

CANDIDATE EMERGENCE IN THE FIRST PARTY ERA, 1788-1816

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
ARIC DALE GOOCH
Dr. Jay Dow, Co-Chair
Dr. Peverill Squire, Co-Chair

MAY 2022

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

CANDIDATE EMERGENCE IN THE FIRST PARTY ERA, 1788-1816

presented by Aric Dale Gooch,
a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,
and hereby certify, that in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Jay Dow

Professor Peverill Squire

Professor Laron Williams

Professor Jeffrey L. Pasley

Dedication

In memory of my dad, Curtis, and in regard to my mom, Vicky. Thank you for always
believing in me.

To my wife, Emma. Thank you for your love and support.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Jay Dow for his guidance throughout this project and for always believing in its potential. I would also like to thank Professor Peverill Squire for his thoughtful feedback as I completed the project. Additionally, thank you to the other members of my committee, Laron Williams and Jeffrey L. Pasley, for their willingness to help me sharpen this work.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Pennsylvania: Democracy in Action.....	33
3 New Hampshire: Candidate Emergence and Centralized Politics	115
4 South Carolina and Ohio: Local Procedures and National Politics	173
5 Conclusion: Candidate Emergence, Political Parties, and American Democratization	239
APPENDIX: Additional Tables	267
BIBLIOGRAPHY	269
VITA.....	281

List of Tables

TABLE	PAGE
1.1 Stages of Candidate Emergence Development in All Four Case Studies, 1788-1816	22
2.1 Summary of Electoral Rules for State and National Legislative Elections in Pennsylvania	37
2.2 Summary of Pennsylvania Candidate Emergence Development.....	38
2.3 Electoral Competitiveness in Chester and Lancaster Counties, 1798-1802	59
3.1 Summary of Electoral Rules for State and National Legislative Elections in New Hampshire	122
3.2 Summary of New Hampshire Candidate Emergence Development (State Senate and Congress).....	127
4.1 Summary of Electoral Rules for State and National Legislative Elections in South Carolina	177
4.2 Summary of Electoral Rules for State and National Legislative Elections in Ohio	177
4.3 Summary of Charleston, South Carolina Candidate Emergence Development	180
4.4 Summary of Ohio Candidate Emergence Development	181
A1 Cumberland County Democratic-Republican Party Organization and Legislative Nomination Procedures, 1800-1816	267

Abstract

My dissertation evaluates the development of candidate in the early republic, 1788-1816.

The creation of nomination procedures to structure candidate emergence informs our understanding on the development of political parties and American democratization. I investigate federal and state-level candidate emergence in four states: New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Ohio. I study these states because of their variation in regional political culture, electoral systems, and electoral competition. My primary data are obtained from period newspapers. These detail candidate emergence and nomination methods used in state legislative and congressional elections. Building on extant theories of party development, I present my own theory to explain the development of candidate emergence and compare development patterns across states. I find political parties developed clear procedures that were relatively durable over time to structure candidate emergence. This is a key indicator of party development. Further, these procedures generally provided for meaningful grassroots participation making them effective agents of democratization.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Driving down Interstate 70 going from one side of Columbia, Missouri to the other, I would pass by the same billboard during the 2020 presidential election. It was a simple design with bold black lettering, a white background, and only three words: “THINK FOR YOURSELF.”¹ This sign intrigued me during an election cycle full of complaints about media bias, misinformation, and the dangers of heightened party polarization. The idea of an unbiased, level-headed, and informed voter is a standard to which the American people have been held to since the Founding and have to this day fallen short. Political parties play an important role coordinating both elites and electorates with similar policy goals around potential candidates that will pursue these policies while in office.

Today, parties achieve this coordination through nomination procedures. First, individuals compete in a primary election to determine who will be a political party’s candidate in an upcoming election. Then, the successful primary candidates compete in the general election for a political office. For example, Missouri’s seventh congressional district held its primary election on August 2, 2016, before the general election on November 8, 2016. The Democratic Party, Republican Party, and Libertarian Party each had a primary election. There were three individuals competing for the Democratic Party nomination, one person on the Libertarian ballot, and eight individuals, including the incumbent, competing for the Republican Party nomination. This process narrowed down the potential candidates to three party nominees, Genevieve Williams for the Democratic Party, Benjamin T. Brixey for the Libertarian Party, and incumbent Billy Long for the

Republican Party. A similar process, dependent upon the type of primary election system a state has, is replicated for state level offices as well year after year.

How did we come to such a routinized and institutionalized procedure of candidate emergence? Previous literature focused on two important periods in American history: the second party era and the Progressive era. The second party era is commonly understood to be the first mass party system where widespread political institutionalization took place to structure elections. The process of becoming a candidate in state and national elections was through the party machine. This development was understood to have placed political power in the hands of party bosses. The process of candidate emergence found its more modern form after the Progressive Era at the turn of the twentieth century with the introduction of primary elections to weaken party control over the election cycle and give ordinary citizens more of a say in who represented them. However, our understanding of how candidates emerge throughout the election cycle across American history is incomplete. Before the Whigs and the Progressives there was the first party era between 1788 and 1816. Understanding how candidates emerged during the first thirty years of American history under the Constitution is important foundational knowledge for understanding the development of American politics and a gap in the political science and political history literature.

In my dissertation, I present new data and a theory on the development of candidate emergence during the first party era. Candidate emergence is the way in which an individual presents themselves, or is presented by others, to a constituency as a candidate for public office. The central question in my dissertation is: how did candidate emergence develop, and its structures vary across space and time in the United States between 1788

and 1816? Shortly after the Founding, there were new national level political offices to compete for that became a part of existing state electoral cycles and politics. This created new political constituencies within states allowing state-level politics to connect to the national political stage like never before. There was no precedent for how someone should present themselves as a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives. This made the period unique and foundational in our understanding of candidate emergence. To answer this question, I investigate how potential candidates were presented to electorates, what type of procedures, if any, developed to structure candidate emergence, and if these procedures varied across space and time.

Research on candidate emergence during the period also allows me to contribute to two central questions in the political science and political history literature. First, my research helps to answer the question of whether the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans were institutionalized political parties. Political historians of the 1960s wrote about the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans as if they were the first political parties in U.S. history.² This resulted in a backlash that challenged this literature and took the popular institutional definition of political parties presented by Frank Sorauf to demonstrate that these two groups failed to meet specific criteria.³ Part of this critique claimed that previous histories took the presence of partisanship and electioneering as evidence of party organization, which were not the same thing. The creation of nomination procedures would constitute supportive evidence of party organization and, therefore, the development of political parties between 1788 and 1816.⁴ However, a systematic study of nomination procedures did not follow this critique.

Political historians turned away from questions on party development and simply accepted the conclusion that the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans were not political parties. They were instead labeled “proto-parties” that looked like political parties but failed to meet the standards of the institutional definition.⁵ This view of the first party era is now foundational in political science literature on party development.

The common narrative in political science on American party development does not consider the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans as political parties that attempted to organize outside the halls of Washington. For example, in the freely available online Introduction to American Government textbook provided by Openstax and Rice University it says that before the creation of the Democratic Party in the 1820s, parties existed just to coordinate elites in government, specifically Congress at the national level, and did not extend down to the people as meaningful organizations.⁶

This view is grounded by John H. Aldrich’s work on party development.⁷ Aldrich described party development as a top-down process that began with national political elites coordinating in government who later sought to coordinate electorates below them. He began his theory on party development with the assumption that the most important actors were the “ambitious office seekers and holders.”⁸ Coalitions were created by politicians in Congress to coordinate legislative voting during the first thirty years of American history and it was not until the 1830s that political parties were formed as a rational choice for office seekers to aid their singular pursuit of gaining and retaining political office. Aldrich’s work culminated in an elite-centric theory of party development that described a process of party development from the national level of politics to that then spread to the masses below. Most importantly, Aldrich assumed that the Federalists and Democratic-

Republicans were only “parties-in-government” and had not attempted to organize the electorate.⁹

Recent work by political historians on the development of political culture during the early republic have brought political parties back into the narrative. With research on festivals, parades, and fashion, political historians have found that partisanship was deeply held by individuals at the grassroots level.¹⁰ Jeffrey L. Pasley’s work on the 1796 presidential election wrestled with the use of the institutional definition of political parties by historians and concluded that the definition was unhelpful for understanding how politics operated during the early republic and also failed in many ways to accurately define political parties today.¹¹ Political historians are not interested in whether these groups constituted political parties or not, but assume their presence to understand the development of political culture during the period.

Political scientists need to address this issue with a more useful definition of political parties. John F. Hoadley pointed out this problem in his work on the development of political parties from 1789-1803. In his conclusion, he remarked that there were only a few times in American history that parties met the institutional definition and he doubted political parties in the 1980s, when he was writing, met the definitional standard.¹² Therefore, I present my own definition of political parties that does not define them away in the early republic and more accurately reflects their role in American politics throughout American history and today. I define a political party as a relatively durable social formation of intense policy demanders which seeks to influence government through the capture of political office and coordinates according to a distinguishable set of perspectives or ideology, generating in-group perspectives.

My definition builds off work by William Nisbet Chambers as well as Cohen et al. and it has four main parts.¹³ First, a political party must have some durability to it. There must be evidence of continued activity or staying power in the organization's ideology across time. Second, a political party is made up of intense policy demanders. Cohen et al. defined intense policy demanders as those who are motivated by specific policy goals, are politically active to reach their goals, and are large enough as a group to have political influence.¹⁴ These groups of policy demanders are the main actors within political parties. Third, a party seeks to accomplish its goals through the capture of political power by successfully placing people into political office. Fourth, a political party is coordinated around a set of ideas making up an ideology that is distinguishable from other political parties. An ideology can be displayed through policy discussions and/or through symbolic language that displays identification with a set of ideas or loyalty to a group. With this definition of political parties, I can conduct a reevaluation of the question on party development during the early republic.

Lastly, my research contributes to the debate over the influence of political parties in the development of American democracy during the early republic. This question is important in political science as well as the growing political history literature on the early republic. Work by historian Daniel Peart pointed to the early republic as an important period for the development of democracy.¹⁵ However, Peart did not argue that political parties were influential in this development. Rather, there were other societal groups and associations that allowed for the development of greater democracy in America. Political parties were, according to Peart, unsupportive or at worst a hindrance in the story of American democratization. In a brief exploration of political parties in Massachusetts

during the early 1820s, Peart concluded they were in fact subversive organizations of popular will and operated as impediments to democratization in that state through their domination of nomination procedures. Peart's line of inquiry sidelines political parties from discussions on American democratization and brings to the center societal associations.

This recent argument from the historical literature comes into conflict with a much older argument from political science that understood political parties as central to the creation of American democracy. E. E. Schattschneider argued in his seminal book that political parties were agents of democratization writing that "the political parties created democracy."¹⁶ The new U.S. Constitution alone was not enough to create American democracy, it required the introduction and activity of political parties.

To understand the role of political parties in the story of American democratization I rely upon Johann N. Neem's approach to conceptualizing democratization. Neem critiques previous discussions of democratization during the early republic with their focus on engagement and measuring the process with voter turnout. He argued that this was a poor proxy for understanding the quality of democracy. Neem used economist Amartya Sen's work on development and freedom as his foundation for a new conceptualization of democratization.¹⁷ Sen argued the expansion of capabilities was what allowed people to live the kinds of lives they valued and, therefore, have freedom.¹⁸ The development of political capabilities was one aspect of his work. This approach would require researchers to discover the extent to which institutions, like political parties, influenced the capabilities of "citizens to deliberate and then influence public policy."¹⁹ Neem concluded that the literature on the topic to date appeared to demonstrate it was civic organizations and

associations, not political parties, that encouraged the development of capabilities and therefore American democratization.²⁰

I argue one of the best mechanisms for influencing public policy is the ability to influence nominations. Determining a party nominee comes with it discussions of public policy and a concrete mechanism for influencing policy through the designation of a potential candidate that would enter political office with policy goals similar to one's own. Therefore, understanding the extent to which political parties incorporated ordinary citizens into nomination procedures is the best avenue for understanding their role in American democratization as either agents or roadblocks of the process.

Data and Methods

I am interested in understanding how candidate emergence develops across the United States. It is generally understood that during the early republic the U.S. had four distinct regions: New England, the mid-Atlantic, the South, and the West. Each region had its own unique political history and its own political culture.²¹ In an attempt to discuss the development of candidate emergence in the U.S. broadly, I analyze a single state within each of the four regions: New Hampshire in New England, Pennsylvania in the mid-Atlantic, South Carolina in the South, and Ohio in the West. I am not trying to suggest that each of these states is the most representative of the region. However, each offers a glimpse into what might be expected from the region.

I also investigate the development of candidate emergence across time, from 1788-1816. The period ranges from the ratification of the Constitution to the election cycle following the end of the War of 1812. The period under analysis encompasses what many

historians would consider the lifespan of the Federalist Party as a national party.²² Analyzing this period offers an opportunity to discover how candidate emergence might have advanced toward party organizations of the second party era, but also developed along a different path.

To guide my inquiry, I look to the American political development (APD) literature on how to proceed with a research project which seeks to understand development. Specifically, I conduct a qualitative analysis of candidate emergence in the United States at the state and national level between 1788 and 1816. My main source of data on candidate emergence comes from historical newspapers. A second source of data comes from election returns for the period that not only offered information to analyze, but also guided my newspaper analysis.

The major dependent variable in the study of American political development is development itself. Orren and Skowronek define development as “a durable shift in governing authority.”²³ The definition as it stands does not help me to frame the development of candidate emergence because of their stipulation of the shift occurring in the government itself. Therefore, I use their definition as a foundation for my own understanding of development. I define development as a durable shift in political legitimacy. This broader definition of development allows me to apply it to the development of candidate emergence outside of the governing apparatus. I am looking for changes or transitions of political authority in relation to the presentation of individuals as candidates for political offices. Authority of this kind can be held by an individual, a small group, or an organization. Authority is granted by others and strengthened or weakened according to the perceived legitimacy of those exercising political authority. When certain

actions are perceived as illegitimate one should expect to see a shift in political authority to a more legitimate source or procedure. It is the perception of legitimacy that undergirds the nature of development for candidate emergence.

Society understands and measures the political legitimacy of various political actions according to political culture. Formisano argued that the political culture of the early republic was a transitional political culture.²⁴ According to his view, deferential political culture dominated during colonial America. A certain class of elites were understood as the best suited for public office. Their place in society gave them a unique perspective to best provide for the public good. Ordinary citizens were expected to give deference to their decisions. With the passing of the American Revolution, the power and political influence of ordinary citizens in the streets began and ushered in a transition to a participant political culture. This new political culture granted ordinary citizens with the power and expectation of being involved in everyday politics. Politics was to be more egalitarian and constituency oriented. Formisano described the political culture of the U.S. from 1789-1840 as a deferential-participant political culture. If these two political cultures did exist at the same time during a transitional period it is important to understand how and where they came into conflict, were combined, or dominated the other across the U.S. over time.²⁵ Variation in political culture during the period meant the standard of what was politically legitimate varied across space and time, and influenced the development of candidate emergence in unique ways.

I analyze four states to exploit variation across three theoretically important factors: political culture, electoral systems, and electoral competition. First, each state was in a different region of the nation with its own unique political history and culture. Second,

these states differed in their electoral rules. The political boundaries they used to elect state legislative positions varied from townships elections in New Hampshire, to multi-county district elections like in Pennsylvania. Furthermore, there was variation in electoral systems in place to elect members of Congress. For example, Pennsylvania used district elections for a majority of the period under analysis, quite a few of them multi-member districts, while New Hampshire employed statewide at-large elections. The electoral systems in place created perceptions of political space important for the development of candidate emergence. Third, each state displayed variation in electoral competition somewhat unique to its political context. Federalist had a relatively strong hold on political power throughout the period in New Hampshire. Pennsylvania had continuous competition between the two parties, albeit with the Democratic-Republicans holding the upper hand. South Carolina was a stronghold for Democratic-Republicans, and Ohio, another base of Democratic-Republican support, offered the best evidence of Federalist competition in the West.

To provide a fuller picture of what candidate emergence looked like I investigate the phenomenon at the state and national level. Previous research on party organization primarily discussed and singularly focused on national level politics.²⁶ While there were a multitude of state level analyses of party organizations from the positive party historiography of the 1960s, the literature failed to understand how these two levels of politics interacted or to compare across cases.²⁷ Therefore, I investigate candidate emergence for both state and national level legislative offices, which includes state lower chambers, state upper chambers, and the U.S. House of Representatives. I exclude executive elections (governors, presidential electors, and presidents) to simplify my

analysis. I also disregard U.S. Senators because they were appointed by state legislatures during this period and not popularly elected.

Investigating from 1788 to 1816 allows me to describe how candidate emergence developed and changed in response to changes in major political events. Conventional wisdom for a time held that the Federalist Party was essentially gone after the presidential election of 1800 and Jefferson's Revolution. Historian Philip Lampi provided evidence to the contrary showing the continuance of the Federalist Party into the early 1820s with a resurgence across the United States between 1808 and 1816.²⁸ Despite the Federalist Party's inability to compete for the presidency throughout the entire period, they were still involved in national politics through congressional elections and quite active in state legislative politics. Therefore, focusing on legislative candidate emergence throughout this lengthy period provides the best avenue to understand the full depth of candidate emergence development.

I used two online resources to collect data on candidate emergence during the period for each of my cases. The *A New Nation Votes* (NNV) dataset is a searchable collection of U.S. vote returns from 1787-1825 including local, state, and national elections. These returns allowed me to discern the ability of parties to nominate the theoretically expected number of candidates and the effect of nomination procedures in the coordination of votes. These data also informed my newspaper analysis by providing me with a list of candidate names and the jurisdiction in which they competed. Readex contains two online collections I used to collect data on candidate emergence. First, the *Early American Newspapers* (Series I) archive contains digitized collections of newspapers published between 1788 and 1824. The archive has the capability to keyword search and

narrow one's search by date, state, and even to within a specific newspaper. This meant I was able to take a first cut using keyword searching of candidate names and other terms before looking newspaper to newspaper during the election cycle.²⁹ The *Early American Imprints* (Series I and II) collection, also provided through Readex, offers a digitized archive of pamphlets, broadsides, and other ephemera to keyword search through as well. Political activists used broadsides or circular letters to transmit election information. These types of documents also offered information on candidate emergence and were sometimes reprinted in newspapers.

An overwhelming majority of my data comes from newspapers. In general, early republic newspapers were founded and heavily used by those invested in state and national politics. Newspapers could even be considered the national political structure for the two parties at the time.³⁰ Newspapers published the announcement of meetings to discuss the nomination of candidates for various political offices. Using newspapers, one can track the progression of candidate emergence within an individual election cycle. Newspaper advertisements were especially important in my data collection process. These ranged from open letters by individuals that placed themselves up for election, to meeting announcements, meeting proceedings, and discussion of these proceedings. I used these announcements to discern the partisan stance of the individual or organization, who was involved, who was presented as a candidate for office, and any connection the individual or organization had to other political meetings or organizations. This required hours of searching through newspapers that published weekly and sometimes daily for the three- to five-month election cycle every year between 1788 and 1816.

There is one possible issue with my data generation process I would like to briefly discuss. One could argue that I am selecting data according to my dependent variable. I am interested in knowing if nomination procedures developed around the candidate emergence process during the period and newspapers are the most likely space where such data would exist. My data gathering process might systematically miss other forms of development that occurred outside of the newspaper. This is a common problem in contemporary research on candidate emergence. One never knows the exact pool of potential candidates that were thinking about running for office. Further, election return data from NNV is not complete making it impossible to search for every candidate by name that ran in each election. For example, sometimes the records only mention the name of the candidate that won and not the other competitors. I acknowledge this methodological problem and take this into account in my conclusions.

Despite the limitation of my analysis, it is an important extension in the realm of political science. Most political scientists, and political historians, who discussed the development of political parties limited themselves to legislative politics.³¹ My research goes beyond voting records found in legislative journals to discuss political parties as organizations outside the legislative session. My research will hopefully broaden the scope of analysis for political scientists beyond voting records to other meaningful party functions like nominating candidates.

Understanding the Development of Candidate Emergence

The theoretical work in my dissertation builds upon the party development and party system literature in political science. The party system literature helps answer the question of why I anticipate the creation of nomination procedures to structure the candidate

emergence process, while the party development literature scaffolds onto this literature to better understand how that development occurred.

Why do nomination procedures develop? Gary Cox argued it comes from the drive to overcome a coordination problem.³² A segment of the electorate with enough votes to elect a candidate to office can only do so if they do not spread their votes across a multitude of candidates, specifically voting for more candidates than seats up for election. Therefore, one way to ensure this does not happen is to limit the number of candidates running for office. This can be accomplished through the development of nomination procedures that limit access to the ballot and provide a stamp of viability to those candidates.

This built off Duverger's work on party systems demonstrating how electoral systems influence the number of candidates up for election within a district and how this influences the size of the national party system. This is Duverger's Law, predicting that strategic coordination limits the number of candidates in a race at the district level which scales up to limit the number of parties in a country.³³ Cox contributed to this research agenda by emphasizing the influence of public expectations as an important factor influencing the number of candidates that will run for office. He also presented a clearer theory for the translation of Duverger's district level expectations to the national party system. Both contributions are important for understanding the development of candidate emergence in the early republic.

First, candidate viability influences public expectations on the number of candidates that could reasonably compete for the same political office. According to Cox, viability comes from party endorsements. Candidates will compete for party labels if they conceive them as being valuable. A party label has value because of its ability to indicate

a candidate's standing on issues to the electorate and as a coordination device for likeminded voters.³⁴ To reach this point, a party label must have the sole nominating power over a given ideological niche of the electorate and that niche must be large enough to conceivably win an election. Understanding this point rounds out the three reasons why one would anticipate nomination procedures to develop around the candidate emergence process: they aid in limiting the number of candidates, provide information on candidate viability, and act as a coordination device for the electorate.

Second, Cox described five possible explanations for the linkage between district level party expectations and the national party system. Two are important for this project: the pursuit of national policy and the pursuit of the presidency. The second explanation is more often discussed in American political development. Cox even uses the United States as a case study to explore this linkage.³⁵ Potential presidential candidates must campaign for votes nationally and are incentivized to create a national organization of potential legislative candidates to aid in their pursuit. This is especially true if presidential elections and legislative elections are held in conjunction. This explanation is referenced most often.

The second explanation relevant to this study for the linkage between the national party system and what occurs at the district level is the pursuit of national policy. Cox described two versions of this argument. The "interior" party story depicts legislators at the national level coming together to accomplish some policy goal and then seeking to organize the electorate below to increase their odds of continued success. The other story suggests parties are started from interest groups, either national or various subnational groups coming together, to form a political party to control government policy. This is the "exterior" party story.³⁶ Cox does not spend much time on this argument and instead places

more emphasis on the executive linkage argument. Nevertheless, this possible linkage mentioned by Cox is important to note because of its connection to the theoretical framework I use to understand the process of party development.

The second grounding theoretical question in my dissertation is: how do political parties develop? I have already mentioned that the dominant understanding in political science is Aldrich's top-down developmental story. Aldrich used rational choice theory to understand why office holders and seekers would create political parties to solve various problems from policymaking to winning elections. Again, he understood the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans as coalitions within Congress and not political parties that extended out to the people during elections.

An alternative is the group-centered theory of party development. Cohen et al. argued that "parties are creatures of interest groups, ideological activists, and others . . . call[ed] intense policy demanders. These actors organize parties to get the governmental policies they want."³⁷ The group-centered theory of party development assumes that intense policy demanders are the major actors driving party development rather than national politicians and the drive to create political parties comes out of the pursuit of policy rather than political office. Pasley used this understanding of party development to conceptualize the development of a national American political culture as a "middle out" process.³⁸ In this period of American history, these middle-men could encompass newspaper editors, state-level political activists, and minor government officials. These groups of intense policy demanders are not large enough to accomplish their goals alone and need allies they can coordinate with to achieve their policy goals. Since influencing government policy is the main goal "the most important party business is the nomination

and election of office seekers who will serve the interests of the party's intense policy demanders.”³⁹ Therefore, the group-centered theory of party development anticipates parties to develop from the middle out with the creation of nomination procedures to ensure the selection of candidates up for election that align with their policy goals.

Because of the incentives created by electoral systems to coordinate votes and the group-centered theory of party development, I expect groups to create procedures to structure candidate emergence. The creation of nomination procedures is the foundation of party development and will have value because of their ability to legitimize candidates and communicate information with party labels. Building off these expectations, I present my own theory to understand the development of candidate emergence in the first party era. My theory on candidate emergence highlights the influence of three factors: political culture, electoral systems, and electoral competition. Political culture determined what was considered politically legitimate. What was considered as politically legitimate influenced the type of procedures created to structure candidate emergence. Electoral systems created boundaries of electoral competition that created a scale of politics and could align, or not, with existing politically salient boundaries. Lastly, the level of electoral competition influenced the likelihood of changes in, either the creation or dissolution of, nomination procedures. Combined, these three factors help explain the nature of candidate emergence development across space and time.

I analyze one state from each of the four regions of the U.S. in the early republic with their own unique political culture. I theorize that political culture influenced what political organization looked like within each state as political parties formed. Previous historical literature highlighted regional culture as central in understanding the

development of American nationalism during this period.⁴⁰ I take this one step further and argue that regional culture combined with the transitional national political culture described by Formisano during the period to create four unique political cultures and therefore histories and expectations of political legitimacy in each of my cases.⁴¹ States with participatory political cultures and positive experiences using political organizations at the grassroots level are more likely to produce nomination procedures that incorporate ordinary citizens to structure the candidate emergence process. States lacking this participatory aspect in their political culture and with negative experiences should be more likely to develop nomination procedures that fail to incorporate ordinary citizens into the process.

Political culture interacted with party ideology to create understandings of political legitimacy. In general, the Federalist Party had a narrow view of when the people should be involved in politics. From the Federalist perspective, the people should only be active in politics on the day of election and should not organize before or after to engage in discussion about government policy. This stemmed from the view that ordinary citizens were meant to give a simple yes or no on how the government was doing and not engage in any kind of debate inherent in deferential politics. The Democratic-Republican Party pushed the boundaries on what was considered as legitimate political participation by ordinary citizens encouraging more involvement through political gatherings. The interaction between political culture and party ideology across the four regions led to differences in what, for example, Federalists considered legitimate in Pennsylvania compared to New Hampshire. Therefore, the procedures one party would develop would not necessarily be the same as their copartisans in another region. Just like today, the two

major parties nominate candidates in a variety of different ways across the U.S. Lastly, the slow acceptance of a more participant political culture across the U.S. during the period caused both regional political culture and party ideology to become slowly more accommodating of and founded upon the participation of ordinary citizens in politics.

From the party system literature, we know that electoral systems will encourage the development of nomination procedures. However, these theories say nothing of their impact on what these procedures will look like. I argue that electoral systems create political boundaries that determine the scale of politics. These boundaries can operate in tandem with meaningful political boundaries or not. For example, the county was the foundation of politics in Pennsylvania and all legislative political boundaries, state and national, used county lines to determine representation and district lines. I anticipate nominations procedures are more likely to develop when electoral systems create boundaries that match existing meaningful boundaries.

Further, political boundaries created by electoral systems can make it easier or more difficult to organize because of the perceived size of political space they create. I argue that the larger the perceived size of politics the less likely it is nomination procedures will be created to structure candidate emergence. Electoral systems, specifically those structuring congressional elections, created new political boundaries within each state that connected ordinary citizens to national level politics like never before. These new national political boundaries created new perceptions of political space within each state. Single-member districts with simple plurality rules eventually become the dominant mode for electing Congress in the U.S., but it did not start this way.⁴² Multi-member districts were employed in Pennsylvania for a majority of the period and New Hampshire used general ticket at-

large elections to elect members of Congress. These differing electoral rules produced their own perceived scale of politics that made is more or less likely for nomination procedures to develop.

Lastly, I anticipate electoral competition to help explain both when nomination procedures were created to facilitate the candidate emergence process and when they were likely to fall out of use. George Luetscher mentioned a connection between electoral competition and political organizations in his research on the development of county conventions.⁴³ Greater competition would push political activists to structure the electoral process in the pursuit of electoral success. Electoral competition would also encourage the adoption of more popularly oriented nomination procedures because of the likely spillover effects of these types of procedures for voter turnout. Further, I argue that when electoral competition declines there would be a subsequent decline in the use of these procedures. Where elections were dominated by one party, the procedures once in place to structure candidate emergence would fall out of use.

Summary of Findings

From my analysis of the development of candidate emergence in each of my case studies I find they each have distinct periods of development. Table 1.1 summarizes the stages of development that occurred in each case study. Taken together, they demonstrate that both Federalists and Democratic-Republicans developed nomination procedures quite early to structure the candidate emergence. Coordination efforts ranged from informal organizations to complex procedures with hierarchical organizations like county and district delegate conventions. These procedures were relatively durable and generally more popularly oriented by 1816.

Table 1.1: Stages of Candidate Emergence Development in All Four Case Studies, 1788-1816

State	Stages of Development
<p>Pennsylvania</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Pre-Party Organization Period (1788-1795): General meetings and hints of county delegate conventions for general assembly, state senate, and congressional nominations. State-wide organizations attempted for congressional elections 1788 and 1792. 2) Decentralized Party Formation Period (1796-1802): Widespread use of county general meetings by Federalists for general assembly nominations. Widespread use of county delegate conventions by Democratic-Republicans for general assembly nominations. District delegate conventions by both parties for state senate and congressional nominations. 3) Factional Party Period (1803-1816): Uneven continued organization by Federalists with adoption of county delegate conventions in some areas for general assembly nominations. Continued use of county delegate conventions by Democratic-Republicans for general assembly nominations. Continued use of district delegate conventions for state senate and congressional nominations.
<p>New Hampshire*</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Pre-Party Period (1788-1895): Independent nominations were widespread without clear efforts to coordinate nominations. 2) Centralized Party Formation Period (1796-1808): The Federalists then Democratic-Republicans used the legislative caucus for state senate and congressional nominations. 3) Party Decentralization Period (1809-1816): Federalists used the legislative caucus for congressional nominations and general meetings for state senate nominations. Democratic-Republicans by 1816 used district delegate conventions for state senate and congressional nominations. <p>Portsmouth, NH (Democratic-Republicans)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Local Party Leaders (1804-1808): The legislative caucus appointed local party leaders to for the coordination of general assembly elections. 2) Popular Party Period (1809-1816): Delegates were elected at the wardship-level who nominated general assembly candidates in convention.

