania in 1834 "as a generic name for all the political opponents of Jackson."<sup>1</sup> The Whig party controlled most of the banks in the state,<sup>2</sup> and its policies attracted the wealthy merchants and manufacturers.<sup>3</sup> Just as in New York, the wealthy counties in Pennsylvania were controlled by the Whigs.<sup>4</sup> Also in the state, just as in the other states, the "foreign-born" voters--in this case the Germans--"had been won over early by the Democratic-Republican party, and later worshipped Andrew Jackson, and the imperturbable 'Pennsylvania Dutch' farmers never failed to rack up large Democratic majorities."<sup>5</sup>

The study on Massachusetts was called Political Changes in Massachusetts 1824-1848 and was written by

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry R. Mueller, The Whig Party in Pennsylvania (New York, 1922), p. 15.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 243.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 244-245.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 245.

Arthur B. Darling. The approach taken by Darling was identical to the one used by the authors of the earlier studies. He focused his attention on the political battles within and between the two parties at the state level, the important elections, and the party candidates. He occasionally incorporated into the narrative statements which described the two parties in the state.

The Jacksonian party began to form in Massachusetts, as it did in the other states, in the early 1830's. The issues that served to create a need for the Democratic party in this state were very similar to the issues that served as a stimulus for the growth of the Democratic party in the other states. In Massachusetts the

Jacksonian Democrats and Workingmen cooperated in the war upon the Bank of the United States; country folk assailed the 'exclusive privileges' of the wealthy who controlled banks and other corporations. Jacksonian managers made much of the protests of the farmers against urban capitalists who owned and exploited the railroads, although they had been largely on the public credit.<sup>1</sup>

Massachusetts was different from most of the states during the early 1830's. It had, for a short time, the two liberal parties that are mentioned in the preceding quotation. Darling described the Workingmen as having begun as a separate part of the Jacksonian movement which

---

<sup>1</sup>Arthur B. Darling, Political Changes in Massachusetts 1824-1848 (New Haven, 1925), p. 3.

later became integrated into the Democratic party. In the following excerpt, the author describes the Workingmen movement and gives a list of the type of men that were attracted to this liberal party. They were the same occupational and ethnic groups that have been identified with the Democratic party in the other states that have been discussed in this survey.

That movement was distinctly agrarian but loosely related to the struggle between native and immigrant labor in Boston and other factory centers. Whatever urban laborers joined with the western farm hands to organize the Workingmen's party were undoubtedly carpenters, mechanics, and more skilled laborers than the truckmen and teamsters who fought with the Irishmen. Nor did the Irish to any extent join in the Workingmen's movement. The Workingmen were fellow liberals in opposition to the conservative order. They were another wing of Jacksonian Democracy.<sup>1</sup>

Darling indicated that in Massachusetts, as in most of the other states, the Democratic party became the party of the foreign born. In this state, the largest group of foreign born voters were the Irish. They supported the party that opposed the wealthy merchants, manufacturers, and railroad builders.<sup>2</sup> These were the same economic factors that attracted this group of voters to the Democratic party in all areas of the North and West.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 167.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 163, 309.

The book on the Whig party in the state of Virginia was called The Rise of the Whigs in Virginia 1824-1840.

Henry H. Simms also followed the accepted methodology of the previous authors.

In the works that have been considered to this point, the various authors have left the definite impression that the political battles of the Jacksonian period between the Whigs and Democrats could be characterized as a "class war" because the two parties seem to have been divided along economic and social lines. But, none of the preceding authors, especially since almost all of them worked with Northern states, used those particular words in their narrative. Simms came to the same conclusions that the others did on the nature of the two parties. His contention was that:

Another consideration which seems valid in the light of the data used in preparing this discourse is that the struggle between the Jackson and anti-Jackson forces was in large part a class struggle.<sup>1</sup>

The other major conclusions reached by Simms were in perfect agreement with those reached by the other historians. They did not conflict with the statements of Cole on the South in general.

The Whigs claimed that intelligence was largely confined to their ranks, and the Democrats did

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry H. Simms, The Rise of the Whigs in Virginia 1824-1840 (Richmond, 1929), p. 163.

not hesitate to charge that the Whigs were aristocrats, and regarded them (the Democrats) as social inferiors. During Jackson's second administration, the majority of the planters who were active political leaders were Whigs, while popular results showed that the East with its slave-holding planters had a strong Whig element. Large sheep farms and the development of manufacturers there help to explain the Whig sentiment in the Northwest. The Valley and Southwest with their small farmer element were strongly Democratic.<sup>1</sup>

Whatever other points of view may be suggested in this discourse, the fundamental proposition which it maintains is that the principal opposition to Jackson in the state came from conservative classes, from men possessed of property in slaves and otherwise, who refused to accept either his brand of nationalism or his theory of democracy.<sup>2</sup>

Making an analysis of the Democratic and Whig parties in a single state was not the only method used to study the Jacksonian period during the 1920's. In the early part of that decade two books were written that were not concerned specifically with the political parties, but still made a contribution to our understanding of the time because of the generalizations made by their authors.

The first was The Party Battles of the Jacksonian Period. The author, Claude G. Bowers, made an observation as to the affect the growth of the Whig party had on certain elements within the society of that day.

Accustomed for years to relying on the wealthy and the influential, the great Whig leaders signally

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 164.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 166.



failed to appreciate that the very elements that had rallied to their support would tend to alienate the mechanics of the cities, the farmers of the plains, the pioneers struggling with poverty on the fringe of the forest.<sup>1</sup>

With the above statement Bowers explained why the two parties came to be divided along definite economic and social lines in all areas of the nation. This idea also explained why the political campaigns of the Jacksonian period have been described by the historians in terms of a class war. Bowers recognized the fact that the Whig party was composed of many factions. This was not an original observation for it has already been shown in this survey that most of the authors expressed the same concept. However, he did make his point in a unique manner:

A more incongruous combination of contradictions and a more sinister and unholy alliance than that of the Whigs of the Jacksonian period has never appeared in the political life of the Republic.<sup>2</sup>

The second book was entitled A History of American Political Theories and was written by Charles Edward Merriam. His definition of the Jacksonian party was that it was "the Radical movement which was destined to break down the power of the landed aristocracy, level the old barriers of exclusiveness, and open the way for govern-

---

<sup>1</sup>Claude G. Bowers, The Party Battles of the Jacksonian Period (New York, 1922), p. 227.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 357.

ment of a more popular character, which took the form of Jacksonian Democracy."<sup>1</sup> The word that sets this definition of the Jacksonian party apart from the definitions formed by the other writers was "radical." None of the earlier authors who have been included in this survey used the word radical in their statements. However, some had expressed the same idea in other ways.

In the historiography of the Jacksonian period, there were two books which became the most respected volumes on the Whig party. The first of these was the work by Cole. The second was Origins of the Whig Party by E. Malcolm Carroll.

This book was mainly a discussion of the issues at the national level. The political leaders that Carroll discussed were the national figures of the period. He did not attempt to identify the party leadership at the state or local level. The discussion did not add any facts to alter the conception of the Whig party which had been established by the earlier authors. It merely repeated and reinforced what had been said before. Carroll, like most of the others, described the Whig party as being composed of many groups. His explanation was that

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles Edward Merriam, A History of American Political Theories (New York, 1924), p. 176.

"it inherited from diverse sources a perplexing variety of opinions and a divided leadership that made united action exceedingly difficult. Upon one issue alone, that of opposing Jackson and the Democratic party, could its various elements cooperate with any degree of harmony, and when in 1840 it ceased to be the opposition it promptly reverted to its former divisions."<sup>1</sup> He went on to explain that the Whig party was composed of its many diverse elements because, "except for occasional periods of economic depression, the majority of voters were Democratic, and therefore, in order to have any prospect of success, the opposition to the Democrats developed as an alliance of all who were dissatisfied with the Democratic control of the government."<sup>2</sup>

If the reader will put together the statements of Bowers, Merriam, and Cole which have been quoted on the last three pages he will receive a broad, general understanding of the political situation in the United States during the late 1830's and the early 1840's. The quotations from Bowers explained the fundamental deficiency of the Whig party. Merriam, in one word, described the

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Malcolm Carroll, Origins of the Whig Party (Durham, 1925), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 171.

nature of the Jacksonian party and then listed its purposes. Bowers and Carroll stated the reason why the Whig party existed for such a short time as a major political party in the United States.

Another influential work written in the 1920's was The Rise of American Civilization by Charles A. and Mary R. Beard. In their book, the authors entitled one of their chapters "Jacksonian Democracy--A Triumphant Farmer-Labor Party." This chapter title indicated not only the theme of that particular chapter, but it also indicated their interpretation of the Jacksonian party. The Beards found a connection between the motives of the classes in the North who were engaged in the struggle for political power and the similar classes in the South who were engaged in the same fight.

But the delay was not so significant for the growth of the western counties in those two states [Virginia and North Carolina] gave them each a population of small farmers who had no more love for the planters on the coast than the Irish mechanics of New York City had for the stockholders in the United States Bank.<sup>1</sup>

They described the political situation in such a manner that the reader is left with the distinct impression that the political battles were conducted as a class war:

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, The Rise of American Civilization (New York, 1927), p. 545.

Thus it may be said that when the nineteenth century turned its first quarter, political power was slipping from the hands of seaboard freeholders, capitalists, and planters into the grip of frontier farmers--usually heavily in debt to the East for capital and credit and into the hands of the working class of the industrial towns, already tinged with leveling doctrines from fermenting Europe.<sup>1</sup>

Into the lists Jackson entered as gladiator-at-large for the masses against the moneyed classes, declaring that the agricultural interest was of 'superior importance' to all others and placing himself, as he said, at the head of 'the humbler members of society--the farmers, mechanics, and laborers who have neither the time nor the means' of securing special favors for themselves.<sup>2</sup>

It is evident from the many quotations that have been taken from the studies which were published during the 1909-1929 period that there was substantial agreement among the authorities on their interpretation of the Jacksonian period. All of them arrived at the same basic conclusions. This unanimity of opinion continued until the publication of Schlesinger's book in 1945.

After surveying all of these volumes it would seem that certain obvious generalizations could confidently be made concerning the social and economic elements that supported the Democratic and Whig parties. The authors did not satisfactorily answer the question of who were the real leaders of the two parties, but they clearly indicated

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 557.

which groups supported each party. They also explained why certain groups tended to support one party and not the other. After using studies from all sections of the nation certain broad generalizations could be constructed to describe the character of the two parties on a nationwide basis for the same type of social and economic groups supported each party in all the states of the union.

### CHAPTER III

#### FROM TURNER TO SCHLESINGER 1935-1948

Frederick Jackson Turner is among the many important American historians who have written studies of the Jacksonian period. In his book, The United States 1830-1850, he made many broad generalizations concerning the Democratic and Whig parties. It is clear from reading the book and from checking its bibliography, that many of the state studies which were discussed in the last chapter were used by Turner in the preparation of his text. His basic generalization as to which groups supported each party could be used as a summation of what was clearly indicated by the works cited in the previous chapter.

Not all regions of property and prosperity voted Whig, and not all the poor regions of rough country were predominantly Democratic. There were exceptions that prevent the historian from formulating a law of political distribution on physical or economic grounds. It can be said, however, that different physical regions usually voted in opposition to each other and that there was a tendency, falling short of the inevitable, for the Democrats to control the less prosperous areas and for the Whigs to rule in the regions of greater wealth and vested interests.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Frederick Jackson Turner, The United States 1830-1850 (New York, 1935), p. 13.

Within this book, Turner divided the nation into several sections and then made statements concerning the nature of the two political parties in each section. It is in these comments that the influence of the state studies could be most readily seen. He stated that in New England "the Whig power rested on the conservative well-to-do classes."<sup>1</sup> These were in the areas "of accumulated property and interrelated wealthy families of bankers, merchants, and manufacturers."<sup>2</sup> In New England the Whig party also found support "in those county districts where farm values were relatively high and where . . . the country gentry--was strongest."<sup>3</sup> The Democratic areas "were in the counties where farm lands had a relatively low value."<sup>4</sup> In the cities of New England "the poorer seafaring people reinforced these agricultural elements, and the urban labor classes (which came increasingly of Irish origin) were Democratic."<sup>5</sup>

Turner stated that in the Middle Atlantic states "as in New England, Democracy found its strength among poorer people, while the capitalists, bankers, merchants, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.



manufacturers, and their following, were usually Whigs."<sup>1</sup>  
 His views on the political division in the Southern states were identical to those expressed by Cole and Carroll.

The more favored areas and those tributary to cities, interested in banks and internal improvements, gave Whig majorities, while isolated rural counties, the more illiterate, less fertile regions which contained a backwoods population living in the rougher country, were the strongholds of Democracy.<sup>2</sup>

It is evident from these statements that Turner, like those upon whom he relied for information, spoke mainly of those groups that supported each party and not those groups that provided the leadership in each party. However, he did include one brief statement concerning the party leadership in the South that is very significant in view of the controversy that is taking place today among historians of the Jacksonian period. He stated that "nevertheless, the important leaders of both parties lived, as a rule, in the fertile, more literate regions, and in or near towns."<sup>3</sup> This sentence was very important because one of the points that is being debated by historians at the present time concerns the source of leadership in each party. The earlier writers leave the definite

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 117.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 232.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

impression that the real leaders in each party came from those same social and economic groups that provided each party with its main voting support. Some of the present day historians would agree that each party drew its voting support from different social and economic groups, but they would go on to state that the real leaders of both parties were basically from the same source--the middle class. The small statement quoted above illustrates that Turner possibly recognized this to be the true situation long before the present controversy began.

In a regional history published at the same time as Turner's book, the author applied the accepted generalizations to the states in the Middle West. Henry Clyde Hubbart, in his volume called The Older Middle West 1840-1880, stated that the Democratic party in that region included "social radicals and revolutionists."<sup>1</sup> He also said that the Democratic party upheld the rights of man and gave "praise for the farmer, the laborer, and the mechanic, the newly arrived foreigner and the Catholic, too."<sup>2</sup> According to Hubbart, the Whig party was forced by the charges of the Democrats to "justify the

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry Clyde Hubbart, The Older Middle West 1840-1880 (New York, 1936), p. 11.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

banker and merchant and to make apology for moderate wealth."<sup>1</sup>

The type of individual that Hubbard said was "praised" by the Democratic party was exactly the same type of voter who the other writers stated supported the party at the time of an election. These statements of Hubbard would indicate that the two parties could be defined in terms of social classes in the frontier areas of the Middle West as well as in the more settled areas of the East.

Among the books that have been used in the survey up to this point, none has been a general history of political parties. An example of this type of work is American Political Parties by Wilfred E. Binkley. In the section that deals with the Jacksonian period, Binkley described the Democratic and Whig parties in general terms. One of his most important observations was that "the nucleus of Jacksonian Democracy was an ethnic group, the Scotch-Irish stock, to a man, intensely proud of their kinsman chieftain."<sup>2</sup> He then went on to say that this ethnic group provided support for the Democratic party among the grain growing families in Pennsylvania and the border states. When he discussed the New England states, he almost used the identical words that had been

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>2</sup>Wilfred E. Binkley, American Political Parties (New York, 1943), p. 121.

used by Turner. Binkley wrote that the Democrats included the "poorer seafaring folk and the urban laboring class of carpenters, masons, and ship caulkers as well as an already teeming element of pick-and-shovel Irish immigrants."<sup>1</sup> With these statements he was the first writer to identify the Democratic support with any specific ethnic group. None of the earlier historians had even mentioned the term ethnic group. They had all stated that the Democratic party had the support of the foreign-born voters which left the impression that these people voted for the Democratic candidates because the party aided the newly arrived immigrant. None of them had made such a broad statement that would have included all of the members of a particular ethnic group--the new arrival as well as the individual who had been in the United States for several years prior to the start of the Jacksonian period. This is an important distinction for it will be shown in the next chapter that some of the present day writers are making statements in terms of complete ethnic groups.

Binkley arrived at several conclusions concerning the groups that supported each party in the various sections of the nation. His statements are in complete agreement with the ones made in the previous works.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 123.

In New England as elsewhere the Whigs were primarily the party of accumulated property, supported at the polls by their dependents, paradoxical though the expression sounds. In the more prosperous communities, whether urban or rural, those notables could count upon the allegiance of lawyers, clergy, and teachers, while shopkeepers, native laborers, and other urban elements also accepted their leadership.<sup>1</sup>

He stated that the Democratic party in the South "included the ever faithful petty planters, owners of few if any slaves, and the grain-growing farmers,"<sup>2</sup> and in general "in the farming communities of better land values the "squirearchy" . . . provided agrarian allies for the urban Whigs."<sup>3</sup> His conclusion that "wherever the sons of New England settled in their western migration, the Whigs found ready recruits"<sup>4</sup> was very similar to the conclusions reached by Streeter and Fox in their studies of Michigan and New York. The only new contribution that Binkley made was the connection he found between the Democratic party and the Scotch-Irish ethnic group.

Since its publication in 1914 the volume on the Whig party in the South by Cole had been the accepted authority on the two political parties in that section of the nation. In it Cole had discussed the Whig party in great detail but he had never made a real analysis of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 162.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 126.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

reasons behind the voting patterns in the South. His main concern was with the results of the elections and with the groups who had supported each party in the election. In his book, The Development of Southern Sectionalism 1819-1848, Charles S. Sydnor did offer explanations for the voting patterns in the Southern states during the Jacksonian period.

