FREEMASONRY AND COMMUNITY IN THE EARLY REPUBLIC: THE CASE FOR ANTIMASONIC ANXIETIES

KATHLEEN SMITH KUTOLOWSKI
State University of New York, Brockport

IN 1826 AN ITINERANT STONE MASON NAMED WILLIAM MORGAN DISAPPEARED after threatening to publish the secrets of the Freemasons. The fraternity's alleged murder unleashed a protest, coalescing in America's "most remarkable" political party.[1] Antimasonry rent the political and social fabric of thousands of communities, realigned voting in the two most populous states, changed voters' perceptions of the political process, and crippled Masonry itself. When the Antimasonic Party petered out after nearly a decade of influence, its veterans joined with other evangelical forces to shape the course of temperance, antislavery, and northern Whiggery.[2]

Freemasonry, the eye of the storm, had played a prominent role in countless early national communities, flourishing in rural hamlets and small villages as well as urban centers. Already prestigious in late colonial America, this esoteric, closed, fraternal order spread rapidly and widely after the Revolution, enjoying "epidemic" growth in Connecticut and "explosive" progress in Massachusetts. In New York, 20,000 Masons operated 450 charters by 1825, with lodges appearing in new settlements simultaneously

[1]John Bach McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States* (New York: D. Appleton, 1900), V, 109.

[2]On Antimasonry's political impact, see Michael F. Holt, "The Antimasonic and Know Nothing Parties," in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., ed., *History of U.S. Political Parties: 1, 1789–1860, From Factions to Parties* (New York: Chelsea House, 1973), 589, 592; Edward Pessen, *Jacksonian America: Society, Personality, and Politics,* rev. ed. (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1978) 261–62; and Robert O. Rupp, "Social Tension and Political Mobilization in Jacksonian Society: A Case Study of the Antimasonic Party in New York, Pennsylvania and Vermont, 1827–1840," Diss. Syracuse Univ. 1981.

with churches and academies.[3] Although the Freemasons attracted members from all classes, large numbers of the "best" men donned Masonic robes while simultaneously holding influential civic positions out of proportion to their numbers. Freemasonry's values, practices, and benefits had found a congenial home in the early republic.

In spite of its influence upon community life and upon Antimasonry, historians until recently have overlooked Freemasonry.[4] This oversight has stemmed from two misjudgments that have operated within the conventional wisdom on Antimasonry: the widespread assessment that Masonry existed largely in cities and the assumption that Antimasonry was a paranoiac aberration from the radical Right.[5] While the first modern treatments of Antimasonry, by Whitney Cross and Lee Benson, had taken the movement's origins seriously, they used impressionistic evidence to portray its protagonists as poor rural folk rising up in populist protest.[6] The egalitarian farmers of Cross and Benson then became historical villains in the post-McCarthyite climate of the 1960s. David B. Davis, Richard Hofstadter, and Seymour M. Lipset and Earl Raab, relying largely on the assumptions of Cross and Benson, have portrayed the Antimasons as irrational, bigoted zealots reacting to a supposed conspiracy. Both misconceptions, that of Masonic urbanism and of Antimasonic irrationality, have undermined the credibility of Antimasonic anxieties. If Masonry was simply urban and Antimasonry rural, the fraternity operated in a limited sphere of influence and Antimasons reacted to imagination, not reality.

These viewpoints provided the locus for general assessments of Antimasonry[7] until 1977, when two systematic studies began to supply a corrective.

[3]Dorothy Ann Lipson, *Freemasonry in Federalist Connecticut, 1789–1832* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1977), 3–4, 90; Richard D. Brown, "The Emergence of Voluntary Associations in Massachusetts, 1760–1830," *Journal of Voluntary Action Research,* 2 (April 1973), 68; and Ossian Lang, *History of Freemasonry in the State of New York* (New York: Grand Lodge of New York, 1922), 100–07.

[4]Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 4. Masonry figures importantly in Don H. Doyle's *Social Order of a Frontier Community: Jacksonville, Illinois, 1825–1870* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1978).

[5]On Masonic urbanism, see Whitney R. Cross, *The Burned-Over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800–1850* (1950; rpt. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965), 117; and Holt, "Antimasonic and Know Nothing Parties," 583–84, 588. On Antimasonic paranoia, see David B. Davis, "Some Themes of Counter-Subversion: An Analysis of Anti-Masonic, Anti-Catholic and Anti-Mormon Literature," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* 47 (1960), 205–24; Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* (New York: Knopf, 1965), 6; and Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, *The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790–1970* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 39–49.

[6]Cross, *The Burned-Over District,* 115–16; and Lee Benson, *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy: New York as a Test Case* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1961), 24–26.

[7]For example, the first edition of Pessen, *Jacksonian America* (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1969), 276–80; and Holt, "The Antimasonic and Know Nothing Parties."

One documented the obstructionist techniques of local Masons after Morgan's kidnapping; the other, Dorothy Ann Lipson's analysis of Masonry's principles and adherents in Connecticut, supplied a full-scale treatment of the fraternity. Yet while Lipson has elucidated Masonry's significent role in Connecticut communities, she did not attempt to explore political Antimasonry, for, in Connecticut, antipathy to Masonry flourished largely as a social movement.[8] Subsequently scholars have undertaken a wide-ranging reexamination of Antimasonry, but as they are still putting the cart before the horse, they cannot correctly assess charges about the fraternity's political influence that provided the basis for party organization. As an Antimason argued in 1831, "Until we know what Masonry is, we cannot well judge of its opposite."[9] First and foremost a grass-roots phenomenon, Antimasonry flourished or withered according to personal perceptions of Masons and Masonic activities. To comprehend the strength, direction, and persistence of Antimasonry, then, we must discern the role Masonry played in the Burned-Over District, the heartland of revivalism, where the fraternity most directly shaped the views and activities of political Antimasons.