Table 1.1: Stages of Candidate Emergence Development . . . Continued

<p>South Carolina</p>	<p>1) Pre-Party Organization (1788-1795): Individual nominations were widespread without clear efforts to coordinate nominations.</p> <p>2) Informal Party Period (1796-1816): Individual nominations continued with informal coordination efforts by the Federalist and Democratic-Republican parties.</p> <p>Charleston, SC</p> <p>1) Pre-Party Organization (1788-1795): Individual nominations were widespread without clear efforts to coordinate nominations.</p> <p>2) Informal Party Period (1796-1806): Individual nominations continued with informal coordination efforts by the Federalist and Democratic-Republican parties.</p> <p>3) Popular Party Period (1808-1816): Federalists used general meetings generally. Democratic-Republicans developed a closed party primary with voting at the wardship-level and a delegate convention to count votes and determine nominee in case of a tie.</p>
<p>Ohio</p>	<p>1) Pre-Party Period (1799-1801): Individual nominations were widespread without clear efforts to coordinate nominations.</p> <p>2) Decentralized Party Formation Period (1802-1809): Federalists organized mass meetings in a few counties early but quickly left electoral politics across the state. Democratic-Republicans used county delegate conventions and general meetings for the general assembly, district meetings for the state senate, and the legislative caucus for Congress. Individual nominations persisted during the period.</p> <p>3) Factional Party Period (1810-1816): Federalists join conservative Democratic-Republican faction delegate conventions and general meetings. Democratic-Republicans continued to nominate general assembly candidates with county delegate conventions and general meetings, district meetings for state senate nominations, and shifted congressional nominations to the most structured county organizations. Individual nominations persisted during the period.</p>

Notes: * The periodization for New Hampshire is just for state senate and congressional elections. The periodization in Portsmouth is just for general assembly elections.

I find supportive evidence for my theory on the development of candidate emergence. The nature of the nomination procedures that developed to structure candidate emergence was in-fact connected to the political cultures they developed within. States with political cultures that encouraged popular involvement in politics to secure a general sense of legitimacy and positive experiences with grassroots organizations had nomination procedures that provided for the inclusion of ordinary citizens. Where the political culture did not require involvement by ordinary citizens to legitimize political processes, procedures to structure candidate emergence failed to develop in a way that incorporated ordinary citizens at the local level.

The impact of regional political culture interacted with party ideology and the widespread acceptance of participatory politics by the end of the period. The relationship between regional political culture and party ideology was as expected. Each unique combination of political culture and partisan ideology encouraged the parties in each state to adopt different nomination procedures early on. Both parties implemented nomination procedures that did not incorporate ordinary citizens when the political culture did not encourage it as in New Hampshire and South Carolina. In contrast, both parties implemented popularly oriented nomination procedures in Pennsylvania and parts of Ohio where there was a participatory political culture. Further, Democratic-Republican Party ideology encouraged local party organizers to create nomination procedures that were generally more popularly oriented and complex than the Federalists. Federalist Party nomination procedures either did not incorporate the people, like in South Carolina, or did so through general meetings that allowed for significant elite control during the proceedings like in Pennsylvania between 1796 and 1802. However, the increased

acceptance of participatory politics by both parties across the U.S. meant that by 1816 popularly oriented nomination procedures were used in all four states to various degrees while the Democratic-Republican Party continued to pursue the incorporation of ordinary citizens to a greater extent than the Federalists.

Second, when electoral systems created political boundaries that matched meaningful boundaries within the state, nomination procedures were more likely to develop at those levels. For example, the alignment of political and meaningful boundaries in Pennsylvania helps explain the consistency of county-level organization that nominated general assembly members and the difficulty that occurred later in the period to coordinate state senate and congressional nominations when the multi-county districts were more arbitrary. Further, political boundaries that created larger scales of politics made it harder to create durable and successful nomination procedures. The multi-county state senate districts in Pennsylvania and Ohio made it more difficult to create consistent nomination procedures and the Democratic-Republican legislative caucuses meant to structure the statewide congressional elections in Ohio between 1803 and 1810 were unsuccessful half the time. Therefore, the mechanical effect of electoral systems explains the base motivation for coordination and the political boundaries they create helps explain the nature and durability of the procedures meant to bring about coordination.

Third, the level of electoral competition influenced developments in candidate emergence, both the creation of structures and their falling away. I show that when elections were competitive, both political parties were encouraged to develop nomination procedures. When electoral competition increased, local party organizers implemented more popularly oriented nomination procedures than previously used to establish their

legitimacy and because of the likely spillover effects of these types of procedures for voter turnout. In contrast, when electoral competition subsided, nomination procedures either fell out of use or became less able to successfully coordinate candidate nomination. However, the fallout from a lack of two-party electoral competition was mitigated in places by the introduction of Democratic-Republican factional politics. Despite the lack of Federalist electoral competition, nomination procedures remained in use in Pennsylvania and Ohio because of Democratic-Republican factional politics and the electoral competition created by it.

My findings also provide insights into other important question in political science and American political history. The development of nomination procedures around the candidate emergence process provides strong evidence of the development of political parties during the first party era. I show that two parties developed earlier than previously thought to coordinate elites and partisan electorates through candidate nomination. In New Hampshire and South Carolina, the Federalists developed coordination procedures first while the process was in tandem for both parties in Pennsylvania and Ohio. Both parties appeared on par with one another in their ability to structure candidate emergence in New Hampshire and Pennsylvania whereas the Democratic-Republicans were more successful in South Carolina and Ohio. Both parties created nomination procedures that were relatively durable over time with clear, and sometimes complex, rules in place to structure the candidate emergence process.

I also demonstrate how these parties developed from the middle out with state- and local-level elites leading the way in coordination efforts. In Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and South Carolina, I present evidence of state-level elites associating or engaging in

attempts to structure candidate emergence before the introduction of partisan labels. I argue these men were policy demanders within each state that created competing ideologies by 1796 to aid their attempts to coordinate fellow elites, including potential candidates, and create clear partisan electorates to support their candidates. My findings support the group-centered theory of party development during the early republic.

Finally, my research on the development of candidate emergence offers insights into the democratic nature of political parties during the first party era. I explore whether political parties aided or obstructed the process of democratization through the capabilities understanding of democratization and find the answer is mixed. In areas like Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Ohio ordinary citizens were brought into the nomination process to choose who would represent them in government. During these procedures, public policy was discussed and connected to political nominations. Ordinary citizens were incorporated into nomination procedures in meaningful ways influencing who was nominated. Because of these characteristics, political parties provided ordinary citizens with opportunities to increase their political capabilities making political parties agents of democratization. This conclusion is not universal. In South Carolina, political parties developed in such a way that they do not encourage the input of ordinary citizens and therefore act as a hindrance to democratization. Charleston, South Carolina is an exception in the state, but overall political parties do not help ordinary citizens develop political capabilities. Because of these divergent conclusions my findings stress the importance of variation across space in determining the democratic effects of political parties in early American history. From research on the American South after the Civil War we know the nature of politics can look very different even within a single country.⁴⁴ Therefore, it is not surprising that I find the

role of political parties in the story of American democratization varies across my case studies.

Road Map for the Dissertation

The rest of the dissertation will proceed with three substantive chapters followed by a conclusion chapter. The substantive chapters present background information on each case study related to the three factors from my theory, the developmental story, and brief conclusions.

I start by analyzing Pennsylvania, the keystone state in American democracy, where politics were vibrant in the early republic. The mid-Atlantic region was known for its participatory politics and the development of some of the most organized party structures during the first party era. I demonstrate that nomination procedures were developed by both political parties early through decentralized county-level party organizations and that they created opportunities for citizens at the local level to engage in party politics and the nomination of candidates.

The second chapter explores the development of candidate emergence in New Hampshire. New England was not known for participatory politics making it an important area to understand the development of nomination procedures. I show how both parties created centralized party organizations to structure legislative candidate emergence. Eventually, both party organizations decentralized to county and district party organizations to varying degrees and incorporated ordinary citizens into the nomination process.

In the final substantive chapter, I analyze South Carolina and Ohio. The South had a deferential political culture and a British style of electioneering that allowed for self-nominations. South Carolina is an important case because of a general understanding of the state that precludes it from having ever developed a party system during this period. I find that informal party organizations provided structure to the candidate emergence process early on. More importantly, I provide new information on the development of nomination procedures in Charleston, South Carolina between 1808 and 1816 that were consistent organizations and popularly oriented. The case study on Ohio offers an opportunity to explore the influence of various regional cultures and histories within a single state. Ohio was quickly populated by people from states like Pennsylvania and Virginia. I show how these previous experiences and mix of political cultures helps to explain the early development of popularly oriented nomination procedures and the persistence of self-nominations.

In the fifth chapter I compare the development of candidate emergence across all four case studies to draw some general conclusions. I then take these conclusions to discuss other important questions in political science and history including party development and the role of political parties in the story of American democratization. I also discuss possible avenues for future research on the development of American political parties and American democracy that build off my findings and further utilize the data I gathered.

Notes

1. I was not the only person interested in this billboard. David Rosman wrote a brief article on the sign and came up short trying to discover who, and what perspective, was behind the message. David Rosman. ““Think for yourself” billboard makes a statement without attribution.” *Missourian*. May 5, 2021. <https://www.columbiamissourian.com>.
2. e.g., Charles 1956; Chambers 1963.
3. Formisano 1974; Sorauf 1975.
4. Formisano 1981, 43.
5. Sharp 1993, 8.
6. Krutz 2019, 332.
7. Aldrich 1995.
8. Aldrich 1995, 20.
9. Aldrich 1995, 95.
10. Waldstreicher 1997; Newman 1997; Pasley et al. 2004.
11. Pasley 2013, 5-6.
12. Hoadley 1986, 188-190.
13. Chambers 1963; 1975; Cohen et al. 2008.
14. Cohen et al. 2008, 30.
15. Peart 2014.
16. Schattschneider 1942, 1.
17. Neem 2015, 248.
18. Sen 1999, 18.
19. Neem 2015, 248.
20. Neem 2015, 268.

21. Park 2018.
22. Fischer 1965; Lampi 2013.
23. Orren and Skowronek 2004, 123.
24. Formisano 1974.
25. Huston 2015.
26. Cunningham 1957; Formisano 1981.
27. e.g., Prince 1967; Young 1967.
28. Lampi 2013.
29. The keywords I used included party labels, candidate names, the political office up for election, district numbers/names, meeting places, organizer names, and general terms including candidate or ticket.
30. Pasley 2001.
31. e.g., Ryan 1971; Main 1973; Risjord and DenBoer 1974; Broussard 1977; Hoadley 1986; Aldrich 1995. Joel H. Silbey published a list of state and national legislative roll-call studies by historians in the early 1980s as a resource for political scientists (Silbey 1981).
32. Cox 1997.
33. Duverger 1954, 113.
34. Cox 1997, 159.
35. Cox builds off historian Richard McCormick's (1966) work on the development of the second party era and begins his brief case study in the 1820's (Cox 1997, 187-188).
36. Cox 1997, 187.
37. Cohen et al. 2008, 20.
38. Pasley 2013, 14.
39. Cohen et al. 2008, 31; Bawn et al. 2012.
40. Park 2018.

41. Formisano 1974.

42. Dow 2017.

43. Luetscher 1903.

44. Mickey 2015.

Chapter 2

Pennsylvania: Democracy in Action

The early development of a democratic style of partisan politics in Pennsylvania is best understood by the region's dominant, participatory political culture and the state's history of popular organizations. Pluralism and participation are the two factors in the mid-Atlantic political culture and history that help explain the development of candidate emergence in Pennsylvania. Benjamin E. Park explained that the mid-Atlantic political culture emphasized diversity and pluralist cohesion.¹ Because of the amount of diversity in the states, especially in Pennsylvania, toleration was paramount to a functional government system. The acceptance of divergent ideas and world views because of religion or Old-World origins meant the political culture, and therefore political system, had to be able to incorporate and tie together these differences. This tolerance was combined with a radically participatory political history connected to the Revolutionary Period. Already by 1774, Pennsylvania had created county-level committees to organize activism against British measures.² Then, between the adoption of the radically democratic state constitution in 1776 and 1790, two competing organizations, especially within Philadelphia, created extra-governmental structures that emphasized popular participation to engage in political conflict and electoral competition.³

The acceptance of political pluralism and the emphasis on participatory politics are important factors when considering the boundaries of legitimate political organization in Pennsylvania. An early acceptance of extra-governmental institutions to coordinate political grievances and mobilize groups for political ends meant the state was more open to developing, or more like co-opting, these methods when organizing the candidate

emergence process under the U.S. Constitution. A history of county committees that were once used to coordinate actions against British policies prior to the Revolution could operate as a starting point for future political entrepreneurs to coordinate and legitimize their own goals of sending specific individuals to the state legislature and Congress after 1788.

Pennsylvania's 1790 constitution altered the state legislature from unicameral to bicameral. The county was the foundation of representation in Pennsylvania and therefore electoral boundaries, as displayed in the summary of electoral rules in Table 2.1. Each county, either individually or jointly dependent upon population, was granted from one to six representatives in the lower chamber. Representation was altered and increased every seven years beginning in 1794. State senate seats were elected by districts that made up either a single county or multiple counties. According to the 1790 state constitution, no county could be placed in more than one district, limiting to a degree the ability to alter the district lines. However, as more counties were created, the borders one could use to redraw district boundaries also increased. A simple plurality was all one needed to win a seat to the lower or upper chamber in Pennsylvania. Elections for the general assembly occurred annually, and after the first reapportionment for the state senate in 1794, a rotation was determined so that one-fourth of the senate was up for election every year with a term of four years.

For a majority of the period under analysis, Pennsylvania held district elections to select members of Congress. In 1788 and 1792, an at-large general election was held to fill Pennsylvania's congressional delegation. Contemporary observers like U.S. Senator Pierce Butler noted the influence of statewide competition on the development of partisanship and

organization around congressional elections.⁴ However, it was the district electoral system that allowed pockets of the state to continue organizing electoral competition after the Federalist Party was relegated to a weak minority party. In single- and multi-member districts, localized party competition between Federalists and Democratic-Republicans, and later a conservative Democratic-Republican faction, allowed continued organized party competition when statewide campaigns were unimaginable for the Federalists.

Elections for Congress and the state legislature occurred concurrently in mid-October. This synchronicity meant that in some areas, they were electing members to Congress and both chambers of the state legislature every two years. Concurrent elections made it easier to coordinate election efforts. One limitation within the electoral system to coordination efforts was the fact that districts for the U.S. Congress and state senate were not the same. One county could be part of a district to elect a member to Congress and part of another district with a different set of counties to elect a state senator. While the elections occurred at the same time, not every county was necessarily part of the same district election as their neighbors, dampening the benefit of concurrent elections to coordination efforts.

Organized interests in Philadelphia around the state constitution issue quickly focused on electoral politics. This group quickly transitioned into a growing Federalist organization that came into direct conflict with Democratic Societies in the legislative elections in 1794. The competition between these two groups then spread across the entire state to encourage the creation of organizations to structure the candidate emergence process through 1800, when the parties were vying for control of the state government and the state's influence in national politics. After 1800, electoral competition between these

two groups declined as the Democratic-Republican Party became the dominant majority. However, this does not mean that the Federalist Party stopped engaging in electoral politics after 1800. In pockets across the state where the Federalist Party could earn a majority in particular counties, competitive elections returned after 1808 and continued through 1816.

In Pennsylvania, the decrease in electoral competition after 1800 in some areas does appear to have impacted the candidate emergence process. In Philadelphia, after the Federalists removed themselves from electoral politics, the Democratic-Republican Party quickly fell into factional disputes. Party infighting broke out across Pennsylvania, with local groups within the Democratic-Republican Party competing with one another and nominating their own candidates for office. This infighting generally also highlighted the existing party structures for nominating candidates and pushed forward further development in nomination procedures.

In the section below, I describe the developmental story of candidate emergence in Pennsylvania, for state-level lower and upper chamber elections and congressional elections between 1788 and 1816. I divide the story into three periods: the pre-party organization period (1788-1795), the decentralized party formation period (1796-1802), and the factional party period (1803-1816). Table 2.2 summarizes the developmental story. Within each period, I highlight the trajectory in three areas of the state: eastern, central, and western. These divisions should not be given much weight when trying to understand development patterns. I use them to show that my evidence and conclusions are not limited to the metropolis of Philadelphia. After this section, I conclude by connecting the development of candidate emergence in Pennsylvania to questions regarding political parties' development and their role in the story of American democracy.

Table 2.1: Summary of Electoral Rules for State and National Legislative Elections in Pennsylvania

State Legislative Lower Chamber	State Legislative Upper Chamber	U.S. House of Representatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Elections • County and Multi-County Elections • Plurality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four-Year Terms with Rotation of Elections After 1794 • County and Multi-County District Elections • Plurality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biannual Elections • State-Wide General Elections (1788 and 1792); Single-Member and Multi-Member District Elections (1790 and 1794-1816) • 8 Seats (1788-1790); 13 Seats (1792-1800); 18 Seats (1802-1810); 23 Seats (1812-1816) • Plurality

Table 2.2: Summary of Pennsylvania Candidate Emergence Development

Pre-Party Period	
Dates	
1788-1795	Widespread county general meetings. Hints of county delegate conventions. Beginning of precedents for geographic representation in district nominations.
Dates	Democratic-Republican Party
1796-1802	<p style="text-align: center;">Federalist Party</p> <p>Widespread use of county general meetings for general assembly nominations. District delegate convention for state senate and congressional nominations. Continuation of precedents of geographic representation in district nominations.</p> <p>Widespread use of county delegate conventions for general assembly nominations. District delegate convention for state senate and congressional nominations. Continuation of precedents of geographic representation in district nominations.</p>
1803-1816	<p>Uneven continued organization. Adoption of the county delegate conventions for general assembly nominations. Continuation of district delegate conventions and precedents for geographic representation in district nominations.</p> <p>Introduction of factional politics encouraging continued organization. Continuation of county delegate conventions. Continuation of district delegate conventions and precedents for geographic representation in district nominations.</p>

The Developmental Story

The mid-Atlantic region, and Pennsylvania specifically, has a rich political history dating back to before the Revolution and the beginning of partisan politics. Still, previous scholars have missed important stories owing to limited scopes of analysis. Previous scholars have highlighted the story of political development in Pennsylvania because of its early use of county and statewide conventions. George Daniel Luetscher centered his analysis of party organization on the mid-Atlantic because of his narrow focus on the development of a specific institution: conventions.⁵ Joseph S. Walton's work on Pennsylvania was also strictly interested in the development of conventions when analyzing the development of party organizations during the period.⁶ An analysis by Nobel E. Cunningham Jr. highlighted the region as doing the most to organize politics but, again, was limited by his scope, with a particular emphasis on national politics and focus on electioneering rather than nomination.⁷ Therefore, the previous literature missed important connections between the pre-party development period and the decentralized party formation period after 1796.

While a lot of the action was limited to Philadelphia early on, the few examples outside the city have shown an attempt to create organizations to structure the nomination process across Pennsylvania before 1796. When clear partisan divisions were possible because of the policy debates in Congress, these same groups took up these divisions to create clear organizations that would support their state and national policy goals. To do so, they continued to rely upon their previous forms of organization and refined them to match their understanding of legitimate political organization.

Lastly, Sandford Wilson Higginbotham's book on Pennsylvania's political history between 1800 and 1816 was immensely helpful when conducting my research and understanding the changes occurring in state politics evident in the newspapers.⁸ His book focuses mainly on the story of the Democratic-Republican Party. While he mentioned the Federalists in a few paragraphs in each chapter, the story of Federalist Party development was underdeveloped. My access to a different set of period newspapers allows me to highlight different aspects of the developmental story than Higginbotham. Therefore, when I discuss the development of candidate emergence, I tend to spend more time on the Federalist Party structures that have not received as detailed an analysis, especially in Philadelphia and the surrounding area. Also, I highlight the Democratic-Republican Party's organization in areas unexplored by previous research.

Pre-Party Candidate Emergence, 1788-1795

After the ratification of the U.S. Constitution, Pennsylvania went through a brief transition period before clear electoral rules and boundaries were in place for state and national legislative elections. The first and third congressional elections were at-large contests. It was not until the passage of the new Pennsylvania Constitution in 1790 that the bicameral legislature was put in place and electoral districts were created to select state senators. The county served as the main electoral boundary for the unicameral legislature under the 1776 constitution, which would remain true for the election of the lower chamber's members under the 1790 constitution. Despite this time of changing rules and boundaries, the county was and remained an integral political boundary for organizing electoral competition.

The statewide congressional elections of 1788 and 1792 produced similarly statewide attempts to organize the candidate emergence process. The organizations in both

elections attempted to consider county boundaries and incorporated them into the nomination process. In 1788, Anti-Federalists and Federalists divided over possible amendments to the U.S. Constitution and held competing conventions of delegates to nominate their own lists.⁹ The Federalists used mass county meetings to send committees to a convention, while the Anti-Federalists had more structure to their convention, encouraging counties to send individuals clearly selected as delegates from the counties. In 1792, the division of groups was no longer over amendments but how best to nominate candidates on a statewide basis. Those who preferred holding a large caucus open to all interested individuals were the “Conference Men,” while the “Correspondence Men” solicited feedback from across the state and supported holding a state convention.¹⁰ The success of the “Conference Men” in 1792 and the use of district elections for Congress thereafter led to the end of any statewide conventions for the next twenty years and a shift to county- and district-level organizations.

The use of local meetings to nominate candidates began during this period. In Philadelphia City, there was a general meeting called to meet at the State House, what is now called Independence Hall, on October 8, 1789. The purpose was to nominate candidates for the unicameral legislature and to create a committee to fill any vacancies in the nomination list because of potential candidates declining the honor.¹¹ A general meeting was also called in Philadelphia County to meet at Widow Leshner’s Tavern in Germantown on October 9, 1789, to nominate candidates for the state legislature.¹² In 1791, when the state was districted for congressional elections, a general meeting was held in Philadelphia City at Byrne’s Tavern on October 10 that nominated a candidate for Congress as well as a slate of candidates for the general assembly.¹³

These meetings were not the only pathway for candidate emergence early on. Independent nominations submitted anonymously to the press were quite common as well. The term “individual nominations” is from Luetscher’s book on the development of the nomination convention during the first party era, which he described as a process whereby groups of individuals, generally the friends of prospective candidates, nominated them in the newspaper.¹⁴

The announcement in 1791 of the general meeting in Philadelphia City was surrounded by other lists of candidates with no indication of their origins.¹⁵ These extraneous individual nominations slowly subsided during the pre-party period and essentially became nonexistent during the party formation period. More than just the metropolis of Philadelphia used general meetings to nominate candidates. Other counties in eastern Pennsylvania also utilized the method. In Delaware County, a group held a general meeting at the Black Horse Tavern in Middleton on October 7, 1789, to nominate candidates for the state legislature.¹⁶ Similar announcements for general meetings appeared for Chester and Montgomery Counties in 1790 and Chester County again in 1795.¹⁷ In central Philadelphia, there was a general meeting in Cumberland County at Bark Tavern on September 24, 1792, nominating candidates for the general assembly.¹⁸ There were two separate general meetings in Franklin County in 1791 that both nominated James Johnston but differed in the second candidate.¹⁹ A post-meeting announcement for one of the meetings mentioned the vote returns when nominating candidates, suggesting that roughly one hundred individuals were present.²⁰ Across the state, county general meetings were a common tool to structure candidate emergence even without the existence of clear partisan groups to compete against one another.

The use of district elections for the state senate and congressional elections in 1791 encouraged some of the first examples of organizations beyond the county boundary. York and Lancaster Counties were in a state senate district and needed to fill a vacancy in that body because of the death of their senator. To do so, “deputies were appointed from the counties” who met on August 1, 1791, at Wright’s Ferry and nominated the eventual winner, Alexander Lowry.²¹ This process is one of the earliest examples of a district delegate convention to nominate a candidate for the state senate. It is unclear how these delegates were chosen, but it is most likely that the county general meeting was used to both select these delegates and come together to agree upon a nominee. A group in Philadelphia County, at a meeting at Widow Leshher’s Tavern, called for a state senate delegate convention to meet on October 2, 1794, and selected five delegates to represent the group.²² It is unlikely the convention occurred because there is no mention of delegates being selected from Philadelphia City and Delaware County that year. Furthermore, at a meeting in Philadelphia County on that same day at Widow Leshher’s Tavern, organized by the same group of individuals who called the first one, they nominated just one candidate for the state senate when the district elected four members.²³ It appears those in Philadelphia County chose to nominate one candidate to represent just their geographic area in the whole state senate district delegation since they nominated Robert Hare, who had served in the general assembly for Philadelphia County in 1791 and 1792. The next year, after a rotation of elections was created and one of four state senate seats was up for election, there appears to have been an agreement that a rotation would begin, with one geographic area getting to nominate one candidate every four years. Robert Hare was

renominated by a general meeting in Philadelphia County on October 3, 1795, and then later by general meetings in Philadelphia City and Delaware County.²⁴

Those interested in organizing the candidate emergence process across county boundaries for congressional elections also used district meetings. Each meeting used different rules in 1791, when the state was first split into districts. The third district called a general meeting of inhabitants from Montgomery and Chester Counties, where they created a twenty-six-man committee, thirteen from each county, to decide on the nominee. The committee reported their votes, and it appears each committee member had one vote. There were five different potential candidates, with Peter Muhlenberg receiving the most votes: nine.²⁵ The second district, including Philadelphia and Bucks Counties, called for and held a general meeting that appears to have allowed each individual in attendance to vote. It reported that Amos Gregg received one hundred and twenty-four votes, and Frederick Muhlenberg received ninety-two votes.²⁶ It is likely more than these two candidates received votes because the announcement only listed the top vote earners; this means well over two hundred people might have attended. This organization appears to be one of the first attempts by those who would become Democratic-Republicans to structure candidate emergence for congressional districts; one might draw this conclusion for three reasons: (1) Amos Gregg went on to be a Democratic-Republican state senate candidate in 1798, (2) Frederick Muhlenberg served as an Anti-Administration and then Democratic-Republican member of Congress through 1797, and (3) one of the secretaries of the meeting was Michael Leib, who quickly became a leading Democratic-Republican in Philadelphia County and the state.²⁷ However, such cross-county coordination efforts did not occur everywhere. Two general meetings occurred in Franklin County whose attendees

nominated two different candidates for Congress; these were the same two general meetings that nominated candidates for the general assembly, despite there being four other counties in the congressional district.²⁸

Areas outside of the eastern metropolis continued to use organizations that quickly encouraged participation at the grassroots level, which became more abundant in the period that followed. The earliest mention of a delegate convention came from an anonymous article signed by Free Choice that suggested an alternative method for nominating candidates for the general assembly in 1792. The author described how two delegates were elected in each election district in the county who then met at the county seat to nominate candidates for the three general assembly seats. Free Choice argued that this method had been controlled by a junto of men who asserted undue influence at each election district meeting to ensure their allies were selected as delegates. The nomination procedure was so influential that the author argued it took away the right to vote, writing that the convention procedure was “leaving no choice to the elector.” To fix the problem, Free Choice suggested that the delegate convention have each of the three election district delegations nominate their own three candidates, therefore nominating three times the number of seats up for election.²⁹

There is even evidence that the counties in eastern Pennsylvania were aware of each other’s organizational efforts and worked to coordinate across county boundaries using delegate conventions. Montgomery County held a general meeting on August 12, 1794, that called for the townships to each send two delegates for a delegate convention that met on August 30 and selected delegates for a joint state senate and congressional district delegate convention.³⁰ Then a general meeting in Bucks County followed “the example set,

by the good people of Montgomery” and called township meetings for August 25 to send delegates to a delegate convention on August 29 in Buckingham, the county seat. At the county delegate convention, delegates from eighteen towns proceeded to select delegates for the joint delegate convention.³¹ It is unclear if a joint state senate and congressional delegate convention met that year. Montgomery County went on to organize a county delegate convention again in 1795 that selected delegates for a state senate district convention and called for a general meeting to nominate candidates for the general assembly.³² These few examples demonstrate an attempt to organize nomination procedures in a way that could incorporate ordinary citizens. They show that counties were paying attention to how one another structured the candidate emergence process.

While these meetings before 1796 were nonpartisan, at least formally, it is clear they were connected to the partisan meetings that followed. In Philadelphia City, a general meeting occurred at Dunwoody’s Tavern to fill a vacancy in a previously created general assembly ticket in 1792. Then general meetings occurred there again to nominate candidates in 1794 and 1795.³³ The chair of the general meeting in 1795 was Levi Hollingsworth, which is noteworthy because Hollingsworth went on to become a prominent Federalist in Philadelphia. Dunwoody’s Tavern quickly became synonymous with Federal Party nomination procedures during the party formation period. Likewise, a general meeting to nominate candidates in Philadelphia County occurred in Germantown at Widow Leshner’s Tavern each year between 1789 and 1795, except 1793.³⁴ The tavern is the same location used by the Federalists in the party formation period to hold general meetings. The Democratic-Republicans in Philadelphia County decided on the Northern Liberties as their base of operations. They held general meetings there in 1795, continued

to do so in the party formation period, and went to hold them there during the factional period.³⁵ The consistency in locations suggests that the party organizations that followed had their origins in state-level actors who were pursuing policy goals via legislative elections before the introduction of partisan labels in 1796.

The participatory political culture in Pennsylvania meant that organizations at the county level were important for structuring candidate emergence even before clear partisan labels were introduced in 1796. These organization that encouraged meetings of the county were most likely dominated by local elites and, it is commonly understood by historians, those living within the township where the meeting occurred. Therefore, these organizations were attempts to coordinate elites at the county level during the nomination process to pursue policy goals at the state and national levels. After 1795, these groups became more distinct, and their procedures became more participatory and institutionalized.

Decentralized Party Formation, 1796-1802

The creation of a clear division between Federalists and Democratic-Republicans beginning in 1796 seems to have tightened up the ranks of elites and electorates alike throughout Pennsylvania, allowing for a clear distinction between partisan nomination organizations. The Federalists generally favored a general meeting to nominate candidates for the state assembly and used district delegate conventions when necessary to nominate for the state senate and Congress. The Democratic-Republicans, on the other hand, generally favored the county delegate conventions that then selected delegates for district delegate conventions when necessary to nominate for state senate and Congress. While both parties favored one type of nomination procedure over the other, this is not to say

there was an agreed-upon process or a centralized body coordinating the use of a specific nomination procedure. During this time, the operation and organization of nomination procedures were decentralized, allowing for local elites to control what procedures were put in place to structure the candidate emergence process and encourage ordinary citizens to engage in party politics. That said, local partisan elites were not structuring candidate emergence in a vacuum and knew what nomination procedures looked like across the state because of the partisan press.