Sydnor found that there was a consistent voting pattern in the South even though "neither Whigs nor Democrats offered a program that was thoroughly satisfactory to large segments of Southern political thought,"<sup>1</sup> and "the larger body of Southern opinion disliked the Whig party because it contained Clay and his American system."<sup>2</sup> As a result of these sentiments "the Southern voter, unable to see much difference between Whigs and Democrats therefore made his choice on the basis of minor events and insignificant words. He was often dubious about the wisdom of his decision, and he was likely to vote for one party in one election and for the other party four years later."<sup>3</sup> In spite of this independent attitude among Southern voters, Sydnor still found, as

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles S. Sydnor, The Development of Southern Sectionalism 1819-1848 (Louisiana, 1948), p. 316.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 317.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

the earlier writers had found, that there were certain groups that "gravitated to the Whig party because they felt an instinctive alliance with Northern champions of economic and social stability and because it was to their advantage to retain a national bank and a protective tariff."<sup>1</sup> Sydnor concluded his discussion with a statement that was fully consistent with the findings of Cole, Simms, Carroll, and Turner. He wrote that "generally speaking, the Whigs were strongest in the planting counties, and it is sometimes said that they owned three fourths of the slaves in the South."<sup>2</sup>

The Age of Jackson by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. is the most debated and controversial book of all those used in this and the previous chapter. It was this volume that precipitated the re-examination and re-interpretation of the Jacksonian period that is taking place among historians at the present time.

Schlesinger clearly viewed the political battles of the period as part of a class war. For example, in the case of New York he wrote that "the exodus of [Nathaniel P.] Tallmadge and his followers [in 1837] from the [Democratic] party established state politics more firmly than

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 318.

ever on class lines."<sup>1</sup>

This book was not a history of the political parties during the Jacksonian period, but was a study of the political theories and philosophies. Thus, Schlesinger did not make any deep analysis of the leadership of either party. He, as many others had done, equated the leaders of the party with the professional politicians within the party.

Schlesinger, like Fox and Darling, found a direct connection between the Whigs and the old Federalist party. He stated that "Federalism and Whiggery represented the same interests in society, the same aspirations for power, the same essential economic policies"<sup>2</sup> for "both intended to serve the business classes, but the revolution in political values forced the Whigs to talk as if they intended primarily to serve the common man."<sup>3</sup>

He did not introduce any really new concepts under the topics which have been discussed in this survey. Several of the earlier historians had described the Democratic and Whig parties as having represented opposing

---

<sup>1</sup>Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Age of Jackson (Boston, 1945), p. 257.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 279.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.



classes. Schlesinger identified each of the two parties with the same social and economic groups, and used the same phrases that all of the previous authors had used. Nevertheless, after this book was published many historians began to re-examine the complete Jacksonian period. Some of the new studies arrived at conclusions that were contrary to the older accepted generalizations that have been quoted in this and the preceding chapter. It was the purpose of these authors to revise the older concepts and to arrive at a truer understanding of the Jacksonian period. Their results will be examined in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE NEW STUDIES OF THE JACKSONIAN PERIOD 1948-1961

Not all of the results of the current interest in the Jacksonian period have appeared in book form. Some historians have presented their findings in professional journals. An example was an article entitled "Who Were the Southern Whigs?" by Charles Grier Sellers, Jr. The article appeared in the American Historical Review in 1954.

In the article, the impression of the Whig party in the South as derived from such respected historians as Cole, Carroll, and Sydnor was disputed. Sellers stated that there has survived through the political histories which have been written "a series of myths about the political life of the South in the 1830's and 1840's."<sup>1</sup> He recognized that even though these myths had some basis in fact, they were still "the product of a misplaced emphasis which has permeated nearly all the studies of pre-Civil War southern politics."<sup>2</sup> He then goes on to explain how these erroneous concepts came to be accepted:

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles Grier Sellers, Jr., "Who Were the Southern Whigs?" The American Historical Review, LIX (1954), 335.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 336.

What did this Whig party stand for? The pioneer account of the southern Whigs was the essay of U. B. Phillips which, significantly, appeared in the Festschrift to Frederick Jackson Turner. This study shows Phillips' characteristic tendency to generalize about the entire South on the basis of conditions in his native Georgia.<sup>1</sup>

Two years after Phillips' essay appeared, Arthur C. Cole published his exhaustive monograph, The Whig Party in the South. Less than a third of the Cole volume is concerned with the period before 1844, when Whiggery was of greatest importance in the South, and he generally follows the Phillips interpretation of its origin.<sup>2</sup>

Cole had stated that the most important issue in the South was the one concerning states rights. In the article, Sellers cited the voting records of Southern congressmen for the 1831-1837 period in order to prove this statement false. Sellers' interpretation of the statistics was that the main elements of the Whig party were composed of the large staple producers and the urban commercial groups. He identified them as "the principal elements which went into the Whig party."<sup>3</sup> The main difference between the conclusions reached by Cole and Sellers was that they were referring to the same party, but discussing different features of it. In his book, Cole was identifying those groups who were the back-

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 337.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 340.

bone and principal supporters of the Whig party. Sellers went one step further and identified that group within the South that provided the principal leadership for the Whig party and determined its policies. Thus, he was not truly proving Cole to have been in error. The conclusion reached by Sellers was that the leadership of the Whig party was "furnished mainly by the commercial groups of the cities and towns, with their allied lawyers and editors."<sup>1</sup> His findings were summarized in one statement:

. . . the Whig party in the South was controlled by urban commercial and banking interests, supported by a majority of the planters, who were economically dependent on banking and commercial facilities.<sup>2</sup> \*

If these statements of Sellers were compared with the passages that were quoted from Cole's book in Chapter I, it would be seen that no significant differences existed between the two studies. Regardless of which aspect of the Whig party they stressed, the two historians came up with the same basic conclusions. Both identified the Whig party in the South with the commercial-banking-planter-lawyer groups. They only differed on the question of which of these groups were the most powerful in the \*

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 341.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 346.

alliance. Sellers stated that the commercial interests were the most powerful and influential while Cole did not stress the point. In the article, Sellers did not differ with the fundamental concepts of political life in the South as stated by the earlier writers.

Several years after the Sellers article appeared, Grady McWhiney wrote an article entitled "Were the Whigs a Class Party in Alabama?" It appeared in The Journal of Southern History. The purpose of the author was to re-examine the generalizations concerning the fact that the political parties during the Jacksonian period could be identified as class parties.

McWhiney regarded the old concepts with the same contempt as Sellers. He stated that "this concept of the Whigs as a class party has not only been incorporated into textbooks but has been endorsed almost without exception by serious students of the period."<sup>1</sup> He then posed two of the concepts as questions to be answered by his article:

Were the Alabama Whigs almost exclusively large planters and slaveholders? the Democrats small farmers and nonslave-holders? Do the county returns for the six presidential elections (1836 through 1856) in which there was a Whig nominee

---

<sup>1</sup>Grady McWhiney, "Were the Whigs a Class Party in Alabama?" The Journal of Southern History, XXIII (1957), 510.

show that the Whigs were a class party? Do the background, education, occupations and religious affiliations of men elected to Congress and to the Alabama legislature suggest that the Whigs were 'the party of the wealthier and more cultivated people?'<sup>1</sup>

In answer to the first question, McWhiney stated that "it cannot be denied that many Whig voters lived in the Alabama Black Belt; nor is it denied that the Democrats received more votes than the Whigs in most of the counties where there were few slaves. What has not been sufficiently emphasized, however, is that the Whigs did not receive votes just in the Black Belt or that areas of small farmers were not the only Democratic strongholds."<sup>2</sup> McWhiney came to this conclusion after a careful analysis of the voting results in the various counties of Alabama for several elections between 1836 and 1856. By these results he was able to demonstrate that on certain occasions each party polled majorities in the other's "strongholds." Even though he was able to demonstrate this fact he still did not really refute the basic concept. In Chapter III there are quotations from the book on Southern sectionalism by Sydnor which discussed the inconsistency of the Southern voter. None of the earlier writers had claimed that the Whigs were receiving votes

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 512.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

from only certain areas and the Democrats receiving votes only from the other areas. In any election both parties had received some votes from all areas of a state. Even Sydnor after discussing the independent attitude of the Southern voter had to admit that certain groups were most likely to be found supporting the Whig party and opposite groups were found supporting the Democratic party. It is this last point which McWhiney is labeling as one of the myths, but in this article he failed to prove the concept erroneous.

In order to answer the second question, McWhiney made a systematic study of the numerous Alabama Congressmen and state legislators who held office between 1836 and 1856. He attempted to obtain information about these men in each of the areas enumerated in the question. After compiling, evaluating, and comparing these statistics, he was able to arrive at the conclusion that "it cannot be proved by the men who sat in Congress and in the Alabama legislature that great social differences existed between the two parties."<sup>1</sup> In this section of his argument McWhiney used the many legislators as the representative group of men who comprised each party. By using this method he may have committed a fundamental error. It was very possible, especially in the case of

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 521.

the Whig party, that all or some of these men were simply the servants of the real leaders of the party. They may have had no personal power at all. They may have been the representatives of the special interest groups that controlled the party in the state. If this were true, and the possibility was very strong that this was the real situation, then these men could not be properly used as a representative sample of the social and economic groups that comprised each party. And, if this was the case then the conclusions reached by McWhiney were invalid.

The first question discussed by McWhiney concerned the voting trends in the various areas of Alabama. He recognized the fact that each party received some votes from all areas of the state. In his book The Jacksonian Persuasion, Marvin Meyers discussed this same point. He realized that during the Jacksonian period the two political parties "were alert to interests everywhere in society."<sup>1</sup> Although he was aware of this situation, he found that he was still "tempted to think that Jacksonian Democracy found a major class constituency, identified its concrete needs, catered to them in its program, won the interested vote, and so became a great political

---

<sup>1</sup>Marvin Meyers, The Jacksonian Persuasion (Stanford, 1957), p. 5.



force; and that the Whigs did much the same thing with opposite interests and policies."<sup>1</sup> Meyers would disagree with those who spoke of the two parties in terms of class organization. His explanation of the voting statistics was as follows:

The parties show some interesting marginal variations in their sources of support; nonetheless--given the relatively loose class structure, the heavy concentration in the middle social ranks as then identified (farmers, mechanics, shopkeepers), the flexibility of careers and the mixture of interests--it seems clear that both parties must have reached broadly similar class constituencies to gain, as they did, only a little more or less than half the popular vote. In sum: social differences were subtly shaded and unstable; party policies were ambiguous in their probable effects upon group interests; and so no general and simple class difference appears in party preferences.<sup>2</sup>

No one would argue with McWhiney or Meyers that in order to win an election a political party must appeal to all segments of the electorate. Even as early as the 1840's the party platforms were designed to attract as many voters as possible, just as they are today. However, at the very same time a political party can exist for and be under the control of a small faction of special interest groups. Political parties have resorted to ambiguous, broadly-based platforms and popular candidates many times in order to hide the true party leadership and their special interests. Thus, it is clear that election

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

results alone cannot be used to determine if the concepts that are under attack are true or false.

In his book Banks and Politics in America, Bray Hammond presented his own interpretation of the social and economic forces behind the political battles of the Jacksonian period. He described the Jacksonians as:

The humbly born and rugged individualists who were gaining fortunes by their own toil and sweat, or wits, were still simple Americans, Jeffersonian, anti-monopolistic, anti-government, but caught with the spirit of enterprise and fired with a sense of what soon would be called manifest destiny.<sup>1</sup>

They envied the social and economic advantages of the established urban capitalists, mercantile and financial. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Though their cause was a sophisticated one of enterpriser against capitalist, of banker against regulation and of Wall Street against Chestnut, the language was the same as if they were all back on the farm.<sup>3</sup>

Their terms of abuse were 'oppression,' 'tyranny,' 'monied power,' 'aristocracy,' 'wealth,' 'privilege,' 'monopoly'; their terms of praise were 'the humble,' 'the poor,' 'the simple,' 'the honest and industrious.'<sup>4</sup>

Hammond did not view the political conflicts as a class war, as that phrase was traditionally used. Rather, he said:

It was a blow at an older set of capitalists by a

---

<sup>1</sup>Bray Hammond, Banks and Politics in America (Princeton, 1957), p. 328.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 328-29.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 328.

newer, more numerous set. It was incident to the democratization of business, the diffusion of enterprise among the mass of people, and the transfer of economic primacy from an old and conservative merchant class to a newer, more aggressive, and more numerous body of businessmen and speculators of all sorts.<sup>1</sup>

The conclusion reached by Hammond was that the political battles of the Jacksonian period could not be described as a class conflict but they should be described as a conflict between opposing groups within the business community. His interpretation was a significant departure from the long accepted concepts as stated by all of the previous historians. In the earlier books the authors had combined all segments of the business community under one heading and then assigned the complete group to the Whig party. Hammond's summary was that "this new common man was manufacturer, banker, builder, carrier, and promoter." He belonged to the "active and enterprising," as against the "wealthier classes,"<sup>2</sup> "and his conflict was not the traditional one between the static rich and the static poor but a dynamic, revolutionary one between those who were already rich and those who sought to become rich."<sup>3</sup>

Not all of the works published since Schlesinger's book were written by revisionists. Some of the recent

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 329.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 349.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

volumes still repeat the older, long accepted concepts. An example of this type of book was A History of Presidential Elections by Eugene H. Roseboom. The author described the Whig party in the South by using phrases which were similar to those used by Cole, Carroll, and Sydnor.

Roseboom wrote that at its core the Whig party "was essentially conservative in the cotton South and centered in the areas of the large plantations and their urban hubs, where businessmen and planters cooperated in politics as they did in the business world."<sup>1</sup>

When he discussed the two parties in other areas of the nation, his statements became very similar to the ones written earlier by Streeter, Fox, and Turner. For example, he stated that "sectionally, the Whig party was strong in conservative New England and where transplanted New Englanders lived in the old Federalist seaboard areas of the Middle Atlantic states, in the wealthier, long settled parts of the Ohio valley, and in the Black Belt of the South."<sup>2</sup> He also stated that the two parties could be divided on the basis of religion, occupation, or place of birth:

---

<sup>1</sup>Eugene H. Roseboom, A History of Presidential Elections (New York, 1957), p. 110.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 111.

Middle-class Protestants, temperance advocates, and nativists found the Whig party a more suitable vehicle than the Democracy with its growing German and Irish segments.<sup>1</sup>

The labor element broadly reformist and humanitarian, contributed to the success of a number of reforms, notably free public schools, but its political influence was most effective in the Democratic party.<sup>2</sup>

The Whigs had the advantage here, for the foreign-born were generally Democrats.<sup>3</sup>

Another of the recent publications that repeated the older concepts was called Political Man and was written by Seymour Martin Lipset. Unlike most of the other authors used in the survey, Lipset was not a historian, but a political scientist. However he relied upon the historian to supply him with his basic information and facts. He accepted the statements of the historians that he consulted without reservation. His book demonstrates how difficult it would be to destroy the long accepted generalizations even if some of the present day revisionists could prove them to be false. The following quotations serve as examples of the way Lipset stated the accepted concepts:

If one compares the results of the elections from 1840-1860, one finds that in each of them, in both

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 115.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 132.

North and South, the Democrats were disproportionately backed by the lower strata--the poorer farmers, the foreign born, the non-Anglo-Saxons, the Catholics, and the nonslaveholders in the South; while the Whigs were based on the more privileged classes--the merchants, the more well-to-do farmers, the native-born Protestants of Anglo-Saxon ancestry, and of the large slaveholding plantation owners.<sup>1</sup>

Although the data are unsystematic and incomplete, an examination of election returns by county for the South suggests that the two major parties, Whig and Democratic, divided the electorate more or less along economic and status lines from the 1830's on.<sup>2</sup>

It was only a matter of time before some of the thinking of the revisionists such as Sellers, McWhiney, and Hammond began to appear in the general historical works. The next two books demonstrate how the new interpretations of the Jacksonian period have been stated by authors who were attempting to describe the period while the controversy was taking place.

The first book, The American Political Tradition, was written by Richard Hofstadter. In his narrative the author included the basic concept of the division in the business community as explained by Hammond. Hofstadter described the Jacksonian period as a struggle "of large sections of the community against a business elite and

---

<sup>1</sup>Seymour Martin Lipset, Political Man (New York, 1959), p. 346.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 352.

its allies."<sup>1</sup> He agreed with Hammond that the main issue between the Democrats and Whigs was in the area of economics. He divided the business community into two groups just as Hammond had done and placed them in opposing parties. He even used the same phrases that Hammond had used when he wrote that "in the Jacksonian period the democratic upsurge was closely linked to the ambitions of the small capitalist,"<sup>2</sup> and "the Jacksonian movement had broadened into a fight against economic privilege," rallying to its support a host of "rural capitalists and village entrepreneurs."<sup>3</sup>

In the second book, The Jacksonian Era 1828-1848, by Glyndon G. Van Deusen, Hammond's conclusions and phrases were again repeated. Van Deusen explained that the economic conflict was really "between the rising entrepreneurial class and the elite group, the former being anxious for bank credits and resentful of the superior privileges of the wealthier bankers and businessmen."<sup>4</sup> He defined the elite group as being conservatives who

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard Hofstadter, The American Political Tradition (New York, 1948), p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

<sup>4</sup>Glyndon G. Van Deusen, The Jacksonian Era 1828-1848 (New York, 1959), p. 13.

preferred the Whigs rather than the Democrats.<sup>1</sup>

Van Deusen also repeated many of the old generalizations. He made several statements which were similar to the ones made by Cole, Turner, and some of the other early writers. Thus in this volume the author included many concepts from the older historians as well as the basic conclusion of one of the current interpretations. He presented them in such a manner that no conflict appeared to exist between the two schools of thinking. Some of the old generalizations that he re-stated were that in New England, "a majority of the small farmers and fishermen, and at least some city laborers, joined the Jacksonians."<sup>2</sup> In the South the Democratic party had "the support of a majority of the smaller planters and the grain-growing, non-slaveholding farmers,"<sup>3</sup> and "in the West, frontiersmen and small farmers with their passion for free land and tax-supported public schools tended to gravitate in to the Democracy."<sup>4</sup> His summary of the Whig party could have been taken from almost any of the early works.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 92.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 93.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.