This essay begins that effort by examining the social context of Freemasonry in Genesee County, New York, from 1809 to 1847. The site of Morgan's disappearance and of the initial Antimasonic efforts, this Yankee colony holds intrinsic interest. The experience of its residents shaped emerging Antimasonic concepts of Masonic elitism, of the dangers of secrecy, and of antirepublican concentrations of power. When Antimasonry spread rapidly from Genesee, incipient Antimasons in neighboring counties and states often learned about the alleged hazards of Freemasonry through the lens of the original antagonists. Thus Genesee Masonry was one "situational condition," rooted in the local ambience, that fueled Antimasonic protest.[10] A look at the backgrounds of 320 Masons who comprised the whole membership of three Genesee County lodges suggests that to have lived in Genesee County in the first quarter of the nineteenth century was to know vividly the increasingly dominant public role played by a closed, secret society.[11]

* * *

What drew thousands to the Masonic lodges of early national America? Certainly attractions varied from place to place, but Freemasonry appealed

[8]Ronald P. Formisano with Kathleen Smith Kutolowski, "Antimasonry and Masonry: The Genesis of Protest, 1826–1827," *American Quarterly,* 29 (1977), 139–65. Lipson, *Freemasonry.*

[9]*The Albany Evening Journal,* 29 Oct. 1831. I am indebted to Robert O. Rupp for bringing this statement to my attention.

[10]Rudolph Heberle, "Types and Functions of Social Movements," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* 14 (New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1968), 441.

[11]The data include present-day Wyoming County, which remained part of Genesee until 1841.

because of its emphasis upon exclusiveness, secrecy, tradition, morality self-improvement, conviviality, and liberal ideology. Enlightenment principles such as latitudinarianism, universalism, and rationalism continued to attract the post-Revolutionary generation, and liberal religious tendencies particularly drew incipient Masons in an increasingly conservative religious climate.[12] Genesee Masons were urged to "observe the moral law," but lodges left "each brother to his own judgment as to particular forms."[13]

Masonry's secular millenialism and moralism meshed with major popular currents. Masons the world over believed fervently that they could bring about a better social order through Masonry. Their faith in notions of reason, progress, and harmony gave them a cosmopolitan vision transcending religion, politics, and even nationality.[14] This appealed mightily to a generation hopeful, yet troubled by increasing sectarianism and partyism.[15] Masons saw themselves as the special holders of a secret fund of timeless knowledge and of the only truly universal religious and moral tenets. As a Genesee County Mason wrote:

> . . . [W]e cordially unite our talents, . . . and bow our knees before the Father of Lights, humbly beseeching him to make us his sons, keep us from contaminating principles of selfishness, and to enable us to spread our arms as extensively as possible to deliver our brethren from calamity, their connections from penury, and the whole world from the powers of darkness and condemnation.[16]

In reality the Masonic lexicon of virtues differed little from the prevailing Protestant code, emphasizing meekness, temperance, piety, charity, and industry.[17] Enforcement of Masonic morality began with a man's petition for membership, when an *ad hoc* committee scrutinized his character.[18] Lest moral laxity surface after initiation, lodges avidly supervised members'

[12]Herbert M. Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1934), 148–51; Bernard A. Weisberger, *They Gathered at the River* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1958), 5–7; Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1972), 356–58; and Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 47–62, 85.

[13]Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 120–21, 124, 132; Joshua Bradley, *Some of the Beauties of Freemasonry* (Rutland, Vt.: Fay and Davison, 1816), 148–49.

[14]Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 13, 38–39, 63.

[15]"No private offenses, or disputes about nations, families, religions, or politicks [sic] must be brought within the door of the lodge," see Bradley, *Beauties of Freemasonry,* 296.

[16]Bradley, *Beauties of Freemasonry,* i. Another thought that Masonry "increases happiness in families and neighborhoods, and exalts a nation." See "Address to Allegheny No. 277," (Batavia) *Republican Advocate,* 2 Aug. 1822. See also (Batavia) *Spirit of the Times,* 21 Oct. 1825; and Joshua Bradley, *An Address to Masons, on the Importance and Utility of Forming Associations* . . . (Rochester: E. Peck, 1842), 24–25.

[17]Bradley, *Beauties of Freemasonry,* 296–97, 148–52.

[18]Frequent rejections indicate rigorous screening. Minutes, Olive Branch No. 244 (1814–1816), passim; Minutes, Olive Branch No. 215 (30 May 1811–1 Nov. 1843), passim.

conduct, investigating, upbraiding, suspending, and sometimes expelling recalcitrant brothers. (Neighboring evangelical churches supervised their flocks in a similar fashion.)[19]

Masons thus participated in a broad American consensus on the central importance of public virtue and morality, even as they eschewed the more orthodox framework of the Protestant mainstream and saw their ethical system as catholic and learned, rather than limited and revealed. Non-Masons often admired the fraternity's standards of conduct, and Masons appeared prominently in almost every facet of community life.[20] They laid the cornerstones of court houses and churches, marched in full regalia through villages and hamlets, and held well-publicized installation ceremonies in churches such as Batavia's St. James Episcopal—while the church choir sang the "Masonic Ode." Militia officers belonging to the Masons marshalled patriotic parades, booksellers and silversmiths featured Masonic items, and newspaper obituaries of prominent brothers resounded with lodge terminology.[21]

Masonry's repute arose also from its benevolent activities, albeit for members only. Masonic charity proved particularly essential on the frontier, with its credit-short economy. When trouble struck, lodges offered monetary as well as moral support. Olive Branch No. 211 paid for the funeral services of an insolvent merchant, loaned money to a carpenter ruined by fire, and helped "a worthy visiting brother in distress." When their own resources proved insufficient, local lodges could call upon the Grand Lodge.[22]

In addition to charity, Masonry also offered members education, or at least indoctrination into the ways of the lodge. The fraternity's knowledge opened to initiates as they mastered the lessons for each successive degree. A "meritocracy," Masonry offered nearly unlimited vertical mobility to ambitious members.[23] This "sponsored mobility" fit well with Americans'

[19]The quasi-religious nature of Masonic discipline appears in its terminology. One brother "threw himself upon the mercy of the brethren" and agreed to "promise a reformation." See Minutes, Olive Branch No. 215, 97, 93–95, 109, 135, 139, for examples.

[20]Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 118. Don H. Doyle, "The Social Functions of Voluntary Associations in a Nineteenth-Century American Town," *Social Science History,* 1 (1977), 343–46, found "ethical restraints" of associations policing the marketplace and ensuring members' credit standing. Lodges emphasized the importance of maintaining high moral reputations. See "Address to Allegheny No. 277."