Federalist Party Development

The earliest organizations of the Federalist Party across Pennsylvania placed the power of nominating candidates in county general meetings. The Federalists in Philadelphia City nominated a congressional candidate at a general meeting on August 26, 1796, and organized another one on September 21, 1796, where they nominated for the state senate and general assembly.³⁶ They then held two other meetings to support the full ticket on September 30 and October 8, 1796.³⁷ All four were held at Dunwoody's Tavern, and Levi Hollingsworth was the chair of two of the meetings. Federalists in the eastern counties of Berks, Bucks, Luzerne, Montgomery, and Philadelphia also held general county meetings to nominate candidates for the state legislature and/or Congress that year.³⁸ Federalists in central and western Pennsylvania utilized the general meeting during the party formation period to nominate candidates for state and national legislative elections in Allegheny (1798), Cumberland (1797, 1798), Dauphin (1799), Franklin (1796), and Huntingdon (1796).³⁹ Federalists also used their early control over county governments to organize nominations. A grand jury in Allegheny County published an announcement stating that after "completing their ordinary business," they "proceeded to speak on a ticket for the

ensuing election” and nominated candidates for the lower chamber, state senate, and Congress.⁴⁰

Some counties opted to hold more than one general meeting and seek the approval of the county at large before making the nomination final. Montgomery County held a general meeting on July 27, 1799, over three months before the election, and nominated candidates for the general assembly and state senate.⁴¹ Those from the Lower District, an election district in Montgomery County, met on September 21, 1799, and supported the same list of candidates.⁴² Then, another Montgomery County general meeting occurred at the same place on October 3, 1799, where the same ticket was supported.⁴³ Federalists in the county also used the general meeting to approve congressional or state senate nominations previously made by district delegate conventions.⁴⁴

Another common tool of the Federalist Party, in conjunction with the general meeting, was the creation of a nomination committee. The first mention I found of a nomination committee created at a general meeting connected to the roots of the Federalist Party is in Philadelphia City in 1792.⁴⁵ Federalists in Chester County used a nomination committee in 1798 and 1801. In 1798, a general meeting at the West Bradford Center House created a twenty-seven-person committee that recommended candidates for the state senate and Congress that was then “confirmed by the meeting at large.” The details of the proceedings and names of committee members were published in the newspaper “for the information of the inhabitants of Bucks, Montgomery and Delaware Counties” so that their copartisans in the state senate and congressional districts knew of their proceedings.⁴⁶ Again in 1801, “[p]ursuant to previous notice the Federal Republicans of Chester County, met at the Court House in” West Chester, the county seat, where they created a nomination

committee of two persons from each township that created a ticket, later approved by the general meeting.⁴⁷ Federalists in Philadelphia City also used a nomination committee for state and national legislative elections in 1800 and 1802, with each individual nominated by the committee approved by a vote of the general meeting.⁴⁸ In Delaware County, a nomination committee was used in 1802 that included eighteen people and their ticket was then approved by a vote of the whole.⁴⁹ Philadelphia County did the same thing as Delaware County in 1802 to nominate candidates for state and national legislative elections, except their committee had only six members.⁵⁰ The use of a nomination committee was meant to demonstrate that the decision was deliberated upon by a number of individuals who were geographically representative of the county they were nominating for.

The most evidence of consistent organization to nominate candidates and coordinate within state senate and congressional district boundaries in eastern Pennsylvania comes from Philadelphia City, Philadelphia County, and Delaware County. These three geographic areas elected their own members to the lower chamber and constituted the first state senate district. After congressional redistricting in 1802, they were combined to create a multi-member congressional district that elected three members of Congress. Federalists in Philadelphia City held general meetings each year, most at Dunwoody's Tavern, to nominate candidates for state and national legislative elections between 1796 and 1801.⁵¹ Philadelphia County also used the general meeting to nominate candidates, generally in Germantown at Widow Leshner's Tavern, between 1796 and 1802, except in 1801 when the party did not organize nor engage in elections.⁵² Delaware County

also consistently held a general meeting to nominate candidates for state and national legislative elections at the Black Horse Tavern every year between 1798 and 1802.⁵³

The rotation of state senate nominations that began in 1795 appears to have remained in effect during the party formation period. Philadelphia County made the nomination in 1795. I assume Delaware County did so in 1796 because the candidate was an individual from Delaware County. Philadelphia City made the state senate nomination in 1797 and 1798 and Philadelphia County did so again in 1799. Lastly, Philadelphia City made the state senate nomination in 1801 and 1802. So, the rotation was every four years, except for Philadelphia City, which nominated a candidate two years in a row and was represented by two state senators. In contrast, Philadelphia and Delaware Counties were represented by one senator each.

Other than knowing where candidates lived, I found evidence of a coordinated effort to rotate the nomination of state senators in this district based on the nomination procedures created by Federalists in each area. In 1799, there was a special election for the state senate because of a resignation as well as the general election. The candidate that resigned their seat was from Philadelphia City, and in 1799, according to the rotation, it was Philadelphia County's turn to nominate a candidate. A Federalist general meeting in Philadelphia City nominated a candidate for the state senate and then created what I call an upper chamber corresponding committee meant to communicate with the party organizations or similar committees created in the other two areas to ascertain their support for the nomination.⁵⁴ Therefore, members of this committee were mentioned as being present at the Delaware County general meeting that determined it would support the nomination.⁵⁵ An account of the Philadelphia County meeting mentioned that they

supported the nomination of the same candidate mentioned in Philadelphia City for the special election and then nominated their own candidate for the general state senate election.⁵⁶ Lastly, Federalists in Philadelphia City held another general meeting where they determined that “this meeting approves of the nomination of JOHN JONES, of Lower Dublin, by their fellow citizens of this county.” The meeting also created another upper chamber corresponding committee to “inform our fellow-citizens of the county of Delaware, that this meeting approves of the nomination of John Jones, of Lower Dublin, and earnestly request their concurrence and support.”⁵⁷

When it was Delaware County’s turn in 1800, they nominated their own candidate and created an upper chamber corresponding committee to “correspond with the Federal committee of the city and county of Philadelphia, and to communicate to them the proceedings of this meeting.”⁵⁸ Both Philadelphia City and County went on to support the candidate nominated by Delaware County. Therefore, this process meant that state senators were nominated at the county level, even within multi-member and multi-county districts. They created structures, upper chamber corresponding committees, to support this practice and ensure its effectiveness so that one area could nominate a local candidate but know it would be fully supported throughout the entire district by their copartisans.

The process became more institutionalized when the final state senate nomination came from an upper chamber delegate convention in 1802. It was Philadelphia City’s turn to nominate a candidate, which they did at their general meeting. However, they also selected delegates to meet with delegates from Philadelphia and Delaware Counties to ensure Federalists in the entire district supported the nomination.⁵⁹ This process resulted in an upper chamber delegate convention, with delegates “appointed by the Federal

Republicans, of the City and County of Philadelphia and County of Delaware, held at George Weed's ferry, on Wednesday, September 22d, 1802," where they supported the same candidate for state senate originally nominated by the Philadelphia City general meeting roughly a month before.⁶⁰

When the three areas were combined in 1802 to make up the first congressional district, they created a precedent and organization to evenly distribute national representation to each geographic area and ensure the support of each local candidate across the district by their copartisans. Each general meeting in 1802 not only used a nomination committee and empowered delegates to meet for the nomination of a state senate candidate but also nominated a single candidate for Congress and empowered those same delegates to agree on the final congressional ticket. Therefore, the meeting at George Weed's Ferry on September 2, 1802, was a joint upper-chamber and congressional district delegate convention that officially approved Philadelphia City's state senate nomination and officially nominated a full Federalist ticket for Congress, with each of the three nominees originally mentioned at a previous general meeting in each area.⁶¹

Federalists in Chester County also worked hard to coordinate with their copartisans across their state senate and congressional districts in 1800. "At a meeting of a number of the Federal citizens of the counties of Chester" on August 30, 1800, they decided to select delegates for an upper chamber delegate convention at Norristown, Montgomery County, on September 12 that would nominate "some suitable Federal Character" for the office.⁶² On the day appointed, three delegates from Chester County plus three from Bucks and Montgomery Counties (the other two in the state senate district) met and nominated a candidate.⁶³ Those in Chester were working to coordinate in their congressional district

that year as well. In the original announcement for the August 30 meeting that would be “held by the FEDERALISTS, of Chester County” at the Court House in West Chester, the “citizens of Delaware County, by committee or otherwise” were invited to attend to be part of nominating a candidate for Congress.⁶⁴ Federalists in Delaware County at their general meeting nominated for the general assembly, the state senate, and created an upper-chamber corresponding committee. They also created “a Committee of eleven persons to be appointed to attend the meeting of Chester county . . . to confer with them on the subject of selecting a suitable character to represent the district in Congress of the United States.”⁶⁵ Therefore, the first thing on the agenda at the August 30, 1800, meeting in West Chester was to nominate a candidate for Congress so that after the “citizens of Delaware having retired,” they could move on with the other nominations they had to coordinate.⁶⁶

While Federalists were creating clear procedures and institutions for the coordination across county boundaries in eastern Pennsylvania, some counties were moving beyond the general meeting to organize nomination procedures that encouraged more widespread involvement at the grassroots level. In 1798, Philadelphia County began using election district meetings to nominate candidates for the state legislature and Congress. At an election district meeting on August 22, 1798, a delegation from the Northern Liberties mentioned that they had met with the “several deputations from the meetings of the district of Southwark, Germantown, and Bussletown” before presenting a list of candidates for the general assembly, state senate, and Congress. I did not find any announcement of an official county delegate convention meeting, but there were announcements for election district meetings in Germantown and Southwark that were to occur before the Northern Liberties delegates reported their ticket back to their district and

could have selected delegates.⁶⁸ When Thomas Mifflin, the outgoing governor in 1799, declined the nomination, another meeting in Philadelphia County was called: “The Committees of the different districts of Philadelphia county, who have lately met to form a Federal Ticket for the ensuing Election, and as many other gentlemen of the county as can conveniently attend, are requested to meet at Mr. Leshner’s tavern in German town, on the 20th inst. at 3 o’clock in the afternoon.”⁶⁹

There is some evidence of continued use of the system in 1799, when an election district meeting on August 31 created an eight-person committee, four from each town, to attend a meeting in Germantown that “will concur in supporting the senator and assembly tickets offered and agreed to by a majority of the Federalists in the several election districts of this county.”⁷⁰ There was a general meeting at Germantown on September 2, 1799, where they nominated candidates for the general assembly and state senate, but it is described as being a “numerous and respectable meeting of inhabitants of the county of Philadelphia” with no mention of election district delegations.⁷¹

Federalists in Chester and Lancaster Counties also adopted the county delegate convention system during the party formation period. They provide examples for understanding the impact of electoral competition on the development of candidate emergence. In 1800, a standing committee appointed “by the friends of government” put an announcement in the newspaper “for the purpose of notifying the Federal inhabitants of the different townships to send deputies to a” county delegate convention at the Court House in Lancaster township on September 22 for the nomination of six members of the general assembly, one state senator, and one member of Congress.⁷² The county itself was a state senate and congressional district unto itself, so it did not require any coordination

with other counties to nominate and elect its representatives to the state or national government. Delegations from twenty-one townships were in attendance when they nominated candidates for all the positions and drafted an address that described the ideology of the group, blamed the Democratic-Republicans for all the unrest in the state and county, and called on all the “federal citizens” and those who “support the government” to turn out to vote.⁷³

It is unclear what type of nomination procedure Federalists in Lancaster County used before 1800, but I argue that this was likely the first year they adopted the system as a reaction to growing electoral competition. In the 1797 general assembly elections, it appears the Federalist candidates had no competition, as displayed in Table 2.3. By 1799, the Federalists were facing increasing competition from a growing Democratic-Republican Party in the county that used the county delegate convention system to nominate candidates for the general assembly.⁷⁴ The Federalist margin of victory was on the decline following 1798, resulting in their first competitive election in 1799. Therefore, the Federalists were motivated to adopt more popularly oriented nomination procedures in an attempt to ensure widespread approval of their full ticket at the next election to better coordinate their partisan electorate at the polls and encourage turnout. Their tactics were successful in 1800, with Federalist candidates winning all six general assembly seats as well as the state senate and congressional elections. However, this election was much closer than the last, with the Federalist margin of victory equaling roughly nine percent in 1800. The party went on to lose the general assembly elections that next year, with the Democratic-Republican Party winning with a margin of victory of only two percent.⁷⁵

Developments in Chester County between 1798 and 1802 also demonstrate the influence of electoral competition on changes in Federalist Party nomination procedures. Federalists in Chester County had used the general meeting to nominate candidates since at least 1798 and could possibly connect back to a general meeting held in 1792 of “associate Judges of the Court of common pleas of said County, the Grand jury, Commissioners, and a number of other respectable freemen” that sent delegates to the “Conference Men” meeting.⁷⁶ That is to say that the Federalists used the general meeting until 1802 when an announcement was made to the “FEDERAL REPUBLICANS of Chester County . . . to meet in their respective Townships in said county . . . in order to choose two suitable persons, in each Township, to meet” at a county delegate convention to nominate candidates for the general assembly and state senate, as well as select delegates to meet with those from Lancaster and Berks Counties to nominate congressional candidates.⁷⁷ I did not find an announcement for the county delegate convention, but a congressional district delegate convention nominated Joseph Hemphill of Chester County as one of the congressional candidates “for the federal republican electors in the district.”⁷⁸ The Federalists went on to lose every state and national legislative election that year in Chester County.

Prior to the Chester County Federalists’ adoption of the county delegate convention system in 1802 and their electoral defeats, the party faced an increasingly popularly oriented and competitive opposition party. The Democratic-Republicans in Chester County used general meetings in 1798 and 1799 before first adopting the county delegate convention in 1800.⁷⁹ Moreover, the level of electoral competition began to increase greatly between the two parties, as shown in Table 2.3, with the Federalist margin of victory in general assembly

elections dropping from twenty-one percent in 1799 to two percent in 1800 and 1801. Therefore, the Federalists adopted the more popularly oriented county delegate convention system in 1802 as a reaction to this increasing electoral competition. Unfortunately, it was to no avail as they lost the general assembly elections that year in another competitive election where the result was a Democratic-Republican margin of victory of five percent.

There were similar occasions where Federalists appeared to transition to more popularly oriented nomination procedures in central and western Pennsylvania. In Cumberland County, the two parties were nearly equal in strength in 1797, when a mixed delegation was sent to the general assembly from the county. Both parties used general meetings to nominate candidates. In response to this competition, the Federalists, no doubt using the height of their popularity in the state and nation, also held a county delegate convention to nominate for the general assembly and for Congress.⁸⁰ This strategy was successful, with their general assembly ticket winning in 1798 and their congressional nominee earning a majority in the county, if not the district.

In Franklin County, a mixed delegation was sent to the general assembly in 1796 and 1797, meaning the county was highly competitive in those years. Then in 1798, Federalists in the county successfully implemented a more popularly oriented nomination procedure where “deputies from the different districts of Franklin county” came together and nominated candidates for the general assembly and Congress. Subsequently township meetings gathered to voice their support for the “federal ticket” agreed upon at the convention.⁸¹ Federalists held another county delegate convention in 1799 where delegates “from thirteen Townships” nominated

Table 2.3: Electoral Competitiveness in Chester and Lancaster Counties, 1798-1802

Chester County				
Year	Federalist Percent of Vote	Democratic-Republican Percent of Vote	Margin of Victory (Party/%)	Margin of Victory (Party/%)
1798^a	69	31	Fed / 38	Fed / 38
1799	61	39	Fed / 22	Fed / 22
1800	51	49	Fed / 02	Fed / 02
1801	51	49	Fed / 02	Fed / 02
1802	47	53	Dem-Rep / 06	Dem-Rep / 06
Lancaster County				
Year	Federalist Percent of Vote	Democratic-Republican Percent of Vote	Margin of Victory (Party/%)	Margin of Victory (Party/%)
1798^b	77	23	Fed / 54	Fed / 54
1799^c	59	41	Fed / 18	Fed / 18
1800	54	46	Fed / 08	Fed / 08
1801	49	51	Dem-Rep / 02	Dem-Rep / 02
1802	44	56	Dem-Rep / 12	Dem-Rep / 12

Notes: The election returns used to calculate party percentages came from *A New Nation Votes*. The percentage of vote is in the county general assembly elections of each year unless otherwise stated.

a One candidate was supported by both parties during this election, and their return was not used for the calculations.

b There were no vote returns this year for the general assembly. I calculated the margin of victory using congressional returns in Lancaster County, which is itself a congressional district.

c The two leading candidates were supported by both parties, and their returns were not used for the calculations.

candidates for the general assembly and the state senate. In both years, the Franklin County Federalists were successful at the ballot box, but their margins of victory went from thirty-one percent in 1798 to nine percent in 1799.

Lastly, in Allegheny County, the two burgeoning political parties encouraged ever-greater political organization between 1795 and 1802. As mentioned above, the Federalists in Allegheny County used the local governing apparatus and the general meeting to nominate candidates in 1796 and 1798, with the Federalists earning a small margin of victory in 1798 when a mixed delegation was sent to the general assembly. The next year, the Federalists organized a county delegate convention and successfully coordinated their partisan electorate around their two candidates.⁸² The party held another county delegate convention in 1800 but lost to the Democratic-Republicans.⁸³ When parts of Allegheny County were made into the counties of Beaver and Butler in 1801, the three made up a multi-member lower chamber district that elected three members to the general assembly. Federalists were still competitive in Allegheny County and ended the period by mirroring the organization of their opposition from the year before and coordinated a lower chamber district convention that nominated candidates for the general assembly and Congress. They even listed specific policy goals for general assembly candidates and for the congressional candidate, should they win office, and encouraged resident foreigners to apply for citizenship so they could vote in the election.⁸⁴ This last attempt was to no avail as they would lose in 1802 and, in fact, not organize to compete in elections the following year.

Democratic-Republican Party Development

As was true for the Federalists, general meetings were the earliest structures to emerge connected to the Democratic-Republican Party, arising in 1796. Philadelphia City and

Philadelphia County held separate general meetings that year to nominate candidates for state and national legislative elections.⁸⁵ The county general meetings remained a tool during the party formation period in counties across the state, including Berks (1798), Bucks (1799), Chester (1796), Cumberland (1796-1798), Dauphin (1801), Delaware (1799, 1800, 1802), Franklin (1796, 1798, 1799), Montgomery (1796, 1799, 1800), and York (1799).⁸⁶

Again, these meetings were generally in the county seat and described as a large collection of people coming together to nominate candidates for state and national legislative elections.⁸⁷ Philadelphia City used the general meeting method from 1796 until 1800, while it became the main method for candidate nomination in Philadelphia County during the period.⁸⁸

During this time, it became more common for Democratic-Republican Party organizers to use the delegate system to provide the basis for county organization, as well as the structure for district nominations when state senate and congressional districts contained more than one county. Calling county delegate conventions became more common after 1800, and according to Luetscher, the approach was used by the Democratic-Republican Party across the state to structure nomination procedures.⁸⁹ It was adopted across Pennsylvania by the Democratic-Republican Party in Philadelphia City as well as Allegheny (1801, 1802), Berks (1800-1802), Bucks (1800), Chester (1802), Crawford (1802), Cumberland (1799-1802), Dauphin (1800), Lancaster (1799), Northumberland (1800), Mifflin (1799), Philadelphia (1801), and Washington (1798, 1800, 1801).⁹⁰ A few of the county organizations created highly structured procedures meant to encourage

ordinary citizens' meaningful involvement at the township or election-district level in the party organization and nomination procedures.

In Cumberland County, the Democratic-Republicans first shifted away from the county general meeting when organizing legislative nominations to a county delegate convention in 1799. A general meeting was held in Carlisle, the county seat, at John Bigler's house; townships were called to hold meetings.⁹¹ It is unclear from this announcement if the town meetings were to organize a county delegate convention, but the announcement of a town meeting in East Pennsborough mentioned that more than ninety people attended who selected three gentlemen as delegates for the "county meeting to be held on Friday the 30th inst. at the sign of the Lamb in Carlisle."⁹² In fact, delegates from fourteen towns in Cumberland County met that day at the house of John Bigler (which was most likely a tavern more easily identifiable to outsiders by the one with a lamb on its sign) and nominated candidates for the general assembly. They attacked the "Federalists" who "stigmatize[d] all who may differ from them respecting men or measures, with the opprobrious terms of Antifederalists, Disorganizers, rank Democrat" and called for the mobilization of their copartisans "at this critical juncture" to help ensure that "the State Legislature should be composed of men of sound judgement, well known integrity, and firm republican principles."⁹³ In central Pennsylvania, the development of more inclusive and structured procedures to nominate candidates came out of a desire to capture the state legislature.

The party organizers in 1800 also held a delegate convention and created a standing committee to ensure the continuation of the party organization year-round. At the 1800 county delegate convention, with ten townships represented, they nominated candidates for

the general assembly, supported a congressional district delegate convention nomination, and appointed five men to the standing committee.⁹⁴ This group of five then met on August 17, 1801, to officially begin the nomination process by calling on the townships to send two delegates for a county delegate convention.⁹⁵ When the standing committee called for township meetings in 1802, it mentioned how townships should also discuss potential candidates and specified that townships' delegates were responsible for bringing this information to the county delegate convention.⁹⁶ At the delegate convention, eighteen townships sent two delegates each—considered “legally authorized” to represent the townships during the proceedings—who nominated candidates for the lower chamber, supported the congressional district delegate convention nomination, and appointed a new standing committee.⁹⁷ Creating committees to organize future nomination procedures represents an important marker of party institutionalization during this period.

It was not until 1800 that evidence of delegate conventions in western Philadelphia appeared. The first example is Washington County, which held a county delegate convention of “Fifteen Delegates appointed from different townships” on September 13, 1800, and nominated candidates for the state senate and general assembly.⁹⁸ In 1801, the Democratic-Republicans of Allegheny County and the twelfth congressional district first used the delegate convention system to nominate candidates. Several Democratic-Republicans in Allegheny County met in March in Pittsburgh, devised a plan for nominating candidates for the state legislative elections, and determined how to nominate for the special congressional election. They called for Allegheny townships to select delegates to meet in Pittsburgh in June during the meeting of the court to nominate candidates. This county delegate convention nominated candidates for state legislative

elections and selected delegates to meet in a congressional district delegate convention. Three delegates from Allegheny County, four from Washington County, and one from Greene County met on August 3, 1801. After several ballots, they nominated a candidate for Congress that went on to easily win election.⁹⁹

Information on the new organization in 1801 comes from a public letter written by a potential congressional candidate who was not nominated for the Democratic-Republican Party, John B. C. Lucas of Allegheny County. Interestingly, his letter was supportive of the nomination process. He highlighted the soundness of the Allegheny County delegate convention first when he mentioned that some of the township meetings were attended by “very few persons” while others gathered as many as “sixty or eighty electors.” Lucas also wrote how four potential candidates were mentioned at the congressional district delegate convention. After deliberation, two of the four were dropped, and zealous argumentation ensued over the convention’s preference for Lucas or William Hoge. It took four or five attempts throughout the day to break the deadlock until, late in the evening, one of the delegates decided to break the four-four tie. This delegate believed it would be “more prudent to yield than to split” the Democratic-Republican vote between the two remaining candidates at the election. The delegate altered their support, and the convention nominated Hoge. Lucas, who was not nominated because of this delegate’s action, concluded his letter by supporting the decision: “I believe that the experiment they made was fair, and well calculated to ascertain as near as possible, the opinions of the republicans throughout the district . . . and the only mean in delicate cases and important occasions, to preserve the republican interest whole and unimpaired.”¹⁰⁰

Democratic-Republicans also used delegate conventions to coordinate across county lines to structure state senate and congressional district nominations. Delegates met from Philadelphia City, Philadelphia County, and Delaware County to coordinate state senate nominations in 1801 and 1802. Democratic-Republicans in Berks and Dauphin Counties are also recorded as sharing delegates to nominate candidates for state senate elections.¹⁰¹ Delegates from Bucks, Montgomery, and Chester Counties met on July 19, 1800, where they affirmed the “genuine Republican principles of William Rodman Esq. of the County of Bucks, and therefore beg leave to recommend him to the Republican Citizens aforesaid, as a proper person to represent the said district in the Senate of this State.”¹⁰²

Congressional district delegate conventions were organized in 1800 and especially in 1802 when the state was redistricted into multiple multi-member districts. Philadelphia City, Philadelphia County, and Delaware County coordinated their congressional nominations using a district delegate convention in 1802.¹⁰³ In 1800, when Chester and Delaware Counties constituted a congressional district, the Delaware county general meeting selected delegates who reported back at another general meeting supporting the congressional nomination made by their copartisans in the adjoining county.¹⁰⁴ Democratic-Republicans from Bucks, Montgomery, and Northampton held a congressional district delegate convention in 1800 where they nominated candidates for Congress, praised the two incumbents as having been “firm members of the republican phalanx” while in Congress, and listed the names of the four delegates from each county.¹⁰⁵ The district also used a congressional district delegate convention for a special election in 1801. The district encompassed Bucks, Montgomery, Northampton, Wayne, and Luzerne Counties. Luzerne was hopelessly Federalist and, therefore, sent no delegates to this

Democratic-Republican convention. Wayne County had such a small population that it shared five delegates with Northampton. The remaining two counties (Bucks and Montgomery) sent five each for a total of fifteen delegates at the convention. These delegates attended the congressional district delegate convention that then made the special congressional election nomination.¹⁰⁶ These same three geographic areas also organized a congressional district delegate convention in 1802.¹⁰⁷

This practice extended into central and western Pennsylvania as well. Democratic-Republicans in Cumberland and Mifflin Counties came together in 1800 to nominate a candidate. When the district was expanded to include Dauphin and Huntingdon Counties, this larger grouping also organized a district delegate convention in 1802.¹⁰⁸ As mentioned above, Allegheny, Washington, and Greene Counties implemented the process in the west to organize for the special election in 1801.

The practice of rotation also began during this period in the multi-county state senate and congressional districts. There is evidence that the Democratic-Republicans followed the same pattern of geographic representation as their Federalist counterparts when it came to the state senate. Further, each geographic area nominated a single candidate in the first congressional district in 1802, just like the Federalists, and the congressional district delegate convention was there to affirm that each local candidate would be supported across the entire district. It appears those in the third congressional district also practiced split nominations based on geographic areas, with the county delegate conventions in Chester and Lancaster Counties each nominating a single, different congressional candidate in the multi-member district.¹⁰⁹ These practices and precedents were the same ones implemented by the Federalists.

Summary for the Decentralized Party Formation Period

By 1802, both political parties had created clear nomination procedures to structure the candidate emergence process across the state. This process was not guided by a centralized body such as a legislative caucus. Political parties in Pennsylvania were decentralized organizations constructed from the county level up. Further, both parties came to encourage the participation of those at the grassroots. The Democratic-Republican Party went further than the Federalists, broadly adopting the delegate convention system that encouraged ordinary citizens to participate at the township and wardship levels in the selection of delegates charged with representing the opinions of the locale during the nomination procedure.¹¹⁰ Federalists more commonly held general meetings to nominate candidates. Even these mass meetings demonstrate that the Federalists were beholden to grassroots support for the endorsement and approval of their party nominees before each election. There are a few examples where Federalists Party organizers reacted to increases in electoral competitiveness and implemented county delegate conventions to incorporate ordinary citizens even more into the party organization and candidate nominations. Lastly, both parties created procedures and institutions for coordinating across county lines to nominate state senate and congressional candidates using corresponding committees and, more commonly by 1802, district delegate conventions.

The partisan press and district-level organizations bound these decentralized, county-level party organizations together. The major partisan newspapers in Philadelphia commonly published the nomination procedures of copartisans from across the state. These same newspapers were then distributed across Pennsylvania. That is why, for example, one can learn from a major central Pennsylvania newspaper of the Democratic-Republican

congressional and state senate delegate conventions for Philadelphia City, Philadelphia County, and Delaware County or of the Federalist general meeting in the western-most county of Allegheny County.¹¹¹ Geographic regions interlocked by the creation of state senate and congressional districts quickly constructed procedures and patterns to coordinate beyond the county line. Both parties created a system of district delegate conventions to coordinate the nominations of state senate and congressional candidates. In fact, it was commonplace for nominations to rotate between the counties in state senate and congressional districts, and in the multi-member congressional districts, each individual county controlled the nomination of one of the seats to ensure a delegation member was from their area.¹¹²

The procedures created by both political parties to structure candidate emergence for state and national legislative elections were well established before 1802, with their roots in the pre-party period. They provide evidence of early party institutionalization in Pennsylvania. Their continuation and further development thereafter depended greatly upon a new factor, intra-party factionalism, which arose in the final period of the developmental story.

Factions and Truly Republican Party Organizations, 1803-1816

Both political parties went into the congressional, gubernatorial, and state legislative elections in 1802 with institutionalized political organizations prepared to compete statewide. In many parts of the state, party organizers implemented the county delegate convention as the foundational institution. Its use encouraged township-level citizen input in the party organization and the nomination of state and national legislative candidates. However, the Federalists lost that year on all fronts, bringing an abrupt end to Federalist

engagement in electoral politics that next year in most counties. After 1803, some counties contained a localized Federalist electorate that could still produce a majority, encouraging continued organization by both parties through 1816. These groups continued using the general meeting but more commonly came to adopt the more popular oriented delegate convention method by the end of the period. This preference was not true for every county. The Federalist recession from electoral politics in the years to follow meant that one party essentially dominated in some counties. I would anticipate the subsequent drop in electoral competitiveness in these areas to cause the degeneration of nomination procedures.

As I demonstrate below, the degeneration of nomination procedures did not follow because of Democratic-Republican intra-party factionalism and the ability of these factional groups to ally with Federalists. Local elites not finding success in the Democratic-Republican Party or finding themselves opposing a radically democratic party initiative split from the party and created similar political organizations that encouraged the incorporation of Federalist Party leaders and the Federalist electorate. The process of candidate nomination itself was another major point of division. Factional groups argued that organizations of the Democratic-Republican Party proper had fallen into the hands of a few and were no longer truly republican. Therefore, they would create separate organizations to combat the party organization that had degenerated into aristocracy and claimed to do so in a way that encouraged truly republican nomination procedures.

Federalist Party Development

After 1802, the Federalist Party in most of Pennsylvania receded from electoral politics for a few years, resulting in a lack of efforts to nominate candidates for state or national legislative elections. For example, Federalists failed to hold meetings or nominate

candidates in Philadelphia City and Philadelphia County in 1803.¹¹³ As factionalism grew within the ranks of the Democratic-Republican Party across Pennsylvania, especially after 1805, Federalist organizations reemerged and sometimes combined with factional groups where the partisan electorate was seemingly large enough to influence elections. When it came to the development of candidate emergence in the final period in Pennsylvania, the decentralized nature meant there was no one common path.

Delaware County represented one type of developmental pattern for the Federalists Party between 1803 and 1816, that of the consistent competitor. Delaware County had a consistent Federalist delegation to the state's legislative lower chamber from 1798 through 1816. Likewise, the county demonstrated a consistent attempt to organize its candidate emergence process every year. Even in 1803, when the Philadelphia Federalists removed themselves from electoral politics, those in Delaware County still met at the Black Horse Tavern in early September and nominated candidates for the general assembly. Further, they demonstrated a desire for their nomination process to be geographically representative, as the delegate convention system of the opposition did, by organizing their committee at the general meeting. The general meeting made the first cut at the official nomination by election district, with four individuals from the county's four election districts. They even selected delegates to meet with those from Philadelphia City and County to make a nomination for the state senate election, which of course, was to no avail.¹¹⁴ Their attempts to compete in the state assembly elections were not in vain, and one of their candidates won one of the two seats by one vote.