Whiggery had certain general characteristics. It was socially conservative. Dominated by those with vested interests, those who had 'arrived,' it distrusted the city rabble, the backwoodsman, the illiterate in general.<sup>1</sup>

In the course of this survey of historical opinion on the nature of the two political parties during the Jacksonian period, many works have been cited which were studies of the two parties in a specific state during the period being considered. Since the controversy began, two new works of this type have been published. Even though they both deal with a Southern state, they are still of interest because they were completed at a time when the whole Jacksonian period was being re-interpreted and the older works re-evaluated. The conclusions of these authors will be used by other historians in comparisons with the conclusions reached by the writers of the earlier state studies. The reputations of Cole, Carroll, Sydnor, and some of the others will be affected by the statements made in these newer books.

The first of the two studies, The Whigs of Florida 1845-1854 by Herbert J. Doherty, Jr., was the more important of the pair because in conducting his research Doherty used what could be termed more precise research methods. He based some of his conclusions on the results

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 97.

of a socio-economic analysis of the leaders of the two parties. What is more important he, unlike most of his predecessors, made a clear distinction between those who gave the party its voting support and those who held the leadership roles within the party.

On the subject of voting support, Doherty arrived at conclusions which were in complete agreement with the established generalizations. He found that he could show a definite correlation "between property ownership and political affiliation"<sup>1</sup> in Florida. He also found that the "Whigs in Florida tended to be men of greater property holdings than were the Democrats."<sup>2</sup>

Doherty's statistics were in agreement with those of Cole, Carroll, and the other earlier writers who had discovered a connection between the Whig party in the Southern states and the large slaveholders. Some of his findings were:

Studies of the Whig party in the South generally have assumed a close correlation between the Whig strongholds and the heavy slaveholding and cotton-producing areas. To a considerable extent that general pattern was true in Florida.<sup>3</sup>

The total slave population of the eleven Whig counties was 25,883 as compared with 13,639 in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Herbert J. Doherty, Jr., The Whigs of Florida 1845-1854 (Gainesville, 1959), p. 63.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

twelve Democratic counties.<sup>1</sup>

The total valuation placed on farm land of these eleven Whig counties was \$4,187,391, as contrasted with \$1,416,113 for ten Democratic counties.<sup>2</sup>

Four of the top counties in the state, so far as value of farm land, number of bales of cotton produced, number of slaves, and size of white population are concerned, were Whig counties.<sup>3</sup>

The strongholds of the Democratic party in Florida were for the most part the thinly populated poorer counties which usually had more whites than slaves.<sup>4</sup>

These findings, however, were not the most important part of this study. Doherty's most significant conclusions were on the subject of party leadership. In order to gather statistics on this topic, he first determined which men held positions of leadership within each of the two political parties. He then compiled several statistical sets of social and economic findings on each of the men he had identified as leaders. After analysing and comparing the statistics Doherty arrived at the following conclusions concerning the leaders of the two parties:

The backgrounds of the individual citizens who took part in Florida politics fall into a general pattern which does not do violence to the generalizations.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 64.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 68.

Thus at the highest levels of leadership, where party politics and programs were shaped, the slaveholding and real-property differences between Whigs and Democrats were far sharper than at lower levels.<sup>1</sup>

It is apparent, however, that the leadership of the Whig party was more predominantly drawn from the wealthy slaveholding, land-owning, upper South 'gentry,' than was the leadership of the Democratic party.<sup>2</sup>

These conclusions confirm, at least for the state of Florida, that the implications contained in the standard generalizations were correct. Doherty found that the same groups supported the Whig party regardless of whether he was using voting statistics or actual party leaders. After reading the several studies conducted in the Southern states over the years, one gets the strong impression that if the methods used by Doherty were used in the studies of the other Southern states, the results would be the same. In the South, there seems to be a definite correlation between those groups that supplied the voting strength for each party and those groups that provided the leaders for each party.

The second of the new studies was concerned with Mississippi. However, in it the author followed the methodology of the older works and did not go beyond the use of voting statistics. The study is still of interest

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

because it agreed with the conclusions reached in the earlier works. Thus, all of the studies conducted in the Southern states came to the same conclusions. This last book was entitled Jacksonian Democracy in Mississippi and was written by Edwin Arthur Miles. He found that in Mississippi the political battles of the Jacksonian period contained the elements of a class struggle. The Whig party "received its most uniform support from the planting and commercial interests of the river counties,"<sup>1</sup> and its "strength lay in the older settled regions of the state . . . where the plantation system had already developed extensively."<sup>2</sup> The Democratic strength in Mississippi "lay in the Choctaw and Chickasaw counties in north and central Mississippi, still for the most part frontier territory."<sup>3</sup>

The last, and most recent book to be discussed in this survey was written by Lee Benson and called The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy. In it Benson not only analyzed those groups which provided voting support for each political party, but, like Doherty, he also analyzed and compared the leaders of each party. The purpose of the study was to test the established generalizations and

---

<sup>1</sup> Edwin Arthur Miles, Jacksonian Democracy in Mississippi (Chapel Hill, 1960), p. 86.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 158.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

he used the state of New York as the testing area. Like Sellers and McWhiney, Benson considered the old concepts to be "time honored but ill-founded preconceptions about liberal Jacksonian Democracy and conservative Whiggery."<sup>1</sup>\*

The single early study that was directly confronted by the conclusions reached by Benson was the highly respected and much cited work by Fox. Benson went much deeper than Fox in analyzing the voting results in the wards of New York City and some outstate areas. The result of this more scientific and systematic analysis was that many of the conclusions that had been reached by Fox were disputed by Benson.

Benson did agree with the earlier historians who had stated that the Whig party was composed of many factions. He stated that they were "best described as a loose, heterogeneous political coalition."<sup>2</sup> However, unlike Fox, Benson did not find a direct connection between the old Federalist party and the new Whig party. His findings were as follows:

Examination of the constitutional theories of the Whigs and Democrats also shows the invalidity of the Federalist-Whig, Republican-Democrat formula.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lee Benson, The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy (Princeton, 1961), p. 105.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

It is true that the Whigs resembled the Federalists in affirming the broad power and clear responsibility of organs of government to promote the general welfare. But it is equally true . . . that the Whigs radically differed from the Federalists in their concepts of political economy.<sup>1</sup>

In my opinion, the superficial analogies drawn between the parties have warped American political historiography. They do not take into account the political transformations which populist egalitarianism brought about, or the crucial differences which exist between the old parties and the new ones.<sup>2</sup>

Benson disagreed with those historians who automatically relate the voting results of a certain area to the economic level of the voters within that specific area. He used statistics from New York City in order to prove that:

The data cited above show that the moderate to strong Democratic percentages in six of the seventeen wards did not necessarily relate to their economic class composition. Instead, they suggest that the high Democratic party percentages may actually have reflected the overwhelming support of Irish Catholic, German, and French voters, as well as Catholics in general, regardless of class, for the Democratic party.<sup>3</sup>

In his conclusions, Benson strongly differed from the previous historians on the subject of which groups supported each party and why they gave that particular party their support. Unlike the earlier writers he found

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 144.

that the Democratic party's "strength was actually concentrated among voters who belonged to certain religious and ethnic groups, not among lower class voters per se."<sup>1</sup> Everyone of his major conclusions challenged the validity of one of the older generalizations. Some of his findings were:

Thus detailed analysis of the returns in Buffalo, New York City, and every other city in the state not only fails to support the traditional claims about voting behavior, but it demonstrates that the lower class-Democratic relationship is a spurious one.<sup>2</sup>

Taking the state as a whole, we find that no significant relationship existed between wealth and voting in 1844.<sup>3</sup>

Systematically examined, therefore, the data reveal that the traditional economic interpretation of voting behavior breaks down in the rural areas as well as in the cities.<sup>4</sup>

This deviant case and several similar ones suggest that, particularly in the absence of severe economic depression, party loyalty and ethnic or religious pressures influence voters more powerfully than membership in tariff-oriented occupational groups or in any other kind of politically-sensitive occupational group.<sup>5</sup>

On the basis of these facts Benson came to the conclusion that the explanation of voting behavior and voting

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 146.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 147.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 156.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 163.



patterns was "that at least since the 1820's . . . ethnic and religious differences have tended to be relatively \* the most important sources of political differences."<sup>1</sup> Just as he disputed the generalization that all lower class voters belonged to the Democratic party, Benson also disputed the generalization that all foreign-born voters belonged to the Democratic party. On the contrary, he found that the "collection and analysis of the relevant data reveal that the sharpest political cleavages occurred, not between immigrants and Yankees, but between different groups of immigrants."<sup>2</sup>

Among the many authorities who have been used previously in this survey, only Doherty attempted to identify and then systematically study the real leaders of each party. Benson did make this type of analysis of the party leaders in New York and his results again disputed the conclusions and implications of the earlier works. He stated that in New York between 1834 and 1844:

If parties were characterized solely by the leaders they keep, it would be difficult to distinguish between the Democrats and Whigs. A composite account of their social and economic backgrounds reveals striking similarities.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 165.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 64.

Unless fine criteria are used, however, both parties can be said to have recruited their leaders from the same social and economic strata.<sup>1</sup> \*

Instead, the evidence indicates that the same socioeconomic groups provided leadership for both parties.<sup>2</sup> \*

When we penetrated the rhetorical surface and struck hard data, however, we found that farmers, mechanics, and 'working classes' did not form the 'main-stay' of the Democratic party.<sup>3</sup> \*

Instead of low-status socioeconomic groups, the Jacksonians' strongest support came from relatively high-status socioeconomic groups in the eastern counties, and relatively low-status ethnocultural and religious groups in all sections of New York.<sup>4</sup> \*

With these statements Benson has challenged all of the previous works, including those of Sellers and McWhiney. His findings for the state of New York were in opposition to the conclusions reached by Doherty in Florida.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 331.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 331-332.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS FROM SURVEY OF HISTORICAL OPINION

After reading all of the works cited in the preceding chapters one is left with several impressions. All of the historians who were included in the discussion attempted to explain the terms "Democrat" and "Whig." However, they used various methods of arriving at their descriptions. Most of the historians obtained their data by examining election results in order to determine voting support. A few also considered party candidates and office holders, usually at the state and national level, but never at the local level. Only two of the authorities, Doherty and Benson, actually attempted to describe the terms after making a detailed study of those individuals who constituted the actual party leadership.

Regardless of which approach might have been used, it was evident that there was general agreement among these historians as to which groups constituted the Democratic and Whig parties. The only authors who would strongly disagree with the consensus of opinion were Hammond and Benson. All of the other studies, especially the one by Doherty, tend to confirm the basic generaliza-

tions that were formulated over the decades before the publication of the Age of Jackson by Schlesinger.

However, in spite of all the evidence that has accumulated from the various studies of the two political parties, a number of questions can still be raised. Are the accepted generalizations really valid, or are all of the works that confirm them based upon insufficient data and incomplete research? Should the descriptions of the two political parties read one way for the Northern states and another way for the Southern states? Is it possible that Doherty and Benson were both correct?

The purpose of the second part of this thesis is to present more evidence on the question of party leadership. This is accomplished by conducting an intensive, systematic analysis of the Democratic and Whig leaders in Wayne County, Michigan in 1844.

In the last chapter of this paper the results of this study will be compared with the accepted generalizations and the finding of such revisionists as Hammond and Benson. The difference between this study and the previous ones is that it will be limited to only one county in one specific year. In other words, it will be conducted at the local level instead of at the state or regional level. The statistics collected at the county level should result in a more exact description of the party leadership than a similar analysis conducted over a larger area.

## CHAPTER VI

### INTRODUCTION TO ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IN WAYNE COUNTY

The first task in doing an analysis of this type was to determine who were the leaders of each party. The initial problem was to find a source of information that would supply this type of data. This was solved by using the newspapers in Detroit. The Democratic Free Press and the Detroit Daily Advertiser were the major newspapers in the city. The former supported the Democratic party and the latter supported the Whig party.

Each paper reported political activities throughout the year. They not only announced the numerous party meetings and conventions, but also reported on the results of the meetings and listed the names of those who had taken part. None of the other newspapers of the city or county supplied this type of information in any significant amount. However, the two newspapers did not supply an equal amount of information. The Free Press seemed to announce the greater number of meetings and report on the results of the meetings in greater detail than did the Daily Advertiser. As a result, two lists were compiled of men who had been active in politics during 1844.

The first contained the names of 257 men who were active in the Democratic party during 1844 and the second contained the names of 185 men who were active in the Whig party. As each man was listed, the role he had played in the party's affairs was also noted.

After the list for each party was completed, the next step was to attempt the acquisition of biographical data for each of the names on the lists. The following is a summary of the items of data that were sought for each one of the men on the two lists:

1. Place of residence
2. Place of birth
3. Date of birth
4. Date of arrival in Wayne County
5. Occupation
6. Religion
7. Education
8. Economic status
9. Previous political offices
10. Political activity in 1844

The information was obtained from numerous sources.<sup>1</sup>  
The complete list of the sources that were used appears in the bibliography for this section of the thesis.

---

<sup>1</sup>The introduction to Appendix D, which is the bibliography for this section of the thesis, explains how the data was gathered. No one single source could be used for

Even though many sources were used, it was not possible to obtain a complete set of data for each of the names on the two lists. A great deal of information could be obtained for the prominent men while no information could be obtained for the more obscure men.

After all of the sources of information had been exhausted, it was possible to eliminate from each list the names of those men who should not be included among the most important leaders of their party. The men who were the most important leaders in each party were determined by establishing a list of criteria in order to rank their importance within their own party. The criteria were divided into three levels.

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Most important:          | National political office<br>State political office<br>High ranking city political office<br>High ranking county political office                                    |
| Second in<br>Importance: | Member state central committee<br>Member county central committee<br>Party officer on local, county, or<br>state level<br>Officer of an important party<br>meeting   |
| Least in<br>Importance:  | Delegate to one or more party con-<br>ventions<br>Nominated for important political<br>office<br>Former holder of high political office<br>Position in the community |

---

all the names on the two lists or for all of the items of data desired. Each source of information was used as much as possible. Therefore, several sources had to be used in order to attempt to gather all of the necessary data on each man. All of the sources listed in Appendix D contributed something to the search for information.

By using the above list, it was possible to settle upon 90 men in each party who, on the basis of the information that was gathered, constituted the top leadership in the two parties in Wayne County in 1844.

However, it was still not possible to collect a complete set of data on all 90 men in each party's list. This fact must be kept in mind as the tables of data are studied. The following table indicates the number of individual items that could be collected under each category.

TABLE 1  
SUMMARY OF NUMBER OF STATISTICS THAT  
COULD BE OBTAINED IN EACH CATEGORY

|                                 | Democrats | Whigs           |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Place of residence              | 90        | 90              |
| Place of birth                  | 72        | 62              |
| Date of birth                   | 72        | 61              |
| Date of arrival in Wayne County | 58        | 56              |
| Occupation                      | 82        | 76              |
| Religion                        | 42        | 46              |
| Education                       | 10        | 20              |
| Economic status                 | 66        | 59 <sup>1</sup> |
| Previous political office       | 67        | 44 <sup>1</sup> |

<sup>1</sup>There are several books which contain short biographies of important leaders in Michigan during the period that was studied. These biographies usually contained information on the date and place of birth, occupation, and sometimes religion and education.

The books that contained these biographies were: Early History of Michigan with Biographies of State Officers, Members of Congress, Judges and Legislators by S. D. Bingham; The Red Book of Michigan by Charles Lanman; The Early Bench and Bar of Detroit by Robert B. Ross; History of Detroit and Wayne County by Silas Farmer; and



In the next eight chapters this data will be analyzed and compared in order to point up the similarities and differences between the leaders of the two parties.

The analysis will be divided into three levels. The first part of the analysis will consider the complete list of 90 men from each party. When this has been completed a chapter will be devoted to an analysis of the top 30 leaders from each party. The final analysis will be made of the top 10 leaders from each party.

The results of these separate comparisons should clearly determine what similarities and differences existed between the most important leaders of the two major political parties of Wayne County in the year 1844.

Even after all of the possible sources of information on the political parties were checked, there was no guarantee that all of the real leaders of the two parties were discovered and their roles identified. It was very possible that some influential leaders were not included and the roles of some of the men were inaccurately evaluated. However, if this were true then none of the many sources consulted and used in the preparation of the dis-

---

the books by Clarence M. Burton. These books were the main sources of information. The other books, biographies, histories, and genealogies only contributed a small amount of data in terms of the entire lists. The next seven chapters will include many tables of statistics. The information for any single table was compiled from many of the sources listed in Appendix D. No individual volume contained all of the information used in any one table.

cussion indicated this fact. None of the sources indicated that either party was being controlled by men who desired to keep their identity unknown to the general public.