[21]*Spirit of the Times,* 16 Dec. 1825; Minutes, Olive Branch No. 215, 263, 238. Rochester Masons similarly "enjoyed the most visible signs of deference." See Paul E. Johnson, *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York,* 1815–1837 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978), 67.

[22]Minutes, Olive Branch No. 215, 84, 86, 97; Letter from Le Roy No. 260 to Elias Hicks, Grand Secretary, 27 Dec. 1824 (typescript copy, Olive Branch No. 39, Le Roy). Local lodges also loaned money to one another. See Minutes, Olive Branch No. 215, 135.

[23]Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 229–32, analyzes similarities between Masonic concepts of merit and prevalent notions of egalitarianism.

achievement ethos.[24] In Genesee lodges most initiates passed quickly to the third degree, and the existence of Mark Masters Lodges, three Royal Arch chapters, and an Encampment of Knights Templar testified to interest in the fraternity's more elevated branches.

How did one gain access to these benefits? Technically one needed only be a freeborn adult male of sound mind and body, believe in "the Eternal God," be able to earn a living, and espouse Masonic principles, but of course Masonry was also a closed order: all members of a lodge had to approve of candidates.[25] This exclusiveness, coupled with secret rituals, handshakes, and passwords, contributed to the fraternity's prestige and appealed to a segment of Americans disturbed by the rapidly changing social, economic, and political order of the early republic. On frontiers such as that of Genesee County, uprooted pioneers faced social disorientation, and mobile, individualistic Americans in general, as Rowland Berthoff has argued, sought "some practical modern equivalent to the old organic society."[26] Many found this in Masonry. While promising a better future, the fraternity's ritualism, hierarchical values, and selectiveness evoked a more stable, orderly past. As old norms and institutions began to give way, Masonry held out "a system that is founded in truth, and cannot be destroyed."[27]

A less elevated but powerful appeal of Masonry distinguished the lodge from other early nineteenth-century voluntary associations—conviviality. "Labor" alternated with "refreshments" during meetings that themselves constituted a rare departure from the demanding, often lonely struggles of the farm and from the sameness of village life. Meetings could occasion a night's stay in the local tavern, while annual St. John's Day festivities and even funerals added an unusual touch of color to the lives of Masons. Since Masonry's high purposes combined functional and leisure activities, men reared in a morally earnest, time-conscious society could rationalize participation in the fraternity's more jovial side.[28] Along with conviviality

[24]Brown, "Emergence of Voluntary Associations," 69.

[25]Bradley, *Beauties of Freemasonry,* 148–52.

[26]Rowland Berthoff, *An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 275. In Jacksonville, Illinois, voluntary associations were "sources of stability and continuity amid all the movement of the nineteenth century." See Doyle, "Social Functions of Voluntary Associations," 346. Also Lipson, *Freemasonry;* and *One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration of Olive Branch Lodge No. 39* (Le Roy: Olive Branch No. 39, 1961).

[27]Bradley, *Beauties of Freemasonry,* i; and Brown, "Emergence of Voluntary Associations," 68–69.

[28]My thinking in this paragraph has been influenced by Lipson's fine discussion of the "play element" and "social pleasure" in Connecticut Masonry, *Freemasonry,* 11, 74–75, 254–67. Genesee's Western Star Chapter No. 35 sometimes paid the hotel expenses for membership conclaves. See William R. Henry and Vernon G. Rupert, *The History of Western Star Chapter No. 35* (Batavia: Western Star No. 35, 1963), 11.

went a Masonic emphasis on masculinity. Masonry championed the moral primacy of men and encouraged them to socialize away from the family at a time when the emerging ideal of domesticity stressed family life and the moral authority of women.[29] Resentment of Masonry by Genesee women surfaced after the Morgan kidnapping when they lashed out at the fraternity's interference in domestic life: "... the time and money spent in Masonic orgies is robbing their families and connexions of their natural and just claims, and is calculated to excite distrust and create discord in families."[30]

While male comraderie brightened hometown life, not the least of Masonry's appeals was its supra-community potential. Initiation brought not only contacts in one's own community but automatic entrée into an influential subgroup in other communities. This offered advantages not only to potential emigrants but to businessmen and politicians conducting affairs beyond community boundaries.[31]

Thus a host of attractions, some abstract, many mundane and practical, produced striking growth. In Genesee County alone ten new lodges and two chapters formed in the five years preceding Morgan's disappearance, drawing hundreds of new members. We can only speculate on their reasons for joining, but systematic study of lodge membership reveals concretely Masonry's social sources and the position of the brethren within local communities. In their streets Masons and nascent Antimasons first confronted one another; the social characteristics and lives of Masons in the villages examined here should reveal much about the reality of Antimasonic anxieties.[32]

* * *

The quest for better opportunities had created Genesee County only a quarter century before William Morgan disappeared. Part of New York's late-blooming western frontier, Genesee reflected the peripatetic culture of New England and resembled many recently settled northern farming communities. Masonry's explosive progress was nowhere more evident than here in the center of the future Burned-Over District. Although historians

[29]Mary Ryan, "American Society and the Cult of Domesticity, 1830–1860," Diss. Univ. of California at Santa Barbara 1971; Ann Douglas, "Heaven Our Home: Consolation Literature in the Northern United States, 1830–1880," in David E. Stannard, ed., *Death in America* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1975), 53–54. Western Star chapter had been "the peacemaker in family troubles," Henry and Rupert, *History of Western Star Chapter No. 35,* 12.

[30]*Republican Advocate,* 8 Dec. 1826; Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 187–200.

[31]Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 75–78; Doyle, "Social Functions of Voluntary Associations," 342–48.

[32]While I have stressed that Masonry in Genesee County crossed rural-urban lines, the following analysis spotlights lodges located in the three most commercially oriented settlements. Only these had full surviving membership lists and two, Batavia and Le Roy, hold special interest as the focal points of the Morgan affair.

often associate the growth of voluntary organizations with modernization,[33] Genesee pioneers replanted a remarkable number and variety of associations in an undifferentiated, largely barter economy.[34] Within this spectrum of voluntary activity, Freemasonry ranked as one of the earliest and apparently most prized associations. Seventeen lodges, three chapters, and one encampment had taken root in the twenty-one townships by the time of Morgan's threatened exposé.