There is evidence that every year between 1803 and 1816, the Federalists in Delaware County held a general county meeting to nominate candidates and coordinate

efforts within state senate and congressional districts. While the announcements about organizing in Delaware County in 1805, 1806, and 1809 used the label “Friends of the Constitution” or encouraged attendance by those “friendly to the Constitution” rather than employing the Federalist name, the meetings were located at the Black Horse Tavern, a traditionally Federalist meeting place.¹¹⁵ Further, those involved in the nomination procedures were the same individuals organizing the explicitly Federalist meetings before and after. Nathaniel Newlin was elected as a Federalist state senator from Delaware County in 1796 for a four-year term. He was the chairman of the 1805 Delaware County general meeting that did not use the Federalist label.¹¹⁶ Before this, Newlin was a district delegate for Delaware County in 1801, 1802, and 1804 and served as a member of the nomination committee at the general county meeting in 1803.¹¹⁷ He then went on to serve as a district delegate for Delaware County in 1807, 1808, 1809, and 1811.¹¹⁸ The change in labeling for those three years does not mean the Federalists disappeared in Delaware County. They remained a consistent presence in electoral politics and only adopted, for a brief period, a more broadly acceptable label connected to a state policy issue.

Federalists in Delaware County between 1803 and 1816 subtly alterer their organization practices. First, they continued to meet at the Black Horse Tavern in Middletown, except for the years 1810-1815, when they consistently met at the house of Isaac Cochran in Upper Providence.¹¹⁹ The method used to create the nomination committee at the general meeting changed a few times while remaining true to the idea that the group should be geographically representative. They used the election districts but upped the number to five people in 1806 and 1807.¹²⁰ Rather than use the election districts,

members were selected for each township to fill the committee in 1805, 1808, 1809, 1810, 1812, 1813, and 1815.¹²¹

There is some question by historians as to the role ordinary citizens played in general meetings like the ones in Delaware County and in local party politics. While it has been assumed that local elites used nomination committees to control candidate nominations and take away any real influence of the people, this does not appear to be the case in Delaware County. It was mentioned in a number of years that meeting attendees were allowed to suggest potential candidates for the various offices, and the committee was supposed to choose party nominees from this list.¹²² Individuals were able to attend and bring forward information on potential candidates from across the county. Further, in 1805, the committee nominations were voted on and approved one at a time by the general meeting, requiring these nominations to have some semblance of popular approval by those in attendance.¹²³ Lastly, Federalists in Delaware County created sizable committees of vigilance, often including people from each township, for multiple election cycles to distribute votes and encourage turnout.¹²⁴ Even where the general meeting and the use of a nomination committee remained a consistent organizational pattern for the Federalists between 1803 and 1816, the party clearly incorporated ordinary citizens into the nomination process and party machinery in meaningful ways.

In other areas where the Federalists continued to expect enough votes to win state offices or act as an ally to a Democratic-Republican faction, these local party organizations sometimes adopted the organizational patterns of their opponents. Luzerne County was another area that could consistently be expected to produce a Federalist majority vote after 1802. In 1805 and 1806, the county held a general meeting nominating candidates for the

general assembly like Federalists had been doing for years across the state.¹²⁵ The Federalists of Luzerne County were also represented in the congressional district delegate convention by Nathan Beach and Arnold Colt in 1808, suggesting a renewed use of the district delegate convention system to nominate candidates for Congress in the area.¹²⁶

Federalists in Luzerne County eventually shifted away from the general meeting to use the county delegate convention system. The Democratic-Republican Party had already begun using the county delegate system.¹²⁷ A general meeting on August 8, 1811, at Wilkes-Barre, the county seat, created a committee of one person from the fourteen townships represented that called for the “Federal Republicans of each Township” to elect two delegates for a county delegate convention on September 12 to nominate candidates. The meeting even went so far as to appoint township committees consisting of two people each to organize the township meetings for the selection of delegates.¹²⁸ The newspaper editor mentioned that the general meeting organizing the county delegate convention was “more numerously attended than any” meeting before in the county. The editor approved of the nomination procedure because it would concentrate the “intelligence and wishes of every part of the county” and if the township meetings were well attended, the procedure would ensure “the voice of the people may be distinctly known.”¹²⁹ At the Federalist county delegate convention, they nominated candidates for the general assembly after “a full and frank discussion” and created a committee to draft an address that highlighted the major national policy issues of the day, like taxes, the embargo, and other issues of foreign affairs.¹³⁰ Only one of the two Federalist general assembly candidates won election. The second candidate lost by seven votes, which the local Federalist editor blamed on

Democratic-Republicans spreading falsehoods before the election and the Federalist electorate's lack of turnout because of overconfidence in their chance of success.¹³¹

The next year, Federalists in Luzerne County took the lead in organizing nomination procedures for the state senate district and the new congressional district it was part of. The process of nominating for the general assembly and state senate was complicated that year because two new counties were created from parts of Luzerne County, but the district lines providing for representation in the general assembly and state senate were unchanged. Consequently, at a general meeting on August 5, 1812, people from Luzerne, Susquehanna, and parts of Bradford County called for townships to select delegates for county delegate conventions to occur on September 14, 1812. These county delegate conventions then selected three delegates each to attend a general assembly district delegate convention to nominate candidates, and sent three delegates to a state senate district delegate convention, and sent another two delegates for a congressional district delegate convention.¹³² Delegates attended the general assembly delegate convention from Luzerne and Susquehanna Counties, where they nominated candidates for the general assembly, nominated a candidate for the state senate, and selected delegates for a congressional delegate convention.¹³³ It appears that there was no Federalist organization in Northumberland County to coordinate with, so the state senate district delegate convention was given up.

One of the Federalist candidates for the general assembly, an individual from Susquehanna County, declined the nomination, causing a general meeting in Luzerne County to convene where an individual of Susquehanna County presented at the meeting, Isaac A. Chapman, was selected to fill the vacancy. He addressed the meeting, stating that

he would have to decline as well because he was a candidate for a county office. Further, a newspaper article reporting Chapman's speech stated that he "was not authorised [sic] to nominate any other person from Susquehanna County-that he knew the Friends of Peace, Commerce and Freedom there, were governed not by local feelings, but by principles . . . and that he had no doubt they would cheerfully unite" with the nomination made by the meeting.¹³⁴ It appears that the lack of Federalist organization in Northumberland County also led to the cancellation of the congressional district delegate convention, and a general meeting in Luzerne County nominated two candidates for Congress.¹³⁵ Despite a division in the Democratic-Republican Party in the congressional election, the Federalists lost in Luzerne County in every legislative election.

Despite the lack of Federalist organizations in surrounding counties, like Northumberland County, Luzerne County continued to use the delegate convention system. Federalists used the same system to nominate candidates for the general assembly in 1813 and created a standing committee for the county.¹³⁶ That year, a township meeting in Salem drafted an address defending the nomination procedure, describing how at the county delegate convention, it was agreed each delegate would get two votes when deciding on the two general assembly candidates and that the two individuals with the most votes would win the nomination.¹³⁷ Federalist delegates for the general assembly district met on September 12, 1814, and nominated candidates that went on to win election that year. They also selected John P. Arndt as their delegate for a joint state senate and congressional district delegate convention and created a large committee of vigilance of two people per township in the general assembly district.¹³⁸ The joint state senate and congressional district delegate convention occurred on September 27, 1814, at John Brown's house,

where they nominated two candidates for Congress and one candidate for the state senate. While Luzerne County's use of the delegate convention system was limited by other counties' lack of Federalist organization, it did not prevent Luzerne from continuing to use it to nominate candidates with the counties that would join in.

Another area where the Federalists reentered electoral politics and chose to adopt the Democratic-Republican nomination procedures was Philadelphia City. Federalists did not organize in Philadelphia in 1803 or 1804. When a clear break occurred in the Democratic-Republican Party in 1805, one wing sought Federalist support and brought them back to electoral politics. This group of malcontents was a conservative wing of the party that was against calling a constitutional convention to seek alterations to the Pennsylvania Constitution that would alter the judiciary in a way that would make it less independent. The Constitutional Republicans courted Federalist support by nominating a few Federalists for public office in 1805.¹³⁹ Federalists in Philadelphia met at a general meeting and agreed that it was "advisable . . . to support the constitutional ticket" but decided to alter the general assembly ticket slightly, replacing Israel Israel with Joseph Hemphill.¹⁴⁰ This change is not surprising since Israel was the Vice President of the Democratic-Society in Philadelphia and the Democratic-Republican state senate candidate in 1798 for the area but was removed from office by a Federalist majority legislature after a heated contested election process.¹⁴¹ Further proof that the Federalists bought into the Constitutional Republican organizational efforts that year is the fact that prominent Federalists can be found as part of the mobilization efforts in 1805. Levi Hollingsworth was a wealthy merchant of Philadelphia and known as one of the most prominent Federalists in the city.¹⁴² Hollingsworth is listed as the chairman of the Dock Ward meeting

of “friends of the Constitution and M’Kean” where they nominated individuals for election inspectors and created a ward committee of vigilance to encourage turnout on election day.¹⁴³

Federalist Party resurgence continued in the city in 1806. An individual writing under the pseudonym Union argued that the Federalists and Constitutional Republicans should continue to organize together by holding joint ward meetings that would select delegates for a city delegate convention with the power to nominate candidates for state and national legislative elections. The author suggested that it was the “nomination of suitable candidates” that would “excite more interest, than any other question” and argued the delegate convention system will ensure that the “most judicious and well qualified citizens” came together to “deliberate . . . [and] dispassionately investigate” the potential candidates before making a nomination.¹⁴⁴ There is evidence of ward meetings in thirteen of the fourteen wards in Philadelphia that selected delegates for the subsequent city delegate convention, which nominated candidates for the state assembly and selected delegates for the joint state senate and congressional district delegate convention.¹⁴⁵

There was once again a division between Philadelphia’s Federalists and Constitutional Republicans, this time over the congressional nominee. Again, each geographic area nominated one candidate in the three-member congressional district. It is mentioned that the “delegates from the city reported they were unable to agree on a candidate for their proportion of the district” because two candidates “had an equal number of votes in the committee appointed for the selection of candidates.”¹⁴⁶ This caused the Federalists to organize their own general meeting to support one of the tied candidates, Joseph Hemphill, who was at the center of the nomination division the year before, as the

third congressional candidate. Also, the general meeting created a standing committee, with Levi Hollingsworth listed as one of the nine members, to encourage their copartisans in Philadelphia and Delaware Counties to support Hemphill.¹⁴⁷ Federalist meetings were announced in both counties, with the Delaware County Federalists meeting at the Black Horse Tavern and officially declaring they would “concur with the Federal Republicans of the City of Philadelphia in the nomination of JOSEPH HEMPHILL” for the third congressional nomination.¹⁴⁸ All of the Constitutional Republican and Federal congressional candidates ultimately lost, but Hemphill received roughly thirteen hundred more votes than the Constitutional Republican candidate also vying for the third slot on the joint party ticket.

In 1807 and 1808, the Federalists and Constitutional Republicans coordinated their organizational efforts to nominate candidates for the state legislature and Congress. The base organization was a general meeting that created a committee to nominate candidates for the general assembly and acted as delegates to represent the city at any district delegate conventions.¹⁴⁹ In 1808, it is mentioned that they tried to make the committee as geographically representative as possible with at least one person from each ward in the city. They also created a standing committee in charge of coordinating all of the ward committees of vigilance similarly geographically representative including one person from each ward.¹⁵⁰

In 1809, the Federalist Party in Philadelphia began organizing independently once again. The year before, the strict two-party division began to reemerge as national issues again took center stage.¹⁵¹ The Federalists’ activities became official in Philadelphia City shortly after the 1808 presidential election with the creation of the American Republican

Society. An anonymous article signed with the pseudonym American Republican explained how the new organization and label was a rebranding effort by the Federalists because the term “had been so basely perverted by their political opponents, as to be represented as synonymous with Aristocrat, Tory and Monarchist.”¹⁵² The society was created to distribute information, raise funds for electioneering, and be the official body to call for the beginning of nomination procedures. This body was a seventy-person “Convention of Delegates” representing of each ward in the city. It decided that the best way to nominate candidates was to have each ward elect delegates to a city delegate convention with the power to nominate candidates for the general assembly and select delegates to meet in the joint state senate and congressional district delegate convention. The author made it quite clear that anyone was allowed to take part in the nomination procedures, not just society members, and “[e]very individual from the poorest to the richest is made to feel his own weight in the political balance” in their nomination procedures.¹⁵³ Therefore, for the first time, the Federalists independently used the delegate convention system to structure their entire nomination procedure in 1809.

As already demonstrated, this system was not a completely novel experience because of the joint efforts with Constitutional Republicans in the years preceding. Federalists previously helped organize ward meetings for nomination procedures and even more so for mobilization efforts. However, by 1809, they did so independently. The Federalists’ process of using ward meetings to select delegates for a city delegate convention continued for the rest of the period, even as the label “American Republican” fell out of style and “Federal Republican” reemerged as the label of choice by 1812. One of the best markers of the process’s consistency comes from information on the location of

ward meetings and the individuals involved in them from 1805 on. For example, Federalists in Dock Ward held their meetings at Widow Smallwood's Tavern every year between 1805 and 1816 (except 1808, but only because none of the announcements mentioned the location of the meetings).¹⁵⁴ Further, Levi Hollingsworth remained a part of the Federalist Party organization in Philadelphia throughout most of the period, either as a member of the Dock Ward committee of vigilance (1805-1813), Dock Ward meeting chairman (1805-1810, 1812-1814), Dock Ward city convention delegate (1810, 1812), member of the Philadelphia standing committee (1805, 1810), and/or a delegate for Philadelphia City in the joint state senate and congressional district delegate convention (1806, 1810).¹⁵⁵

Several counties in eastern Pennsylvania showed evidence of the Federalists and Constitutional Republicans coordinating together to structure the candidate emergence process and, eventually, the Federalists returning to organize their own nominations after 1808. Sometimes the general meeting format served as the foundation, like in Berks (1805-1808), Bucks (1805-1809), Chester (180, 1813), Montgomery (1805, 1806, 1808, 1812), and Northampton (1809, 1812).¹⁵⁶ Later in the period, the county delegate convention was the foundational organization, as in Berks (1808), Chester (1804, 1806-1810, 1812), Lancaster (1804-1810, 1812), Montgomery (1812), and Northampton (1809).¹⁵⁷

In central Pennsylvania, where the Federalist Party did not have a sizeable partisan electorate, opposition essentially disappeared after 1800, except for a few opportunistic resurgences. Federalists in Cumberland County took advantage of the official break in the Democratic-Republican Party in 1805 and held a general county meeting consisting of "a number of the Federal Republicans from different parts of the County," where they agreed to support the Constitutional Republican candidates for the state legislative elections and

their congressional candidate nominated by a district delegate convention for the special election.¹⁵⁸ They also held a general meeting in 1807 in Newville Township, where they nominated a slate of candidates for the general assembly.¹⁵⁹ The party did not reemerge until 1812 when Federalists in Cumberland and Franklin Counties called for township meetings to select delegates for a county delegate convention with the power to nominate candidates for the general assembly and select delegates for a congressional district delegate convention.¹⁶⁰ Then in 1814, a Federal Ticket was published in a Philadelphia-based newspaper for Cumberland County for the general assembly and congressional elections, which were coordinated around each election to no avail. However, there is no indication of what procedure was in place to nominate the candidates. Constitutional Republicans and Federalists in Dauphin (1805, 1808), Huntingdon (1808), and Franklin (1808, 1812, 1816) Counties also relied upon the delegate convention system.¹⁶¹ In all, it appears that even in areas of Pennsylvania where the Federalist Party stopped organizing for multiple years, they were still able to structure the candidate emergence process using the tried-and-true method of the general meeting and eventually adopted the more popularly oriented delegate convention system.

Lastly, Federalists in the west demonstrated that their continued organizational efforts were not consistent over time but came to take on the same procedures as their opponents. The Federalists in Allegheny County took advantage of the split in the Democratic-Republican Party in 1805 and organized a county delegate convention to nominate candidates for the general assembly, state senate, and Congress. The convention was held on August 31, 1805, with delegates from nine towns, the most attending from Pittsburgh.¹⁶² They nominated candidates for legislative elections, but they did not

nominate a full slate for the general assembly, leaving room for those in Butler County to organize and nominate a candidate for this office because Allegheny's representation in the state legislative lower chamber was tied to Butler's.

This practice continued in Allegheny County when the Federalists of Pittsburgh met on April 26, 1808, and selected their delegates for the county delegate convention. They also called for a second township meeting on May 21, a week before the convention, where they instructed their delegates on whom to support for nominations at the county convention.¹⁶³ The meeting later instructed their delegates to "recommend William Wilkins, of Pittsburgh, as one of the candidates proper" for the general assembly.¹⁶⁴ At the Allegheny County delegate convention, they went on to nominate three candidates for the general assembly, Wilkins being one of them, and again left one position vacant for Butler County to nominate a single candidate for the general assembly. They also appointed seven delegates for a congressional district delegate convention.¹⁶⁵ Beaver and Butler Counties have also been recorded as sending delegates to the congressional district delegate convention but held county general meetings instead of delegate conventions as their county-level organization; they also nominated candidates for the general assembly.¹⁶⁶ Federalists in Erie County held a county delegate convention on July 8, 1808, where they nominated candidates for the general assembly and supported the nomination of the congressional district delegate convention, held on June 25, 1808, in Venango County.¹⁶⁷ Because of a lack of information in the newspapers, it is unclear what procedures were used by Allegheny County and the surrounding western counties after 1808. From vote returns for congressional elections, it appears that some process continued to structure the

candidate emergence process, most likely the district delegate convention system, from 1812 to 1816, with Federalist victories in the latter two elections.

Federalists and Constitutional Republicans also coordinated in a few other counties in the west using general meetings and county delegate conventions. Crawford, Erie, Mercer, and Washington all used the general meeting as their foundational organization in 1805.¹⁶⁸ Erie and Westmoreland Counties used the county delegate convention in 1808.¹⁶⁹ The Federalist organization was so similar to the Democratic-Republican organization in Westmoreland that in 1812, their newspaper announcements showed they even used the same ratio of representation for township delegates.¹⁷⁰

Democratic-Republican Party Development

In contrast to the Federalists, the Democratic-Republicans appear to have continued using the county delegate convention between 1803 and 1816 across the state with only a few exceptions. This continued organization, with no apparent lapse in organizational efforts that I would have expected with the decline in Federalist competition, appears to be the result of Democratic-Republican factionalism during the period. However, long-term factionalism in Pennsylvania began the process of party-system decay by the end of this factional party period.

In eastern Pennsylvania, the original source of factionalism in Democratic-Republican politics came out of a fight over control of the Philadelphia County nomination process. In 1801, Democratic-Republicans in Philadelphia County used a county delegate convention to nominate candidates for the general assembly.¹⁷¹ This approach did not continue in 1802 when a general meeting was again held in the Northern Liberties, They

made a partial congressional nomination, selected delegates for the joint state senate and congressional district meeting, and met again at a later date to nominate candidates for the general assembly.¹⁷² However, a group that met at the Rising Sun Tavern opposed. They were against the nomination of Dr. Michael Leib as the member of Congress for Philadelphia County in the first congressional district's delegation, which eventually failed to produce any real opposition.¹⁷³ Higginbotham described how this factional group arose from personal competition between two individuals in Philadelphia County, Leib, who was well supported in the Northern Liberties, versus George Logan, who had ambitions of high office in the state and saw Leib as standing in the way of that.¹⁷⁴

The Rising Sun factional group organized again in 1803 and this time created their own nomination procedures in direct competition with the general meeting organization, claiming their rejection of the prior party nomination process was in the name of true republican principles. They proposed to nominate candidates in a way that would prevent any one individual, Leib for example, from controlling the nomination process. They called for each election district in Philadelphia County to hold a meeting to make a partial nomination of candidates for the general assembly and send delegates to a county delegate convention to approve the full ticket.¹⁷⁵ The group then held a general meeting on October 1, 1803, where they defended their counter organization, highlighting the truly republican credentials of their nomination procedures over that of the Leib group, writing

“ . . . we are of opinion, that the citizens of each district are entitled to a proportion of the representation in the State Legislature, and that the most just way to obtain such representation, is by district meeting. The former mode pursued by holding county meeting in the Northern Liberties, gave to that township an undue influence—and a few designing men had it in their power to have such men placed in nomination as best suited themselves.”¹⁷⁶

It was on this front, the republican nature of the nomination procedure, that factional groups in Philadelphia County and the rest of the state competed with one another for the support of their candidates and to be seen as the true Democratic-Republican organization in their respective area.

Those in the Northern Liberties were quick to react to the counter organization by calling for their own election district meetings. This action did not result in the group adopting the county delegate convention system, as the convention did not nominate candidates. Nominations were still made via a general meeting. Rather, they organized these election district meetings to highlight a flaw in the Rising Sun's Democratic-Republican credentials. Instructions for organizing the Leibite group's election district meetings mentioned that those involved in the proceedings must be U.S. and Pennsylvania citizens, they must be "known to be a democrat, and that the general committee be empowered to vacate the seat of any person appointed a delegate, who is not known to be a democrat and a citizen as aforesaid, or who has not been duly elected by democratic citizens only."¹⁷⁷ The Rising Sun faction was allowing anyone, even Federalists, to be involved in their party proceedings in Philadelphia County to boost their support in their challenge to the entrenched Leibite group. In Philadelphia County, the Democratic-Republican Party was trying to decide who was allowed to be involved in nominating candidates. Should the proceedings be closed or open? The inclusion of Federalists in the proceedings of the Rising Sun group appears to have hurt their chances of courting more from their own party, and the Leibite group remained dominant for a few more years.

The Rising Sun group continued to compete against the Leibite group. They used the county delegate convention as their base organization, when they became more than

just an isolated faction in 1805 and became part of the larger break in the Democratic-Republican Party, taking on the label of Constitutional Republicans. At a meeting on June 10, 1805, the group published a twenty-page political manifesto that described their history of opposition, the retaliation they inflicted, their defense of the state constitution, and the manipulation of nomination procedures by elites in the Democratic-Republican Party.¹⁷⁸ George Logan was listed as the President of the new group. The same group met in early August and called for the organization of a county delegate convention to organize nominations in Philadelphia County.¹⁷⁹ Shortly thereafter, there was an announcement for a meeting in all five election districts in the county for the selection of delegates.¹⁸⁰ At the Southwark election district meeting, the delegates were instructed to nominate any candidate for the state legislature “whose sentiments are opposed to the constitution and Governor; as no confidence can be placed in such characters at this important crisis.”¹⁸¹ When the county delegate convention met on September 11, 1805, they nominated a full slate of candidates for the general assembly from various parts of the county.¹⁸²

The Leibite group in Philadelphia County, eventually termed the Old School, would later clash with a radical, western-Pennsylvania-aligned group called the Snyderites. Simon Snyder was the Democratic-Republican gubernatorial candidate in 1805 against the Democratic-Republican incumbent Thomas McKean, who was at that time connected to the conservative coalition of Constitutional Republicans and Federalists. Snyder was known as a prominent farmer turned politician from western Pennsylvania, serving as a member of the general assembly from Northumberland County. He became the figurehead of the more radical democratic wing of the Democratic-Republican Party across the state. Even after his loss in 1806, he was mentioned in Fourth of July toasts as emblematic of a

specific wing of the party. For example, a group of “Democratic Republicans of the Borough” of Carlisle in Cumberland County met and made several toasts that included one to “Simon Snyder, the uniform Republican and friend of the people.”¹⁸³ That same year in Philadelphia County, the Snyderites used the county delegate convention to structure nominations for the general assembly while the Leibite group defended the general meeting nomination procedure.¹⁸⁴ The division and differences in nomination procedures in Philadelphia County remained through 1814.¹⁸⁵ This dissonance changed in 1815 and 1816 when the now out-of-power Leibite group in Philadelphia County adopted the county delegate convention system but required that a general meeting approve their nominations shortly before the election.¹⁸⁶ Therefore, by the end of the period the Democratic-Republican Party continued to structure the candidate emergence process with clear, routine procedures that brought the process of candidate nomination closer to the people via factional conflicts within the party.

The factional conflict in Philadelphia County appears to have spurred continuous organization throughout the period when the party was dominant in state and national politics. However, the Federalists continued to compete in the area, meaning there was still the threat of the opposition party to keep the Democratic-Republicans organizing their candidate emergence process. The continued threat of Federalist mobilization in various areas appears to have been enough to ensure continued organization by the Democratic-Republicans in other parts of the state as well.

An address by the Democratic-Republican standing committee in Bucks County in 1803 described the delegate convention system in place and supported the process because it matched the republican principles established by the government for which it was

nominating candidates. The organization was highly institutionalized. It mentioned how township delegates were chosen in March on the same day as the election of township officers and how the township committee should publish announcements at least ten days before the party proceedings in the local paper as well as on broadsides. Each town was allowed to select one to three delegates, but at the county delegate convention, the township would only have one vote in the nomination process. The election of township delegates was a closed party election that only allowed those who professed “to be a Democratic Republican and ha[d] supported the” party for at least the past six months. The county delegate convention was then empowered to create a list of potential candidates for the various offices up for election. Then the delegates gathered information from their local constituencies on these potential candidates and met again in convention to officially nominate candidates and select delegates for the congressional district delegate convention. When it was Bucks County’s turn in the rotation of congressional representation, they also instructed their delegates on who to nominate at the convention.¹⁸⁷

The Democratic-Republicans in Bucks County continued to use the quite elaborate system in 1804 and 1806. The standing committee put out an announcement for the county delegate convention to occur on September 4, 1804, at Addis’s Tavern and reminded delegates to “bring the certificates of their election” with them to allow entry into the proceedings.¹⁸⁸ At the convention, more candidates were nominated than seats available for the general assembly, state senate, and congressional elections. The convention was adjourned until a follow-up on September 13 at Dunlap’s Tavern.¹⁸⁹ Between the meetings, the delegates returned to their townships and gathered information on the potential candidates, returning on the 13th to make the official nominations. At the adjourned

conference, twenty-six towns were represented, and it was here that the group made their official nominations for the state and national legislative elections that year as well as selected delegates for the congressional district delegate convention, where their partial, geographic congressional nomination would be affirmed and combined with other such partial nominations to create a full Democratic-Republican ticket.¹⁹⁰

In 1806, the Democratic-Republicans met in mid-August in a county delegate convention and once again suggested more candidates than could be supported for the general assembly; sixteen potential candidates were listed for four open seats.¹⁹¹ While there was no announcement of the subsequent convention to make the official nomination the election returns suggest that such a convention occurred since there was clear coordination around only four Democratic-Republican candidates in that year's general assembly election.

The use of the county delegate convention remained a staple of Democratic-Republican organization across the state between 1803 and 1816. Democratic-Republicans in Philadelphia City and other eastern counties, like Berks (1803, 1807, 1808), Lancaster (1803, 1806-1808), and Montgomery (1804-1807), utilized the delegate convention to nominate candidates for the state legislature and select delegates for congressional district delegate conventions.¹⁹² So too did the central and western counties of Beaver (1807, 1810, 1811), Bedford (1813), Butler (1807, 1810, 1811), Dauphin (1804-1806, 1808, 1810, 1814, 1816), Erie (1811), Fayette (1814), Franklin (1812, 1814, 1816), Greene (1816), Lebanon (1814), Northumberland (1806, 1812), Mifflin (1802, 1810), Washington (1808, 1816), Westmoreland (1808, 1812), and York (1808).¹⁹³

To better understand the influence of factional politics on the development of candidate emergence, one needs to turn to an area where the Federalists all but removed themselves from electoral politics after 1802. Central Pennsylvania offers the best chance to find this type of county. In Readex, issues of the *Carlisle Gazette* are available for each year between 1789 and 1816. The newspaper was printed in Carlisle, the county seat of Cumberland County located in central Pennsylvania. The newspaper quickly aligned with the Democratic-Republican Party organizational efforts in the county. This allegiance and allowed me to track the development of candidate emergence every year between 1796 and 1816. I have already mentioned how the Democratic-Republican Party organization in Cumberland County went from holding general meetings to county delegate conventions by 1802. Further, in 1800, they began appointing a standing committee each year. The committee was charged with organizing party nomination procedures during the next election cycle. Federalist organization quickly became a rare occurrence after 1802. Much more consistent was factional opposition to the Democratic-Republican Party. Below, I describe the organizational efforts of Democratic-Republicans in Cumberland County between 1803 and 1816 and the factional conflicts that ensued. A table containing information on when party meetings occurred, their size, and the offices nominated can be found in Table A1 in the appendix.

The Cumberland County Democratic-Republican Standing Committee was consistently appointed every year between 1803 and 1816. The members were appointed annually at the county delegate convention. Those appointed to the standing committee at the 1800 county delegate convention oversaw organizing the party for the election cycle in 1801. The size of the group changed over the years, ranging from as small as six in 1800

to as many as forty-four in 1813. The standing committee's size slowly increased on average over time. In 1803, the announcement of the new standing committee connected each member to an election district within the county.¹⁹⁴ From then on, it appears the Democratic-Republican Party in Cumberland County attempted to create a geographically representative standing committee by having roughly the same number of members as there were election districts as the latter increased over time. There were seven election districts from 1800-1802, eight from 1803-1804, nine from 1805-1812, ten in 1813, twelve in 1814, and thirteen from 1815-1816. The standing committee created in 1813 was an exception to this pattern when the new standing committee included forty-four individuals from all nineteen townships. In 1814, there was no mention of who was on the new standing committee, but there was an announcement of a standing committee meeting in 1815 to organize party nominations meaning the 1814 body likely created one.