## CHAPTER VII

### COMPARISON OF PARTY LEADERS BASED UPON OCCUPATION

Most of the books that were used in the preceding survey of historical opinion stressed the issue that the supporters and leaders of the two parties differed greatly on the basis of their occupations. The purpose of this chapter is to determine the accuracy of that statement insofar as it applies to Wayne County in the year under study. In order to make a comparison, the occupations were divided into six broad categories.

The following table shows the occupational distribution for the two parties. Out of the 90 names on each list, the occupations of 82 Democrats and 76 Whigs could be established.<sup>1</sup>

TABLE 2  
COMPARISON OF PARTY LEADERS BASED UPON OCCUPATION

|                    | Democrats | Whigs |
|--------------------|-----------|-------|
| Lawyers            | 25        | 21    |
| Businessmen        | 34        | 38    |
| Farmers            | 14        | 4     |
| Craftsmen-Artisans | 3         | 4     |
| Doctors            | 0         | 2     |
| Others             | 6         | 7     |

<sup>1</sup>The data on occupation was one of the easiest items

It can be seen from the above table that there were no significant differences in the number of lawyers or businessmen who were leaders in each of the two parties. Among the six categories, the two that are the most important are the lawyers and businessmen. The rest of this chapter will be devoted to making a separate analysis of the men in each of these two groups.

The 25 Democratic leaders who were lawyers and the 21 Whig leaders, also lawyers, can be compared in several ways.<sup>1</sup> The results are in the tables below.

TABLE 3  
PLACE OF BIRTH OF LAWYERS

| PLACE OF BIRTH         | Democrats (24) | Whigs (21) |
|------------------------|----------------|------------|
| New England States     |                |            |
| Massachusetts          | 4              | 1          |
| Vermont                | 2              | 3          |
| New Hampshire          | 1              | 1          |
| Connecticut            | <u>2</u>       | <u>4</u>   |
| Total                  | 9              | 9          |
| Middle Atlantic States |                |            |
| New York               | 7              | 6          |
| Pennsylvania           | <u>0</u>       | <u>3</u>   |
| Total                  | 7              | 9          |

to obtain. The best sources were the volumes containing the short biographies. Another excellent source was the Directory of the City of Detroit. In the 1845 and 1846 issues names and occupations of many of the residents of Detroit were listed.

<sup>1</sup>The best source of information on lawyers was The

TABLE 3--Continued

| PLACE OF BIRTH                   | Democrats (24) | Whigs (21) |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| <b>Other States</b>              |                |            |
| Washington, D.C.                 | 1              | 0          |
| Kentucky                         | 1              | 0          |
| Ohio                             | <u>0</u>       | <u>1</u>   |
| Total                            | 2              | 1          |
| Born in Detroit                  | 1              | 2          |
| <b>Born in Foreign Countries</b> |                |            |
| Scotland                         | 3              | 0          |
| Ireland                          | <u>2</u>       | <u>0</u>   |
| Total                            | 5              | 0          |

It is obvious from these figures that the lawyers did not differ appreciably on the basis of birthplace, except in one category. Five of the lawyers who were Democratic leaders were born outside of the United States, while none of the Whig leaders was foreign born. All five of these Democrats arrived in Wayne County as young men. One arrived in 1826 at the age of 28, one in 1833 at the age of 25, one in 1834 at the age of 24, and two in 1837, their ages being 18 and 29. The only trend that this table indicates is a connection between the Democratic party and the foreign born.

Early Bench and Bar of Detroit by Robert B. Ross. The book contained a series of short biographies of the attorneys in Detroit in the first half of the 19th century.

TABLE 4

## DATE OF BIRTH OF LAWYERS

| Date of Birth | Democrats (24) | Whigs (21) |
|---------------|----------------|------------|
| Before 1800   | 7              | 4          |
| 1801-1805     | 3              | 1          |
| 1806-1810     | 9              | 5          |
| 1811-1815     | 3              | 5          |
| 1816-1820     | 2              | 3          |
| 1821-1825     | 0              | 3          |

The numbers in the above table illustrate that the Whig lawyers had a fairly even age distribution, while the vast majority of the Democratic lawyers were born before 1810. This would make them 34 years of age or older in 1844. On the Whig side of the table, 10 men were born before 1810 and 11 were born after 1810. The conclusion that can be made from such evidence was that the lawyers who were leaders of the Democratic party tended to be older than the lawyers who were leaders in the Whig party.

TABLE 5

## DATE OF ARRIVAL IN WAYNE COUNTY OF LAWYERS

| Date of Arrival in Wayne County | Democrats (24) | Whigs (19) |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Before 1820                     | 1              | 1          |
| 1820-1825                       | 1              | 1          |
| 1826-1830                       | 2              | 3          |
| 1831-1835                       | 10             | 6          |
| 1836-1840                       | 9              | 6          |
| After 1840                      | 1              | 2          |

This table shows no differences between the two parties on the basis of arrival date in the county.

When the two groups of lawyers were compared on the basis of their religion, no differences appear.

TABLE 6  
RELIGION OF LAWYERS

| Religion         | Democrats (12) | Whigs (15) |
|------------------|----------------|------------|
| Episcopalians    | 7              | 7          |
| Presbyterians    | 5              | 6          |
| Catholics        | 0              | 0          |
| Other Protestant | 0              | 2          |

A major difference did appear when these two groups of lawyers were compared on the basis of their educational background. Only nine of the 25 Democratic lawyers graduated from a college or university, while 16 of the 21 Whig lawyers graduated from such institutions. However, it must be remembered, that in the 1830's and 1840's it was not necessary to go to a law school or have a college education in order to become a lawyer.

The second largest occupational group was the one composed of those party leaders who were businessmen. It was not possible to break down this broad heading into several smaller classifications because the sources of information, generally, only used the terms "businessman" or "merchant." It must be remembered that in 1844, De-

troit was still a frontier town with a population of only a few thousand. Most of these men owned what could be termed "general stores." Many of them, along with several lawyers, were involved in land speculation.

When these men were compared on the basis of their place of birth, a number of differences appeared. Unlike the distribution for the lawyers, which showed only one major difference (foreign born) between the two parties, the distribution for businessmen showed several significant differences:

TABLE 7  
PLACE OF BIRTH OF BUSINESSMEN

| Place of Birth         | Democrats (27) | Whigs (29) |
|------------------------|----------------|------------|
| New England States     |                |            |
| Connecticut            | 1              | 1          |
| New Hampshire          | 1              | 1          |
| Vermont                | 1              | 3          |
| Massachusetts          | <u>0</u>       | <u>5</u>   |
| Total                  | 3              | 10         |
| Middle Atlantic States |                |            |
| New York               | 9              | 10         |
| Pennsylvania           | <u>0</u>       | <u>3</u>   |
| Total                  | 9              | 13         |
| Other States           |                |            |
| Ohio                   | 1              | 0          |
| Indiana                | 0              | 1          |
| Born in Detroit        | 7              | 1          |



TABLE 7--Continued

| Place of Birth                   | Democrats (27) | Whigs (29) |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| <b>Born in Foreign Countries</b> |                |            |
| Austria                          | 1              | 0          |
| Canada                           | 1              | 2          |
| France                           | 2              | 0          |
| Germany                          | 1              | 0          |
| Ireland                          | 1              | 0          |
| Scotland                         | 1              | 1          |
| Wales                            | <u>0</u>       | <u>1</u>   |
| Total                            | 7              | 4          |

The above table showed that three times as many of the Whigs came from the New England states as did Democrats. If the two Eastern groups (New England states and Middle Atlantic states) were added together, the Whigs outnumbered the Democrats 23-12.

The table also showed that seven of the Democrats were born in Detroit while only one of the Whigs was born in the city. The Democrats also included a large number of the foreign born than did the Whigs.

If the same procedure is followed with these men as was followed with the lawyers, no real differences appear when they are compared in terms of their date of birth and date of arrival in Wayne County. The table showed that neither party could be said to have attracted the younger businessmen nor the older businessmen, but both parties attracted businessmen from all age groups. The

table dealing with their date of arrival in Wayne County also showed that neither party could be said to have exclusively attracted the early arrivals nor the late arrivals to the district. The table in which a real difference did appear was the one concerned with religion. The Whig businessmen who were party leaders were mainly of the Episcopalian and Presbyterian faiths. On the other hand, the Democratic leaders who were businessmen included many Catholics and a substantially fewer number of Episcopalians and Presbyterians than did the Whig party. This significant difference was not evident when the lawyers were compared.

TABLE 8  
SUMMARY OF STATISTICS OF BUSINESSMEN

| Date of Birth                   | Democrats (28) | Whigs (29) |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Before 1800                     | 13             | 11         |
| 1801-1805                       | 1              | 7          |
| 1806-1810                       | 8              | 5          |
| 1811-1815                       | 4              | 5          |
| 1816-1820                       | 2              | 1          |
| Date of Arrival in Wayne County | Democrats (21) | Whigs (26) |
| Before 1820                     | 3              | 8          |
| 1821-1825                       | 3              | 4          |
| 1826-1830                       | 7              | 2          |
| 1831-1835                       | 5              | 7          |
| 1836-1840                       | 3              | 4          |
| After 1840                      | 0              | 1          |

TABLE 8--Continued

| Religion          | Democrats (19) | Whigs (24) |
|-------------------|----------------|------------|
| Episcopalian      | 2              | 8          |
| Presbyterian      | 5              | 11         |
| Catholic          | 9              | 1          |
| Baptist           | 0              | 1          |
| Congregationalist | 0              | 2          |
| Methodist         | 3              | 1          |

The comparison on the basis of education could be ignored for none of the Democrats and only two of the Whigs had attended a college or university.

An important difference was brought out when the nine Democratic Catholics and one Whig Catholic were compared in terms of their background. Among the nine Democratic Catholics, six had been born in Detroit. All six were born between 1782 and 1797. Of the remaining three Democrats, one was born in France, one in Ireland, and one in Germany. The single Whig Catholic emigrated to Detroit in 1809 from Canada. He was born in 1789.

The important point that was proven by this data was that the leadership of the Democratic party in Wayne County included the businessmen from the French community in the city.

When a comparison was made of only the businessmen who were born in New York, then only those born in the Eastern states, and then those born in foreign countries,

two slight trends appeared. The table on page 85 following compare all three groups on the same basis that has been used previously.

When the columns for those born in New York were compared first, it was seen that the age distribution was fairly even and no significant differences appeared. The same could be said about the distribution based upon the date of arrival in Wayne County. The figures under the heading of religion followed the pattern that was established in the earlier part of this chapter. This remained true in spite of the fact that 12 Democrats were being compared with 23 Whigs. The section of the columns that indicated date of birth showed that the Whigs attracted the older businessmen who were born in the Eastern states. Fourteen of the Whigs were born before 1805 as compared to only five Democrats.

The part of the table that indicated date of arrival in Wayne County showed that the businessmen who were born in the Eastern states and came to Wayne County after 1830 tended to join the Whig party. The Whigs outnumbered the Democrats 12-3 in the number that arrived after 1830.

However, if we try to put the two statements together and say that the Whigs included the older businessmen who arrived in Wayne County after 1830, the data does not

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF STATISTICS OF BUSINESSMEN BORN IN NEW YORK, EASTERN STATES, FOREIGN COUNTRIES

| Date of Birth | Born in New York |            | Born in Eastern States |            | Foreign Born  |           |
|---------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|---------------|-----------|
|               | Democrats (9)    | Whigs (10) | Democrats (12)         | Whigs (23) | Democrats (7) | Whigs (4) |
| Before 1800   | 2                | 3          | 4                      | 8          | 2             | 2         |
| 1801-1805     | 1                | 2          | 1                      | 6          | 2             | 2         |
| 1806-1810     | 4                | 1          | 5                      | 3          | 3             | 2         |
| 1811-1815     | 2                | 4          | 2                      | 5          | 1             | 0         |
| 1816-1820     | 0                | 0          | 0                      | 1          | 1             | 0         |

  

| Date of Arrival<br>in Wayne County | Born in New York |           | Born in Eastern States |            | Foreign Born  |           |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------------|------------|---------------|-----------|
|                                    | Democrats (9)    | Whigs (9) | Democrats (12)         | Whigs (20) | Democrats (7) | Whigs (4) |
| Before 1820                        | 2                | 1         | 2                      | 5          | 2             | 2         |
| 1821-1825                          | 1                | 1         | 1                      | 2          | 0             | 1         |
| 1826-1830                          | 4                | 1         | 6                      | 1          | 1             | 1         |
| 1831-1835                          | 0                | 3         | 1                      | 6          | 4             | 0         |
| 1836-1840                          | 2                | 3         | 2                      | 5          | 0             | 0         |
| After 1840                         | 0                | 0         | 0                      | 1          | 0             | 0         |

  

| Religion          | Born in New York |           | Born in Eastern States |            | Foreign Born  |           |
|-------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------------|------------|---------------|-----------|
|                   | Democrats (4)    | Whigs (6) | Democrats (6)          | Whigs (17) | Democrats (4) | Whigs (4) |
| Episcopalian      | 2                | 4         | 2                      | 6          | 0             | 1         |
| Presbyterian      | 1                | 2         | 1                      | 8          | 1             | 1         |
| Catholic          | 0                | 0         | 0                      | 0          | 3             | 1         |
| Baptist           | 0                | 0         | 0                      | 1          | 0             | 0         |
| Congregationalist | 0                | 0         | 0                      | 2          | 0             | 0         |
| Methodist         | 1                | 0         | 3                      | 0          | 0             | 1         |

support this statement. Only four of the 14 Whigs who were born in the Eastern states before 1805 arrived in Wayne County after 1830. In fact, eight of the 14 arrived before 1820.

The columns on the foreign born did not include sufficient numbers to allow the formation of any generalizations.

#### Conclusions

1. There were approximately the same number of lawyers among the top 90 leaders in each party.
2. Among the lawyers who were Democrats, several were of foreign birth while none of the lawyers who were leaders of the Whig party was foreign born.
3. There were no real differences between the lawyers who were leaders in each party on the basis of the section of the United States in which they were born, when they arrived in Wayne County, or their religion.
4. The lawyers who were Democratic party leaders tended to be older than the lawyers who were Whig party leaders.
5. Almost twice as many of the lawyers who were Whig party leaders graduated from a college or university as had the lawyers who were Democratic party leaders.
6. The leadership of the Whig party included a greater

number of businessmen who were born in the Eastern states than did the Democratic party.

7. Several businessmen who were of French-Catholic origin and who were born in Detroit were included among the top 90 Democratic leaders. None was included among the top 90 Whig leaders.

8. The leadership of the Democratic party included a greater number of businessmen who were of foreign birth than did the leadership of the Whig party.

9. There was no consistent difference between the businessmen who were among the top 90 party leaders in each party on the basis of their ages or date of arrival in Wayne County. However, the Whig leadership did include more of the older businessmen from the Eastern states and more of those men who arrived in Wayne County from the Eastern states after 1830.

10. The Whig leaders who were businessmen were mainly of the Episcopalian and Presbyterian religions, while the Democratic leaders who were businessmen included almost all of the Catholics and a lesser number of Episcopalians and Presbyterians.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE BIRTHPLACES OF THE PARTY LEADERS

The books dealing with the political parties in the Middle Western states made the point that the leaders of the two parties could be compared on the basis of their place of birth.

This item could be determined for 72 out of the 90 top Democratic leaders and 61 of the 90 top Whig leaders. In the table below the distribution is shown.<sup>1</sup>

TABLE 10  
BIRTHPLACE OF THE PARTY LEADERS

| New England States            | Democrats (72) | Whigs (61) |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Vermont                       | 4              | 10         |
| Massachusetts                 | 5              | 7          |
| New Hampshire                 | 3              | 2          |
| Connecticut                   | <u>3</u>       | <u>5</u>   |
| Total                         | 15             | 24         |
| <u>Middle Atlantic States</u> |                |            |
| New York                      | 25             | 22         |
| Pennsylvania                  | 0              | 6          |
| New Jersey                    | <u>1</u>       | <u>0</u>   |
| Total                         | 26             | 28         |

<sup>1</sup>The data on birthplace was an easy item to obtain. Almost all biographies included this information. Sometimes it was limited to only the state, but many times the



TABLE 10--Continued

| Other States           | Democrats (72) | Whigs (61) |
|------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Virginia               | 1              | 0          |
| Kentucky               | 1              | 0          |
| Ohio                   | 1              | 1          |
| Washington, D.C.       | <u>1</u>       | <u>0</u>   |
| Total                  | 4              | 1          |
| <u>Born in Detroit</u> | 12             | 4          |
| <u>Foreign Born</u>    |                |            |
| Ireland                | 5              | 0          |
| Scotland               | 4              | 1          |
| Canada                 | 1              | 2          |
| France                 | 2              | 0          |
| England                | 1              | 0          |
| Germany                | 1              | 0          |
| Austria                | 1              | 0          |
| Wales                  | <u>0</u>       | <u>1</u>   |
| Total                  | 15             | 4          |

The above table showed that for both parties there were more leaders born in New York than in any other single state or area. Several of the authors who were

town or county of birth was also included. If the complete item was given in one of the books that contained short biographies, then the name could be checked in the genealogies and the histories of the other states.