Taking at face value Antimasonic rhetoric, historians have associated Freemasonry with urban life. In Genesee County, however, lodges sprang up in the most underdeveloped, sparsely settled areas, as well as in the market villages. The county's first lodge opened in 1809 in a town having just 5.5 persons per square mile, while another town with only seven percent of its acreage improved, housed two lodges.[35] Contrarily, disinterest cost the county seat its lodge from 1820–1824 despite a large population of tradesmen and professionals, and despite an enviable location along the main turnpike from Albany to Buffalo.[36]

Scattered membership figures testify to extraordinary growth for these lodges. Le Roy No. 260 numbered 54 by the end of its first year and added another 103 in the next decade, while Warsaw drew 87 brothers in just three years.[37] Such growth sprang from Masonry's attraction for new members as well as the reestablishment of former affiliations. Among Olive Branch No. 215's 162 members were 104 new initiates.[38]

[33]Brown, "Emergence of Voluntary Associations," 69–70; and Stuart Blumin, *Urban Threshold: Growth and Change in a Nineteenth-Century American Community* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1976), 165.

[34]By 1820 only three townships had more than fifteen percent of their work force in nonagricultural endeavors; seven had less than one-quarter of their acreage improved as late as 1825. *Census for 1820,* U.S. Census Office (Washington, 1821), following 10; New York State Census for 1825, *Senate Journal,* 49th Session, 1826, Appendix A. For county-level societies, F.W. Beers, ed., *Gazetteer and Biographical Record of Genesee County, New York* (Syracuse: J.W. Vose, 1890), 61–62, 106, 108, 150; Stafford E. North, ed., *Our County and Its People: A Descriptive and Biographical Record of Genesee County,* New York (Boston: Boston History Co., 1899), 278, 478; and "Miscellaneous Records," Genesee County, Liber I.

[35]Similarly China had 8.2 persons per square mile when its first lodge opened, and Pembroke had 9.5. Calculations are based on census data for the year nearest the lodge's founding, from Franklin B. Hough, *Census of the State of New York for 1855* (Albany: C. Van Benthuysen, 1857), Table 1, Appendix A.

[36]Three townships without lodges also ranked among the least developed, however. Indicators must be used cautiously; lodge territory did not necessarily coincide with a town's geographical bounds.

[37]Minutes, Olive Branch No. 244 (1814–1816); typescript membership list, Le Roy No. 260, 1815–1827.

[38]Computed from David Seaver, *Freemasonry at Batavia, New York: 1811–1891* (Batavia: J.F. Hall, 1891), 29–34.

New and old Masons alike, along with their non-Masonic neighbors, belonged to the same Yankee cultural group. The denizens of Warsaw's Olive Branch No. 244, Le Roy No. 260, and Batavia No. 433 (the 320 subjects of this examination) had emigrated from the same New England and eastern New York counties as some ninety percent of their neighbors.[39] Typical was Le Roy with forty-five of its fifty-four initial members born in New England and another seven in Yankee-dominated counties along the eastern border of New York. Several had joined the fraternity together in their home towns back in New England.[40] Many were kinsmen as well; over one-fifth of both the Warsaw and the Le Roy Masons could expect to find at least one relative at lodge gatherings.

If part of the same ethno-cultural mosaic, however, Masons nonetheless stood apart from the general populace of Genesee in several ways, one of the most noteworthy being their religious orientation. Historians rightly associate Yankees with evangelicalism, and Genesee County enjoyed fame as an evangelical stronghold by the early 1820s when some eighty-five percent of its ninety-four churches could be characterized as evangelical.[41] Yet while Freemasons held membership, office, and pastorates in the dominant Presbyterian and Baptist congregations, a striking number clustered in the handful of Episcopal parishes. This liturgical denomination claimed eighty-four percent of the members of Batavia No. 433 whose religious affiliations are known, and almost seventy percent of the Masons living in neighboring Le Roy.[42]

[39]Genesee contained seventy-seven percent Yankees as late as 1855. See Hough, *Census for 1855,* Table 1, Appendix A. Benson estimated the state electorate at sixty-five percent Yankee in 1845. See *Concept of Jacksonian Democracy,* 342. David M. Ellis, "The Yankee Invasion of New York, 1783–1850," *New York History,* 32 (Jan. 1951), 3–17.

[40]Typescript copy of membership returns, Le Roy No. 260; Morris Rote-Rosen, *Freemasonry in . . . Granville: A History of Granville Lodge, No. 55, 1796–1936 + 1936–1962* (Granville: Granville Lodge No. 55, 1936; rev. 1962), 13, 15.

[41]The Genesee church map of the 1820s can be reconstructed from incorporation records in the office of the County Clerk, *Miscellaneous Records,* Liber 1. There were twenty-nine Presbyterian/Congregational, twenty-nine Baptist, eighteen Methodist, and a handful of Christian, Friends and Evangelical Reformed churches among the evangelical congregations. As late as 1855 Congregational, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist churches accounted for eighty-two percent of the available church seats in the county. Calculated from Hough, *Census for 1855,* Table 1, Appendix A.

[42]"Records of the Rector," 1823 ff., St. James Episcopal; the "Unpublished Record of St. James Episcopal Church, Batavia, New York, 1815–1839," comp. Christine Fowler. On Le Roy, Seth Beardsley to Bishop J.H. Hobart, 16 Sept. 1828, J.H. Hobart Papers, vol. 35 (Archives and Historical Collections, Episcopal Church). Manuscript subscription list, St. Mark's, 1 Aug. 1826; cemetery records, St. Mark's.

Table 1. DENOMINATION OF MASONS[43]

Denomination	Le Roy No. 260			Batavia No. 433		
	N	absolute percent	relative percent	N	absolute percent	relative percent
Baptist	2	2.8	4.7	0	0	0
Episcopal	30	42.3	69.8	42	55.3	84.0
Presbyterian	10	14.1	23.3	8	10.5	16.0
Universalist	1	1.4	2.3	0	0	0
Unknown	28	39.4	—	26	34.2	—

St. James (Batavia) and St. Mark's (Le Roy) offered an ample measure of status within their assemblages of land agents, merchants, and professionals, but the religious orientation of Episcopalianism also attracted Masons strongly.[44] The more latitudinarian doctrine of Genesee's Episcopal bodies, emphasizing the "institutional administration of grace," harmonized better with the universalist, rationalist tenets of Freemasonry. Of equal import, Episcopalianism's nondevotional stance allowed parishioners to compartmentalize their religious and secular lives.[45] This appealed both ideologically and practically in the increasingly evangelical atmosphere of the Burned-Over District. One Le Roy Mason, for example, renounced Presbyterianism after the pastor publicly rebuked his wife for attending a tavern ball. St. Mark's welcomed him.[46] In Batavia, St. James opened its communion to Masons proscribed by the Presbyterian Church after the Morgan kidnapping.