The standing committee was empowered to organize party nomination procedures each year. The committee generally met in August to decide the date for township delegate elections and the county delegate convention and published this information in the newspaper. They also served other party organization functions. In 1801, it was mentioned that the secretary of the standing committee was in charge of collecting the election returns of the township delegate elections.¹⁹⁵ On a number of occasions, the stand committee members encouraged attendance at the township elections, even calling them earlier in 1811 so as to occur just after the harvesting season, so the county delegate convention could truly represent the opinion of the Democratic-Republican electorate.¹⁹⁶

The county delegate convention was meant to be a geographically representative body that nominated candidates, selected delegates for district conventions when

necessary, and appointed the new standing committee. Township delegate elections generally occurred sometime in late August to mid-September and were held at the same place as the township elections. For example, in Carlisle, the delegate election was at the Cumberland County Courthouse, and in 1810, it occurred between the hours of four and seven in the evening.¹⁹⁷ The convention itself could occur in mid- to late-September before the general election in mid-October. The size and geographic representation of the convention varied over time. There were a total of eighteen towns in Cumberland County from 1800 to 1812 and nineteen towns from 1813 to 1816. In 1800, the townships were instructed to send three delegates. Every year after that, they were instructed to send two delegates, except for the county delegate convention in June 1806, when they were instructed to send only one delegate. For most years, it was explicitly mentioned that individuals had to present a certificate of their election as a township delegate, signed by the election judges, before they would be admitted to the proceedings. The county delegate convention also provided other party organization functions. They called for party discipline around the agreed-upon ticket in 1806 and ordered themselves to take a collection of money from the townships they represented to subsidize the printing of party tickets in 1809.¹⁹⁸

More often, the convention nominated candidates for the state legislature. It was only when the district delegate convention system failed that the body nominated a congressional candidate, as in 1808. The controversy surrounding the 1810 convention gives a glimpse into the balloting process for general assembly candidates at the convention. Cumberland County sent three candidates to the state legislative lower chamber. From the number of votes recorded by the secretary of the meeting, it appears

each delegate was allowed three votes, so one for each open seat. After determining the top three individuals, each delegate had one vote for an up-or-down vote on the full general assembly list. The slate of candidates was approved by a majority vote in 1810, eighteen to five.¹⁹⁹ The creation of a majority seemed to be important during the proceedings. It was mentioned in 1815 that several ballots were required before arriving at a majority decision.²⁰⁰ Lastly, it appears the convention attempted to nominate candidates for the general assembly to ensure geographic representation of the county. In 1813, they explicitly designated that each of the three general assembly candidates hailed from a different region within the county (east, center, and west).²⁰¹

Factional opposition in Cumberland County was consistently grounded in opposition to the nomination procedures used by the Democratic-Republican Party proper, just like in Philadelphia County. Unlike their counterparts to the east, their proceedings were not a reflection of their criticisms, and they often held general county meetings. Intra-party conflicts began in 1802 when a group in Carlisle announced they were displeased with the party procedures, specifically the way the county delegate convention appointed the standing committee.²⁰² Other early criticisms against the party organization align with my own logic: they argued that the party organization that structures nomination procedures should be done away with since the Federalists were no longer an electoral threat in the county.²⁰³

Other than these early attacks, there were two consistent criticisms made by the factional group in Cumberland County: (1) a small number of elites controlled the proceedings, and (2) the proceedings were not representative. Anonymous articles and resolutions from the faction's general meetings mentioned how a small group operated to

control the nomination procedures to forward their own interests, whether that was being nominated themselves or having someone loyal to their own interests nominated for office.²⁰⁴ The group generally praised the county delegate convention nomination procedure with caveats. For example, the faction thought it was “a fair and eligible mode to collect the sense of the County” when nominating candidates while also noting that the “wisest and best plans may be abused,” specifically by a small group seeking to control the entire process.²⁰⁵ The strongest attack about a small group controlling all of the Democratic-Republican nominations came in 1816 when an anonymous author described how those in the Tammany Society met before the township delegate elections so they could control who was selected from a number of the towns and, therefore, influence a majority of the convention delegates.²⁰⁶

The faction also attacked the representative nature of the proceedings. In 1805, the faction argued that if township delegate elections were held at irregular places, rather than the same location as the elections for township officials, the proceedings could not produce truly representative delegates and the convention was illegitimate.²⁰⁷ Further, if the township delegate elections were not well attended, the convention itself could not claim to represent the party electorate’s opinion.²⁰⁸ When the convention had its smallest collection of delegates and townships in 1810 and 1814, the faction argued the convention was not representative and could not claim to legitimately nominate candidates in the name of the party county-wide.²⁰⁹

The factional group nominated their own candidates relatively consistently between 1803 and 1816. They used the general meeting to nominate candidates for the general assembly and state senate from 1803-1807, 1810, 1811, and 1813.²¹⁰ In 1810, 1811, and

1813, a meeting in Carlisle nominated candidates, and subsequent meetings in other parts of the county followed to support the nomination. The faction was at its strongest in 1810 and 1811 when they successfully elected two out of three of their candidates in 1810 and all three in 1811. This accomplishment was fueled by a local banking issue ultimately decided by the state legislature. The almost even divide between the Democratic-Republican Party and the faction resulted in the only time the faction coordinated a county delegate convention in 1812. They created a peace coalition with the Federalists that year, mentioning how the delegates had been “previously chosen at Public Elections in different townships, by the friends of PEACE, Commerce, and the Union, without regard to political distinction,” which resulted in a delegate convention of twenty-nine delegates representative of fifteen townships.²¹¹ However, the faction did not achieve electoral success as the Democratic-Republican Party won by a landslide in the general assembly elections. The group organized again in 1813, specifically against the nomination of one general assembly candidate and the state senate candidate.²¹² However, they were unsuccessful, and a clear factional group did not organize again in 1815 or 1816.

In response to these factional conflicts in Cumberland County, an equally strong narrative claimed that the delegate convention was actually the best way to nominate candidates and was an important extension of the republican government itself. In response to the first factional attack in 1802, one author defended the county delegate convention by writing that the delegates had been “legally, freely, and fairly chosen to represent the different Townships of the county.”²¹³ Two potential candidates declined the factional group’s nomination for the general assembly, noting that the general assembly procedure was an illegitimate way to nominate candidates; they supported the county delegate

convention procedure.²¹⁴ The convention system allowed ordinary people to “choose and instruct their delegates” on who to nominate, making the procedure a way for the opinion of the Democratic-Republican to be accurately expressed when deciding on party nominees.²¹⁵ One author, in their defense of the county delegate convention system, asked rhetorically, “Are not [conventions] the very offspring of democracy?”²¹⁶ Therefore, the belief that the nomination procedure itself was a legitimate extension of republican government and allowed for the accurate expression of the party electorate’s opinion on party nominees helps explain why it continued to structure candidate emergence in Cumberland County without the electoral threat of the Federalists.

Summary for the Factions and Truly Republican Party Organizations Period

Between 1803 and 1816, the Democratic-Republicans were the clear majority party in Pennsylvania. Across the state in 1803, the Federalists receded from electoral politics. This was not the end of the story. Many counties across the state demonstrated renewed two-party competition for state and national legislative elections. Both parties continued to structure candidate emergence with nomination procedures they had developed during the party formation period. Both parties continued to utilize county organizations to nominate candidates for the general assembly and created district conventions to coordinate the nomination of state senate and congressional candidates.

There is evidence that nomination procedures fell apart in some areas towards the end of the period. Higginbotham has noted how the War of 1812’s end and Democratic-Republican’s continued factionalism combined explain why party organization and division began to break down across the state in 1815.²¹⁷ Coordination efforts by the Democratic-Republican Party to nominate congressmen and the precedent of rotation of

geographic representation in senate nominations began to break down as early as 1810 in Allegheny, Beaver, and Butler Counties, and by 1816, that partisanship was “meaningless in Pittsburgh.”²¹⁸ This decline was true of other Democratic-Republican organizations in western Pennsylvania, with a breakdown in coordination between Washington and Greene Counties in 1816 to share state senate representation and the demise of the county delegate convention in Fayette County in 1815 over claims of the process being controlled by a few individuals and therefore illegitimate.²¹⁹ However, the extent of party organization degeneration at the county level seems to be more true in western counties than central and eastern, at least before 1816.

Between 1803 and 1816, the Federalist Party had inconsistent organization across the state. It appears that the party remained active in structuring the candidate emergence process almost every year in those years where the party could still expect to produce enough votes to be influential in elections via an alliance with a Democratic-Republican faction or produce a county majority itself. The use of the county general meeting remained intact but should not be considered the dominant method used by the Federalists to nominate candidates at this time. In some areas, the Federalists adopted the county delegate convention system as the base organization to structure candidate emergence. For state senate and congressional elections, the use of district delegate conventions depended on the level of Federalist organization in the geographic area within each district. Between 1806 and 1816, the Philadelphia Federalists successfully used the district delegate convention system in conjunction with their geographic neighbors to nominate candidates for the state senate and Congress. Further, they maintained the practice of each geographic area nominating one of the three candidates and appear to have followed a practice of

rotating the nomination of a state senator between each region. However, some areas were left making state senate and/or congressional nominations at the individual county level when their neighbors within the district failed to organize. In western Pennsylvania, the use of the district delegate system appears to have remained strong when Federalists provided some form of county organization, either a delegate convention or general meeting.

Democratic-Republicans continued to use the county delegate convention as the foundation of their party nomination procedures. In all regions of the state, delegate conventions were the method of choice when nominating candidates for the general assembly, state senate, or Congress. The procedures provided geographic representation. Further, the organizations in place to structure candidate emergence encouraged the inclusion of ordinary citizens in the proceedings to ensure the nominations accurately reflected of the party electorate's opinion.

In areas where the Federalists did not return to organize against the Democratic-Republicans in Pennsylvania, the subsequent falling away of nomination procedures did not occur as I anticipated. Earlier, I demonstrated how factional politics in Pennsylvania helped explain the continuation of party structures when electoral competition ceased within a geographic area. In Cumberland County, a factional group organized against the party delegate convention most years between 1803 and 1816. Their reason for counter-organization was similar to the factional group in Philadelphia County. They claimed that the existing nomination procedures were controlled by a few and not representative of the county in general. The competition created by this factional group helps explain why the party continued to organize. By the end of the period, organizations in eastern and central

Pennsylvania appeared to continue structuring candidate emergence while, in the western part of the state, party decay was already underway.

Conclusion: Institutionalization and Democratization in Pennsylvania

During the early republic, Pennsylvania was the state to watch to understand democratic politics. Even before clearly defined partisan groups, those in Pennsylvania had a history of political organization and a participatory political culture that encouraged local groups to structure candidate emergence with popularly oriented procedures. During the pre-party era, county general meetings were widely accepted as a legitimate form of political organization. During the party formation period, each party favored one type of nomination procedure at the county level. Democratic-Republicans used the county delegate convention to encourage ordinary citizens at the township level to engage in the party as an organization and help nominate party candidates. The Federalists continued to use county general meetings, where large gatherings would nominate candidates, but the proceedings could be guided more easily with the use of a nomination committee. When the Federalists solidified their place as the minority party after 1802, they stepped away from electoral politics for a few years or, essentially, for the rest of the period in some areas of the state. Where the Federalists continued to compete, they often coordinated with Democratic-Republican factional groups and eventually adopted the county delegate system as their foundational organization. During the party formation period and through 1816, both parties created and implemented district delegate conventions to coordinate across county boundaries to nominate candidates for the state senate and Congress. Federalists and Democratic-Republicans across the state also developed precedents for

sharing representation in these two legislative bodies across the geographic areas within their districts, which also structured the candidate emergence process.

Pennsylvania's party development process was from the middle out, with those at the state level providing the foundations of party organizational development. The best evidence of this fact comes from Philadelphia City and Philadelphia County. Before 1796, both areas fostered the beginnings of organizational efforts to structure candidate emergence. Groups in these areas began to meet in the same location each year to nominate candidates for legislative elections. After 1796, these groups sharpened and became the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans, nominating their own list of candidates to compete in state and national legislative elections. During the pre-party period organizing activities beyond the metropolis, as well, can be considered the origins of the organizational efforts that followed in the party formation period.

The political parties in Pennsylvania were quickly institutionalized between 1796 and 1802. Both parties created consistent nomination procedures to structure the candidate emergence process for state and national legislative elections. Democratic-Republicans quickly utilized the county delegate convention, while the Federalists originally engaged in county general meetings and eventually adopted the methods of their opponents. These county-level organizations nominated candidates for the state legislature's lower chamber and provided the foundation for party coordination efforts across county lines. There is evidence of a continuation of party structures from year to year, with groups meeting at the same location each year to creating standing committees to ensure the continuity of party procedures. District delegate conventions became commonplace across the state to structure state senate and congressional elections when these districts encompassed more

than one county. Further, the parties quickly adopted precedents that encouraged a geographic distribution of representation in these multi-county districts for state senate and congressional delegations. These organizations and precedents developed early and remained intact in most areas of Pennsylvania through 1816.

Lastly, nomination procedures encouraged ordinary citizens to participate in party organizational activities and candidate nominations for state and national legislative representatives, making the political parties agents of democratization. While Democratic-Republicans were more eager to create structures that integrated popular participation in the nomination process, even Federalists recognized the importance of popular engagement, having their tickets approved at county general meetings. By 1808, both parties consistently used the county delegate convention system, encouraging ordinary citizens' participation in nomination procedures via delegate selection. Further, groups across the state argued that the county delegate convention was the truly republican organization for nominating candidates when not perverted by a small number of local elites. At its best, the county delegate convention allowed for the nomination of legislative candidates that met the party electorate's approval and reflected the partisan ideals of all involved.

Notes

1. Park 2018, 174.
2. Owen 2018, 21.
3. Owen 2018; Miller 1976.
4. Butler 2007, 188.
5. Luetscher 1903, 4.
6. Walton 1897.
7. Cunningham 1957; 1963.
8. Higginbotham 1952.
9. Walton 1897, 263-267.
10. Walton 1897, 268-269.
11. *Independent Gazetteer* Oct 8, 13, 1789.
12. *Independent Gazetteer* Sept 30, 1789; *Pennsylvania Packet* Oct 12, 1789.
13. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 11, 1791.
14. Luetscher 1903, 63.
15. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 11, 1791.
16. *Federal Gazette* Oct 9, 1789.
17. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 28, 1795; *Independent Gazetteer* Oct 2, 1790.
18. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 26, 1792.
19. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 7, 1791.
20. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 7, 1791.
21. *General Advertiser* Aug 12, 1791.
22. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 29, 1794.

23. *Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 13, 1794.
24. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 5, 1795; *Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 9, 1795.
25. *Claypoole's Daily Advertiser* September 17, 1791; *Federal Gazette* October 5, 1791.
26. *General Advertiser* September 24, 1791; *Federal Gazette* October 5, 1791.
27. The announcement lists that there were two secretaries, James Hanna and Michael Lybe. I think "Lybe" is a typo and that this is referring to Michael Leib.
28. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* October 7, 1791.
29. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 3, 1792.
30. *Independent Gazetteer* Aug 16, 1794; *General Advertiser* Sept 4, 1794.
31. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 11, 1794.
32. *Independent Gazetteer* Sept 5, 30, 1795.
33. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 8, 1792, Oct 11, 1794; *Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 9, 1795. There were three general meetings in 1794. There was a meeting at the German Lutheran School House before the Dunwoody Tavern meeting that nominated a slightly different general assembly list and the same state senate ticket (*Gazette of the United States* Oct 8, 1794; *General Advertiser* Oct 10, 1794). Then there was a general meeting at City Hall, after the Dunwoody general meeting, that nominated the same ticket as the Dunwoody Tavern meeting (*Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 13, 1794).
34. *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 8, 1791, Oct 6, 1792, Sept 23, 29, 1794, Oct 5, 1795; *Federal Gazette* Oct 5, 1792; *General Advertiser* Oct 2, 1791, Oct 3, 1792; *Independent Gazetteer* Sept 30, 1789, Oct 2, 1790; *Pennsylvania Packet* Oct 12, 1789, Oct 11, 1790; *Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 13, 1794.
35. *Aurora General Advertiser* Oct 1, 8, 1795.
36. *Philadelphia Gazette* Aug 31, 1796; *Gazette of the United States* Sept 22, 1796.
37. *Gazette of the United States* Oct 3, 1796; *Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 10, 1796.
38. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 29, Oct 10, 1796; *Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 03, 1796; *Weekly Advertiser of Reading* Sept 24, Oct 8, 1796.

39. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 6, 1797, Sept 12, 1798; *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 27, 1796; *Herald of Liberty* Sept 2, 1799, Sept 29, 1802; *Oracle of Dauphin* Oct 7, 1799; *Gazette of the United States* Sept 10, 1796.
40. *Gazette of the United States* Sept 16, 1796. This continued past 1796 with one in Chester County nominating candidates in 1799 (*Gazette of the United States* Aug 24, 1799). Kenneth W. Keller mentions this nomination method in his book on rural Pennsylvania politics and claims that in 1799 Federalists used grand juries in almost every county of the state to nominate candidates for office (1982, 7-8).
41. *Philadelphia Gazette* July 31, 1799.
42. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 27, 1799.
43. *Gazette of the United States* Oct 5, 1799.
44. *Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 11, 1800; *Porcupine's Gazette* Sept 25, 1798; *Gazette of the United States* Sept 27, 1798, Sept 17, 1800.
45. *Federal Gazette* Oct 3, 1792.
46. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 12, 1798; *Porcupine's Gazette* Sept 26, 1798.
47. *Gazette of the United States* Oct 9, 1801.
48. *Gazette of the United States* July 29, 1800, Aug 25, 1802.
49. *Philadelphia Gazette* Sept 8, 1802.
50. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 10, 1802.
51. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 19, 1799, July 28, Aug 28, 1800; *Gazette of the United States* Sept 22, Oct 3, 10, 1796, Oct 2, 1797, Aug 25, Sept 4, 1798, Aug 13, 14, Sept 26, 1799, July 24, 29, 1800 Sept 26, 30, Oct 7, 1801; *Philadelphia Gazette* Aug 31, 1796, Aug 27, Sept 25, Oct 1, 1798; *Porcupine's Gazette* July 27, 1798; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 5, 1801.
52. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 1, 1798, Aug 17, Sept 23, 1799, Sept 18, 1800; *Gazette of the United States* Sept 24, 1796, Oct 6, 9, 1797, Sept 22, 1798, Sept 29, Oct 11, 1800, Sept 2, 1802; *Porcupine's Gazette* Sept 19, 1798, Aug 13, Sept 13, 1799; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 10, 1802.
53. *Gazette of the United States* Aug 19, 1799, Sept 2, 1802; *Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 3, 1798, Aug 4, 15, 1800, May 20, 1801.

54. *Gazette of the United States* Aug 14, 1799.
55. *Gazette of the United States* Aug 19, 1799.
56. *Porcupine's Gazette* Sept 13, 1799.
57. *Gazette of the United States* Sept 26, 1799.
58. *Philadelphia Gazette* Aug 15, 1800.
59. *Gazette of the United States* Aug 25, 1802.
60. *Philadelphia Gazette* Sept 23, 1802.
61. *Philadelphia Gazette* Sept 23, 1802.
62. *Gazette of the United States* Sept 25, 1800.
63. *Gazette of the United States* Sept 17, 1800.
64. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, 1800; *Universal Gazette* July 31, 1800.
65. *Philadelphia Gazette* Aug 15, 1800.
66. *Gazette of the United States* Sept 25, 1800.
67. *Gazette of the United States* Aug 25, 1798.
68. *Gazette of the United States* Aug 2, 10, 1798.
69. *Farmers' Register* Aug 15, 1798; *Porcupine's Gazette* Sept 19, 1798.
70. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 23, 1799.
71. *Porcupine's Gazette* Sept 13, 1799.
72. *Philadelphia Gazette* Sept 8, 1800.
73. "To the [. . .] At a Meeting of the Federal Citizens . . ." 1800.
74. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 28, Sept 18, 1799, Aug 27, Oct 1, 1800.
75. I calculate the margin of victory of the total Federalist and Democratic-Republican votes. I sum up all the Federalist candidate and the Democratic-Republican candidate returns to get two party totals. Then, I determine the percentage of the vote

each party received of the combined party totals and subtract the greater party percentage from the smaller to determine the margin of victory.

76. *Claypoole's Daily Advertiser* Sept 6, 1792 Sept 12, 1798; *Gazette of the United States* Aug 24, 1799, Sept 25, 1800, Oct 9, 1801; *Porcupine's Gazette* Sept 26, 1798; *Universal Gazette* July 31, 1800.
77. *Gazette of the United States* Aug 23, 1802.
78. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 4, 1802.
79. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 20, 1800; *Porcupine's Gazette* Sept 26, 1798; *Universal Gazette* July 25, Sept 26, 1799.
80. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 26, 1798.
81. *Farmers' Register* Oct 3, 1798.
82. *Herald of Liberty* Sept 2, 1799; *Oracle of Dauphin* Sept 18, 1799. The Herald article is attacking the Federalist delegate convention as not a true call for widespread, popular involvement but hand-selected individuals from the county invited to attend to approve of a ticket crafted by those in Pittsburg. Both articles also only mention the purpose of the meeting is to support James Ross, a Federalist and Allegheny County resident, for Governor that year but I assume that this convention also nominated candidates for the general assembly that year.
83. *Herald of Liberty* Oct 6, 1800. The article is attacking the eventual Federalist state senate candidate John Hoge and claims he has been shamelessly electioneering for himself the past four years. This year it mentions he attended at "the meeting in Pittsburgh of Federalists last court week," which I assume is another delegate convention.
84. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 29, 1802.
85. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 29, Oct 10, 1796; *Philadelphia Gazette* Sept 28, Oct 6, 1796.
86. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 28, 1796, Sept 27, 1797, Sept 28, 1798, Sept 11, 1799, Sept 22, 1802; *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 27, 29 1796, Aug 28, Sept 20, 1799, Sept 28, 1800; *Reading Adler* Aug 7, 14, 1798; *Farmers' Register* Sept 19, Oct 3 1798; *Gazette of the United States* Oct 3, 1796; *Herald of Liberty* July 29, Aug 19, Sept 23, 1799; *Oracle of Dauphin* Sept 7, 1801; *Universal Gazette* Aug 8, 1799, May 8, July 17, 1800.

87. Keller describes them as local supporters that were unelected nor delegate the power of nomination that would meet at the county seat to endorse candidates or create a full party ticket (1982, 6).
88. *Carey's United States' Recorder* Aug 16, 1798; *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 7, 1797, Oct 1, 8, 1798, Sept 30, 1799, June 21, 27, July 28, 1800; *Gazette of the United States* July 3, 21, 1800; *Philadelphia Gazette* Oct 7, 1797, Aug 8, Sept 25, Oct 2, Dec 19, 1798, July 25, 1800; *Universal Gazette* Sept 20, Dec 27, 1798, Sept 26, Oct 3, 1799; Higginbotham 1952, 43-44.
89. Luetscher 1903, 79.
90. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 14, 28, Sept 18, 25, 1799, Aug 27, Sept 12, Oct 1, 8, 1800, Aug 19, Sept 16, 18, 1801, July 28, Aug 11, Sept 8, 22, 29, 1802; *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 20, 1800; *Herald of Liberty* Oct 8, 1798, Sept 23, 1799, Sept 29, 1800, Aug 31, Sept 7, 21, 28, Oct 12, 1801; *Oracle of Dauphin* Aug 18, Sept 8, 15, 22, 29, Oct 6, 1800, Sept 27, 1802; *Reading Adler* Oct 7, 1800, Sept 18, 1801; *Universal Gazette* May 29, July 3, Aug 7, 1800; Higginbotham 1952, 36-37, 45.
91. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 14, 1799.
92. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 28, 1799.
93. *Herald of Liberty* Sept 23, 1799.
94. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 24, 1800.
95. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 19, 1801.
96. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 11, 1802.
97. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 29, 1802.
98. *Herald of Liberty* Sept 29, 1800.
99. *Herald of Liberty* Aug 31, 1801.
100. *Herald of Liberty* Aug 31, 1801.
101. *Reading Adler* Oct 7, 1800, Sept 18, 1801.
102. *Universal Gazette* July 31, 1800.
103. Higginbotham 1952, 43-44.

104. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 18, 1800; *Universal Gazette* May 8, 1800.
105. *Universal Gazette* July 31, 1800.
106. *Philadelphia Gazette* July 15, 1801; Higginbotham 1952, 39.
107. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 22, 1802.
108. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 24, 1800, Sept 1, 1802.
109. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 8, 22, 1802.
110. Luetscher 1903, 79.
111. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 22, 29, 1802.
112. Higginbotham also notes the practice of rotating the nomination of congressional candidates between the various counties in his discussion of the 1801 special congressional election in the fourth congressional district (1952, 39).
113. This fact can be observed by the list of election returns on NNV. Higginbotham also notes that the Federalists were not active across the state (1952, 64).
114. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, Sept 5, 15, 1803.
115. *United States' Gazette* Aug 14, 1805, July 28, 1806; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, 1805, July 29, Aug 14, 1806, Sept 14, 1809.
116. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, 1805.
117. *Philadelphia Gazette* May 20, 1801, Sept 8, 1802; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 15, 1803, Aug 29, 1804.
118. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 8, 1808, Sept 14, 1809, Sept 5, 1811; *United States' Gazette* Aug 22, 1807.
119. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, 1810, Sept 5, 1811, Aug 14, 1812, Aug 18, 1813, Sept 20, 1814, Sept 4, 1815.
120. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 14, 1806; *United States' Gazette* Aug 22, 1807.
121. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, 1805, Aug 8, 1808, Sept 14, 1809, Aug 29, 1810, Aug 14, 1812, Aug 18, 1813, Sept 4, 1815.

122. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, 1810, Aug 14, 1812, Aug 18, 1813, Sept 20, 1814, Sept 4, 1815.
123. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, 1805.
124. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, 1805, Aug 14, 1806, Aug 8, 1808, Aug 14, 1812, Sept 20, 1814.
125. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 18, 1805, Oct 1, 1806.
126. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 15, 1808.
127. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 27, 1807. The article is an address by a meeting of citizens from Tunkhannock township rejecting the call for the selection of township delegates for a county delegate convention by the Democratic-Republican Party. In stating their reasons against the announcement, they mention how only members of the party would be allowed in the township proceedings to select delegates and no one from the town considers themselves as party members.
128. *Gleaner* Aug 9, 1811.
129. *Gleaner* Aug 16, 1811.
130. *Gleaner* Sept 20, 1811.
131. *Gleaner* Oct 18, 1811.
132. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 12, 1812.
133. *Gleaner* Sept 25, 1812.
134. *Gleaner* Oct 9, 1812.
135. *Gleaner* Oct 9, 1812.
136. *Gleaner* July 30, Aug 20, Sept 10, 1813.
137. *Gleaner* Oct 8, 1813.
138. *Gleaner* Sept 16, 1814.
139. *United States' Gazette* Aug 14, 1805.
140. *United States' Gazette* Oct 3, 1805.

141. *Gazette of the United States* Oct 17, 1797; *Philadelphia Gazette* Jan 22, 23, 25, Feb 2, 1798; *Carey's United States' Recorder* Feb 8, 1798.
142. *Pennsylvania Correspondent* Sept 30, 1805; Tinkcom 1950, 227-228; Higginbotham 1952, 19.
143. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 21, 1805.
144. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 16, 1806.
145. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, Sept 1, 12, 15, 22, 24, 1806; *United States' Gazette* Aug 19, 20, 30, 1806.
146. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 22, 1806.
147. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 22, 24, 1806.
148. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 27, 1806.
149. *United States' Gazette* Aug 26, Sept 1, 9, 15, 1807; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 12, 15, 20, 23, 1808.
150. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 23, 1808.
151. Higginbotham 1952, 172.
152. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 9, 1809.
153. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 9, 1809.
154. *United States' Gazette* Aug 20, 1806; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 21, 1805, Oct 1, 1807, Aug 16, 1809, Aug 17, 1810, Sept 12, 1811, July 20, 1812, July 21, 1813, July 28, 1814, Aug 5, 1815, Aug 5, 1816.
155. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 20, Sept 24, Oct 1, 1806, Oct 1, 1807, Sept 23, 30, 1808, Aug 21, 26, 1809, Aug 23, 29, Sept 19, 24, 1810, Sept 8, 1811, July 23, Sept 23, Oct 10, 1812, July 21, Sept 24, 1813, Aug 2, 1814; *United States' Gazette* Nov 27, 1805.
156. *Gleaner* Sept 17, 1813; *Pennsylvania Correspondent* May 7, July 30, Aug 12, Sept 2, 16, 1805; *Pennsylvania Herald* Sept 6, 20, 1809; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 29, Sept 4, 21, 1805, Aug 25, Sept 4, Oct 1, 1806, Sept 8, 1807, June 16, Sept 8, 29, 1808, Sept 6, Oct 3, 1809, Aug 28, Sept 5, 1812, Aug 12, 1813; *Reading Adler* Aug 6, 1805, Aug 12, 1806, Aug 18, Sept 22, 29, 1807, July 12, Aug 9, 1808; *United States' Gazette* Sept 28, 1805.

157. *Pennsylvania Herald* Oct 4, 1809; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* June 10, Aug 29, 1805, May 28, Aug 25, Oct 2, 1806, Oct 8, 9, 1807, July 19, Aug 17, 18, Sept 1, 5, 8, 14, 1808, July 28, Aug 25, Sept 4, Oct 3, 1809, Aug 10, 28, Sept 14, 1810, Aug 24, 22, 29, 1812; *Reading Adler* Aug 30, Sept 20, 1808; *United States' Gazette* May 31, Sept 11, 24, 1804, Aug 19, 1806, Aug 21, 1807; *Wahre Amerikaner* Aug 16, 1806, Aug 22, Sept 5, 1807.
158. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 13, Oct 4, 1805.
159. *Carlisle Gazette* Oct 9, 1807.
160. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 4, 12, 1812; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 24, 1812.
161. *Democratic Republican* Aug 26, 1816; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 2, 4, 1805, May 30, June 13, July 1, Aug 20, Sept 8, 1808, Aug 24, 1812.
162. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 16, 1805.
163. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* May 12, 1808.
164. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* May 12, 1808.
165. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* June 9, 1808.
166. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* June 23, 1808.
167. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* July 20, 29, 1808.
168. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* June 10, 17, July 1, Sept 26, 1805.
169. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* July 29, Sept 7, 1808.
170. *Greensburgh and Indiana Register* Aug 27, 1812.
171. *Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser* June 21, 1800; Higginbotham 1952, 36-37.
172. *Independent Whig* July 23, 1802; Higginbotham 1952, 43-44.
173. Higginbotham 1952, 44-45.
174. Higginbotham 1952, 45.
175. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 17, Sept 6, 8, 9, 10, 16, 1803.
176. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 8, 1803.

177. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* July 16, 1803.
178. "Address of the Society of Constitutional Republicans 1805" 1805.
179. *United States' Gazette* Aug 14, 1805.
180. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 20, 21, 1805.
181. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 3, 1805.
182. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Sept 14, 1805.
183. *Carlisle Gazette* July 10, 1807.
184. Higginbotham 1952, 115.
185. Higginbotham 1952, 202, 214-215, 233, 264, 297.
186. Higginbotham 1952, 311 and 319.
187. Luetscher 1903, 79-83.
188. *Pennsylvania Correspondent* Aug 15, 1804.
189. *Pennsylvania Correspondent* Sept 11, 1804.
190. *Pennsylvania Correspondent* Sept 25, Oct 1, 1804.
191. *Wahre Amerikaner* Aug 30, 1806.
192. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 26, 1806; *Pennsylvania Correspondent* Sept 25, 1804, Sept 2, 23, 1805; *Reading Adler* Aug 9, Sept 27, 1803, Aug 19, 1806, Sept 8, 15, 1807, July 12, Aug 9, 23, Sept 6, 20, 1808; *Wahre Amerikaner* Aug 16, 30, Sept 13, 20, 1806, Aug 22, Sept 5, 26, 1807, May 28, June 4, 25, July 23, Aug 6, 17, 27, 1808; "To the electors of the borough and county of Lancaster . . ." 1813; Higginbotham 1952, 60, 70, 98, 115, 215, 232-233, 264, 298, 311, and 319.
193. *American Telegraph* Sept 6, 27, 1815, July 31, Oct 2, 1816; *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 1, 1802, Aug 30, Sept 6, 1805, Sept 19, 1806, Aug 26, 1808, Aug 24, 31, 1810, Aug 9, 1811, Aug 21, 1812, Aug 19, Sept 23, 1814; *Democratic Republican* Aug 26, Sept 9, 16, 23, 1816; *Greensburgh and Indiana Register* Aug 27, 1812; *Harrisburgh Visitor* Aug 22, Sept 19, 26, 1814; *Northumberland Republicaner* Aug 29, Sept 19, Oct 3, 1812; *Oracle of Dauphin* Aug 4, 11, Sept 22, 27, 1804; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Oct 10, 1808; *True American* Aug 11, Sept 1, 8, 15, 22 1813; *Wahre Amerikaner* Sept 20, 1806, Aug 8, 1807, June 11, Sept 24, 1808; Higginbotham 1952, 219, 234-235, and 265.

194. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 28, 1803.
195. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 19, 1801.
196. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 11, 1802, Aug 10, 1810, June 14, 1811, Aug 21, 1812.
197. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 1, 1810.
198. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 26, 1806, Sept 8, 1809.
199. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 31, Sept 21, 1810.
200. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 20, 1815.
201. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 24, 1813.
202. *Carlisle Gazette* Oct 6, 1802.
203. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 24, 1804; *Oracle of Dauphin* Sept 22, 1804.
204. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 24, 1804, Oct 9, 1807, Oct 8, 1813; *Oracle of Dauphin* Sept 22, 1804.
205. *Carlisle Gazette* Oct 9, 1807.
206. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 4, 1816.
207. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 9, 1805.
208. *Carlisle Gazette* Oct 9, 1807.
209. *Carlisle Gazette* Aug 31, 1810, Sept 30, 1814.
210. *Carlisle Gazette* Oct 5, 1803, Sept 21, 28, Oct 5, 1804, Sept 13, 27, 1805, Aug 29, Oct 10, 1806, Oct 9, 1807, Aug 31, Sept 7, 1810, Sept 20, 27, 1811, Oct 1, 8, 1813.
211. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 4, 1812.
212. *Carlisle Gazette* Oct 1, 8, 1813.
213. *Carlisle Gazette* Oct 6, 1802.
214. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 21, 28, 1804.
215. *Carlisle Gazette* Sept 28, 1810.

216. *Carlisle Gazette* Oct 4, 1806.

217. Higginbotham 1952, 304, 313.

218. Higginbotham 1952, 219, and 320-321; quotation from page 321.

219. *American Telegraph* Sept 6, 13, 1815, Oct 2, 1816.

Chapter 3

New Hampshire: Candidate Emergence and Centralized Politics

New Hampshire offers a unique opportunity to understand the development of candidate emergence during the early republic. New England is not known for participatory politics like the mid-Atlantic is, making it an important area to study. Also, the region was the Federalist Party stronghold during the period, setting it apart from the rest of the nation. New Hampshire is a small state and, as a recent book demonstrated, had geographically dispersed press systems early on in the state that are well-represented on the Readex archive.¹ In this chapter, I demonstrate how the unique combination of political culture and electoral systems encouraged the creation of centralized party organizations. The nomination procedures changed over time as a reaction to electoral competition and eventually yielded two decentralized party organizations that structured candidate emergence in New Hampshire.

While political culture can help explain the original boundaries of legitimate political organization, it must be combined with New Hampshire's political history for a fuller understanding. Combing this information provides a clear picture of the political landscape open to candidates and those seeking to place individuals in office, as all as the landscape's constraints on their actions. Park described the political culture of New England as encapsulated by an emphasis on centralized authority, a culture of submission and conformity, and even ethnic purity.² Beyond a general political culture, aspects of New Hampshire's history are important to understand for my analysis of candidate emergence. First, the township was the foundation of representation. Second, the history of political organizations during the Revolution and shortly thereafter enlightens subsequent events

concerning the development of structures and organizations surrounding the candidate emergence process.

Park described New England's political culture as primarily one that placed centralized authority on a pedestal. This reverence went beyond the right to govern. Those in government were considered the only source of legitimate political authority. Those who attempted to organize outside of government were illegitimate and only represented partial or self-interested views. A culture of submission and conformity in New England only encouraged this aspect of the political culture. Citizens were expected to accept the decisions made by the government without question. Beyond this, the pursuit of conformity translated into the desire for consensus in elections. This desire is evidenced New Hampshire's early years under the Constitution when unanimous decisions were encouraged and described as providing greater authority or legitimacy to those elected. Submission to a centralized authority that was the only venue for legitimate political organization together describe the original political guide rails in New Hampshire.

To understand the boundaries of legitimate political organization more precisely, I drew from the history of political organization in New Hampshire during the Revolutionary period and the years thereafter but before the U.S. Constitution's ratification. Organization in the lead-up to the American Revolution began with the colonial assembly calling of a provincial committee of correspondence in 1774.³ This committee called for the election of township delegates to a general congress that elected New Hampshire's two members to the First Continental Congress. In 1775, after the British colonial government had all but fallen away, it was townships that stepped up to provide order and stability. Only two counties attempted to construct organizations to wield political authority during this time,

but both failed to fully materialize and have any continued influence aft 1775.⁴ Rather, the provincial congress filled the political vacuum to organize New Hampshire across townships.

An important period followed the American Revolution, where citizens attempting to organize outside the bounds of government were swiftly rejected in a very public way. As the postwar depression swept through New Hampshire in 1785 and 1786, placing heavier burdens on farmers across the state, people began to organize outside the bounds of institutionalized government. These popular organizations were “reminiscent of prerevolutionary history” in their build-up and mobilization.⁵ There was a call for a state convention at the same time the state legislature was meeting to guide the assembly on the issue of paper money. A group of conservative young men usurped the process, leading to the convention’s quick disillusion and failure. Afterward, towns in western New Hampshire met in county conventions to discuss how to make the state government listen to them on the issue of paper money, advocating for state-issued paper notes as a means to boost the postwar economy.⁶ One such county convention in Rockingham became so frustrated with the proceedings in the state legislature that it decided to use force to make its point. A man named Joseph French led an attempted insurgency/riot outside the meetinghouse in Exeter, where the General Court was in session.⁷ Following this failed extra-governmental mobilization, Governor John Sullivan issued a proclamation that the people should no longer consider engaging in these kinds of political organizations acceptable.⁸ Extra-governmental organization was too dangerous to the safety and continuation of the republican government in New Hampshire and was deemed unacceptable.

The influence of these events on New Hampshire's political culture should not be underestimated. The failure of these extra-governmental organizations and the governor's rebuke of them were powerful enough to become part of the Federalist critique of the first Democratic-Republican statewide organization to contest state-level elections in 1804. After the Democratic-Republicans announced the creation of a "Grand Committee of Election and Correspondence" to organize the campaign for state offices, the Federalist media was full of articles attacking it. An anonymous article used satire to denounce the extra-governmental organization created by the party to win the election, writing that the Democratic-Republican Party's "intentions for the good of the State were as sincere as those Conventions . . . which were held in the years of '85 & '86 under the guidance of Gen. French."⁹ While the influence of the events no longer prevented extra-governmental organizations from appearing in New Hampshire, they were still powerful enough in citizen's collective memory for anonymous authors to use them to cast a dark shadow on similar types of organizations.

From these events, I drew two important conclusions. First, those in New Hampshire understood politics as occurring at the township or state level. During the Revolution, it was at the township and state level that political organization against British control developed. When groups attempted county-level organization during the period, they quickly abandoned it. Then in early statehood, county-level organization cropped up and, in one example, devolved into an attempted government insurrection, resulting in its public condemnation and the punishment of individuals involved. Similar to the prerevolutionary times, the township and the state were the two organizing political boundaries in early New Hampshire.

Second, the state government itself was the only legitimate source of political authority by 1789. This conclusion matches what Park discussed about New England's political culture and was realized in New Hampshire with 1786's paper-money popular mobilizations. After the first attempt failed and the second led to a pitiful riot, political organization outside of the constituted governing authority was deemed dangerous. To many, this sentiment made sense because it was exactly what pushed out the British government in colonial New Hampshire. The new republican state government did not want to allow such popular mobilization to threaten its stability and therefore spoke out against extra-governmental political organization. These events narrowly defined the legitimate use of political authority, limiting it to the state government. Therefore, it should be no surprise that the first attempt at structuring the nomination process came from the state legislature in 1800.

The principle of township representation in New Hampshire influenced my ability to investigate candidate emergence in an unexpected way. In many New England states, representation was understood to be grounded at the local level. New Hampshire's 1784 state constitution institutionalized township representation, ensuring individual towns or a collection of smaller towns had a certain amount of representation in the state legislature's lower chamber. Member in New Hampshire's state assembly were elected at town meetings each March. This process is important to note because it quickly becomes clear that citizens, or at least newspaper editors, considered members of the lower chamber to be township agents rather than state-level officials.

In the 1790s, the races for members of the state legislature's lower chamber were relatively discounted when it came time for the election cycle. Very few of the newspapers

available from this period mentioned nominations for the positions. Generally, there was no mention of the votes taken despite a list of votes given for the state senate and governor elections. Further, one newspaper editor went so far as to make it clear that lower chamber nominations would no longer take up space in his newspaper because they were local concerns. They were not general, statewide concerns like elections for state senators, councillors, and the governor.¹⁰ When newspapers did list who won elections for the lower chamber in specific towns, the offices and winners were generally listed among the town officers and not with state officials. Therefore, my analysis below mainly focuses on the development of candidate emergence for state senate and congressional elections, with a brief section before this chapter's conclusion on the organization that Democratic-Republicans in Portsmouth used to structured candidate emergence for lower chamber elections.

Lastly, the township-centered understanding of representation meant that most people in New Hampshire mainly focused on local affairs and not the quickly evolving state or national politics early in the period. During the beginning of the Revolution, as the British colonial government was disintegrating and no new provincial government was ready to create order, it was the township level that created order in New Hampshire. It was the township that citizens drew delegates from to produce the first provincial congress, and New Hampshire was the first state to ask its citizens at the township level to approve a state constitution.¹¹ Citizens in these townships rejected a constitution in 1781 that would have taken away this right by creating a layered election system separating the township from representatives in the lower chamber, similar to that in the Massachusetts Constitution. One historian noted that it was difficult to get citizens to care about anything

above the local level.¹² This local understanding of representation combined with a political culture and history that discouraged political organization at the county level limited the options for those wanting to structure the candidate emergence process after the U.S. Constitution's ratification.

The second major factor that influenced the development of the candidate emergence process was the electoral system. The rules to determine the political boundaries for office seeking played an important role in incentivizing coordination and determining what types of structures might develop to facilitate the candidate emergence process. The electoral rules in place for each legislative election are summarized in Table 3.1. In New Hampshire, there are three different levels of politics at play when analyzing state and national legislative elections. Because of the township-level understanding of representation continually upheld in the New Hampshire Constitution between 1776 and 1792, those seeking office in the lower chamber were elected at the township level. Rarely were two or three towns combined to elect one representative to the general assembly when the populations of each town individually were not enough to grant representation in the chamber. Some of the more populous towns were able to elect two or three representatives. State senatorial districts constitute the second level of political boundaries in my analysis of New Hampshire's elections. The amendments of 1792 to the New Hampshire Constitution carved up the five counties into twelve senatorial districts. Each district elected one member to the upper chamber. The final political boundary is the state itself, used for electing seats to Congress. For the entire period under analysis, New Hampshire held statewide at-large general elections to select the congressional delegation.

Table 3.1: Summary of Electoral Rules for State and National Legislative Elections in New Hampshire

State Legislative Lower Chamber	State Legislative Upper Chamber	U.S. House of Representatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Elections • Township Elections • Majority Threshold and Runoff Elections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Elections • County Elections (1788-1792); Single-Members District Elections (1793-1816) • Majority Threshold and Legislative Selection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biannual Elections • Statewide General Elections • 3 Seats (1788-1790); 4 Seats (1792-1800); 5 Seats (1802-1810); 6 Seats (1812-1816) • Majority Threshold and Runoff Elections

Each of these political levels and their electoral rules encouraged the development of formal nominations, especially the congressional electoral system. The general ticket method in New Hampshire gave each voter as many votes as there were seats to be filled. For example, in the 1796 congressional election, there were four congressional seats up for election, so each voter could cast four votes. However, voters could not stack their votes on a single candidate; each voter could only give each candidate one vote. There was also a majority-runoff proviso for congressional elections. The threshold changed with the total number of seats up for election. When New Hampshire only elected three seats to Congress, a candidate earned a majority by winning more than one-third of the total vote. By 1812, when the state elected six congressmen, the threshold was one-sixth of the total vote. When candidates failed to surpass this threshold, a runoff election occurred involving the top two vote-getters for each seat not filled. Between 1788 and 1800, a second ballot was necessary to fill at least one seat in seven different congressional elections.¹³ The general ticket and runoff proviso encouraged the development of nomination procedures around the candidate emergence process to create a disciplined partisan vote that could sweep all seats up for election. Like-minded political elites wanted to present candidates on a ticket that could win all the seats on the first ballot.

The electoral rules were slightly different for upper chamber elections. The state was divided into electoral districts that cut across county lines. These were single-member district elections with, again, a majority rule. Unlike congressional elections where an unfilled seat cause a runoff election, the newly elected lower chamber selected the winner from the two highest vote-getters. In the same way, this majority requirement inspired coordination, not to save time and money but to prevent the chance of a plurality win

translating into a lost seat. When partisan politics developed in New Hampshire, this mechanism quickly became the tool of strategic partisans. The slowly waning Federalist majority held onto what strength they had left by choosing their copartisans to fill these seats despite coming in second or even third place.¹⁴

State senate election districts were created from parts of one or two counties. New Hampshire's political culture discouraged organizing at the county level. These two factors conspired to make it unlikely nomination procedures were created at the county level. Procedures were unlikely to develop around lower chamber legislative elections in New Hampshire for similar reasons. Specifically, nomination procedures were highly unlikely to develop around state legislative elections first because of the local understanding of representation in the lower chamber and the view that popular political organization at the county level was dangerous. Lower chamber elections were conducted at the township level, meaning there was less need to create a process for a candidate to present himself. As one editor noted, everyone in town knew each other and therefore knew the abilities and character of potential candidates.¹⁵ Upper chamber elections were district elections that were still smaller than counties. A combination of the small size of the associated political boundaries and the aversion to extra-governmental popular organization meant that these elections were also ill-suited for the creation of nomination procedures.

Political culture and electoral rules helped provide a foundation for the early development of nomination procedures by the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans alike. The aversion to extra-governmental organizations and people's lack of interest in the newly created national politics after 1788 meant local party organizational tools, like mass meetings or conventions, were unlikely to develop. More than likely, those within the state

government itself would first produce organizations to structure the candidate emergence process because it would be the only legitimate venue.

To help understand development in candidate emergence throughout the period, one must take into account a third factor, electoral competition. Changes in electoral competition can help explain the impetus to structure the candidate emergence process to coordinate groups within the electorate around specific candidates. In New Hampshire, electoral competition for state senate and congressional elections generally increased between 1796 and 1805, decreased dramatically between 1806 and early-1808, and increased once more between mid-1808 and 1816. I posit that increases in electoral competition encouraged the development of new procedures to structure the candidate emergence process, while drop-offs led to a degeneration in some structures and faltering discipline those that remained. Variation in electoral competition across time in New Hampshire allowed me to test these hypotheses.

In the section below, I describe the developmental story of candidate emergence in New Hampshire for state senate and congressional elections between 1788 and 1816. I divide the story into three periods: the pre-party period (1788-1795), the centralized party formation period (1796-1808), and the party decentralization period (1809-1816). Table 3.2 summarizes the developmental story. During the first period, there was a lack of coordination, and individual nominations dominated the candidate emergence process. Then, both parties underwent a period of coordination efforts through the press that eventually culminated in the creation of centralized party nomination procedures via the legislative caucus. As each party created an extensive electioneering organization and accepted the necessity of popular mobilization for electoral success, the power of

nomination shifted, to varying degrees, to local organizations by 1816, becoming less centralized. After describing the developmental story, I briefly present information on Portsmouth's Democratic-Republican nomination procedures for state legislative lower chamber elections. Lastly, I connect New Hampshire's developmental story to questions regarding the development of political parties and their role in the story of American democratization.

Table 3.2: Summary of New Hampshire Candidate Emergence Development (State Senate and Congress)

Pre-Party Period	
Dates	Independent nominations dominated state senate and congressional candidate emergence.
1788-1795	Independent nominations dominated state senate and congressional candidate emergence.
Dates	Federalist Party
1796-1808	Editor coordination gave way to legislative caucus control over nominations.
1809-1816	The legislative caucus maintained control of congressional nominations and shifted state senate nominations to local organizations that used general meetings and delegate conventions.
	Democratic-Republican Party
	Independent nominations gave way to legislative caucus control over nominations.
	The legislative caucus shifted power over state senate and congressional nominations to local organizations that used district delegate conventions.

The Developmental Story

The story of partisan organization in New Hampshire, and in New England in general, is often overlooked. As discussed in the previous chapter on Pennsylvania, previous authors limited their research to uncovering the development of county and statewide conventions. This limitation meant that Luetscher failed to even consider New England in his analysis because its states did not develop a system of conventions.¹⁶ When Fischer explored Federalist organization in New Hampshire, the story began in 1804 because it was when a statewide caucus occurred.¹⁷ Turner's political history of New Hampshire designated 1800 as the beginning of Federalist organization, with the creation of a congressional ticket by a pure-legislative caucus.¹⁸ When Cunningham discussed New Hampshire, the story began in December 1803 with a mixed-legislative caucus organizing state elections for 1804.¹⁹ Turner also began his narrative of Democratic-Republican organization in the state with this election cycle.²⁰ These limited scopes caused by the strictly institutional understanding of party organization limited both parties' narratives as they relate to the candidate emergence process.

These works also focused more on organizations that conducted and coordinated campaigning rather than political nominations. Both Fischer and Cunningham discussed party organizations that provided coordination to the candidate emergence process, but they only "discovered" them when they were accompanied by a convention or committee meant to disseminate political information and engage in electioneering. Because of this limited focus, tactics for party organization that were less than strictly institutional or institutions without an explicit campaign arm went unrecognized. Especially in the story of New Hampshire, this research approach leaves out important information on party

development connecting the state's electoral politics to partisan divisions beginning in 1796 with the rest of the nation.

Pre-Party Candidate Emergence, 1788-1795

After the ratification of the Constitution, the New Hampshire Legislature called on citizens to take the first congressional elections seriously. The new national offices should be filled with “gentlemen of abilities and integrity, who shall be well acquainted with the different objects which the national Government may have in view; for however the Federal Government may be well calculated to promote the happiness of the United States, yet it will require ALL the exertions of the most able and upright men to form the first arrangements, as on these will greatly depend our future happiness and tranquility.”²¹ It is important to mention that the state legislature as a single group thought it was their place to guide the citizenry on who should be elected. However, the state legislature never said who these “able and upright men” were.

Candidate emergence manifested in what Luetscher called “individual nominations” during the pre-party era.²² Groups of individuals, generally the friends of the prospective candidates, anonymously or pseudonymously nominated them in the newspapers to present their candidacy to the electorate, allowing others to know that a prospect had support and that they were likely to accept the position. In the 1788 election, an individual or group writing under the pseudonym Publicus presented the question, “Are not the names of a Sullivan, or a Pickering, grateful to our ears” as a subtle nod that these men be candidates for Congress.²³

Support for the Constitution became an issue benchmark that individual nominators could use to set their list of candidates apart beyond the prospective candidates' abilities

and integrity. The 1788 congressional election resulted in a runoff election to fill all three spots, with the top six candidates moving on to the second election. Consequently, a clear distinction among candidates appeared and was defined by support for the Constitution. An anonymous author commented that in New Hampshire, “the proceedings of this state have hitherto been perfectly federal” and then supported Samuel Livermore, Benjamin West, and Nicholas Gilman because of their support for the Constitution during ratification or their general “federalism.”²⁴ These candidates all ended up winning in the special election. Language on support for the Constitution or lowercase “federalism” appeared one other time in the next election.²⁵ It is unsurprising that supporting the Constitution was of limited use in New Hampshire since the same could be said of most candidates.

I understand the development of candidate emergence as placing political power in the hands of those who are considered politically legitimate. At this time, the citizens of New Hampshire believed such a power—specifically, the right to define how candidates were fielded—resided with the people, allowing anyone to submit to a newspaper a list of nominations. Before submitting their nominations for the congressional election in 1792, an anonymous author noted, “I find a number of persons in this state seem to be engaged in publishing lists of a number of men which they recommend as candidates to Congress” and then proceeds to present their own.²⁶ A Farmer asserted that despite numerous nomination lists already published in the newspapers, all people “have equal rights to nominate” and took the liberty of mentioning their own list of candidates.²⁷ By 1794, An Inhabitant of Portsmouth, before making their own nomination, wrote, “As the custom of handing to the Public, through the medium of the press, the names of such Candidates, as are understood to be qualified to sustain the Offices of Government, has generally obtained,

and is now an established practice in most of the State,” solidifying the practice of individual nominations and the newspapers as the form and forum of candidate emergence.²⁸ Therefore, the right of nomination was not delegated to a representative or representative group. The people retained the right and exercised it through the newspapers.

A lack of clear coordination efforts led to a multitude of nominations and the necessity of congressional runoff elections during the pre-party era in 1789, 1790, 1792, and 1794. Contemporaries recognized this issue. An Old Soldier mentioned how the “numerous lists of candidates for federal representatives, with which the papers is pregnant . . . has so divided the people that they know not who to vote for.”²⁹ Another pseudonymous author, Gratitude, listed thirteen men as candidates for three congressional seats in 1790.³⁰ Some individuals even called for coordination efforts.³¹ One anonymous author mentioned that if all parts of the state united in a decision, “its’ probable we should not be put to the expence [sic] of a second election.”³² This did not come to fruition in 1790, with a second election necessary to fill the third seat.

As with congressional elections, individual nominations were the main candidate emergence pathway for lower and upper chamber elections in New Hampshire. One anonymous author mentioned the existence of self-nominations directly in his reflection on the upcoming 1790 state election, writing, “A GREAT number of gentlemen are proposed by their particular friends, as Candidates for Representatives the ensuing year.”³³ A later anonymous author noted how candidate emergence through the press was doubtless to occur, with candidates having “their respective claims and merits puffed off either by themselves, or their friends.”³⁴ Amicus discussed their preferred candidate’s virtues and

referenced federalism in 1789 before nominating a candidate for the state senate.³⁵ Sometimes, there was be no attempt to support the candidates, and just a list of names was presented for state legislative offices.³⁶

The lack of coordination efforts led to an overabundance of candidates in state legislative elections. In 1793, *An Elector* published in the newspaper a short address to the “free Electors of the 8th District,” a state senate district. The author nominated John Bradly, “whose reputation as a judicious and useful man in the General Court is well established; and who will, by accounts from a number of towns, be generally voted for.”³⁷ Eventually, three more candidates were nominated for the same position by other pseudonymous authors like *A Voter*, *Phio. Patriae*, and *Vox Populi*.³⁸ *A Friend to Order* demonstrated this same occurrence in Concord’s 1795 lower chamber election, writing that there will be those who say, “Let us vote for JOHN BRADLEY, Esq.–another says, We’ll have the Hon. PETER GREEN, Esq.–a third says, Let us all vote for Mr. WILLIAM KENT—a fourth says, I’ll vote for Major DUNCAN—and many are for Maj. LIVERMORE.”³⁹

The lack of coordination also caused another problem: the winning candidate sometimes declined to serve. This issue was a common in colonial America.⁴⁰ It would continue to occur after 1789 in New Hampshire. For example, on March 16, 1795, at the Portsmouth election, one of the winning candidates for a seat in the state lower chamber, Dr. Goddard, declined the post at the town meeting. The town then balloted again, and Dr. Nathaniel A. Haven was pronounced the winner. He also declined the position.⁴¹ Portsmouth had to postpone deciding their third state representative until March 25, 1795, when Nathan Folsom was elected and took the position.⁴² Without a coordinated effort to

solicit candidates, the candidate emergence process swept up those who did not wish to be a part of it.

Behind some of these individual nominations for Congress and the state senate were state-level elites. Jere R. Daniell mentioned how some of the most influential politicians in New Hampshire drew up their own lists of candidates and distributed them to local elites across the state.⁴³ He went on to describe the implementation and acceptance of electioneering practices, like providing liquor and distributing ballots. These state-level and local elites had “begun to think of electioneering as a necessary and even desirable part of the political system.”⁴⁴ Before using partisan labels, state-level elites were already attempting to coordinate themselves through private correspondence and support their preferred candidates through electioneering.

Overall, before 1796 independent nominations dominated New Hampshire’s candidate emergence pathway for state lower chamber, state upper chamber, and congressional elections. Individuals or groups placed articles in newspapers presenting their candidates to the electorate. Sometimes, the articles only included a list of names. A majority of the time, they also included references to candidates’ virtues to reflect the deferential political culture dominant at the time. Candidates’ morals were presented as part of the nomination to support their successful election. The people retained the right of nomination and exercised it through the press. Consequently, a large number of individuals presented a number of nominations for the same political office. This lack of coordination during state and national legislative elections led to an overabundance of nominations, more than the expected number according to political theory. In congressional elections, this oversupply led to several runoff elections to complete the congressional delegation.

State-level elites attempted to coordinate candidate emergence, but it was informal and not enough to limit candidate entry. Candidate emergence was unstructured, causing inefficiency. Yet, it was a liberty retained by the people at large.

Partisan Nominations and Centralized Organization, 1796-1808

The emergence of partisan labels and coordination efforts began to appear during the charged presidential election of 1796. The individual nominations that characterized the pre-party era began to incorporate partisan language for the first time in 1796 when historians generally mark the beginning of the first party era on a national scale.⁴⁵ This practice culminated in a short period where newspaper editors were the sole agents of political coordination for both parties before the party-in-government of both groups assumed for themselves the power to nominate candidates for Congress and the state upper chamber. As the Democratic-Republicans gained political power in New Hampshire, their centralized party structure ensured continuous victories and led to the Federalists all but removing themselves from electoral politics between 1805 and the first half of 1808. The legislative caucus provided the basis for political coordination around an efficient number of candidates for both political parties in New Hampshire.

Using individual nominations remained central to candidate emergence in New Hampshire for the Federalists in 1796 and 1797 and persisted even longer for the Democratic-Republicans, until 1801. Including partisan labels in these anonymous nominations began in 1796, with an author supporting a candidate because one was “a Federalist,” for example, or another author nominating candidates while addressing their article to “the Republicans of Portsmouth.”⁴⁶ However, introducing partisan labels into individual nominations did not ensure coordination at the ballot box. In 1796, three

congressional candidates in passed the necessary majority threshold in the first ballot, requiring a second election to fill the fourth seat in Congress. The necessity of a second election came about because of a lack of coordination among the Federalists and two prospective congressional candidates, Peleg Sprague and Jonathan Freeman, who were both supported as Federalists in the newspapers.⁴⁷ In a close call during a special congressional election in 1797, the lack of Federalist coordination allowed a rising Democratic-Republican, Woodbury Langdon, to proceed to the second balloting. It was a wake-up call to the importance of coordinating nominations and the Federalist electorate at the polls.

Newspaper editors were the first group to take on the role of partisan coordinators in New Hampshire for both political parties. I am not the first to place newspaper editors in a leading role in the developmental story of partisan politics during the first party era.⁴⁸ Between 1798 and 1800, newspaper editors, as partisan agents of coordination, attempted to use their presses to limit access to partisan labels and, therefore, the claim to each partisan electorate's votes. Individual nominations continued to dominate how prospective candidates for state and national legislative elections were presented to these two competing electorates. Still, editors began to use their own voices to ascribe which ones had the real claim to partisan loyalty on election day. For example, the editor of the *Oracle of the Day*, a Federalist newspaper out of Portsmouth, published a short remark in the newspaper explaining why an individual congressional nomination list would not be published, reasoning that those in the list were not all "purely Federal" and that this lack of partisan purity in the nomination was enough to forgo a space in the newspaper.⁴⁹ In a special congressional election in 1799, the *Federal Observer* marked out James Sheafe as

“a principal candidate” and called upon subscribers to “suspend opposition and unite” around a single candidate, Sheafe, to ensure his successful election.⁵⁰

In August 1799, the *Republican Ledger* out of Portsmouth began to combat the Federalist-dominated press in New Hampshire, and in 1800, an anonymous author gave it credit for the minority’s congressional nomination.⁵¹ The central role of newspapers in the candidate emergence process meant that Federalist newspaper editors across the state had essentially complete control over access to the ballot under the Federalist label. Meanwhile, those in Portsmouth controlled the limited Democratic-Republican opposition. Newspapers provided a loose, undemocratic party organization that designated specific candidates as likely sharing the policy preferences of the political party the newspaper was associated with and, therefore, had a legitimate claim to the votes of the party’s electorate.

Newspaper editors’ significance in the candidate emergence process faded as nomination procedures arose in 1800. While editors remained important actors throughout the period, they were no longer the sole group attempting to coordinate partisan electorates in New Hampshire, as state legislators took on this role. The candidate emergence process became a centralized affair, with partisan nominations quickly controlled by state legislative caucuses. In New Hampshire, this type of nomination structure made sense because of the state government’s sole claim to legitimate action in political affairs according to the region’s political culture. Federalists were the first to use the legislative caucus to nominate candidates in the 1800 congressional election.⁵² A Farmer supported the centralized procedure, highlighting its legitimacy by referencing both the connection with the state government itself and the geographic representation it ensured.⁵³ The novelty of the method in 1800 meant Federalist editors’ voices were still important in the candidate

emergence process, with the *United States Oracle* going so far as to say that the party had “fixed upon a list” for Congress and that only the legislative caucus ticket would be published in the paper, shutting out any individual nominations.⁵⁴ The legislative caucus came to control the nomination of state upper chamber and congressional candidates between 1800 and 1804.⁵⁵ During this period, the framework for candidate emergence under the Federalist Party label placed the power of nomination in the hands of a legislative caucus and relied upon editors to encourage unity and coordination around these nominees.

In 1800, the Democratic-Republican party really only operated out of Portsmouth, the leading city and home to the most important Democratic-Republican in the state, John Langdon. Langdon served in the U.S. Senate for New Hampshire between 1789 and 1801. His politics were celebrated in Portsmouth in 1795 at a public dinner “in complement to his manly opposition” to the Jay Treaty; later a pseudonymous author boasted of Portsmouth’s long opposition to the Federal administration.⁵⁶ Individual nominations, most likely from a small, elite caucus in Portsmouth, presented candidates to the limited Democratic-Republican electorate, and editors used these lists to publish a ticket under the party label. The Democratic-Republicans attempted a full congressional ticket in 1802, but it became a complicated affair, with two of their proposed candidates declining the nominations.⁵⁷ For the first time, in 1803, the Democratic-Republican ticket for state upper chamber elections extended beyond those districts local to Portsmouth and covered the entire state.⁵⁸ The probability of these nominations coming from those in Portsmouth alone is supported by the difficulty in keeping the ticket full by the mid-March election, with some individuals nominated for a district they did not reside in, others declining nominations, and those at the local level rejecting the slated candidate for their area.⁵⁹ As

a growing party between 1800 and 1804, congressional and state senate nominations were controlled by a small junto in Portsmouth hidden behind anonymous articles and friendly partisan editors.