For the men who were born in Detroit and were of French descent the book by Marie Caroline Watson Hamlin called Legends of Le Detroit was used in order to trace the genealogies of the French families. The Burton Historical Collection of the Detroit Public Library contained manuscripts from many of the early leaders of the French community in Detroit. Many of the manuscript collections contained biographical information that was useful.

cited in the first part of the thesis had stated that the Whig party was more attractive to immigrants from one part of New York and the Democratic party was more attractive to immigrants from another part of that state. The purpose of this section of the chapter is to systematically analyze these New York-born leaders in order to determine the validity of the claim that those with certain backgrounds became affiliated with one party and those with other backgrounds joined the other.

The actual town and/or county of birth could be ascertained for 16 of the 25 Democrats and 18 of the 22 Whigs.

The table on page 91 following shows the distribution of these men by counties and gives some indication of the location of the county in the state. In some cases, especially if the same county appears in the list for both parties, the name of the city is also included.

This table indicated that most of the leaders of both parties who were born in New York came from the out-state or up-state areas. Neither party possessed a leader born in New York City. The number from each party born in the area between New York City and Albany was too small to support a statement that the men from this area favored one of the two parties. The only conclusion that can be

TABLE 11

## BIRTHPLACE OF LEADERS BORN IN NEW YORK

|            | County     | Location            | Number Born There             |                 |
|------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Democrats: | Chautaugua | Lake Erie           | 1                             |                 |
|            | Jefferson  | Lake Ontario        | 2                             |                 |
|            | Ontario    | Lake Ontario        | 1 (Canandaigua)               |                 |
|            | Oswego     | Lake Ontario        | 2 (both from Lyons)           |                 |
|            | Franklin   | Quebec border       | 1 (Whitehall)                 |                 |
|            | Washington | Vermont border      | 1                             |                 |
|            | Herkimer   | North Central       | 2                             |                 |
|            | Oneida     | North Central       | 2 (Holland Patent, Paris)     |                 |
|            | Cortland   | Central             | 1                             |                 |
|            | Saratoga   | East Central        | 1                             |                 |
|            | Albany     | Hudson River Valley | 1                             |                 |
|            | Dutchess   | Hudson River Valley | 1                             |                 |
|            | Whigs:     | Genesee             | Lake Ontario                  | 1 (Batavia)     |
|            |            | Monroe              | Lake Ontario                  | 1               |
|            |            | Ontario             | Lake Ontario                  | 2 (Canandaigua) |
|            |            | Oswego              | Lake Ontario                  | 1 (Camillus)    |
| Washington |            | Vermont border      | 2 (Glens Falls, Fort Edwards) |                 |
| Oneida     |            | North Central       | 3 (Oneida, Utica) (2)         |                 |
| Steuben    |            | Pennsylvania border | 1                             |                 |
| Seneca     |            | West Central        | 1                             |                 |
| Montgomery |            | East Central        | 1                             |                 |
| Delaware   |            | Catskill Mountains  | 1                             |                 |
| Ulster     |            | Hudson River Valley | 1                             |                 |
| Dutchess   |            | Hudson River Valley | 1                             |                 |
| Rensselaer |            | Albany area         | 2                             |                 |

drawn from this table was that both parties attracted men from all areas of the state, especially along its northern borders.

In the following table the 25 Democrats and 22 Whigs who were born in New York are compared using the same method that has been applied in the earlier discussions.

TABLE 12

## COMPARISON OF STATISTICS OF LEADERS BORN IN NEW YORK

| Date of Birth | Democrats (23) | Whigs (22) |
|---------------|----------------|------------|
| Before 1800   | 6              | 7          |
| 1801-1805     | 3              | 4          |
| 1806-1810     | 9              | 3          |
| 1811-1815     | 3              | 5          |
| 1816-1820     | 1              | 3          |
| After 1820    | 1              | 0          |

  

| Date of Arrival<br>in Wayne County | Democrats (22) | Whigs (20) |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Before 1820                        | 2              | 2          |
| 1821-1825                          | 3              | 1          |
| 1826-1830                          | 6              | 5          |
| 1831-1835                          | 6              | 6          |
| 1836-1840                          | 5              | 6          |

  

| Religion     | Democrats (11) | Whigs (11) |
|--------------|----------------|------------|
| Episcopalian | 5              | 7          |
| Presbyterian | 3              | 4          |
| Catholic     | 1              | 0          |
| Methodist    | 2              | 0          |

TABLE 12--Continued

| Occupation  | Democrats (25) | Whigs (22) |
|-------------|----------------|------------|
| Lawyer      | 7              | 6          |
| Businessman | 9              | 10         |
| Farmer      | 8              | 2          |
| Other       | 1              | 4          |

The above table showed no differences between the leaders of the Democratic and Whig parties who were born in New York on the basis of age or date of arrival in Wayne County. The majority of these men in both parties were born before 1810 and arrived in Wayne County after 1825.

A small difference did appear in the section of the table based upon religion. The Whig party had a slightly larger total of those who were Episcopalians and Presbyterians. The lone Catholic was a Democrat. Even though the difference in numbers was very slight, it is noted here because it followed the pattern that has been established in the earlier chapters.

Another trend that appeared during the earlier discussions was that the Democratic party included more farmers among its 90 top leaders than did the Whig party. The eight Democrats who were farmers came from such counties as Dutchess, Herkimer, Jefferson, and Washington. The two Whigs who were farmers were born in Montgomery and

Ulster counties. Both Whigs were born in the southeastern part of the state. Three of the eight Democrats were born in the northern part of the state. However, the numbers here were too scant to allow the formation of any conclusions based upon this data.

The farmers did not differ in terms of age or date of arrival in Wayne County. They tended to be older men who arrived in the county before 1832. No comparison could be made on the basis of religion because the religions of only two of these men could be determined.

When the lawyers of the New York-born group were analyzed, no significant differences appeared. The Democrats were born in such counties as Oneida (2), Saratoga, Jefferson, and Chautaugua. The Whig New York-born lawyers came from such counties as Delaware, Dutchess, Ontario, Oswego, and Oneida. Thus, all of these men except two of the Whigs were born in counties outside of the southeastern section of the state. Most of the counties just listed were in the northern-Great Lakes area of the state.

When the New York-born lawyers were compared on the basis of age, the Whigs could be said to be the younger men, but to balance this fact, the Democrats generally arrived in the county later than the Whigs. In both parties, three of the men were Episcopalians and one Pres-

byterian.

The businessmen among the New York-born leaders also showed the usual patterns when their counties of birth, ages, or religions were listed. The Democrats were born in such counties as Cortland, Oneida, Oswego, Herkimer, Ontario, and Albany. The Whigs were born in such counties as Washington, Rensselaer (2), Oneida, Ontario, Steuben, and Seneca. All except one Democrat and two Whigs were born outside of the Southeastern part of the state. The youngest Democrat was born in 1812 and the youngest Whig was born in 1815. Two Democrats and four Whigs were Episcopalian and one Democrat and two Whigs were Presbyterian.

The only difference between the New York-born businessmen appeared when they were compared in terms of their date of arrival in Wayne County. Out of the nine Democrats, only two arrived after 1830 and of the eight Whigs, for whom this item could be determined, only two arrived before 1830. Thus, the Democrats tended to arrive earlier in the county.

Four of the New York-born Whigs and three of the Democrats attended a college or university.

The table at the beginning of this chapter showed that 15 of the 90 top Democratic leaders and 24 of the 90 top Whig leaders were born in New England states. Sev-

eral of the historians of the Jacksonian period such as Streeter and Fox made statements concerning the political affiliation of settlers from New England. It must be kept in mind as these men are being discussed that the Whigs outnumber the Democrats by nine men, thus their totals are constantly greater. The following table shows the distribution of these men in several categories.

TABLE 13

## COMPARISON OF STATISTICS OF LEADERS BORN IN NEW ENGLAND

| Date of Birth | Democrats (15) | Whigs (24) |
|---------------|----------------|------------|
| Before 1800   | 7              | 10         |
| 1801-1805     | 3              | 6          |
| 1806-1810     | 3              | 3          |
| 1811-1815     | 1              | 4          |
| 1816-1820     | 1              | 1          |

  

| Date of Arrival<br>in Wayne County | Democrats (14) | Whigs (23) |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Before 1820                        | 1              | 6          |
| 1821-1825                          | 1              | 2          |
| 1826-1830                          | 4              | 0          |
| 1831-1835                          | 4              | 7          |
| 1836-1840                          | 4              | 7          |
| After 1840                         | 0              | 1          |

  

| Religion          | Democrats (7) | Whigs (17) |
|-------------------|---------------|------------|
| Episcopalian      | 2             | 4          |
| Presbyterian      | 3             | 9          |
| Catholic          | 0             | 0          |
| Baptist           | 0             | 1          |
| Congregationalist | 0             | 3          |
| Methodist         | 2             | 0          |



TABLE 13--Continued

| Occupation  | Democrats (15) | Whigs (23) |
|-------------|----------------|------------|
| Lawyer      | 9              | 9          |
| Businessman | 3              | 10         |
| Farmer      | 3              | 1          |
| Other       | 0              | 3          |

The table on date of birth indicated that neither party could be said to have included the younger men who had been born in New England, or the older men who had been born in that area. Both parties showed their largest numbers in the group born before 1805. Nor can the statement be made that either party attracted the early arrivals to Wayne County from New England, or the late arrivals. Almost all of the Democrats arrived during the 15 year period from 1826 to 1840. The Whigs had larger totals for the early as well as the late periods.

However, when the section on religion was studied, a difference did appear. This was the same pattern that has been established earlier. The Whigs included more New England-born leaders who were Episcopalians and Presbyterians than did the Democrats. Neither party included a New England-born leader who was a Catholic.

Of the two Democrats who were Episcopalian, one was born in Vermont and the other was born in Massachusetts. Both were lawyers. Two of the four Whig Episcopalians

were born in Connecticut, and one each in Vermont and Massachusetts. Three of the four Whigs were lawyers and the fourth was a clothier. No important differences were noted when these men were compared in any other manner.

When the three Democrats who were Presbyterian were compared with the nine Whigs of the same church, it was found that each of the three Democrats was born in a different New England state. Four of the nine Whigs were born in Massachusetts, three in Vermont, and two in New Hampshire. Again, as in the case of the Democrats who were New England-born Episcopalians, all three of the Presbyterians were lawyers. Three of the Whigs were lawyers, five were businessmen, and one was a teacher.

All of the New England-born Presbyterians were born before 1813 and except for two Whigs they all arrived in Wayne County before 1834.

When the three Democrats and one Whig who were New England-born farmers were studied, it was found that the Democrats were born in three different states. The lone Whig was born in Vermont. All four men were born between 1796 and 1808. The Whig was the first to arrive in Wayne County. No data were found on their religion.

The section on religion for these New England-born leaders shows that two of the Democrats were Methodists.

On the Whig side, three were Congregationalist and one Baptist. Five of these men were businessmen. One Whig Congregationalist was a lawyer. One Democrat and two Whigs were born in Vermont. One from each party was born in Connecticut. They were all born before 1813. The three Whigs arrived in Wayne County after the two Democrats had arrived, but the difference was only a few years.

All nine of the New England-born Whig lawyers were graduates of a college or university and six of the nine Democratic lawyers were graduates. There were no differences between these men on the basis of date of birth or date of arrival in Wayne County.

A separate analysis must be made of those leaders from each party who were born in foreign countries. Again, this was necessary because of the many statements made by several historians cited earlier. The number of Democrats in this category was several times larger than the number of Whigs.

When the two groups were compared in terms of their birth dates, all four Whigs were born before 1810, while nine of the Democrats were born before 1810 and six afterward. These numbers seem to indicate that the Democratic party attracted the younger men who were born in foreign countries. But, this was not the important difference between them. When the two groups of men were

compared on the basis of their date of arrival in Wayne County, the data showed that all four Whigs arrived in the county between 1809 and 1826. Of the 15 Democrats, only four arrived before 1828 and 11 arrived between 1832 and 1840. This was an important difference for it illustrated a definite connection between the foreign born who had arrived in the county within the 12 years preceding 1844 and the leadership of the Democratic party.

No significant differences appeared among these men on the basis of occupation and religion. All four of the Whigs and seven of the Democrats were businessmen. In addition, five of the Democrats were lawyers and three were government officials. Each of the four Whigs was of a different religion. The religion of only five of the 15 Democrats could be determined. Three were Catholic and two Presbyterian. The three Catholics were from three different countries. The two Presbyterians were Scots.

The last important category in this chapter is concerned with those leaders who were born in Detroit. When the 12 Democrats and four Whigs who were born in Detroit were compared, some significant differences did appear. Out of the 12 Democrats, 11 were members of the French

community.<sup>1</sup> Only one of the 11 was not a Catholic. Of the four Whigs, two were from French families, one of these was a Catholic and another an Episcopalian.

In the comparison of these 12 Democrats and four Whigs on the basis of date of birth, no difference was found. Almost half (seven out of the combined total of 16) were born after 1800 and another four were born between 1801 and 1810. Thus, they tended to be older men.

Among the 12 Democrats, eight were businessmen, three were farmers, and one a lawyer. Two of the four Whigs were lawyers, one was a businessman, and the other was a mason.

It must be noted that three of the Democrats-- Joseph Campau, Charles Moran, and John R. Williams--were not only of French origin but, what is more important, they were three of the wealthiest men in the county and also three of the most influential men.<sup>2</sup> There was no dispute over the fact that Joseph Campau was the largest landowner in the county, as well as a wealthy merchant. Charles Moran had held several territorial and city of-

---

<sup>1</sup>The best sources on the French community in Detroit are the various manuscript collections and the Legends of Le Detroit by Marie Caroline Watson Hamlin.

<sup>2</sup>See the footnote for Chapter XI and the introduction to the chapter.

fices beginning in 1827. In 1844 he was elected to the city council for the sixth straight time. John R. Williams was a nephew and business partner of Joseph Campau and in 1844 he was elected mayor of Detroit for the fourth time. These facts are stated here in order to demonstrate again that there was a strong tie between the Democratic party and the French community in Detroit. These men also serve to demonstrate the fact that some of the most influential members of this community were included among the top leaders of the Democratic party. The same statement cannot be made for the Whig party.

#### Conclusions

1. Considerably more of the 90 top Whig leaders were born in the New England states than were Democratic leaders.
2. The number of leaders from each party who were born in the Middle Atlantic states was almost identical.
3. Of the 61 top Whig leaders for whom birthplace could be determined, 52 were born in the Eastern states as compared to 41 of the 72 Democratic leaders for whom this item could be determined.
4. The Democratic party included a significantly larger number of leaders who were born in Detroit than did the Whig party.

5. The Democratic party included a significantly larger number of men who were born in foreign countries among its leaders than did the Whig party.

6. Most of the New York-born leaders from each party were born in counties outside of the Hudson River Valley region.

7. The two parties showed no significant differences among their New York-born leaders on the basis of age, date of arrival in Wayne County, number of lawyers or businessmen in their ranks.

8. The Democratic party included more New York-born farmers among its 90 top leaders than did the Whig party.

9. The Whig party included more New York-born leaders who were Episcopalian or Presbyterian than did the Democratic party.

10. No significant differences appear in any category when the New York-born lawyers in each party were compared, or when the New York-born farmers were compared.

11. The only significant difference that existed between the New York-born businessmen was that the Democrats arrived in Wayne County at an earlier date than did the Whigs.

12. There was no distinction between the Democratic and Whig leaders who were born in New England on the basis of age, date of arrival in Wayne County, or occupation.

13. The number of Episcopalians and Presbyterians

among the New England-born Whigs was considerably greater than among the New England-born Democratic leaders.

14. The New England-born lawyers who were leaders in the Whig party and those who lead the Democratic party were similar when compared on the basis of age and date of arrival in Wayne County.

15. There was a definite connection between the leadership of the Democratic party and the foreign born.

16. Over 10 per cent of the 90 most important Democratic leaders were men who were born in a foreign country and had arrived in Wayne County since 1832. There were no Whig leaders who fit this description.

17. The Democratic party was closely allied with the French-Catholics in Wayne County. Several of the most influential members of this community were included among the 90 top leaders of the Democratic party.



## CHAPTER IX

### AGE COMPARISON OF THE PARTY LEADERS

It has been repeatedly shown in earlier chapters that there were no substantial differences between the 90 top leaders of the two parties on the basis of date of birth. The main table for this chapter shows the actual distribution for the 72 out of the 90 top Democratic leaders and 61 of the top 90 Whig leaders for whom this item of data could be determined. The distribution of numbers confirms what has been established by the findings in previous chapters.<sup>1</sup>

TABLE 14

### AGE COMPARISON OF THE PARTY LEADERS

| Date of Birth | Democrats (72) | Whigs (61) |
|---------------|----------------|------------|
| Before 1800   | 27             | 21         |
| 1801-1805     | 8              | 11         |
| 1806-1810     | 21             | 12         |
| 1811-1815     | 8              | 10         |
| 1816-1820     | 6              | 4          |
| After 1820    | 2              | 3          |

<sup>1</sup>The information on date of birth was included in almost all of the biographies that were used. No one source contained the ages of all of the men who were used in the analysis.

The largest single age group for both parties were those who were born prior to 1800. Among the other age groups, the numbers are almost equal for both parties, except for those men who were born between 1806-1810. The Democrats outnumbered the Whigs in this age group by nine men. However, the Whigs slightly outnumber the Democrats in the age groups on both sides of the 1806-1810 group, thus the combined totals for the 1801-1815 period were almost equal (37 Democrats-33 Whigs).

The only age group that will be dealt with on an individual basis in this chapter is the "before 1800" group. This group will be analyzed separately because it was the largest single group of men in both parties.