Though lacking Episcopalianism's social prestige, other countervailing religious tendencies attracted Genesee County Masons. Scattered evidence suggests the convergence of Masonry and Universalism, a rapidly growing frontier denomination particularly detested and feared by evangelicals.[47]

[43]Figures for Le Roy include only those Masons living in the township of Le Roy, although the lodge drew early members from four adjacent towns. There are no surviving Universalist records for Le Roy, while Batavia had no Universalist church.

[44]Fully four-fifths of Genesee County's political leaders residing in Batavia belonged to St. James. See Kathleen S. Kutolowski, "The Social Composition of Political Leadership: Genesee County, New York, 1821–1860," Diss. Univ. of Rochester 1973, 100.

[45]Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965), 18, 28, 30, 32–33; Gerhard Lenski, *The Religious Factor: A Sociological Study of Religion's Impact on Politics, Economics and Family Life* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961), 22–23, 206–07.

[46]Albert F. McVean, *St. Mark's Church* (Le Roy: Le Roy Historical Society, 1967), 3–4. Two years after the Morgan kidnapping, St. Mark's rector wrote: ". . . most of the members of our society are Free Masons *or men who do not denounce Masons*" (italics mine). See Beardsley to Hobart, 26 Sept. 1828.

[47]On countervailing religions, see Ahlstrom, *A Religious History,* 513–15; Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 62–63, 117–18; Cross, *The Burned-Over District,* 43–44, 323; Winthrop S. Hudson, *American Protestantism* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961), 102, 105; and Albert Post, *Popular Freethought in America, 1825–1850* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1943), 195. Children of Genesee County Universalists were excluded from a Sabbath School celebration. See *Farmer's and Mechanic's Journal* (Alexander), 21 Sept. 1839.

Genesee Masons helped found at least four Universalist Churches and provided nearly one-quarter of the organizers of a Union Society that stressed "harmony, good understanding, and social intercourse with all men. . . ."[48] If the Reverend Eliphalet Spencer is any index, Masons belonging to evangelical churches sometimes held dissonant beliefs. The Reverend Spencer shocked and angered his Baptist congregation by advocating infant baptism and "sprinkling."[49]

Perhaps most indicative of Masonic religious liberalism are the twenty-six members of Batavia No. 433 who are not recorded as belonging to any church during the lodge's brief existence from 1824–1826. While large numbers of early national males held no church affiliations, these were years when Genesee experienced repeated revival meetings and expanded church membership. For these twenty-six, just over one-third of the membership, Masonry may have functioned as a surrogate religion. Lodge funeral rites could be sufficient for such: Olive Branch No. 215 conducted at least two funerals without benefit of clergy although three churches existed in the village.[50]

Just as minority religious postures demarcated many Genesee Masons from community denominational norms, so too did their occupations. Over four-fifths of the Batavia, Le Roy, and Warsaw Masons were engaged in the professions and business at a time when some ninety-three percent of Genesee County's work force made its living on farms. To be sure, these lodges were all housed in market villages, but they drew members from the surrounding countryside and from neighboring rural towns. Occupation, not location, would seem to have been the key variable. Masonry clearly held the greatest attraction for businessmen and professionals who, quite sensibly, stood to benefit most from its associations and contacts.[51] Of course, such entrepreneurial types could best afford the financial cost and time required for Masonry. Well into the 1820s much of Genesee County operated in a barter economy exacerbated by poor transportation and lack

[48]Andrew W. Young, *History of the Town of Warsaw* . . . . (Buffalo: Press of Sage, 1869), 178–79.

[49]Mrs. Bertha Faar, "Wyoming Baptist Church—100th Anniversary Sketch," typescript, Wyoming County Historian's Office, Warsaw, New York, 4.

[50]Minutes, Olive Branch No. 215, 137. Absence of church membership was not uncommon prior to the Finney revivals, however. On Masonry as religious surrogate, Lipson, *Freemasonry,* 8, 122–24.

[51]Some ninety percent of the brothers in a nearby rural lodge, Tompkins No. 350 of Wheatland, Monroe County, were involved in trade and manufacturing. See Gary J. Ward, "The Social Composition of Free Masonry in the Early Republic (graduate seminar paper, 1980, SUNY, Brockport). Aggregate occupational data for Genesee County, *Census for 1820.* On Warsaw Masons, See Young, *History of Warsaw;* for Le Roy, "Records of the Town of Bellona and Le Roy from 1813 to 1832," No. 1 Town Book; advertisements in the *Le Roy Gazette*; and the collections of the late Mrs. Harry Russell, Town and Village Historian. For Batavia, see David Seaver, *Freemasonry at Batavia,* 44–46; and advertisements in the *Advocate, Spirit of the Times,* and *People's Press.*

of markets and capital. Quality of farmland varied greatly and large numbers of settlers did not have clear title to their farms; they had neither the leisure nor the funds to join a lodge. Clearly such conditions made Freemasonry, like politics and voluntarism in general, inaccessible to most. While merchants, artisans, attorneys, and physicians frequently dealt in kind, they nonetheless were most likely to possess disposable time and money.[52]

Table 2. OCCUPATIONS OF MASONS[53]

Occupation	Le Roy No. 260			Batavia No. 433			Olive Branch No. 244		
	N	absolute percent	relative percent	N	absolute percent	relative percent	N	absolute percent	relative percent
Agriculture	18	25.4	29.0	4	5.3	5.7	7	8.0	19.4
Business	37	52.1	59.7	48	63.2	68.6	26	29.9	72.2
Professions	7	9.9	11.3	18	23.7	25.7	3	3.4	8.3
Unknown	9	12.8	—	6	7.9	—	51	58.6	—

While advantages of time, capital, and location thus contributed to Masonic elitism, Masons were not unusually wealthy and came from all economic levels. In the township of Le Roy, members fell into every quintile of property-holding, with 28.6 percent in the top and 18.4 percent in the bottom 20 percent. While Thomas Tufts, a Mason, paid Le Roy's highest tax assessment, the wealthiest fifteen property-holders included only four lodge brothers. At least four Le Roy Masons had no taxable property at all in 1820.[54]

[52]The initial three degrees in Olive Branch No. 215 cost sixteen dollars, Minutes (By-Laws, 1814), not including expenses for regalia and meetings. Royal Arch Masonry required twenty dollars more. See Henry and Rupert, *History of Western Star Chapter No. 35,* 10. Meetings took place during the day on weekdays. See Brown, "Emergence of Voluntary Associations," on occupations allowing leisure and voluntary activity.