Everything would change when the Democratic-Republican Party gained enough members in the state legislature to hold two mixed-legislative caucuses to organize the 1804 state senate and congressional elections.⁶⁰ To engage in a statewide campaign for the twelve state senate seats, the party constructed a “Grand Committee of Election and Correspondence” consisting of six persons from each county to serve as a centralizing body. Also, the party established a county committee for each county consisting of one person from each township to organize the campaign on the ground.⁶¹ The opposition party was now able to extend its influence and control over nominations and electioneering to every county and township in the state. This expansion led to the Democratic-Republican Party controlling both chambers of the state legislature for the first time in 1804 and the closest congressional election to date in New Hampshire between the two competing parties.

The Democratic-Republican success in 1804, topped off with the successful election of their full slate of presidential electors in November, was quickly followed by the deterioration of the Federalist Party’s nomination procedures and engagement in state senate or congressional elections. In 1805, the Federalist Party failed to nominate candidates for every district and newspaper editors were at a loss to publish full tickets for their subscribers. With the election just a month away, the editor of the *Portsmouth Gazette* wrote, in surprise, that there had not been a word written on a list of nominations, with most Federalist “papers being silent on the subject.”⁶² In its original ticket, the *Courier of*

New Hampshire, the leading Federalist paper in the state, left the ninth and tenth districts blank because it had no information on who the candidates might be. It also failed to update the ticket when local newspapers provided this information.⁶³ Two articles in the *Political Observatory* claimed that the Federalists still had a legislative caucus at Concord and that the nominations eventually appearing in the Federalist papers were not from local information as they suggested but were born from elite coordination by a “well-born few.”⁶⁴ However, 1805 would see the Federalists lose the governorship for the first time, become a minority party in both state legislative chambers, and precipitate the closure of the *Courier of New Hampshire* in October. The party did not compete in any structured manner for the state senate or congressional election until three years later.

Local areas that could still produce a Federalist majority did compete during the period. In 1806, in the ninth state senate district the Federalists coordinated around a single candidate and won a plurality of votes, if not representation in the state legislature.⁶⁵ More interesting is the attempt by local Federalists in state senate district nine to coordinate votes around Federalist incumbent Lockhart Willard. A local group took the power of nomination into their own hands with a meeting of “30 respectable characters” in Keene who “unanimously voted to support” Willard’s reelection.⁶⁶ The announcement of a meeting rather than an individual nomination in the newspaper is an intriguing occurrence in New Hampshire candidate emergence. This type of nomination procedure was akin to Federalist nominations in Pennsylvania where a general meeting was held at the county seat to nominate candidates for local and state offices. Keene is the county seat of Cheshire County. However, this meeting was a single event, and for a majority of the state, these elections were not contested.⁶⁷ Still, this unique example appears to be a precursor to the

Federalist Party's impending use of nomination procedures closer to the people and more participatory in nature.

The decline in electoral competition appears to have led to a corresponding decline in coordination efforts by the Democratic-Republican Party in 1807 and 1808 in state senate elections. In 1807, there were challenges made to the Democratic-Republican legislative caucus ticket in three districts. In state senate districts one and ten, there were individual nominations made as challengers to the party nominees.⁶⁸ Neither challenger won the election nor earned a small number of votes. However, a candidate in state senate district five not printed on the Democratic-Republican ticket won the election, beating the party nominee.⁶⁹ In district ten, an individual nomination called for the reelection of the Democratic-Republican incumbent instead of the new candidate, which had no impact on the outcome of the election.⁷⁰ Worse than that, no candidate was nominated for the eighth senatorial district in 1808, leading to multiple individual nominations connected to the Democratic-Republican Party. The situation allowed William Wallace, the Federalist incumbent, to earn a plurality of votes.⁷¹ However, Wallace accepted a government appointment and dropped out of the race, allowing the Democratic-Republican-controlled legislature to have their choice between the top two Democratic-Republican candidates. In all, the slump in competitive elections for the state senate appears to have produced a limited number of examples of organizational degeneration and the inability of the Democratic-Republican Party to coordinate their electorate around the party's candidate.

Not all Federalists had lost hope in New Hampshire and looked towards the horizon for their opportunity to return to power. The editor of the *New Hampshire Sentinel* hoped that time would aid the Federalist Party because only time could allow the Democratic-

Republicans to enact policies that could be felt by the people and produce a shift in public opinion back towards Federalism.⁷² After almost no competition for state senate elections again in 1808, except a few localized nominations,⁷³ New Hampshire began to boil with partisanship as the embargo issue ignited two-party competition across the United States. An extract of a letter from a gentleman of New Hampshire described how the Federalists had declined to compete in elections for the past few years but, with the embargo issue, had determined that a majority of the state was with them.⁷⁴ As the *New Hampshire Sentinel* editor predicted, an issue had arrived that the Federalists could leverage for electoral gain.

The Federalists, ever hesitant to publicize their centralized coordination efforts, used Federalist newspapers to hide their organization. At the same time, they presented a ticket for the upcoming congressional election that was both geographically representative and limited to an efficient number of candidates. The ploy to hide their coordinated efforts began with an anonymous call for each county to nominate a congressional candidate. New Hampshire was allocated five seats in Congress, and the state had six counties at the time. So, two of them, Grafton and Coos, coordinated to choose a single candidate.⁷⁵ This same anonymous article nominated a candidate for Rockingham County and was followed a week later by an anonymous article stating that Hillsborough County had agreed upon a candidate.⁷⁶ A few weeks later A Cheshire Voter nominated a congressional candidate for Cheshire County, and the editor presented the full Federalist ticket for Congress.⁷⁷

However, the New Hampshire Federalists' attempt to present a decentralized, grassroots empowered candidate emergence process did not fool the Democratic-Republicans or nonpartisan editors for a second. The editor of the *New Hampshire Gazette* argued that the ticket was, in fact, made by a legislative caucus and that "persuading the

people” of this falsity would be difficult.⁷⁸ An anonymous author described how a nonpartisan paper, the *Farmer’s Cabinet*, had published the Federalist Party congressional ticket before the first call for localized nominations and how the editor said the Federalist congressional ticket came from Concord, which was true.⁷⁹ Therefore, the Federalists reentered electoral politics using the same nomination procedure as before, the legislative caucus.

By 1808, the Democratic-Republicans had all but perfected this centralized party structure first used by the Federalists. During the June session of 1808, the Democratic-Republican members of the state legislature met for a “convention” to nominate candidates for Congress. A ticket was formed “by a fair ballot, ” and all were called upon to place party considerations above personal interests to ensure unity around the party nominees and electoral victory.⁸⁰ A circular letter was also produced by the legislative caucus to organize the Democratic-Republican campaign all the way down to the township level and included an argument for the legitimacy of the legislative caucus as a nomination procedure. The circular argued that the organization was legitimate because each Democratic-Republican member had a responsibility to their constituents to present them with a way to coordinate their efforts to elect Democratic-Republicans to the national legislature. The Democratic-Republican legislators “were conscious that their constituents looked to them for information in an hour of peril, and had a right to expect such advice as might combine their powers, and direct their exertions.”⁸¹ This argument made it seem like the Democratic-Republicans in 1808 were still operating with the guide rails of their region’s and state’s political culture. They maintained the beliefs that legitimate political

organization could only reside within the state government itself and that the people expected the state legislature, particularly, to bear this burden.

Attack articles from the Federalist press offer some insight into the Democratic-Republican congressional nominations in 1808 and how the legislative caucus handled intra-party nomination fights. According to the Federalist press, the Democratic-Republicans held a series of caucuses to determine the full slate of congressional candidates. The first, on June 9, 1808, resulted in a congressional ticket including Charles Cutts, Daniel M. Durell, Jedediah K. Smith, Francis Gardner, and Obed Hall.⁸² However, this ticket was corrected shortly thereafter because another caucus was held with Clement Storer listed, a Democratic-Republican congressional incumbent, instead of Obed Hall.⁸³ According to the Federalists, Storer had communicated that he was outraged at not being renominated, leading to the second legislative caucus meeting placing him on the ticket.⁸⁴ An author writing under the pseudonym A Friend to His Constituents claimed that there were multiple Democratic-Republican caucuses and that members of Congress were present during the session, attempting to influence members of the state legislature.⁸⁵ Another author, Octavius, even suggested that the Democratic-Republican Party sent printed ballots with the circular letter in 1808 to every township committee to prevent splitting votes between Storer and Hall.⁸⁶ In the end, it appears the intra-party squabble had no impact on coordination at the ballot box because Clement Storer received a vote share close to the rest of the ticket, and Obed Hall garnered less than one percent of the party vote.

The reintroduction of partisan electoral competition and Federalist organization in the 1808 congressional election culminated in a Federalist victory. All five Federalist

candidates won clear majorities, and no second ballot was required. The five Federalist candidates received roughly fifteen thousand votes apiece while the highest Democratic-Republican candidate was approximately twenty-five hundred votes behind. The Federalist Party claimed county majorities in Rockingham, Hillsborough, and Coos, which roughly tracked with the “swing” areas highlighted by Turner as important to the Federalist resurgence.⁸⁷ Despite the nearly three-year hiatus in statewide electoral politics, the Federalists were able to smoothly organize their congressional nominations and once again mobilize their partisan electorate around the legislative caucus nomination. This 1808 effort was not ad hoc organization but a strategic resurgence of a robust nomination procedure.

Decentralization of Party Nominations, 1809-1816

While the Federalist return to power was short-lived, ending after the 1809 elections, party competition did not fade away during this slump before the next surge in partisan politics surrounding the War of 1812. Both parties competed across the state in what were often highly competitive elections for the state senate between 1809 and 1816. Such contests were also true for congressional elections. Continuous competitive elections brought with them renovations to nomination procedures for both political parties that shifted the power of nomination closer to the people. By 1816, Democratic-Republicans retained a centralized party structure but shifted the power to nominate candidates for the state senate and Congress to the grassroots level, while Federalists only did so for the state senate. Both political parties made important changes to their nomination procedures, leading to greater involvement of ordinary people in the party organization and candidate nominations.

Extant literature does not clarify the Federalists' efforts to structure nominations for the state senate in 1809 and 1810, but if the preceding decade is any indication of their efforts, they most likely used a legislative caucus. Most of the upper chamber nominations in 1809 first appeared in the newspapers as independent nominations. These anonymous, independent nominations generally only covered the geographic region in which the newspaper was published. For example, *A Whig* nominated candidates for state senate districts four and eight who were both described as "disciples of the old school of Washington."⁸⁸ Concord was located within district four, and district eight was adjacent to the west. However, the *Portsmouth Oracle* was able to print half of the upper chamber nominations in 1809 by mid-February and a complete list of candidates for all twelve districts right before the election.⁸⁹ In originally presenting the partial list of Federal state senate nominations, the editor said the information was gathered from various local newspapers and that the nominations were made "BY THE PEOPLE."⁹⁰ In 1810, the *Concord Gazette* was able to present a full list of state senate candidates for the Federalists by mid-February, with the editor similarly claiming they gathered the information from local public opinion in each district.⁹¹ Because of the proclivity of the Federalist Party to hide their organizational efforts surrounding nominations, I think it is a correct assumption that these individual nominations and full tickets were actually the product of a legislative caucus rather than truly local activity.

The process of structuring state senate nominations for the Democratic-Republican Party in 1809 is equally unclear. There were a number of individual nominations for various state senate districts across New Hampshire.⁹² Despite the appearance of a disjointed effort to nominate individuals for these positions, Federalists believed that the

party still held a mixed-legislative caucus to nominate these candidates. The pseudonymous author Enquirer said as much when describing the connection between the Democratic-Republican Party organization and the new partisan press in Concord, the *American Patriot (Patriot)*, which quickly became the party's main organ to distribute electioneering and candidate information.⁹³ Either way, it appears the electoral losses of 1808 hurt Democratic-Republican efforts in 1809 because two election districts never nominated an official candidate.

Despite the lack of clarity surrounding Democratic-Republican nomination procedures in 1809, 1810 was the beginning of a clear shift towards localized nomination procedures for state senate elections. The first example actually appeared in a single district in 1809 when the newspaper announced that “delegates from twelve towns in” state senate district two met on February 24, 1810, and “agreed to support Gen. HENRY BUTLER of Nottingham, as the Republican candidate for 1809.”⁹⁴ This same district held “a general meeting of the Republican Inhabitants from the several townships” on February 15, 1810, and nominated William Plumer for state senate.⁹⁵ Up to three other state senate election districts held similar meetings to nominate candidates in 1810.⁹⁶ There is evidence of similar meetings resulting in nominations for four state senate districts in 1811.⁹⁷ Beginning in 1810, the Democratic-Republican Party made an effort to break out of the mold of their political culture and utilize political organizations outside of the state itself to structure nominations and engage their partisan electorate.

The rise in partisan fervor with the declaration of war in 1812 led the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans in New Hampshire to engage in mobilizations efforts never before seen in the state. These efforts produced powerful ripple effects on the trajectory of

nomination procedures for both congressional and state senate elections. Both parties held massive county conventions, demonstrating the extent to which their electioneering organizations could structure campaigning at the county and township levels. The Federalists held county conventions in at least five of the six counties⁹⁸ while I found evidence of Democratic-Republicans organizing conventions in four of the six counties.⁹⁹ I explore below one convention in-depth for each party to describe the structures in place to organize these conventions and highlight their centrality to understanding future developments in nomination procedures.

The Federalists were the first to call for a large convention of their electorate to meet and discuss the pressing issues of the day and the upcoming election. The first convention held by Federalists in New Hampshire was in Rockingham County. The event resulted in an estimated two thousand “legal and qualified Electors” in attendance on August 5, 1812, supporting a list of candidates for Congress alongside resolutions on national policy issues and a memorial to President James Madison.¹⁰⁰ It was followed by other counties, like in Strafford County, where “a meeting of sundry persons from almost all the towns in the county” met in a general meeting on September 2, 1812, and called for a convention on October 7, 1812, to “take into consideration the present alarming state of our public affairs, and to adopt such prudent legal and constitutional measures as will most effectually promote the interest, welfare and honor of the nation.”¹⁰¹ In early October, a meeting of somewhere between two thousand and two thousand five hundred “free and independent Voters” were in attendance. There were speeches on the present war and the creation of multiple committees to draft various documents. One such committee presented a list of candidates, the same list as the other Federalist conventions that was also published

in the press as the Federalist ticket, which “was voted to give . . . our unanimous support.”¹⁰² The Federalist Party of New Hampshire in 1812 demonstrated they were very willing to engage with their electorate and used organized meetings to mobilize and coordinate them before the election.

I suggest that these county conventions were not ad hoc organizations but strategically planned and implemented by a statewide party organization for electioneering. Just like the Democratic-Republicans, the Federalists also had county committees appointed by this central body to engage in electoral politics and organize party leaders down to the township level. Previous literature on Federalist Party electioneering organizations has argued that in New Hampshire, this type of system was in place before 1810.¹⁰³ A letter from 1810 suggested that the Federalists had county organizers who directed individuals at the township level to create committees to count voters, keep track of issues being discussed, and translate this information back up the organizational chain. Further, this letter reported that this type of system was used to structure electioneering campaigns throughout the state.¹⁰⁴ The Democratic-Republican editor of the *Patriot* even claimed that leading Federalists, right before the 1812 congressional election, prepared to distribute *en masse* reams upon reams of printed tickets by party committees “in every school district throughout the state.”¹⁰⁵ I suggest that this same organization mobilized in 1812 to call for conventions in each county and mobilized ordinary citizens in support of the Federalist Party.¹⁰⁶ The power of nomination remained in the hands of the legislative caucus. The caucus planned “extensive arrangements for the coming elections” via mass general conventions out of a determination “to do their very best at the ensuing election of members of Congress,” which successfully swept the election in the end.¹⁰⁷

The Federalists continued to use the legislative caucus to nominate congressional candidates in 1814 and 1816. For the first time in 1814, the presentation of the Federalist ticket for Congress publicly described the caucus's creation. The introduction to the ticket reads:

“At a large and respectable meeting of the Members of the Legislature, and other gentlemen from various parts of the State, holden at Concord, on the 22d of June last, it was agreed to recommend and support the following list for Members of Congress, at the election in this State.”¹⁰⁸

The ticket went on to list the six candidates who swept the congressional election. A similar announcement preceded the 1816 congressional election, stating how “the Federal Members of the Legislature and other citizens” nominated candidates for Congress, who would eventually lose on all accounts.¹⁰⁹ Therefore, despite the presence of an extensive organization across the state, the Federalist Party kept the power to nominate congressional candidates, elected on a statewide basis, in the hands of their centralized party apparatus, the legislative caucus.

The developmental story of state senate nomination procedures varies from this trajectory in important ways. The Federalist legislative caucus, rather than retaining the power to nominate all the state senate candidates, shifted this power of nomination to county-level organizations. Between 1811 and 1812, the Federalist Party empowered local party leaders to structure nomination procedures for state senate elections, allowing ordinary citizens to engage in the party as an organization and candidate nominations.

Despite attacks by the Federalist press against the creation of extra-constitutional, localized party organizations in New Hampshire, the use and implementation of these nomination structures from 1811 to 1816 only expanded and became more popular in

nature. Federalists “from various parts of” state senate district four met on February 7, 1811, and nominated William A. Kent for the position. They also called a subsequent meeting to “adopt such measures in regard to the ensuing elections” that all in the district should attend to ensure a successful mobilization of the Federalist electorate.¹¹⁰ An anonymous author attacked a similar organization in the same district in 1812.¹¹¹ Three Federalist meetings nominating candidates for the state senate occurred in New Hampshire in 1813, two in 1814, three in 1815, and five in 1816.¹¹²

Information from announcements of Federalist organization in a couple of New Hampshire regions in 1815 and 1816 further support my claim that the Federalist legislative caucus encouraged these procedures and local committees carried out them out. The Grafton County general meeting that nominated candidates for state senate districts eleven and twelve in 1815 offered some important details that might explain how the Federalist Party went from a centralized to decentralized organizing approach for state senate nominations. In attendance at this general meeting was “a numerous and respectable assembly of the legal voters from fourteen Towns in the county of Grafton.” The general meeting nominations were then approved by two-thirds of a committee present at the meeting that was appointed by the legislative caucus to coordinate a nomination of state senate candidates for the county.¹¹³ In 1816, the state senate district nine meeting also mentions the presence of delegates.¹¹⁴ The details of these meetings demonstrate that a Federalist legislative caucus was still held in Concord each year and that this group appointed county committees to organize the elections within their geographic areas. Their responsibilities included creating a local organization that nominated candidates for the state senate elections within their county. Therefore, the origin of the Federalist Party’s

local nomination procedures was the centralized legislative caucus. Still, shifting the power of nomination to these county committees embodied a meaningful development in nomination procedures, specifically candidate nomination was closer to the grassroots level.

The developmental pattern of the Democratic-Republican Party in New Hampshire had important similarities and differences to that of the Federalists between 1812 and 1816. By the end of the period, they shifted the power of nominating state senate and congressional candidates to lower-level party organizations at the grassroots level. Having already placed the power of nominating state senators in the hands of local party organizations, by 1816, the legislative caucus provided a uniform structure for all districts to follow when nominating candidates. That same year, they did the same to empower county delegate conventions for the first time to nominate congressional candidates. The organizations they created in New Hampshire to structure candidate emergence for state senate and congressional elections looked similar to the nomination procedures of their copartisans across the United States.

The existence of a structured electioneering organization of appointed county committees had its origins in 1804 and, as I demonstrated above, was already doing more than encouraging turnout before 1812. The process of empowering these county committees to do more than rally people on election day continued in 1812 when they were charged with organizing mass conventions to demonstrate widespread support for the Democratic-Republican congressional ticket well before the election. In Rockingham County, Democratic-Republicans held a meeting on August 15, 1812, calling for the selection of delegates “by the Republicans of each town” who would have to present

“certificates of their appointment” for admittance to the delegate convention at Kingston Plains on September 10, 1812.¹¹⁵ The Democratic-Republicans of Portsmouth held their township meeting to select delegates on the evening of September 2, 1812, in Jefferson Hall.¹¹⁶ The mass convention in Rockingham County had somewhere between two and three thousand in attendance, “principally Delegates appointed by the Republicans of the several towns in the County.”¹¹⁷ After the reading of a letter by Governor John Langdon, who could not attend, and after a lengthy, impassioned speech by sitting Democratic-Republican Congressman Josiah Bartlett, two committees were created: the first to draft resolutions expressing the opinions of the convention and the second to report a list of names to nominate for Congress.¹¹⁸ The list of candidates presented by the committee and “unanimously agreed” to by the convention was created by “a General Convention of Republican Gentlemen throughout the State, held in concord in June last,” the Democratic-Republican mixed-legislative caucus.¹¹⁹

I argue that just like the Federalists, the Democratic-Republican Party used their extensive organization for electioneering purposes throughout the state to organize these mass delegate conventions. The county committees met to produce the original meetings, called for the selection of delegates for a county meeting, and attended to guide the proceedings. However, their calls for delegates to be selected at the township level showed that the Democratic-Republican Party was more interested in encouraging the cooperation of those at the grassroots level in the electioneering efforts. These meetings were meant to mobilize and coordinate their electorate around a ticket nominated by the legislative caucus. Unlike the Federalists, they provided more structure to their proceedings to try to

ensure that those at the local level in every township were mobilized to send delegates and engage in the party organization.

After 1812, the Democratic-Republicans in the state had to pick themselves up from their loss in the congressional election. While every district had an official candidate listed in the Democratic-Republican press, there was only mention of one public meeting to nominate candidates for the state senate in 1813.¹²⁰ The use of local meetings swelled again with evidence of them occurring in four districts in 1814 and six districts in 1815.¹²¹

The makeup of these meetings is unclear from the descriptions offered by the Democratic-Republican press, but their opponents offered some insight, making these organizations out to be strictly party organizations and not truly popular in nature. A circular letter from the Democratic-Republican Hillsborough County Committee found its way into the “neutral” but more and more Federalist-leaning *Farmers’ Cabinet* in 1814. It described how the Democratic-Republican Central Committee appointed the Hillsborough County Committee and called them to a meeting on January 20, 1814, to nominate county offices. Either at this meeting or shortly thereafter, the Hillsborough Democratic-Republicans crafted this circular letter calling state senate district meetings for districts seven and eight. They designated a chairman for each meeting and called on the “Committees in the several towns comprising” each district to meet in convention and nominate candidates.¹²² The editor of the *Concord Gazette* later claimed that the county committees themselves had the power to appoint these township committees of three or more individuals and that each county in the state had the same organizational structure.¹²³ From this evidence, it appears the composition of these general meetings and delegate conventions held by Democratic-Republicans between 1810 and 1815 might not have been

as popular as the language of the announcements suggested. Despite this fact, the Democratic-Republican Party was clearly working to ensure those at the township level were involved in nomination procedures for the state senate, even if those likely to attend were previously appointed by county committees rather than each township's Democratic-Republican electorate.

This process appears to have changed in 1816 when the Democratic-Republican legislative caucus set out to produce a uniform nomination procedure across New Hampshire for state senators and members of Congress that truly empowered the Democratic-Republican electorate to express their opinions on candidate nominations. The legislative caucus officially transferred the power to nominate candidates for state senate and congressional elections to the local organizations previously relied upon for electioneering purposes alone. Further, the use of district delegate conventions across the state shows that the Democratic-Republican Party intentionally sought to include those at the grassroots level in the nomination of party candidates.

While perfect conformity to the legislative caucus' instructions did not occur, the 1816 candidate emergence process structured by the Democratic-Republican Party clearly demonstrates that by this time, they were encouraging the involvement of as many people as possible in the party organization at the grassroots level and placing the power of nominating candidates in the hands of these conventions.

The structure of nomination procedures for the 1816 state senate elections was determined at the Democratic-Republican mixed-legislative caucus in June 1815. This body "recommended that the republicans in their respective towns appoint delegates to meet . . . for the purpose of nominating suitable candidates to be supported for Senators."

Following this announcement was a list of the dates, times, and meeting places for eleven of the twelve districts, excluding district two because they had already held their meeting.¹²⁴ Despite the fact that not all the districts met on the right date, before the election, the press published an announcement of a delegate convention for every district.¹²⁵ A few of the announcements mentioned that the selection of a candidate was done by a vote of those present, with the delegate convention in district seven actually doing so “by ballot.”¹²⁶ After the election, the Democratic-Republicans found themselves the majority party in the state senate once again.

Later that year, the Democratic-Republican legislative caucus translated this practice to the nomination of congressional candidates. Under the headline “PRIMARY MEETINGS” read a call for “the People by their delegates” to “meet in the several counties” across the state to nominate candidates for Congress. Five conventions were scheduled, with one for each county and Grafton and Coos Counties holding a joint convention. Each convention was given the power to nominate one candidate, except for Rockingham County, which got to nominate two candidates. Each town was instructed to send “one or more persons as delegates to represent them in their County Convention.” The caucus recommended that that the conventions require a majority threshold in their nomination procedures when voting to select their candidate “to produce a desirable unanimity.”¹²⁷ Not only did the legislative caucus give the power of nomination away to these local conventions, but they also provided clear instructions on who should compose them and recommended procedures to encourage the production of a widely supported candidate.

What does the selection of township delegates look like for these congressional conventions? The process in Portsmouth and the controversy surrounding it gives a hint as to what the selection of township delegates looked like across the state. An announcement was published in the paper calling on the “Republican citizens of Portsmouth . . . to assemble at Jefferson-Hall on TUESDAY EVENING next, the 20th inst. at 8 o’clock, for the purpose of choosing delegates to represent this town in the Republican Convention . . . for the nomination of suitable candidates for . . . Representatives to the next Congress.”¹²⁸ The meeting decided to adjourn to a later date to ensure an accurate selection of delegates by the people of Portsmouth. At the postponed meeting, the attendees successfully selected ten delegates for the county convention.¹²⁹ However, the Portsmouth delegates arrived at the convention, they were not allowed to partake in the proceedings and individuals not elected by the public meeting in Portsmouth were recognized as the delegation from the city.¹³⁰

What can explain this occurrence? The author Brutus described in a lengthy article how the supporters of John F. Parrott, a longtime Democratic-Republican state representative for Portsmouth, were eager to see him nominated for Congress. When they could not control delegate selection to ensure those in attendance would press Parrott’s nomination, they moved to control the nomination by other means. They worked to influence the township delegates “from the country,” the rural areas of Rockingham County, and convinced these delegates to refuse the Portsmouth delegation entry to the proceedings.¹³¹ The same author claimed in another article that most of the townships in Rockingham County did not hold elections to select delegates, but those interested in the proceedings attended as if they were there to represent the towns they were from.¹³²

These articles were meant as criticisms from a group of Democratic-Republicans opposing the nomination and election of John F. Parrott to Congress, so they might have exaggerated the widespread nature of the problem. However, the descriptions offered by the party critics suggest that county conventions across the state contained delegates elected or appointed by townships and these townships proceedings still had to deal potential elite influences. Despite the attacks on party discipline from those in Portsmouth, the ticket was still widely accepted, and the entire slate of Democratic-Republican candidates won seats to Congress with wide margins, even Parrott.

Candidate Emergence in a Large Town: Democratic-Republicans in Portsmouth

The story above on the development of candidate emergence and the organizations that structured the process focused only on state senate and congressional elections rather than also include discussions on elections concerning the lower chamber of New Hampshire's state legislature. As I mentioned in the chapter's introduction, this focus was because editors of the time decided to omit lower chamber nominations. Elections to the general assembly were considered only of local concern and not newsworthy enough for publication. Members of the lower chamber were elected at the township level with one or more representatives for each town dependent upon population size. This process meant that the office was better understood as a township position rather than a state-level position.

Despite the modest usefulness of newspapers as a source for understanding the candidate emergence process for the state assembly in New Hampshire, a limited amount of information began to emerge in the post-1808 period in Portsmouth. It brought to light an interesting story of Democratic-Republican party organization to structure these

elections. Here, I present suggestive evidence of who was in control of state legislative lower chamber nominations in smaller towns and the evidence on Democratic-Republican nomination procedures in Portsmouth after 1808. The nomination procedure in Portsmouth was similar to that found in other cities across the United States. Popularly oriented ward meetings provided the basis for a township delegate convention and had the power to nominate candidates for the state assembly and organize mobilization efforts before the election.

As early as 1803, the Democratic-Republican Party made it clear that those at the township level should pay attention to and support someone from their party for state assembly positions. In an anonymous article presenting a full slate of Democratic-Republican candidates for the state senate, the author noted: “But before I conclude, beg leave to suggest the importance of attending to the choice of Representatives, which above all others should be truly Republican . . .”¹³³ That same year there was a ticket in the newspaper for Democratic-Republican candidates for the offices in Portsmouth but no indication of how the ticket was made.¹³⁴ An 1806 Democratic-Republican circular letter to township party organizers published in the Federalist press mentioned that these individuals “should endeavour to have a firm republican chosen to represent [the] town in the General Court” but offered no instructions on how to nominate such a candidate.¹³⁵ A similar circular letter penned a decade later called for this same group to pay particular attention to the election of state assembly members but offered no guidance on how to proceed in this endeavor.¹³⁶ Although it is unclear how these candidates were nominated, the partisanship of candidates at the elections was apparently perfectly obvious to contemporaries because after the elections were held, newspaper editors were able to list

election winners and label whether the town's partisan representation had changed or remained the same.¹³⁷

In the town of Portsmouth, the first mention of a gathering to nominate state assembly candidates emerged out of a celebration. Democratic-Republicans gathered across the United States on March 4 to honor Jefferson's and then Madison's inauguration. Luckily enough for those in New Hampshire, such celebrations meant that the party had a reason to gather roughly a week before state elections. "Republicans assembled at JEFFERSON HALL" on March 4, 1809, and they listened to an address, passed a number of resolutions, and unanimously accepted a ticket nominating candidates for the lower chamber "reported by their committee of nomination."¹³⁸ The reference to a committee bringing these nominations before the gathering suggests it was a pre-determined list constructed by local elites, but for the first time, they placed the list before a gathering to earn the party electorate's support before the election day.