TABLE 15

## COMPARISON OF STATISTICS OF LEADERS BORN BEFORE 1800

| Place of Birth                | Democrats (26) | Whigs (20) |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| <b>New England States</b>     |                |            |
| Massachusetts                 | 3              | 5          |
| Vermont                       | 1              | 4          |
| Connecticut                   | 1              | 1          |
| New Hampshire                 | <u>2</u>       | <u>0</u>   |
| Total                         | 7              | 10         |
| <b>Middle Atlantic States</b> |                |            |
| New York                      | 6              | 7          |
| New Jersey                    | 1              | 0          |
| Pennsylvania                  | <u>0</u>       | <u>1</u>   |
| Total                         | 7              | 8          |

TABLE 15--Continued

|  | Democrats (26) | Whigs (20) |
|--|----------------|------------|
| <b>Other States</b>                        |                |            |
| Kentucky                                   | 1              | 0          |
| Virginia                                   | 1              | 0          |
| Born in Detroit                            | 7              | 0          |
| <b>Foreign Born</b>                        |                |            |
| France                                     | 1              | 0          |
| Scotland                                   | 1              | 0          |
| Austria                                    | 1              | 0          |
| Canada                                     | 0              | 1          |
| Wales                                      | <u>0</u>       | <u>1</u>   |
| Total                                      | 3              | 2          |
| <b>Date of Arrival<br/>in Wayne County</b> |                |            |
|  | Democrats (19) | Whigs (18) |
| Before 1820                                | 4              | 8          |
| 1820-1825                                  | 3              | 4          |
| 1826-1830                                  | 6              | 2          |
| 1831-1835                                  | 3              | 1          |
| 1836-1840                                  | 3              | 3          |
| <b>Religion</b>                            |                |            |
|  | Democrats (16) | Whigs (13) |
| Episcopalian                               | 4              | 6          |
| Presbyterian                               | 3              | 5          |
| Catholic                                   | 8              | 1          |
| Methodist                                  | 1              | 0          |
| Congregationalist                          | 0              | 1          |
| <b>Occupation</b>                          |                |            |
|  | Democrats (22) | Whigs (15) |
| Lawyer                                     | 7              | 4          |
| Businessman                                | 8              | 6          |
| Farmer                                     | 5              | 2          |
| Other                                      | 2              | 3          |

Seven Democrats and ten Whigs, as shown above, were born in New England states. Most of these men arrived in Wayne County after 1820. Only one of the Democrats and three of the Whigs had occupations other than lawyer or businessman. There was only one farmer from each party in this group. The data on religion could only be collected for three of these Democrats and six of the Whigs. It showed that one of the Democrats and one of the Whigs were Episcopalian and one of the Democrats and four of the Whigs were Presbyterian. Thus, on the basis of the data on these leaders who were born in New England before 1800, it can be stated that they showed no significant differences.

New York had the largest total for a single state in the section on place of birth. It showed that six Democrats and seven Whigs were born in that state. The county of birth could be determined for three of these Democrats and six of these Whigs. The Democrats were born in Herkimer, Dutchess, and Albany counties. The latter two counties are in the Hudson River valley. The Whigs were born in Ontario (2), Washington, Montgomery, Dutchess, and Rensselaer counties. Again, only the last two are in the Hudson River valley.

These New York-born leaders showed no real differences when they were compared on the basis of date of arrival

in Wayne County, occupation or religion. They were mainly businessmen or lawyers. Three of the Democrats and one Whig were farmers. The only data that could be collected on religion showed that one of the Democrats was Episcopalian and one Catholic. Three of the Whigs were Episcopalian and one was Presbyterian.

On the basis of this comparison, it can be stated that no significant differences existed between the leaders who were born in New York after 1800.

When comparing the birthplaces of the leaders of the two parties, the only difference which emerged is that seven of the Democrats, but none of the Whigs was born in Detroit. As might be expected on the basis of what has been stated in previous chapters, six of the seven were members of the French-Catholic community in Detroit.

Data in this chapter deals with the date of arrival in Wayne County for these leaders who were born before 1800. It shows that neither party could be said to have included the early arrivals or the late arrivals.

The distribution of numbers in the area of religion is in conformity with conclusions that have been well established in the previous chapters. The Whig party contained the larger number of Episcopalians and Presbyterians. The Democratic party included almost all of the Catholics.

The analysis of the data in the section of the table dealing with occupation was incorporated into the earlier parts of this chapter. The only point that needs to be added is that out of the group of eight Democratic businessmen, six were French-Catholics.

#### Conclusions

The leaders of the two parties did not significantly differ on the basis of age. No new conclusions were established by the analysis of the data in this chapter.

## CHAPTER X

### COMPARISONS BASED UPON DATE OF ARRIVAL IN WAYNE COUNTY AND RELIGION

No detailed analysis of these two categories will be undertaken here because the data has been continually presented in previous chapters. The table is presented at this time in order to confirm what has been proven throughout the analysis of the 90 top leaders from each party.

The table on date of arrival in Wayne County shows that the totals are nearly the same for both parties in all time periods. The portion of the table on religion indicates that the Whigs were mainly Episcopalian and Presbyterian. The Democrats had smaller totals for both of these religious groups. The Catholics represented the largest total for the Democratic party.<sup>1</sup> \*

---

<sup>1</sup>Several church histories were used in order to determine the religion of the men being studied. Most of the other sources only used the word "Protestant" when they offered this item of information. Even though the church histories were the best sources of data on religion, none of them contained extensive lists. Most of them contained the names of early church officers and a few contained birth, marriage, death, and pew lists for these years. The main problem was that many of the list of members and pew holders were entered in the wife's name and not the husband's name.

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF STATISTICS ON DATE OF ARRIVAL IN  
WAYNE COUNTY AND RELIGION OF THE LEADERS

| Date of Arrival<br>in Wayne County | Democrats (58) | Whigs (56) |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Before 1820                        | 5              | 11         |
| 1821-1825                          | 6              | 6          |
| 1826-1830                          | 12             | 8          |
| 1831-1835                          | 19             | 17         |
| 1836-1840                          | 15             | 12         |
| After 1840                         | 1              | 2          |

  

| Religion          | Democrats (42) | Whigs (46) |
|-------------------|----------------|------------|
| Episcopalian      | 11             | 15         |
| Presbyterian      | 12             | 21         |
| Catholic          | 15             | 3          |
| Baptist           | 0              | 1          |
| Congregationalist | 0              | 3          |
| Methodist         | 4              | 2          |
| Other Protestant  | 0              | 1          |

The table in Chapter VI shows that this item was the hardest to obtain among all of the items of data except education. Only a few of the short biographies mentioned the religion of the individual being discussed.



## CHAPTER XI

### COMPARISON ON THE BASIS OF ECONOMIC STATUS

The data that is included in this chapter was the least reliable of all the statistical information that has been presented in this thesis. It was for this reason that there has been no mention of this item in any of the preceding discussions.

The information on economic status was collected by using the 1844 tax rolls on real property. The tax rolls for all of the areas in the county except the 2nd Ward in Detroit were available.<sup>1</sup>

The amounts listed on the rolls were in terms of assessed valuation. It can only be presumed that they were accurately recorded and were complete. Also, it must be assumed that the method used to determine assessed valuation was the same in all of the Wards and Townships.

---

<sup>1</sup>The tax rolls were found in the Burton Historical Collection of the Detroit Public Library. They were not bound in any special manner, nor given any special titles. They were entered by hand and list the name of the tax payer, the amount of tax assessed, and the amount of assessed valuation. Many of the men owned property in several areas, and many owned the land for speculation purposes. Some land was still held as part of an earlier land grant to an original settler and the land was still held by the family.

In spite of the obvious and serious inadequacies in this data, a table is presented that shows a comparison between the top 90 leaders in both parties.

TABLE 17  
COMPARISON ON THE BASIS OF ECONOMIC STATUS

| Assessed Valuation | Democrats (66) | Whigs (59) |
|--------------------|----------------|------------|
| \$0-\$500          | 19             | 15         |
| \$500-\$1000       | 8              | 14         |
| \$1000-\$1500      | 13             | 4          |
| \$1500-\$2000      | 8              | 7          |
| \$2000-\$2500      | 3              | 7          |
| \$2500-\$3000      | 5              | 3          |
| \$3000-\$10,000    | 6              | 3          |
| Over \$10,000      | 4              | 6          |

The rest of the chapter will be devoted to a comparison of the ten Democrats and nine Whigs whose property was assessed for over \$3000. There is no doubt that some of the men in this group, such as Joseph Campau (D)-\$15,900, Lewis Cass (D)-\$71,000, Peter Desnoyers (D)-\$8,970, Charles Moran (D)-\$16,650, and John Biddle (W)-\$15,950 had large assessed valuations because they held large tracts of land for the purpose of speculation. This information was given in their biographies.

Five of the ten Democrats were members of the French-Catholic community. One Democrat was born in Scotland, one in New Hampshire, one in Vermont, and one in New York. Only two of the ten were born after 1800. In terms of their religion, the group included two Episcopalians and

two Presbyterians besides the five Catholics. Of the ten men, three were lawyers and the rest businessmen.

The men of the Whig group were mainly from the East. Three were born in New York, two in Massachusetts, and two in Pennsylvania. Of the remaining two, one was born in Canada and the other in Detroit. The Detroit-born Whig was Theodore Williams, son of the Democrat John R. Williams. John R. Williams is included among the Democrats being discussed in this chapter. He was not only a nephew, but also a business associate of Joseph Campau. It is very likely that Theodore Williams, like his father and Joseph Campau, owned land for the purpose of speculation.

These nine Whigs were slightly younger than the ten Democrats. Only four of the Whigs were born before 1800 and the rest were born between 1804 and 1813. The two groups were similar on the basis of their date of arrival in Wayne County. In each group only two men arrived in the county after 1830. One from each party arrived in 1834 and one from each party came in 1835.

The Whig group did not include any Catholics. Theodore Williams is listed as an Episcopalian. They were mainly Episcopalian and Presbyterians. Again, like the Democratic group, five were businessmen and two were lawyers. The two remaining men were farmers--both were born

in the eastern part of New York.

### Conclusions

1. On the basis of the type of data used in this chapter, the leaders of the two parties could not be divided along class lines. \*

2. Almost all of the leaders from each party could be described as middle class. \*

3. Half of the ten wealthiest leaders of the Democratic party were members of the French-Catholic community, while the Whigs were mainly born in the Eastern part of the country. \*

4. There is no significant difference between the wealthiest leaders of each party on the basis of age, date of arrival in Wayne County, or occupation. \*

## CHAPTER XII

### COMPARISON OF THE THIRTY MOST IMPORTANT LEADERS IN EACH PARTY

The preceding chapters were devoted to a comparison of the 90 top leaders from each party. The several analyses were based upon specific statistical information. It resulted in the formation of certain conclusions regarding the similarities and differences between these two groups of leaders.

The question to be answered by this chapter and the next is: Will these same conclusions hold true if the analysis is limited to the 30 most important leaders from each party and then the 10 most important leaders from each party? This chapter will deal with the group of 30 from each party and the next chapter will be limited to 10 men from each party. In Appendix B there is a list of the men used in this chapter. The names that were chosen to be included in this chapter were selected because their official party position or political office indicated that they were in the highest echelon of party leadership. In Appendix B this information is listed next to the individual's name.

In the table below the two groups are compared in the same manner that has been used in the earlier chapters. Again it must be kept in mind that a complete set of data could not be obtained for every name. Therefore, a difference of one or two on any specific item cannot always be interpreted as being of great significance.

TABLE 18  
COMPARISON OF STATISTICS OF THE THIRTY MOST  
IMPORTANT LEADERS IN EACH PARTY

| Plsce of Birth                 | Democrats (28) | Whigs (30) |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| <b>New England States</b>      |                |            |
| New Hampshire                  | 1              | 1          |
| Vermont                        | 2              | 4          |
| Connecticut                    | 2              | 2          |
| Massachusetts                  | <u>1</u>       | <u>4</u>   |
| Total                          | 6              | 11         |
| <b>Middle Atlantic States</b>  |                |            |
| New York                       | 12             | 9          |
| Pennsylvania                   | <u>0</u>       | <u>4</u>   |
| Total                          | 12             | 13         |
| <b>Other States</b>            |                |            |
| Virginia                       | 1              | 0          |
| Ohio                           | 0              | 1          |
| Born in Detroit                | 7              | 2          |
| <b>Born in Foreign Country</b> |                |            |
| Canada                         | 1              | 1          |
| Austria                        | 1              | 0          |

TABLE 18--Continued

| Place of Birth                         | Democrats (28) | Whigs (30) |
|--|----------------|------------|
| Born in Foreign Country<br>(Continued) |                |            |
| Scotland                               | 0              | 1          |
| Wales                                  | <u>0</u>       | <u>1</u>   |
| Total                                  | 2              | 3          |
| Date of Birth                          | Democrats (28) | Whigs (28) |
| Before 1800                            | 12             | 11         |
| 1801-1805                              | 4              | 4          |
| 1806-1810                              | 9              | 10         |
| 1811-1815                              | 3              | 3          |
| Date of Arrival<br>in Wayne County     | Democrats (21) | Whigs (27) |
| Before 1820                            | 5              | 7          |
| 1821-1825                              | 4              | 3          |
| 1826-1830                              | 4              | 5          |
| 1831-1835                              | 5              | 7          |
| 1836-1840                              | 3              | 5          |
| Religion                               | Democrats (18) | Whigs (22) |
| Episcopalian                           | 5              | 9          |
| Presbyterian                           | 4              | 9          |
| Catholic                               | 6              | 1          |
| Other                                  | 3              | 3          |
| Occupation                             | Democrats (29) | Whigs (30) |
| Lawyer                                 | 8              | 11         |
| Businessman                            | 15             | 14         |
| Farmer                                 | 5              | 0          |
| Other                                  | 1              | 5          |

The results of the table on Place of Birth were the same as the results for the complete group of 90 which was obtained in Chapter VIII, except for one area. The Whig total in this group of 30 under the heading of those who were born in New England is again almost twice as great as the Democratic total. The number from each party born in New York is again almost the same for both parties. The Democrats used in this group show a large majority of leaders born in Detroit, just as they have done in all of the preceding chapters. The area where there is any difference between the two tables is in the comparison of the number of foreign born leaders. In Chapter VIII the figures show that the Democratic party had almost four times the number of foreign born as did the Whig party. The table for this chapter shows that the Whigs outnumbered the Democrats under this heading 3-2.

The next two sections on Date of Birth and Date of Arrival in Wayne County show no differences between the two parties for these items. The tables in this chapter coincide with the similar tables in Chapters IX and X for the complete group of 90 men.

The section on Religion shows the same results that have been obtained throughout this analysis. The Whigs



were mainly Episcopalian and Presbyterian. The Democratic party included almost all of the men who were Catholics. ✕

The comparison based upon Occupation matches the table in Chapter VII. The majority of the men in each party were either lawyers or businessmen, and just as in the earlier chapter, the Democratic party included the larger number of leaders who were farmers.

Chapter VII dealt with those leaders from the businessman's group. If the 15 Democratic and 14 Whig businessmen were to be separately studied, the results would be the same as they were in Chapter VII. Eleven of the 15 Whigs were born in the Eastern states as compared to seven of the 14 Democrats. Five of the Democrats were born in Detroit while, just as in Chapter VIII, none of the Whigs was born in Detroit. Four out of these five Democrats were French-Catholics.

The two political parties showed no important differences based upon date of birth or date of arrival in Wayne County for these businessmen. When they were compared on the basis of religion the expected results were obtained. The 15 Democratic-Businessmen included one Episcopalian, two Presbyterians, and four Catholics. The 14 Whigs included four Episcopalians, six Presbyterians, and no Catholics.

The table for this chapter on Place of Birth shows

that 12 of the Democrats and nine of the Whigs were born in New York. The Democrats were born in Chautaugua, Jefferson (2), Oswego, Washington, Herkimer (2), Oneida (2), Courtland, Albany, and Dutchess counties. Only the last two counties were in the Hudson River Valley.

The Whigs were born in the counties of Monroe, Ontario, Washington (2), Oneida (2), Dutchess, and Rensselaer. Again, only the last two are in the Hudson River Valley.

When these New York-born leaders were compared on the basis of date of birth, date of arrival in Wayne County, religion, and occupation, they followed the patterns established in Chapter VIII.

#### Conclusion

When the 30 top leaders from each party were compared the results coincided with the results obtained in the previous chapters when the 90 top leaders from each group were compared.



## CHAPTER XIII

### COMPARISON OF THE TEN MOST IMPORTANT LEADERS IN EACH PARTY

Out of the two lists used in the preceding chapter, the ten most important men were selected to be used in this chapter. Their names appear in Appendix B and they are designated by the use of an asterisk after the name. The results of this comparison are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Place of Birth: Four of the Democrats were born in New York, three in Detroit, and one each in Connecticut and Vermont. The place of birth of one of the Democrats could not be determined. Three of the Whigs were born in New York, two in Connecticut, and one each in Massachusetts, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Canada, and Scotland. When the numbers are grouped together the result is that six Democrats and eight Whigs were born in the Eastern states. The fact that out of the ten most important Democrats three should have been born in Detroit as opposed to none of the Whigs, only confirms what has been established throughout this analysis. It is of interest to note that none of the Democrats was born in a foreign country while one of

the Whigs was born in Canada and one in Scotland, but this fact does not establish any trend for in the preceding chapter the figures show that this point was inconsequential.

Date of Birth: All of the men were born before 1815. In each party, three were born before 1800.