[53]Business includes entrepreneurs (those engaged in a number of enterprises simultaneously), merchants, and artisans, all of whom seem to have owned their own shops or manufacturing establishments. Two persons were classified as semiprofessionals, a newspaper editor and a person who identified himself only as a civil official. Professionals included attorneys, physicians, and clergymen. These general categories, while simplified, nonetheless reflect the decidedly nonfarm orientation of the brothers. The low rate of identification for Warsaw Masons stems from the instability of the period (1816–1818) and the fact that the lodge membership covered six far-flung townships.

[54]Compiled from manuscript assessment roll, real and personal property, Town of Le Roy, 1820. I ranked all property-holders by their assessed valuation and divided them into fifths. Overall, property was widely held, with seventy-seven percent of all heads of household (as correlated with the federal census of 1820) owning property and the wealthiest ten percent having thirty-five percent of the valuation.

Table 3. PROPERTY-HOLDING OF LE ROY MASONS, 1820

	N	Top 20%	Next 20%	Bottom 20%
Percentage of Masons	49	28.6	24.5	18.4

No tax lists survive for Batavia in this era, but fraternity members clearly fell outside the economic elite in that village. When the first bank in western New York was established in the village in 1829, the fifty-nine stockholders included only six Masons. Of the $100,200 issued in stocks, the six Masons purchased $5,300. By contrast, six wealthy non-Masons bought $36,900. Of eight local bank directors, only one was a lodge member, and no Mason was among the top nine shareholders, all of whom held $3,000 or more in stock.[55]

A similar indicator of relative wealth in Batavia comes from an 1822 subscription list for St. James Episcopal, home of so many brothers. Masons made up thirty-five percent of the subscribers to this $5,100 fund, but their pledges accounted for only twenty-four percent of the total money, and only one Mason appeared among the eight largest contributors. Thirteen years later, when raising money for a new church, St. James again relied most heavily on its non-Masonic members. This time Masons constituted thirty percent of the subscribers and donated twenty-eight percent of the funds.[56]

As these examples indicate, Genesee Masonry, even in the most commercial settlements, cut across class lines. Three years after organization Warsaw brothers owed over $500 in back dues, and local lodges frequently threatened to suspend members in arrears.[57] The master of Batavia Lodge at the time of Morgan's kidnapping had languished in jail as an insolvent debtor just two years earlier.[58] Antimasonic propaganda to the contrary, wealthy Batavians and Le Royans heading the land agencies and large mercantile ventures eschewed Masonry. In fact, successful non-Masonic entrepreneurs dominated lists of bank, canal, and railroad developers throughout the 1820s and 1830s.

Masonry's aura of prestige, influence, and concentrated power came not from members' economic might in Genesee County, but from Masons' increasingly disproportionate share of influential public positions. The militia units of Genesee provided one such arena and Masons held unusually large

[55]Manuscript Stock Ledger, Bank of Genesee, 1829 ff. (Holland Land Office Museum, Batavia).

[56]Computed from "Subscription for Pews and Slips," 26 Aug. 1822, St. James, and from "Treasurer's Account with Subscribers and with Builders of St. James Church, 1835."

[57]Minutes, Olive Branch No. 244, 24 Aug. 1815, 3 Dec. 1816.

[58]"Colonel William Seaver's Diary," including "A brief sketch of the life of William Seaver written by himself for the information and use of his children March 1847," 27–31, 36.

numbers of commissions, particularly at the apex of command, from the county's founding in 1803 until the disappearance of Morgan. Masons supplied the first two brigadier generals, half the commanders and second officers of the 164th regiment and five of six commanders of the 171st. Altogether, one-third of the 320 Masons studied held militia commissions, frequently serving together in units located in strong lodge areas. It mattered little whether officers received commissions through political appointments (prior to 1822) or whether units elected their own officers under the new state constitution of 1821.[59]

Masons' public influence was even more evident in politics. Fully half of the county's pre-1822 office holders (including fourteen of seventeen assemblymen and senators) belonged to lodges. In the five years following enactment of the liberalized Constitution of 1821, fifty-five percent of all county political leaders—candidates and party committeemen alike—were Masons.[60] A step below, at the town level, Masons dominated officeholding no less. Lodge brothers supplied three-fourths of Warsaw's supervisors and justices and the town's only postmaster, and over half of Le Roy's supervisors, town clerks, and assessors.[61]

What can we make of this convergence of Freemasonry and politics in early Genesee County? The fraternity considered itself apolitical and its constitution expressly forbade bringing politics into the lodge. Of course, one could hardly prevent members from discussing perhaps the most popular subject of the day. Meeting in the long rooms of taverns enhanced this possibility; local parties frequently sought tavernkeepers as committeemen to take full advantage of their potential for political propagandizing. Yet did established politicians merely join Genesee lodges to further their careers, or was Masonry itself a "path to power,"[62] as Antimasons argued?

To be sure, politics offered unusual opportunities in early Genesee County. Initially the county had included all of New York west of the Genesee River.

[59]Compiled from Hugh Hastings and Henry Harmon Nobles, eds., *Military Minutes of the Council of Appointment of the State of New York*, 1783–1821, 4 vols. (Albany: J.B. Lyon, 1901–02); and from "Military Commissions Issued," (1823–1827), MS, War Records Office, Division of Naval and Military Affairs of New York, Albany. Charles Z. Lincoln, *A Constitutional History of New York,* 5 vols. (Rochester: The Lawyer's Co-operative, 1905–06), I, 202, 203.