Date of Arrival in Wayne County: This item cannot be compared correctly because three of the Democrats were born in Detroit. Almost all of the others from both parties arrived in the county between 1822 and 1837.

Religion: The Democrats included three Catholics, two Episcopalians, and one Presbyterian. The Whigs included two Episcopalians, two Presbyterians, and one Methodist, Congregationalist, and Protestant.

Occupation: Half of the ten Democrats were lawyers, four were businessmen, and one was a farmer. Six of the ten Whigs were lawyers, two were businessmen, one a joiner, and one a physician.

All of the leaders who were born in New York came from the outstate counties. The counties were Oneida, Jefferson, and Chautaugua for the Democrats and Monroe, Washington, and Ontario for the Whigs.

All of the lawyers from both parties were born in the Eastern states. Neither party can be said to have had the younger lawyers or the older lawyers among the men used

in this chapter. Nor can either party be said to have had the lawyers who had arrived in the county early or who had arrived in the county late. The backgrounds of the five Democrats who were lawyers did not significantly differ from the six Whigs who were lawyers.

Only two out of the ten Democrats (both lawyers) graduated from a college or university. Six of the ten Whigs (five lawyers and a physician) graduated from a college or university. These numbers agree with the general distribution between the two parties on this point that has been established in the previous chapters.

Among the ten Democrats three were members of the French-Catholic community. All three were born in Detroit.

### Conclusion

When the top ten leaders from each party are compared the results coincide with the results obtained in the previous chapters when the 90 top leaders from each party were compared.

## CHAPTER XIV

### THE DATA VERSUS HISTORICAL OPINION

The only book that was used in the survey of historical opinion that dealt specifically with the Whig and Democratic parties in the state of Michigan was the one by Streeter. Many of the conclusions that were reached in the preceding chapters did not completely agree with his statements. In most of his findings Streeter was referring to the voting behavior of various groups of citizens. But, in several instances he was specifically speaking about the party leaders. It must be kept in mind that he was dealing with an entire state while this paper was limited to only one county in only one year. Therefore certain differences were bound to appear between his conclusions and the data presented in the preceding chapters.

Streeter had stated that the Democratic party during the Jacksonian period "was composed mainly of the poor and uneducated people in the cities."<sup>1</sup> The table in Chapter XI showed that neither party could be described as having

---

<sup>1</sup>Streeter, op. cit., p. 4.

the wealthy leaders, or the poor leaders. In fact, the discussion in Chapter XI demonstrated the fact that the Democratic party contained several of the wealthiest members of the community. He had also stated that the Democrats "were hostile to monopolies and vested interests and wished to break down the power of the monied men in politics."<sup>1</sup> Chapter XI discussed the fact that several of the wealthiest leaders were members of the French community in Detroit. These men were businessmen and large landowners. They were interested in the "vested interests" that Streeter spoke about and they certainly could be described as "monied men in politics," since all of them had been active in politics for many years.<sup>2</sup> It was made clear in that chapter that the leadership of the two parties could not be divided along economic lines. Streeter had recognized that there were some wealthy men in the Democratic party.<sup>3</sup> But, his statement was misleading for the Democratic party in Wayne County included the wealthiest men in the entire area.

The conclusions in the preceding chapters definitely

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>2</sup>In his book History of Detroit and Wayne County, Silas Farmer included many lists of early officeholders at all levels of government. The political backgrounds of these men can be traced by going through his various lists and searching for their names.

<sup>3</sup>Streeter, op. cit., p. 26.

did not support the implications in Streeter's statements that "the vast majority of the Whigs were well-to-do and conservative men"<sup>1</sup> and "among them were many bankers, merchants and financiers in the cities, and large landowners in the country."<sup>2</sup> The initial table in Chapter VII showed that the two parties were almost equal (59 Democrats -61 Whigs) in the number of professional men who were party leaders. The discussion in Chapter XI indicated that if either party could be said to have included the large landowners among its leaders, it was probably the Democratic party and not the Whig party. \*

The results of the discussion in Chapter VIII did agree with Streeter's statements that the Democratic party attracted the naturalized citizens and was supported by the French voters.<sup>3</sup> Among the leaders of the Democratic party there were 15 men who were born outside of the United States as compared to only four men among the Whig leaders. The ratio became even greater when the leaders who were born in Detroit from French families were added to the totals. It was pointed out in Chapter VIII that 11 of the 12 Democratic leaders born in Detroit were \*

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 162, 172.



of French ancestry as compared to only half of the four Detroit-born Whig leaders. Thus, the totals became 26 Democrats as compared to only six Whigs. \*

Streeter was also supported by the findings of the preceding chapters in his division of the two parties on the basis of religion. He had stated that the Whigs were mainly Episcopalians and Presbyterians<sup>1</sup> while the Democratic party was supported by the Catholics, Baptists, and other minority religious groups.<sup>2</sup> That this division existed among the leaders in Wayne County was constantly pointed out in the analysis and summarized in Chapter X. The table in that chapter showed that the Whig party included the larger number of Episcopalian and Presbyterian leaders while almost all of the Catholic leaders were found in the Democratic party. He was not as well supported when the totals for the other religious groups were compared. \*

The single concept underlying Streeter's entire discussion was that the two parties could be definitely divided along social and economic lines and also on the basis of place of birth. The results of the analysis of the leaders in Wayne County did not generally support \*

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 212.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 207-208.

this broad generalization. The many tables showed that the leaders could not be positively divided on the basis of occupation, birthplace, or age. In all of the chapters, individual findings were made that would support Streeter's basic conclusion, but, in general, we could not say that the division was as pronounced as his discussion would lead us to believe. \*

The results of the analysis showed that the composition of the leadership of the two parties in Wayne County was not completely identical to the parties in other states. Pease had written that in Illinois the Whig party was the party of the businessman.<sup>1</sup> The table in Chapter VII showed that neither party in Wayne County could have been labeled as the party of the businessman. Pease had also stated that the two parties in Illinois could be divided along certain religious lines.<sup>2</sup> Even though no author accused the Whig party in Michigan of being anti-Catholic or Nativistic, as it was in other states, it was shown throughout the analysis that the Whig leaders were mainly Episcopalian and Presbyterian and the Democratic party included almost all of the leaders who were Catholic. \* +

---

<sup>1</sup>Pease, op. cit., pp. 258, 260.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 261.

In Michigan, the evolution of the political parties was different from the development of the two parties in New York because of the location and history of the two states. There had never been a Federalist party in Michigan in the same degree that the Federalist party existed in New York. In fact, until the rise of the Whigs in the 1830's there had never been a real two party system in the state, for the territory had been organized and governed by the Democrats. Fox made a statement about the composition of the two parties in New York that identified the Whig party with the counties in western New York, with their New England-born farmers, and their wealthy and conservative towns.<sup>1</sup> The entire statement was quoted in Chapter II. Much of the discussion in Chapter VIII was included with that statement in mind. The first table in the chapter showed that the Whig party did include more leaders who had been born in New England (24-15) than did the Democratic party. However, when the backgrounds of these men were discussed in detail later in the chapter, it was shown that they only differed on two points--religion and occupation.

The number of leaders from each party who had been born in New York was almost equal (25 Democrats--22 Whigs).

---

<sup>1</sup>Fox, op. cit., pp. 424-25.

When the counties in which they were born were compared in Chapter VIII it was shown that almost all of the New York-born leaders from both parties were born in the western part of the state. In the statement quoted from Fox in Chapter II, he listed some of the wealthy Whig communities in western New York that he had been referring to in that statement. When the lists in Chapter VIII were compared with the towns, he had mentioned it was found that two Democrats and three Whigs were born in these communities. The numbers in this case were too small to allow a comparison to be made between Wayne County and New York.

Fox, like Streeter, in Michigan, had found that there was an "economic interpretation of the Whig party in New York state."<sup>1</sup> Besides Fox and Streeter, Mueller and Darling had also made similar statements in their studies of Pennsylvania<sup>2</sup> and Massachusetts.<sup>3</sup> It has already been discussed in this chapter that no economic interpretation could be made for the leadership of the two parties in Wayne County. The three other states did match Wayne County on the point that in all instances

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 437.

<sup>2</sup>Mueller, op. cit., p. 243.

<sup>3</sup>Darling, op. cit., p. 3.

the Democratic party was supported by the foreign-born voters.<sup>1</sup>

The volumes dealing with the South that were used in the survey all arrived at the same basic conclusions. The social cleavages that existed in the Southern states were so different from the society that existed in the frontier town of Detroit that the two areas can not be properly compared. The books on the Southern states were included in the survey because the authors of these works made the same statements concerning the social and economic differences between the two parties as were made by the authors of the other studies. If the historians of the Southern states were correct in their findings, then it could be said that definite social and economic differences existed between the leadership of the two parties in the Southern states. This difference did not exist between the leadership of the two parties in Wayne County.

When the findings of the analysis of the party leaders in Wayne County were compared with the statements cited from the general works which were used in the survey several differences appeared. The differences were the same ones that have been discussed throughout this

---

<sup>1</sup>Mueller, op. cit., p. 245; Darling, op. cit., pp. 163, 309.

chapter on the comparison of the social and economic backgrounds of the party leaders. In Wayne County no basic differences existed between the leadership of the two parties on the basis of their social and economic backgrounds.

The last volume used in the survey was the study completed in New York by Benson, Benson found that in New York the Democratic party had "the overwhelming support of Irish Catholic, German, and French voters, as well as Catholics in general, regardless of class, for the Democratic party."<sup>1</sup> That same statement could be made for Wayne County even though there were not as many ethnic groups in Wayne County as there were in New York. The findings in the preceding chapters would also agree with Benson's statements that the Democratic party was not the party of the lower classes, and that the voting patterns were not fundamentally based upon occupational groups.

The basic question which was to be answered by the comparison of the leaders in Wayne County was: Who were correct in their interpretation of the political parties during the Jacksonian period--the early historians or the revisionists? The results of the analysis certainly

---

<sup>1</sup>Benson, op. cit., p. 144.

did not support the accepted generalization. In fact, several statements which were made by Benson could be used as a summary of the analysis:

If parties were characterized solely by the leaders they keep, it would be difficult to distinguish between the Democrats and Whigs. A composite account of their social and economic backgrounds reveals striking similarities.<sup>1</sup>

Unless fine criteria are used, however, both parties can be said to have recruited their leaders from the same social and economic strata.<sup>2</sup>

Instead, the evidence indicates that the same socio-economic groups provided leadership for both parties.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 64.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 331.

## APPENDIX A

### NAMES OF THE TOP DEMOCRATIC AND WHIG LEADERS IN WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN IN 1844

#### Democrats

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Alvord, Joshua Nichols | Hale, William            |
| Ames, Michael E.       | Hand, George E.          |
| Andrews, Hiram R.      | Hanmer, James            |
| Atlee, Samuel Yorke    | Harmon, John H.          |
| Bagg, Ashael Smith     | Harrington, Ebenezer     |
| Bagg, Joseph Hall      | Harvie, Andrew           |
| Barclay, William       | Hill, John H.            |
| Beaubien, Henry        | Hunt, William Brown      |
| Beaubien, Louis        | Kearsley, Jonathon       |
| Beaufait, Louis        | Leadbetter, Alexander    |
| Bellair, Oliver        | Lee, Elisha Smith        |
| Blindbury, John        | Lewis, Thomas            |
| Brooks, Edward         | Lothrop, George Van Ness |
| Brown, Ammon           | McGinnis, Patrick        |
| Brown, High            | McKnight, Sheldon        |
| Buel, Alexander W.     | McReynolds, Andrew T.    |
| Campau, Daniel         | Moore, Benjamin B.       |
| Campau, Joseph         | Moran, Charles           |
| Chittenden, William F. | Moran, George            |
| Cicotte, Francis       | Morell, George           |
| Cass, Lewis            | Mungery, William         |
| Davidson, Alexander    | Murray, Archibald Y.     |
| Dean, Luther           | Nowell, John             |
| Desnoyer, Peter        | O'Flynn, Cornelius       |
| Dibble, Orville B.     | Otis, Asa H.             |
| Dort, Titus            | Perry, Henry E.          |
| Edwards, John          | Reno, John               |
| Farnsworth, Elon       | Robb, George             |
| Ferrington, George W.  | Roberts, Elijah J.       |
| Fiske, David Woodward  | Rowland, David H.        |
| Fralick, Henry         | Ruehle, Fred             |
| Franks, E.             | Saunders, Harry          |
| Gallagher, Thomas      | Schwarz, John E.         |
| Gantt, Samuel N.       | Scott, John              |
| Gibson, John Jr.       | Shearer, Jonathon        |
| Gillett, Reynolds      | Sheldon, Thomas Carleton |
| Godfroy, Peter         | Smith, Job               |
| Griswold, George R.    | Stearns, Willard Egerton |
| Gunning, James         | Streeter, Samuel         |
| Hake, Joseph           | Stringer, Joseph         |



Taylor, Elisha  
 Ten Eyck, Anthony  
 Ten Eyck, Conrad  
 Thompson, Daniel  
 Tuttle, Warren  
 Vaughn, James C.  
 Walker, Henry N.  
 Wightman, Volney  
 Williams, Ezra  
 Williams, John R.

Whigs

Abbott, John Stearns  
 Backus, Henry Titus  
 Bacon, Washington A.  
 Baldwin, Lyman  
 Barstow, Samuel  
 Bates, Morgan  
 Baxter, W. J.  
 Biddle, John  
 Bour, Joseph  
 Brewster, William  
 Cady, Daniel Lovejoy  
 Caniff, Abram C.  
 Chapoton, Eustache  
 Chillson, G. W.  
 Chipman, Henry  
 Clark, George  
 Cram, Jesse  
 Crawford, John  
 Crossman, G. D.  
 Duffield, Divie Bethune  
 Duffield, William Ward  
 Edwards, Arthur  
 Ewers, Alvah  
 Farrar, John  
 Forbes, John  
 French, David  
 Gooding, Mathew  
 Graves, J. O.  
 Harbaugh, David E.  
 Harding, Fisher A.  
 Harsha, William  
 Hastings, Samuel A.  
 Hoffman, John  
 Holbrook, Henry B.  
 Howard, Jacob Merritt  
 Howard, William Alanson  
 Hulbert, John

Hurlbut, Chauncey  
 Hyde, Oliver Moulton  
 Jackson, Charles C.  
 Jenness, John Smith  
 Jerome, Edwin  
 Joy, James Frederick  
 King, John E.  
 Krider, Jacob  
 Langdon, B. J.  
 Leech, Clement C.  
 LeRoy, Henry H.  
 Loranger, Joseph  
 Macy, George F.  
 Mather, Alonzo T.  
 Mather, Henry H.  
 Matthews, Thomas P.  
 Mead, Amos  
 Messmore, James  
 Moore, Franklin  
 Morse, Chauncey  
 More, Stephen B.  
 Morton, Eurotas  
 Mullett, John  
 Murphy, Michael  
 Owen, John  
 Patrick, Milton S.  
 Penniman, Ebenezer Jenks  
 Pitcher, Zina  
 Platt, Zephaniah  
 Porter, Augustus Seymour  
 Potter, Linus  
 Roberts, John  
 Roberts, Robert Ellis  
 Seymour, Elisha G.  
 Sibley, Frederick Baker  
 Smart, David  
 Smith, John F.  
 Stevens, Gideon B.  
 Stevens, Marcus  
 Stewart, James  
 Tillman, James W.  
 Tomlinson, Nelson  
 VanCleve, Horatio P.  
 Van Dyke, James A.  
 Van Rensselaer, Jeremiah  
 Watkins, John  
 Wickware, Cornelius  
 Williams, Alpheus Starkey  
 Williams, Theodore  
 Wilmarth, Hiram  
 Woodruff, Henry  
 Woodworth, Benjamin  
 Woodbridge, William

## APPENDIX B

### NAMES OF THE THIRTY MOST IMPORTANT LEADERS IN EACH PARTY<sup>1</sup>

Democrats (\* indicates the individual was included among the ten most important leaders in the party)

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Andrews, Hiram R.   | Elected sheriff in 1844, vice-president of County Democratic Convention   |
| Bagg, Ashael Smith  | Publisher and owner of the <u>Democratic Free Press</u>   |
| Blindbury, John     | Supervisor of Greenfield Township, 1837-1844, re-elected in 1844  |
| Brown, Annon        | Member of Constitutional Convention in 1835, Supervisor of Nankin Township 1843, delegate to two County Conventions in 1844 |
| Campau, Daniel*     | City Treasurer 1842-44, County Treasurer 1844, delegate to five Conventions in 1844 and secretary of four of them           |
| Cass, Lewis         | National political figure, Governor of Michigan 1813-31   |
| Dean, Luther        | Supervisor of Livonia Township 1843-45  |
| Dibble, Orville B.* | Member of Democratic State Central Committee, City of Detroit Alderman 1843-44  |

---

<sup>1</sup>The information for this Appendix was collected from three major sources. The two city newspapers reported the political activities during the year. They listed officers for the party at all levels, delegates to party meetings at the ward, township, city, county and state level. They also listed the officers of each meeting. The third source was the volumes of the History of Detroit and Wayne County by Silas Farmer. In these volumes Farmer included lists of city and county officers for the many offices starting with the first territorial appointments.