[60]The Constitution of 1821 liberalized the franchise greatly and made county clerks and sheriffs elective. Figures underestimate the participation of Masons because the affiliations of many are unknown. County leadership positions included membership on central corresponding committees or candidacy for county-wide offices. See Kutolowski, "Social Composition of Political Leadership," 4–5.

[61]Young, *History of Warsaw,* 382–83; "Records of Bellona and Le Roy."

[62]The phrase is Whitman H. Ridgway's in *Community Leadership in Maryland, 1790–1840* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1979), 160, and describes "recruitment patterns where men with certain attributes were able to assume leadership roles with greater ease. . . ."

Batavia, its county seat, served as headquarters for the powerful Holland Land Company, which owned some three million acres. Until Rochester and Buffalo began to flourish in the mid-1820s, much of western New York's political and economic development rotated around Batavia. In this fertile party atmosphere, Masonry indeed helped launch political careers. Some fifty-five Masons became party leaders at the county level. Comparing dates of Masonic initiation or local affiliation to their political careers reveals that fully forty-five of these fifty-five party leaders became candidates, appointees, or central committee members only after joining lodges—and often within a year or two. Only five entered the county leadership prior to joining, while dates are lacking for five others.

In fact, both local political organizations deserved the designation "Masonic Party," not just the Bucktail-Democrats, as Antimasons charged. Genesee Masonic politicians leaned only slightly (fifty-six percent) toward the Bucktails and both parties recruited Masons equally: forty-eight percent of the Bucktail and forty-six percent of the Clintonian leadership of the 1820s belonged to lodges, extraordinary figures considering that Masons constituted at most five percent of the voting population.[63] This striking preponderance of Masonic politicians reflected the genuine popularity Masons enjoyed with Genesee voters. Party brokers, most of whom were non-Masons, relied most heavily on the lodges to secure candidates, not committeemen or appointees. From 1803 to 1827 two-thirds of the eighty-five known candidates for political office at the county level were Masons, including three-quarters of the Assembly candidates before 1822. Certainly Masonry served well those interested in seeking elective office, as well as cadre managers faced with marshalling an increasingly large electorate.

By contrast, Masons never dominated the inner sanctum of Genesee County's early parties. The key central committees of each party, which orchestrated the county nominating conventions, had a majority of non-Masons. In the early 1820s only six Masons were among a group of fourteen especially active Bucktail committeemen.[64] Prior to that Joseph Ellicott, resident agent of the Holland Company and a non-Mason, had enjoyed wide repute as the political boss of the region. A coterie of relatives and close associates, not one a Mason, aided him.[65] If voters had few alternatives to

[63]A liberal and rough estimate based on an average lodge membership of thirty in 1825; adult male population extrapolated from the New York Census for 1825, based on ratios of the United States for 1820.

[64]Four others joined the lodge in 1826, one suspects for the purpose of solidifying their political contacts.

[65]William G. Chazanof, *Joseph Ellicott and the Holland Land Company* (Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1970), 43–80; and Paul D. Evans, *The Holland Land Company,* Buffalo Historical Society Publications, 8 (Buffalo: Buffalo Historical Society, 1924), passim. Historians such as Cross and Benson repeated Antimasonic charges that the Agency was a Masonic stronghold.

Masonic office-holding before 1826, non-Masons were largely responsible for the heavily Masonic tickets.

Why, then, did non-Masons recruit Masons for public office in such striking numbers? The answer lies partly in personal availability. The same resources that enabled men to join a costly, time-consuming, fraternal organization allowed them to participate in politics. Many frontier situations dictated political elitism, Turnerian concepts to the contrary. Political availability, however, probably had more to do with Masons' preferment. Prior to the Morgan kidnapping there seems to have been little resentment toward Masonry. Masons came from all social classes and played highly respectable roles in a variety of community institutions. In this still deferential political culture, parties wisely tapped such local notables for elected positions. Additionally, Masonic political candidates generally lived in the more rural townships, areas otherwise chronically underrepresented within the county political hierarchy. It was good politics to distribute some candidacies among these towns. When leaders of these outlying settlements gained access to the county party structure, their preferment came, it seems, partly through Masonry. In the early 1820s, for example, eighteen party leaders lived in Attica, Bethany, Middlebury, and Warsaw; sixteen were Masons. Finally, while there is no way to document it, party managers undoubtedly hoped that Masonic candidates would carry a block of votes by dint of their fraternal bond.

Not all of Genesee County's early leaders chose Masonry as an avenue to success, and most of the economic and political magnates of Batavia and Le Roy remained outside the fraternity. Common sense suggests that the greater wealth and position of these non-Masons made many of the fraternity's practical appeals extraneous. Several were relatives or friends of Ellicott; the Land Office connection, rather than Masonry, guaranteed their preferment. By contrast, ambitious but not yet fully established men found Freemasonry a reliable avenue to opportunity in pre-Morgan Genesee County.[66]

* * *

Masonry's comfortable existence, mushroom growth, and access to civic leadership ceased abruptly after 1826. As legal machinery sputtered, Genesee

[66]Junior grade militia officers often joined lodges before achieving higher rank. Lee Benson has argued that "admittance to Masonic lodges apparently represented a distinction 'successful' Americans acquired to signify their passage to a higher social status." See *Concept of Jacksonian Democracy,* 25. In Genesee, at least, Masonry appears more a ladder to success than a mere badge of distinction.

citizens began to question the legitimacy of a secret, closed fraternal order in a republic. While egalitarianism echoed through public utterances, Masons championed exclusiveness and secrecy. In an era suffused with sectarianism and evangelical piety, Masons were secular and universalist, thus threatening religious canons as well. In enforcing their separate morality, they competed with church and family, thus challenging both religiosity and domesticity. Probably most significant, Masons had held too many offices and played too prominent a role in affairs. Their apparent ability to advance themselves and to stand above the law raised legitimate anxieties among their neighbors. Seemingly overnight the "Morgan Affair" mustered an army of Antimasonic voters from a citizenry that previously had divided about equally between the old parties.