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Dort, Titus           | Supervisor of Dearborn Township  |
| Farnsworth, Elon*     | President of Detroit Democratic Party, State Attorney General 1843-45, State Chancellor 1836-42                            |
| Ferrington, George W. | Supervisor of Redford Township 1832, 1833-40, 1842-45  |
| Godfroy, Peter*       | Member of Democratic State Central Committee   |
| Hale, William*        | Member of Democratic State Central Committee, elected State Senator 1844   |
| Hand, George E.*      | Member of Democratic State Central Committee   |
| Hunt, William Brown   | Supervisor of Hamtramck Township   |
| Kearsley, Jonathon    | Vice-President of Democratic State Central Committee   |
| Lewis, Thomas         | Supervisor of Monguagon Township 1842-44   |
| McKnight, Sheldon     | Detroit Postmaster 1836-41, associated with the <u>Democratic Free Press</u> , delegate to three party Conventions in 1844 |
| Moran, Charles        | Detroit Alderman 1839-44   |
| Moran, George         | Elected Supervisor of Hamtramck Township   |
| Morell, George        | Chief Justice of State Supreme Court 1842, Presiding Judge of Wayne County Circuit Court 1840-44                           |
| Munger, William*      | Member of Democratic State Central Committee   |
| Rowland, David H.     | State Representative 1843-44, delegate to two Conventions  |

- Saunders, Harry Elected Supervisor of Monguagon Township in 1844
- Schwarz, John E. Adjutant General of State Militia 1836, 1844-55, State Representative, nominated for Supervisor of Springwells Township
- Ten Eyck, Anthony\* City of Detroit Alderman 1842-43, delegate to Democratic National Convention, Chairman of Executive Committee of Detroit Democratic Party, Member of Democratic State Central Committee
- Ten Eyck, Conrad His hotel was the headquarters of the Wayne County Democratic party, Supervisor of Dearborn Township 1833-39, U.S. Marshal 1837-41
- Walker, Henry N.\* State Attorney General 1843-45, Secretary of Democratic State Central Committee, State Representative
- Williams, Ezra Chairman of Democratic State Central Committee
- Williams, John R.\* Elected Mayor of Detroit in 1844 for the fourth time
- Whigs
- Bates, Morgan Nominated for City Alderman, delegate to state Whig Convention, member of County Committee
- Biddle, John Supervisor of Ecorse Township 1842-46
- Chapoton, Eustache City of Detroit Alderman
- Chipman, Henry Delegate to Whig National Convention, vice-president of Whig State Convention, member of County Committee

- Ewers, Alvah President of Detroit Mechanics Society, delegate to city Whig Convention
- Farrar, John City of Detroit assessor 1843-44, officer of Detroit Mechanics Society 1836, 1841-44
- Harbaugh, David E. Detroit City Attorney
- Harding, Fisher A.\* Member of Whig State Central Committee, Member of County Committee
- Harsha, William Supervisor of Springwells Township, organized the Detroit Mechanics Society
- Howard, Jacob Merritt\* Member of Whig State Central Committee, elected to U.S. Congress in 1840
- Hurlbut, Chauncey City of Detroit Alderman 1839-41, delegate to State Convention, treasurer of Detroit Mechanics Society
- Hyde, Oliver Moulton City of Detroit Alderman
- Joy, James Frederick One of the most prominent men in the city, connected with the Bank of Michigan and the railroads
- LeRoy, Henry H.\* Member of County Committee, delegate to State Convention
- Mullett, John Grand Master in state of Masonic Lodges, founder of the Masonic Lodge in Detroit
- Owen, John\* City of Detroit Alderman, member of Whig State Central Committee
- Penniman, Ebenezer Jenks Supervisor of Plymouth Township 1842-45
- Pitcher, Zina\* Mayor of City of Detroit 1840, 41, 43

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Platt, Zephaniah              | State Attorney General 1841-43, delegate to three Conventions at state level  |
| Porter, Augustus Seymour*     | U.S. Senator 1840-45  |
| Roberts, John                 | President of Mechanics Society of Detroit   |
| Roberts, Robert Ellis         | Detroit City Clerk 1844-45  |
| Smart, David*                 | Member of Whig State Central Committee  |
| Stewart, James                | City of Detroit Alderman 1839, 1843, 1844   |
| Tillman, James W.             | Delegate to four Conventions at county and state level  |
| Van Dyke, James A.*           | Detroit City Attorney 1836-39, City of Detroit Alderman 1843-44, member of County Committee   |
| Williams, Alpheus<br>Starkey* | Whig candidate for mayor in 1844, City of Detroit Alderman 1843, member of County Committee, owner of the <u>Detroit Advertiser</u> |
| Williams, Theodore            | City of Detroit Treasurer 1841-43, County Clerk 1841-42, Chairman of Detroit Whig Convention  |
| Woodworth, Benjamin           | City of Detroit Alderman 1843-44  |
| Woodbridge, William*          | Governor of State of Michigan 1839, U.S. Senator 1840-45  |

APPENDIX C

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR SURVEY OF HISTORICAL  
OPINION BOOKS

- Beard, Charles A. and Mary R. The Rise of American Civilization. New York: Macmillan, 1946.
- Benson, Lee. The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Binkley, Wilfred E. American Political Parties. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1947.
- Bowers, Claude G. The Party Battles of the Jackson Period. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1922.
- Bugg, James L., Jr. Jacksonian Democracy, Myth or Reality? New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1962.
- Buley, R. Carlyle. The Old Northwest Pioneer Period 1815-1840. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1951.
- Carroll, Malcolm E. Origins of the Whig Party. Durham: Duke University Press, 1925.
- Channing, Edward. A History of the United States. Vol. V. New York: Macmillan, 1921.
- Cole, Arthur Charles. The Whig Party in the South. New York: American Historical Association, 1914.
- Darling, Arthur B. Political Changes in Massachusetts 1824-1848. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925.
- Doherty, Herbert J., Jr. The Whigs of Florida 1845-1854. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1959.
- Fox, Dixon Ryan. The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York. New York: Columbia University, 1919.
- Fuller, George N. Historic Michigan. Vol. I. National Historical Association, 1924.

- Hammond, Bray. Banks and Politics in America. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Hofstadter, Richard. The American Political Tradition. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1959.
- Hubbart, Henry Clyde. The Older Middle West 1840-1880. New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, Political Man. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1959.
- MacDonald, William. Jacksonian Democracy 1829-1837. New York: Harper, 1906.
- Merriam, Charles Edward. A History of American Political Theories. New York: Macmillan, 1924.
- Meyers, Marvin. The Jackson Persuasion. California: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- Miles, Edwin Arthur. Jacksonian Democracy in Mississippi. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960.
- Mueller, Henry R. The Whig Party in Pennsylvania. New York: Columbia University, 1922.
- Parkes, Henry Bramford. The American Experience. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1947.
- Pease, Theodore Calvin. The Frontier State 1818-1848. Springfield: Illinois Centennial Commission, 1918.
- Quaife, M. M. and Glazer, Sidney. Michigan. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1948.
- Roseboom, Eugene H. A History of Presidential Elections. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. The Age of Jackson. Boston: Little-Brown, 1945.
- Sellers, Charles Grier, Jr. James K. Polk. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Simms, Henry H. The Rise of the Whigs in Virginia 1824-1840. Richmond: William Byrd Press, 1929.
- Stevens, Harry R. The Early Jackson Party in Ohio. Durham: Duke University Press, 1957.



Streeter, Floyd Benjamin. Political Parties in Michigan 1837-1860. Lansing: Michigan Historical Commission, 1918.

Sumner, William Graham. Andrew Jackson. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1882.

Sydnor, Charles S. The Development of Southern Sectionalism 1817-1848. Louisiana State Press, 1948.

Turner, Frederick Jackson. The United States 1830-1850. New York: Henry Holt, 1935.

Van Deusen, Glyndon G. The Jacksonian Era 1828-1848. New York: Harper, 1959.

Weisenburger, Francis P. The Passing of the Frontier 1825-1850. Columbus, Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society, 1941.

Wilson, Woodrow. Division and Reunion 1829-1909. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1918.

#### Periodicals

McWhiney, Grady. "Were the Whigs a Class Party in Alabama?" The Journal of Southern History, Vol. XXIII, No. 4 (November, 1957).

Sellers, Charles Grier, Jr. "Andrew Jackson Versus the Historians," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, Vol. XLIV, No. 4 (March, 1958).

Sellers, Charles Grier, Jr. "Who Were the Southern Whigs?" The American Historical Review, Vol. LIX, No. 2 (January, 1954).

## APPENDIX D

### ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCES USED TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ON INDIVIDUALS BEING STUDIED

It must be remembered that all of these sources were used with only one purpose in mind. That purpose was to first determine which individuals living in Wayne County were active in the Democratic and Whig parties in 1844, and once this was determined, the sources were used to find the necessary biographical information about each individual. In almost every case the material that was used contained valuable information on other topics. There is a scarcity of material, either in printed or manuscript form, on the topics considered in this paper. In fact there is very little material available on any subjects dealing with the period from 1800-1860. Thus, the researcher must find his material wherever he can, and from a variety of sources.

#### Books

Bingham, S. A. Early History of Michigan with Biographies of State Officers, Members of Congress, Judges and Legislators. Lansing, Thorp & Godfrey, 1888.

Contains many short biographies. For many early leaders it is the only source of information.

Conover, Jefferson S. Freemasonry in Michigan. Coldwater: The Conover Engraving and Printing Company, 1897.

This volume contains information on the development of the Masonic movement in Michigan in the early 1800's. It also lists those who held various offices and some biographical information on various early leaders.

Edwards, Richard (ed.). Industries of Michigan. New York: Historical Publishing Co., 1880.

Contains information on the development of industries in Michigan in the early 1800's and information on the early industrial leaders.

Fuller, George N. (ed.) Historic Michigan. Dayton: National Historical Association, Inc., 1924.

A general history of Michigan.

Hamlin, Marie Caroline Watson. Legends of Le Detroit. Detroit: Thorndike Nourse, 1884.

Traces the genealogy of the old French families.

Hotchkiss, George W. History of the Lumber and Forest Industry of the Northwest. Chicago: Published by author, 1898.

Very detailed, informative history of the development of the industry in the Great Lakes area. Also contains short biographies of the early leaders of this industry.

Lanman, Charles. The Red Book of Michigan. Detroit: E. B. Smith & Company, 1871.

Contains many short biographies of prominent men.

Look, Henry M. Michigan Trails and Michigan Digest. Pontiac: Rann & Turner, 1869.

Contains information on Masonic Lodges in Michigan. Includes list of state officers in early 1800's.

Palmer, Friend. Early Days in Detroit. Detroit: Hunt and June, 1906.

The author is one of the foremost authorities on the early history of Detroit.

Ross, Robert B. The Early Bench and Bar of Detroit. Detroit: Richard P. Joy and Clarence M. Burton, 1907.

This book contains scores of short biographies on the members of the Detroit bar. Goes back to the early 1800's.

Russell, John A. The Germanic Influence in the Making of Michigan. Lansing: Michigan Historical Commission, 1927.

Contains information on the migration of families from Germany to Michigan. Tells where they originated

in Germany, the year they arrived in Michigan and where they settled in Michigan. Also includes families of German origin who first settled in other states before coming to Michigan.

### Church Histories

Many different sources were used to identify the religious affiliation of individuals being studied in this paper. There was very little material that covered the years before 1850. A few publications contained lists of early members and information on the history of the church and its early spiritual leaders. Some were anniversary souvenirs.

Carnegie, William R. The Scotch Presbyterian Church of Detroit. Detroit: Central Presbyterian Church, 1938.

Dickie, Rev. J. F. The Story of the Central (Scotch) Presbyterian Church. Detroit.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Organization of the First Congregational Church and Society of Detroit, Michigan, 1894.

St. Mary of Redford, 1843-1949. St. Mary of Redford Parish, Detroit, 1949.

The Commemoration of Seventy-Five Years of Christ Church Detroit, 1920.

### City and County Histories

All of the books in this section were useful for two purposes. They were probably the only detailed sources on the early settlement and development of their particular city or county. They included short biographies of early leaders. Some of these leaders were not found in the other state histories. Most of the information that they contained on the early settlement of the county was not available in any other source.

Burton, Clarence M. The City of Detroit, Michigan, 1701-1922. Detroit: J. J. Clarke, 1922.

The author is the foremost authority on the history of Detroit. His works must be used in any study involving the city of Detroit.

Burton, Clarence M. History of Detroit, 1780 to 1850, Financial and Commercial. Reprinted from the Detroit News, 1917.

Reprint of articles appearing in the Detroit News.  
Very brief summary.

Carlisle, Fred (ed.). Chronography of Notable Events in the History of the Northwest Territory and Wayne County. Detroit: O. S. Gulley, Bornman & Co., 1890.

Carlisle, Fred (ed.). Wayne County Chronography.  
Detroit: O. S. Gulley, Bornman & Co., 1880.

Catlin, George B. The Story of Detroit. Detroit: The Detroit News, 1926.

Chapman, Charles C. History of Washtenaw County Michigan.  
Chicago: Charles C. Chapman & Co., 1881.

Compendium of History and Biography of the City of Detroit and Wayne County Michigan. Chicago: Henry Taylor & Co., 1909.

Directory of the City of Detroit. 1845 and 1846.

Durant, Samuel (ed.). History of Oakland County Michigan.  
Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1877.

Farmer, Silas. History of Detroit and Wayne County.  
Detroit: Silas Farmer & Co., 1890.

This book is one of the main sources of information on the history of Detroit. Along with the books by Clarence M. Burton it is the main source of information on the city of Detroit.

Leake, Paul. History of Detroit. Vol. III. New York: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1912.

Manual of the County of Wayne, Michigan, 1826. Detroit: Board of County Auditors, 1826.

Minutes of the Meetings of the Townships of Bucklin, Pekin, and Dearborn, May 28, 1827-April 13, 1857. Detroit: The Michigan Historical Records Survey Project, 1941.

Portrait and Biographical Album of the Members of the Legislature of the State of Michigan. Chicago: Chipman Brothers, 1883.

The Government of the City of Detroit and Wayne County,  
Michigan 1701-1907. Detroit: Mannausa & Wieber, 1907.

### Genealogies.

The main use of these volumes was to establish date, place of birth, and family background. Usually the information is limited to the vital statistics and little else. The exception is found when a member of the family was of real historical importance.

Abbott, Maj. Lemuel A. Descendants of George Abbott.  
Boston: Published by the author, 1906.

Alvord, Samuel Morgan. A Genealogy of the Descendants  
of Alexander Alvord. Webster, New York: A. D.  
Andrews, 1908.

Backus, William W. A Genealogical Memoir of the Backus  
Family. Connecticut, 1889.

Chaffin, William L. History of the Town of Easton, Massa-  
chusetts. Cambridge: John Wilson and Son, 1886.

Kingsbury, Frank Burnside. History and Genealogical  
Register of the Town of Langdon, N.H. Published by  
author, 1932.

Pierce, Frederick Clifton. Fiske and Fiske Family.  
Chicago: Published by author, 1896.

### Magazines and Periodicals

Detroit Society for Genealogical Research Magazine.

This publication could have two possible uses for the researcher. The feature article may contain useful information and scattered throughout the various issues are short biographies on various persons. These individuals need not be from Michigan, nor are they necessarily of any historical importance. The chances of finding any new information on anyone of historical importance is rather remote.

Reports of the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society.

The various volumes in this series contain articles on a multitude of topics. They comprise the largest single accumulation of information on the history of the state of Michigan--especially in its early years.

Michigan History Magazine.

This magazine is a continuation of the reports of the Pioneer Society.

Michigan Library Bulletin. Vol. 19, No. 9.

Contains several short biographies.

Manuscripts

These sources contained various types of information. They were very sparse on the topic of local political developments. They usually contained biographical data on the subject of the collection. Many included such items as account books of businessmen, legal correspondence of lawyers, and routine correspondence to office holders. Their usefulness depended on the topic under study.

Barclay (William) Papers 1808-1885.

Beaubien family genealogy.

Burton (Clarence M.) Papers and Works.

Campau Family Papers.

Catlin (George R.) Papers 1857-1934.

Detroit Michigan Common Council Proceedings, 1844.

Duffield (George) Papers 1794-1868.

Fitzgerald (Thomas) Papers 1796-1855.

Hastings (Eurotas Parmele) Papers 1833-1848.

Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Michigan (Detroit First Protestant Society).

Scrap Books of Clarence M. Burton.

Scrap Books of Friend Palmer.

Stowell (Alexander) Papers.

Williams (John R.) Papers 1782-1854.

#### Masters' Theses

Chinitz, Ben S. Political Techniques in Michigan, 1824-1844. Wayne State University, 1938.

This thesis gives a good review of the development of the technique of politics in Michigan during the Jacksonian era.

McCabe, James A. Personal Politics in Michigan 1821-1830. Wayne State University, 1937.

This thesis contains certain statements as to the political power of various political leaders.

#### Newspapers

The newspapers for this period were useful for two purposes, first through their reporting of political meetings, publishing of lists of candidates, and results of elections. It was possible to determine who was active in the political parties during the years under study. Secondly, later issues contained biographical material in obituary reports.

Detroit Constitutional Democrat.

Detroit Daily Advertiser.

Detroit Democratic Free Press (Daily and Weekly). It later became the Detroit Free Press.

Michigan State Journal (Ann Arbor).



**AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT**

**Name:** Lawrence Howard Sabbath.

**Birthplace:** Chicago, Illinois, December 9, 1934.

**Degree:** B.S., Wayne State University, 1959.

**Positions Held:** Science Teacher, Clinton Junior High School, Oak Park, Michigan, 1959.

Chairman, Science Department, Clinton Junior High School; Oak Park Michigan, 1963-