In the ensuing furor, a few Genesee County Masons seceded and publicly renounced the old order while some left the county forever; loyal Masons, however, established a Masonic newspaper, expelled seceding members for "unmasonic conduct," and attempted to continue as usual. They met only harassment and violence. Antimasons stoned a St. John's Day procession and ransacked a Royal Arch Chapter.[67] Eventually, sixteen of seventeen Genesee lodges and two chapters surrendered their charters. Only the feisty Olive Branch No. 215 continued to meet underground, initiating candidates in the midst of turmoil and surfacing in the late 1830s.[68]

When Masonry began to revive slowly a decade and a half after the Morgan incident, its altered place in the public affairs of Genesee County testified to the powerful impact of Antimasonry. Members of the county's two lodges of the 1840s held almost no positions of prominence in their towns or in the county. While their absence from politics is unsurprising, members also disappeared from other leadership positions. Neither did they hold prestigious jobs; nearly half were small farmers, while several others were artisans and one a laborer. Indeed, Genesee Masonry retained only one previous characteristic: the fraternity still drew men affiliated with nonevangelical churches.[69]

[67]Minutes, Olive Branch No. 215, 242, 254–55, 265, 267; *The Craftsman* (Rochester), 21 April 1829. Harriet A. Week, ed., *Life of Thurlow Weed, Including His Autobiography and a Memoir,* 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1893), I, 323–25; Henry Brown, *A Narrative of the Anti-Masonick Excitement* (Batavia: Adams and McCleary, 1829), 149–54; and Henry and Rupert, *History of Western Star Chapter No. 35,* 13.

[68]Minutes, Olive Branch No. 215, 272.

[69]These generalizations are based on a social profile of the whole membership of Olive Branch No. 39 and Batavia No. 88. Data from "Membership Return" to the Grand Lodge, Olive Branch No. 39, June 1842–June 1843 (Microfilm, Library and Museum, Grand Lodge F. and A.M., State of New York); David Seaver, *Freemasonry at Batavia,* 61–63; and population returns, Seventh Census of the United States, 1850, Genesee County. Some twenty-two of thirty-four Batavia Masons were Episcopal, another five Universalist. Church Records Survey, St. James, and typescript membership role, the Universalist Church of Alexander (Richmond Library, Batavia).

Whatever the ravages of Antimasonry, however, they must not obscure the earlier significance of Masonry. Like later nineteenth-century fraternal lodges, Masonry helped organize the lives of both rural and urban Americans in the early republic. Such associations must be studied widely and systematically if the new social history is to reconstruct fully the warp and woof of community life. Influence and power were integral to social structure, and Freemasonry was both influential and powerful through its members' public positions and social characteristics. Those social traits seem to be remarkably similar for both Genesee County Masons and the brothers whom Lipson profiled in Windham County, Connecticut, but additional studies must probe the nature of Masonry in non-Yankee areas, in other rural communities, and in areas less susceptible to Antimasonry, as well as in other regions of Antimasonic strength. Also, Masonry's role within the spectrum of voluntary organizations, its influence on both domesticity and early feminism, and its place in the structure of community power call for further exploration.

Like Freemasonry, Antimasonry is vital to understanding both the early republic and the new political history. Reshaping voting patterns in many communities from New England to the old Northwest, Antimasonry influenced the tone and substance of evangelical politics, imbuing Whiggery with its moral fervor and its antipartyism. A reexamination of Antimasonry is underway, but it must not exclude Freemasonry from its purview. While Antimasonry's social correlates have yet to be determined, the concentration of office-holding among Genessee Masons suggests that Antimasons, far from being irrational, as Davis, Hofstadter, and Lipset and Raab have argued, had good reason to fear the fraternity's influence. The "stone-walling" tactics utilized after Morgan disappeared had their roots in Masons' local control, from county judges down to town leaders who submitted lists of potential jurors to county sheriffs. Evangelical Americans viewed both power and party as antithetical to republican virtue, and they were rightly alarmed by the political influence wielded by this fast-growing society.[70] If other polities resemble Genesee, antiparty and anti-Masonic sentiments did not merely overlap. They converged and were directed against the Masons, simultaneously agents of party and fraternity.

Studies that have taken Antimasonry seriously have assumed that Masons were urban and connected with local land offices. In Genesee County they crossed rural-urban lines and Masonic party leaders resided in the more rural towns. Nor were they mostly Bucktail-Democrats or connected with the land agency, as Cross, Benson, and Holt have assumed. The social

[70]Ronald P. Formisano, "Political Character, Antipartyism, and the Second Party System," *American Quarterly,* 21 (1969), 683–709.

configuration of Masonry in Genesee reveals no simple division between classes, lifestyles, or parties but rather, potentially, a split within the local elite.

Masonic political influence and divisions within a community elite, quite aside from their shaping role in Antimasonry, offer further evidence for a broader reinterpretation of the early republic. As Edward Pessen has argued, egalitarianism was hardly the order of the day.[71] Concentration, not distribution of power, and oligarchy, not democracy, characterized governing elites and politics in many types of communities. Masonry, while overlooked, contributed to the less than egalitarian society and thus to the "essential continuity" of inequality hypothesized by Pessen for the first half of the nineteenth century.[72] Neither can we cast aside elements of discontinuity, however; Antimasonry, along with evangelical revivalism, gripped communities across the Yankee belt of settlement and culture. Antimasons knew Masonry and its influence intimately. Acting upon knowledge and experience and arguing the unrepublican implications of Masonic political power, they crippled the lodge in many areas, rendered it politically dysfunctional, and along the way shaped political behavior for decades to come.*

[71]For Pessen's synthesis of the new literature, see *Jacksonian America,* rev. ed. He presents the anti-egalitarian thesis persuasively in "Who Governed the Nation's Cities in the Era of the Common Man?" *Political Science Quarterly,* 87 (1972), 591–614.

[72]Edward Pessen, "We Are All Jeffersonians, We Are All Jacksonians: Or a Pox on Stultifying Periodizations," *Journal of the Early Republic,* 1 (1981), 1–26. See also Pessen's controversial essay, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South?" *American Historical Review,* 85 (1980), 1119–49.

*My thanks to Professors Richard D. Brown, David Hackett Fischer, Ronald P. Formisano, John F. Kutolowski, John N. Ingham, two anonymous *American Quarterly* readers, and particularly Robert A. Gross and Lynn Hudson Parsons for helpful criticism and suggestions. I am grateful for Masonic records provided by Mr. Leslie Derrick, Leroy, and Mr. William Smallwood, Warsaw.