The next year, Democratic-Republicans of Portsmouth created an organization to mobilize the partisan electorate at the wardship level and empowered ordinary citizens to engage in general assembly candidate nominations. An announcement appeared in the local Democratic-Republican newspaper, the *New-Hampshire Gazette*, that stated the Democratic-Republicans of each ward (North, Middle, and South) were to meet on three different nights at the same location, the brick schoolhouse, to "make arrangement for the approaching Election."¹³⁹ After all the ward meetings, another announcement called on all the Democratic-Republicans to gather at Jefferson Hall on March 12, 1810, which was the night before the state elections.¹⁴⁰ Similar announcements for wardship meetings at the schoolhouse continued through 1816, except in 1814 when they were at the Bunker Hill

Society reading room; these wardship meeting were followed by general meetings at Jefferson Hall.¹⁴¹

I argue that from 1810 through 1816, these ward meetings selected delegates to meet in a township convention to nominate state assembly candidates and organize the mass general meetings right before state elections. I base this claim on a few pieces of evidence. First, in 1812, there was an announcement of a middle meeting in Portsmouth between the wardship meetings and the day-before-the-election general meeting; this middle meeting nominated a list of candidates for the general assembly.¹⁴² Second, an article by Voice of the People critiquing the Democratic-Republican organization claimed that “nominating committees” had controlled the nomination of state assembly members in Portsmouth for years.¹⁴³ Lastly, it was the “Chairman of the Committee of nomination” who organized a meeting like the one in 1812 that first presented the Democratic-Republican candidates for the state assembly and called a mass general meeting right before the election.¹⁴⁴

Conclusion: Institutionalization and Democratization in New Hampshire

New Hampshire is an important case study for understanding the development of candidate emergence in the early republic for two reasons. First, previous literature on the development of political parties has generally not given New England much consideration. New England has been quickly discarded from many discussions of political organization, let alone any type that mobilizes the people to engage in party politics. Luetscher quickly moved past the discussion of party organization development in New England because his focus was on county conventions, and the region’s political culture and early development

did not aid this endeavor.¹⁴⁵ Cunningham and Fischer both highlighted developments in New England, and New Hampshire specifically, in their discussions of the Democratic-Republican and Federalist parties but focused on the general form the party structures to understand electioneering; they were sparingly concerned with how these structures organized nominations.¹⁴⁶

Second, the region is not known for a participatory political culture like the mid-Atlantic. The histories of Pennsylvania and New York teem with discussions of mass meetings and organizations developing around electoral politics even before the ratification of the U.S. Constitution. What discussions do exist on party organizations in New England during the first party era have concluded that they were elite-controlled and centrally dominated; they are not to be taken seriously for understanding neither the development of mass participatory politics nor American democracy.¹⁴⁷

Taking on a case study in New England and conducting it with a broader scope of analysis has allowed me to uncover a richer history of development than previously understood in New Hampshire. I have demonstrate a unique pattern of development that eventually broke away from the guide rails of the region's political culture and the state's political history to create political party organizations that extended beyond the halls of government. I have shown how Federalist editors took on the role of party coordinators before the creation of nomination procedures. When both parties created their first nomination procedures, they used a legislative caucus, as the political culture of the region and political history of the state suggested they would. With the state considered the only legitimate venue for political organization, it follows that the legislators were seen as the best source for producing political nominations. The fact that congressional elections were

statewide also encouraged the use of the legislative caucus because it could legitimately claim to speak for the entire state.

Despite early limitations on political organization in New Hampshire, both parties eventually created highly institutionalized party apparatuses for the nomination of candidates. Early in the development of both parties, they created extensive organizations for electioneering that extended to the county and township levels. By 1812, these organizations demonstrated their ability to mobilize their separate partisan electorates to attend mass conventions by the thousands. The Federalists' consistent use of the legislative caucus to nominate candidates for congressional elections demonstrates the organization was not *ad hoc* each year but a consistent institution. Further, they transferred the power to nominate state senate candidates to local electioneering organizations appointed each year to encourage ordinary citizens to be more involved in Federalist politics and candidate nominations.

The Democratic-Republicans, by 1816, provided for even more structure in the candidate emergence process. The legislative caucus transferred the power to nominate state senate and congressional candidates to the local organizations originally created for electioneering. At first, the county committees held either county or district meetings to nominate candidates. Then in 1816, the legislative caucus provided for a uniform procedure to nominate state senators: district delegate conventions. The solidification of clear procedures continued later that year with the call for district delegate conventions to nominate congressional candidates. Each convention was further instructed by the legislative caucus to implement a majority-threshold rule to nominate candidates. Lastly, the Democratic-Republican Party in Portsmouth had a highly institutionalized party

organization to nominate candidates for the state assembly, with meetings at the same location each year between 1810 and 1816.

The development of organizations to structure the candidate emergence process in New Hampshire is also a story of parties as agents of democratization during the early republic. Early on, the Federalist Party had an extensive organization to mobilize their partisan electorate across the state. In 1812, the Federalist Party demonstrated its commitment to engage in popular politics and candidate nominations that could be supported at mass gatherings of the party electorate. Moreover, when they shifted the power of nominating state senate candidates to local organizations, they created procedures that encouraged the inclusion of ordinary citizens in the proceedings.

The Democratic-Republicans went even further to include ordinary citizens in party politics and nomination procedures in meaningful ways. The party simultaneously created a nomination organization and a plan for an extensive electioneering apparatus in 1804, fully embracing participatory politics to combat the Federalists. Moreover, as early as 1810, they made even more of an effort to create party structures to nominate candidates for the state senate that would bring in those at the grassroots level. By 1816, they provided a clear process for involving citizens in every township. That same year, they provided structures to encourage the same level of grassroots involvement in the nomination of candidates for Congress. Lastly, Democratic-Republicans in Portsmouth provided for meaningful citizen inclusion at the wardship level in the nomination of state assembly candidates.

Overall, the development of candidate emergence in New Hampshire between 1788 and 1816 shows a clear progression towards the creation of institutionalized political

parties to structure candidate emergence and the adoption of procedures that sought the incorporation of ordinary citizens in political nominations.

Notes

1. Lafferty 2020.
2. Park 2018, 53 and 66-67.
3. Daniell 1970, 80.
4. Daniell 1970, 100-101.
5. Turner 1986, 49.
6. Daniell 1970, 197.
7. Turner 1986, 52-54.
8. Daniell 1970, 199; Turner 1983, 57.
9. *Courier of New Hampshire* May 16, 1804.
10. *Courier of New Hampshire* Feb 13, 20, 1798. This view was not shared by all with one anonymous author remarking the editor of the *Courier* had “strange ideas of locality” and that a state senator was just as local as any other state office holder (*Mirror* Feb 20, 1798).
11. New Hampshire was the first to do this although unsuccessfully. Massachusetts is generally referenced regarding the first popular affirmation of a constitution because it was the first to do so successfully. However, it was in fact New Hampshire who first gave this opportunity to its citizens.
12. Daniell 1970, 207.
13. The first five general elections between 1788 and 1796 required second elections. Special congressional elections because of resignations in 1797 and 1800 also required second ballots.
14. Turner 1983, 182 and 185.
15. *Courier of New Hampshire* Feb 27, 1794, Feb 13, 1798.
16. Luetscher 1903, 3 and 68-71.
17. Fischer 1965, 61-62.
18. Turner 1983, 183.

19. Cunningham 1963, 142.
20. Turner 1983, 215.
21. *New-Hampshire Spy* Nov 14, 1788.
22. Luetscher 1903, 63.
23. *New-Hampshire Spy* Dec 12, 1788.
24. *New-Hampshire Spy* Jan 27, 1789.
25. *Concord Herald* Aug 24, 1790.
26. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Aug 23, 1792.
27. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Aug 23, 1792.
28. *Oracle of the Day* July 15, 1794.
29. *Political and Sentimental Repository* Aug 26, 1790.
30. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Aug 26, 1790.
31. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Aug 26, 1790.
32. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Aug 26, 1790.
33. *New-Hampshire Spy* March 3, 1790.
34. *Oracle of the Day* March 15, 1794.
35. *New-Hampshire Spy* Feb 27, 1789.
36. *Concord Herald* Feb 16, 1791; *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 7, 1792.
37. *Concord Herald* Feb 7, 1793.
38. *Concord Herald* Feb 7, 14, 1793.
39. *Mirror* Feb 27, 1795.
40. Squire 2017, 105-107.
41. *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 17, 1795.

42. *Oracle of the Day* March 25, April 4, 1795.
43. Daniell 1970, 233-234.
44. Daniell 1970, 234.
45. Hoadley 1986, 42; Pasley 2013.
46. *Mirror* Feb 23, 1796; *Oracle of the Day* Feb 24, 1796.
47. *Farmer's Weekly Museum* July 26, 1796; *Rising Sun* Aug 2, 1796.
48. Pasley 2001.
49. *Oracle of the Day* Aug 18, 1798.
50. *Federal Observer* Nov 14, 1799.
51. Pasley 2001, 167 and 408.
52. *United States Oracle* June 21, 1800.
53. *United States Oracle* June 21, 1800.
54. *United States Oracle* June 28, 1800.
55. *Courier of New Hampshire* July 29, 1802, Aug 15, 1804; *New-Hampshire Gazette* July 17, Aug 7, 1804; *New Hampshire Sentinel* March 3, 1804; *Political Observatory* July 28, April 7, 1804.
56. *Gazette of the United States* July 25, 1795; *Oracle of the Day* Aug 18, 1796.
57. *Courier of New Hampshire* Aug 12, 1802; *New-Hampshire Gazette* July 27, Aug 3, 24, 1802; *United States Oracle* Aug 7, 1802.
58. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Jan 18, 1803.
59. *Courier of New Hampshire* Jan 27, 1803; *Farmer's Cabinet* Feb 3, 1803; *New-Hampshire Gazette* Feb 8, 15, 1803. Another example of the local level rejecting the Portsmouth ordained state senate nomination comes from state senate district five. When analyzing the election returns it appears there are two Democratic-Republican candidates supported in the election, John Waldron the official nominee and Moses L. Neal a prominent lawyer of Rochester who goes on to serve as clerk of the lower chamber while under Democratic-Republican control beginning in 1809. Neal receives almost a unanimous vote from the town of Rochester to the amount of 159

votes. In this election, this number of votes would have secured Waldron the election rather than placing him in second (NNV).

60. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Feb 14, 1804; Cunningham 1963, 143.
61. Cunningham 1963, 142.
62. *Portsmouth Gazette* Feb 9, 1805.
63. *Courier of New Hampshire* Feb 6, 1805; *Farmer's Cabinet* Feb 19, 1805; *Farmer's Weekly Museum* Feb 16, 1805; *New Hampshire Sentinel* Feb 16, 23, 1805.
64. *Political Observatory* March 2, 9, 1805.
65. *New Hampshire Sentinel* Feb 22, March 1, 1806.
66. *New Hampshire Sentinel* March 7, 1807.
67. *Farmer's Cabinet* March 17, 1807; *Political Observatory* March 20, 1807.
68. *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 3, 1807; *Political Observatory* Feb 20, 1807.
69. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Feb 17, 1807; NNV.
70. *Political Observatory* Feb 22, 1808.
71. *Concord Gazette* Feb 23, 1808; *Farmer's Cabinet* March 1, 1808.
72. *New Hampshire Sentinel* March 22, 1806.
73. *Concord Gazette* March 1, 1808.
74. *Portsmouth Oracle* June 25, 1808.
75. *Portsmouth Oracle* June 25, 1808.
76. *Portsmouth Oracle* June 25, July 2, 1808.
77. *Portsmouth Oracle* July 16, 1808.
78. *New-Hampshire Gazette* July 5, 1808.
79. *Farmer's Cabinet* June 21, 1808; *New-Hampshire Gazette* July 26, 1808.
80. *New-Hampshire Gazette* June 21, 1808.

81. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Aug 23, 1808.
82. *Portsmouth Oracle* June 18, 1808.
83. *Portsmouth Oracle* June 25, 1808.
84. *Portsmouth Oracle* July 30, 1808; *Dartmouth Gazette* July 20, 1808.
85. *Concord Gazette* Aug 23, 1808.
86. *Portsmouth Oracle* Aug 20, 1808.
87. Turner 1983, 390.
88. *Concord Gazette* Feb 7, 1809.
89. *Portsmouth Oracle* Feb 18, March 4, 1809.
90. *Portsmouth Oracle* Feb 18, 1809.
91. *Concord Gazette* Feb 13, 1810.
92. e.g., *Farmer's Cabinet* Feb 14, 1809; *New-Hampshire Gazette* Feb 28, 1809; *Political Observatory* Feb 20, 1809.
93. *Concord Gazette* March 14, 1809.
94. *American Patriot* Feb 28, 1809.
95. *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 20, 1810.
96. District Three general meeting: *New Hampshire Patriot* March 6, 1810; District Four delegate convention: *New Hampshire Patriot* March 6, 1810; Possible District Twelve delegate convention: *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 6, 1810; *Concord Gazette* March 13, 1810.
97. District One: *New-Hampshire Gazette* Feb 5, 1811; Districts Five and Six general county meeting: *New-Hampshire Gazette* Feb 12, 1811; District Eight delegate convention: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 26, 1811.
98. Rockingham: *Constitutionalist* Aug 25, 1812; Cheshire: *Portsmouth Oracle* Oct 27, 1812; Strafford: *Concord Gazette* Oct 20, 1812; Hillsborough: *Constitutionalist* Aug 18, 1812; Grafton: *Portsmouth Oracle* Oct 27, 1812.

99. Rockingham: *New Hampshire Patriot* Aug 18, Sept 15, 1812; Cheshire: *Democratic Republican* Sept 7, 28, 1812; Hillsborough: *New Hampshire Patriot* Aug 4, 11, 18, Sept 22, 1812; Grafton: *New Hampshire Patriot* Sept 15, Oct 6, 13, 1812.
100. *Portsmouth Oracle* July 25, Aug 8, 1812; *Constitutionalist* Aug 25, 1812.
101. *Concord Gazette* Sept 15, 1812.
102. *Concord Gazette* Oct 20, 1812.
103. Fischer 1965, 62 and 76.
104. *New Hampshire Patriot* Oct 13, 1812.
105. *New Hampshire Patriot* Oct 27, 1812.
106. *Portsmouth Oracle* Oct 27, 1812.
107. *New Hampshire Patriot* June 16, 1812.
108. *New Hampshire Sentinel* July 23, 1814.
109. *Concord Gazette* Sept 17, 1816.
110. *Concord Gazette* Feb 12, 1811.
111. *New Hampshire Patriot* March 10, 1812.
112. District Four general meeting: *Concord Gazette* Feb 9, 16, 1813; Districts Five & Six general county meeting: *Portsmouth Oracle* Feb 6, 1813; District 7 general county meeting: *Farmer's Cabinet* Feb 22, 1813. District Three delegate meeting: *Portsmouth Oracle* Jan 29, 1814; District Seven general county meeting: *Farmer's Cabinet* Feb 14, 1814. District Six delegate convention: *Concord Gazette* Feb 7, 1815; District Seven general meeting: *Farmer's Cabinet* Feb 27, 1815; Districts Eleven & Twelve general county meeting: *Concord Gazette* Feb 21, 28, 1815. District Three general meeting: *Concord Gazette* Jan 30, 1816; District Four general meeting: *Concord Gazette* Jan 16, Feb 6, 1816; District Five general county meeting: *Portsmouth Oracle* Feb 24, 1816; District Nine general meeting: *Portsmouth Oracle* Feb 17, 1816; Districts Eleven & Twelve general joint county meeting: *Concord Gazette* March 5, 1816.
113. *Concord Gazette* Feb 21, 1815.
114. *Portsmouth Oracle* Feb 17, 1816.
115. *New Hampshire Patriot* Aug 18, 1812.

116. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Sept 1, 1812.
117. *New Hampshire Patriot* Sept 15, 1812.
118. *New Hampshire Patriot* Sept 15, 1812.
119. *New Hampshire Patriot* Sept 15, 1812.
120. *Democratic Republican* Feb 22-March 8, 1813. District Four general meeting: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 19, 23, 1813.
121. District Three general meeting: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 1, 1814; District Four general meeting: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 1, 8, 15, 1814; District Seven delegate convention: *Farmer's Cabinet* Feb 7, 14, 1814; District Eight delegate convention: *Farmer's Cabinet* Feb 7, 1814. District Three delegate convention: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 14, 1815; District Four general meeting: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 14, 1815; Districts Five and Six county general meeting: *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 7, 1815; Districts Eleven and Twelve county general meeting: *New Hampshire Patriot* March 7, 1815.
122. *Farmer's Cabinet* Feb 7, 1814.
123. *Concord Gazette* March 5, 1814.
124. *New Hampshire Patriot* Jan 9, 1816; *New-Hampshire Gazette* Jan 9, 1816.
125. District One: *New Hampshire Patriot* Jan 30, 1816; District Two: *New Hampshire Patriot* Jan 16, 1816; District Three: *New Hampshire Patriot* Jan 30, 1816; District Four: *New Hampshire Patriot* Jan 30, 1816; District Five: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 20, 1816; District Six: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 6, 1816; District Seven: *New Hampshire Patriot* Jan 30, 1816; District Eight: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 6, 1816; District Nine: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 20, 1816; District Ten: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 6, 1816; District Eleven: *New Hampshire Patriot* Feb 20, 1816; District Twelve: *New Hampshire Patriot* Jan 30, 1816.
126. *New Hampshire Patriot* Jan 30, 1816.
127. *New Hampshire Patriot* Aug 6, 1816.
128. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Aug 13, 20, 1816.
129. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Aug 27, 1816; *People's Advocate* Sept 24, 1816.
130. *People's Advocate* Sept 24, Oct 29, 1816.
131. *People's Advocate* Sept 24, 1816.

132. *People's Advocate* Oct 22, 1816. A general meeting of the Democratic-Republican faction against Parrott in their resolutions also claim that "more than half of the number who voted" at the county convention "were not elected delegates" (*People's Advocate* Oct 29, 1816).
133. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Jan 18, 1803.
134. *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 1, 1803.
135. *Farmer's Weekly Museum* March 28, 1806.
136. *Concord Gazette* Feb 13, 1816.
137. e.g., *Concord Gazette* March 21, 1809; *Farmer's Cabinet* March 21, 1809; *New Hampshire Sentinel* March 17, 1810.
138. *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 7, 1809.
139. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Feb 27, 1810.
140. *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 6, 11, 12, 1810.
141. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Feb 26, March 12, 1811, Feb 25, March 3, 1812, Feb 23, March 2, 1813, Feb 22, March 1, 7, 1814, March 7, 11, 1815, Feb 13, 27, March 5, 11, 1816.
142. *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 3, 1812.
143. *New-Hampshire Gazette* Feb 13, 1816.
144. *New-Hampshire Gazette* March 11, 1816). There were two meetings organized by the Democratic-Republican township convention because of a factional dispute that year over a local policy issue on allowance of either wooden or brick structures within the town of Portsmouth (*New-Hampshire Gazette* March 11, 1816; *Portsmouth Oracle* March 16, 1816).
145. Luetscher 1903.
146. Cunningham 1957; 1963; Fischer 1965.
147. Cunningham 1963; Formisano 1983. An exception to this is James M. Banner Jr.'s (1970) work on the Massachusetts Federalist Party, which takes seriously the influence of mass meetings and procedures meant to mobilize ordinary citizens before elections on the participatory nature of party politics during the period.

Chapter 4

South Carolina and Ohio: Local Procedures and National Politics

In this chapter, I discuss the development of candidate emergence in the South and West with case studies on South Carolina and Ohio. These regions are often discounted in discussions of political organization. The South is considered to have lagged behind the rest of the nation when it comes to party development and the West has received limited analysis.¹ Understanding candidate emergence in these regions helps to demonstrate moreover the decentralized nature of political parties in the United States at that time while also pointing to the interconnectedness of party politics in areas far removed from Philadelphia or Washington D.C. I demonstrate how factors like political culture, electoral systems, and electoral competition help explain the characteristics and development of candidate emergence in both states. I find that local partisan elites structured the candidate emergence process with complex nomination procedures that provided for the incorporation of ordinary citizens at the grassroots level in Ohio and Charleston, South Carolina. These findings are important when considering larger questions on party institutionalization and the role political parties played in the story of American democratization.

While there is not the same sectional understanding in the South compared to New England, the region still had a few distinct characteristics that are helpful for understanding the development of candidate emergence.² These two elements were deference and a desire to maintain the societal and cultural status quo. Deference can be understood as a limiting institution when thinking about its relation to candidate emergence. Only the elite, like rich landowners and merchants, were the best potential candidates because of their wealth

making them independent and above corruption.³ Submission to those atop the social hierarchy by those at the bottom meant only the wealthy few were even considered as potential candidates. The cultural habit of deference fed into early structures of candidate emergence as well.

Second, Park notes a couple times in his book that the political culture in the South was one that encouraged maintaining the status quo. When contrasting New England and Southern providentialism the main difference was whether it was meant to encourage change towards some moral goal, as in the North, or maintain the social order and resist change, as in the South.⁴ Those in the South, and South Carolina particularly, were interested in using religion to encourage ordinary citizens to accept the social order as it was. They should accept deference and not attempt to change the hierarchy already in place within their specific local and state political sphere. When Park describes the centrality of slavery to the development of an explicitly divergent political culture from the North during the first thirty years of the new republic, he mentions the protection of the status quo as a major factor.⁵ Each state was understood to have their own unique culture and tampering with this would be catastrophic. Protection of the status quo was used to protect the institution of slavery within Southern States. For my purposes, it is important to understand the centrality of maintaining the status quo, as in maintaining the existent social hierarchy, was in the political culture of the South.

When it comes to understanding the political culture of the West, one must consider what the new inhabitants brought with them. During the 1790s in Ohio, this meant a rapid shift away from dominance by a few leading men who brought their New England political culture of submission to central authorities to a more participatory political culture as

individuals from the mid-Atlantic, Pennsylvania in particular, and the South, specifically Virginia, immigrated into Ohio.⁶ The incorporation of southerners brought with it experiences with self-nominations and candidates more openly seeking office. The influx of mid-Atlantic inhabitants with their participatory political culture and experiences with participatory political organizations caused Park to note that by the 1810s the political culture of the northwest could be described as democratic and the Jeffersonian ideal of a farmer's republic.⁷

The introduction of a more participatory political culture in Ohio was evident in the lead up to statehood. Donald Ratcliffe, in his book on the development of democratic politics in Ohio, describes how those who supported statehood, many of whom became Democratic-Republicans, quickly utilized extra-governmental organizations similar to those used during the time of the Revolution in the mid-Atlantic to coordinate elites and leverage public opinion with the incorporation of ordinary citizens.⁸ Therefore, those in West were not beginning with empty canvases or clean slates when creating their political culture. They brought with them the political culture and political histories of the states from which they came that served as the foundations for what was considered as legitimate political organization in their new community.

The electoral rules in both states remained relatively constant over time and are displayed in Tables 4.1 and 4.2. In South Carolina, the parish and county served as the building blocks for representation. Either individual locations or a collection of smaller populated regions collectively elected representatives to the general assembly and the state senate. Before the 1790 Constitution, members of both chambers served two-year terms. However, this was altered to have state senators serve four-year terms and a rotation of election begun so half

of the state senate was elected every two years. These districts were frequently multi-member elections and required a plurality of votes to win office. Those living on the coast, called the low country, used their early control over determining the apportionment of representation to ensure this geographic area had more representatives in the state legislature. The low country maintained this advantage until an agreement was made to reapportion in 1808 that gave the rural West, known as the back country, greater representation that more accurately reflected its larger share of the state's total population. The state used single-member district plurality elections to select members of Congress every two years for the entire period. The state went from having five districts in 1788 to nine after redistricting in 1812. In fact, no office, including the governor nor presidential electors, were elected on a statewide basis in South Carolina for the entire period. This is something previous scholars have noted as central to understanding the lack of organizational development in South Carolina.⁹

In Ohio, the county served as the building block of representation similarly to Pennsylvania. Those in the state legislative lower chamber were elected annually by an individual county or a collection of smaller population counties. The state senate was elected biannually with a rotation of election created by the state constitution meaning half of the senate was up for election each year. Both chambers were elected according to plurality rules. Since Ohio was admitted to the U.S. after reapportionment in 1802, they were allowed one representative to Congress from 1803 through 1810 who was elected in a statewide election. It was not until 1812 that Ohio was apportioned according to its population going from one representative to six. The state legislature in 1812 altered the mode of election districting the state and providing for single-member district elections.

Table 4.1: Summary of Electoral Rules for State and National Legislative Elections in South Carolina

State Legislative Lower Chamber	State Legislative Upper Chamber	U.S. House of Representatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biannual Elections • Parish and County Elections • Plurality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biannual Elections (1788); Four Year Terms with Election Rotation (1790-1816) • Parish and County District Elections • Plurality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biannual Elections • Single-Member District Elections • 5 Seats (1788-1790); 6 Seats (1792-1800); 8 Seats (1802-1810); 9 Seats (1812-1816) • Plurality

Table 4.2: Summary of Electoral Rules for State and National Legislative Elections in Ohio

State Legislative Lower Chamber	State Legislative Upper Chamber	U.S. House of Representatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Elections • County Elections • Plurality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two Year Terms with Election Rotation • County and Multi-County District Elections • Plurality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biannual Elections • State-Wide General Elections (1803-1810); Single-Member District Elections (1812-1816) • 1 Seat (1803-1810); 6 Seats (1812-1816) • Plurality

The pattern of electoral competitiveness is similar in both states. After very competitive elections in 1800 in South Carolina there was a drop-off of Federalist engagement across the state. Similarly, Ohio entered the Union in 1803 and after clear victories by Democratic-Republicans, Federalists receded from electoral politics in most places for the rest of the period. Between 1808 and 1816 there was a reinvigoration of electoral competition in specific counties in both Ohio and South Carolina where Federalists could still expect to win with the boost from highly polarizing events like Jefferson's embargo and the War of 1812.

In what follows, I describe the development of candidate emergence in each state separately. I begin with South Carolina and the informal party structures created by each group early on. Then, I focus on developments in Charleston. The city doesn't provide a generalizable story for the rest of the state but is central to understanding politics in South Carolina and is an important story to understand when considering the interconnectedness of party organizations across state lines. Candidate emergence went through three stages in Charleston as presented in Table 4.3. The stages include the pre-party period (1788-1795), the informal party period (1796-1806), and the popular party period (1808-1816). I present new evidence on the development of nomination procedures in the city that sets the organization apart from other major cities previously explored, specifically in the meaningful incorporation of ordinary citizens with the creation of something akin to a closed party primary to nominate state and national legislative candidates. I finish the section with a brief discussion on the connection of South Carolina nomination procedures to those in the mid-Atlantic.

Then, I present the developmental story of Ohio. As a foundation, I use historian Donald Ratcliffe's political history of early Ohio to supplement the lack of newspaper coverage in the Readex Archive. His book is an example of a more recent piece of scholarship on the period that takes party organization seriously. Candidate emergence went through three stages of development in Ohio displayed in Table 4.4. The stages include the pre-party period (1799-1801), the decentralized party formation period (1802-1809), and the factional party period (1810-1816). Understanding the political culture and likely previous experiences with political organizations helps explain the quick development of nomination procedures that structure the candidate emergence process before statehood as well as the continued use of self-nominations. Democratic-Republican factional politics was once again important for understanding the development of candidate emergence after the Federalists exited electoral politics. The section is then capped with a brief discussion on the relationship between nomination procedures in Ohio and the nation. I conclude the chapter by connecting the development of candidate emergence in both states to questions on party institutionalization and the role of parties in the story of American democratization.

Table 4.3: Summary of Charleston, South Carolina Candidate Emergence Development
Pre-Party Period

Dates	Deferential political patterns continued to dominate candidate emergence and individual nominations were the main pathway for potential candidates.	
1788-1795		
Dates	Federalist Party	Democratic-Republican Party
1796-1807	Deferential political patterns dominated candidate emergence. Local partisan elites operated in the background with an informal party organization. Individual nominations were the main pathway for potential candidates.	Deferential political patterns dominated candidate emergence. Local partisan elites operated in the background with an informal party organization. Individual nominations were the main pathway for potential candidates.
1808-1816	Local partisan elites organized general meetings to nominate candidates and briefly used the delegate convention system.	Local party organizers developed a closed party primary with voting at the wardship level. The delegate convention counted the wardship votes and determined nominations only in case of a tie.

Table 4.4: Summary of Ohio Candidate Emergence Development

		Pre-Party Period
Dates		
1799-1801	Individual nominations dominated candidate emergence.	
Dates	Federalist Party	Democratic-Republican Party
1802-1809	Partly leaders in a few counties used general meetings early on. There was limited engagement after statehood. Independent nominations persisted.	Party leaders used county delegate conventions and general meetings in numerous counties. The legislative caucus made congressional nominations. State senate district general meetings occurred in some areas. Independent nominations persisted.
1810-1816	Federalists joined conservative factional groups to engage in county delegate conventions and general meetings. Limited independent Federalist organization of general meetings.	The introduction of factional politics encouraged continued organization through county delegate conventions and general meetings. Congressional nominations were decentralized to the most structured counties with new congressional districts. State senate district general meetings continued to occur in some areas. Independent nominations persisted.

South Carolina's Developmental Story

Politics in the South was a continuation of English election customs of deference and electioneering. This meant local elites were potential candidates who pursued political office through self-nomination and the treating of electors. Self-nomination has a long history in the South, dating back to the colonial era.¹⁰ The practice continued into the new republic where individual nominations, generally self-nominations, in the press dominated early candidate emergence in the South.¹¹ A letter written by Jeremiah Smith of New Hampshire described how the phrase “being a candidate” meant something altogether different in the South compared to the North. In the South, it mean self-nomination, electioneering, and “perhaps treat[ing] the electors.”¹² In a speech by Arnoldus Vanderhorts right after he was elected intendent of Charleston, essentially the mayor, he spoke out against the custom of successful candidates taking their supporters to taverns to buy them all drinks because it would “establish an expensive election” and limit potential candidates for elected office “to the rich only.”¹³

Candidate emergence in South Carolina when considering the entire state only appears to have two stages of development. During the pre-party period (1788-1795) individual nominations were widespread without clear efforts to coordinate nominations. Elites would begin associating with one another during this period, but not for the express concern for candidate nomination or even electoral politics. From 1796 through 1816 individual nominations continued to be the main way a potential candidate was presented to a constituency for state and national legislative office. Through self-nomination or nomination by an anonymous group or individual, potential candidates were presented to constituents in relatively the same way but with partisan labels and rhetoric connected to

them. During the second stage informal coordination efforts likely operated in the background across the state, local Democratic-Republican elites, who would gather and nominate candidates. They would then present these nominations to the press either through anonymous individual nominations or by telling their preferred candidate of their support and having the individual present themselves to the constituency via self-nomination.

Both parties in South Carolina originated in associations prior to 1796. John Wolfe, in his book on South Carolina politics during this period, remarked that there were signs of interest groupings as early as 1792, but it was not until the French Revolution and the Jay Treaty that the formation of two distinct groups occurred.¹⁴ The overarching divide in South Carolina society, that between the low country and the back country, was the foundation for the partisan divide which followed. Democratic-Republican support came from the rural, increasingly populated back country while Federalist support came from the coastal, merchant dominated low country.¹⁵ Lisle A. Rose argued that it was “those who supported national policies, rather than opposed them” who created the first outlines of partisan politics in the South and within South Carolina this was done through the Society of Cincinnati.¹⁶ Similarly, the first hints of association of an opposition interest came from the organization of Democratic Societies in South Carolina in 1794.¹⁷ By 1796, one could clearly connect a member of Congress from South Carolina with one of the two political parties.

Between 1788 and 1800, potential candidates in South Carolina continued to operate within the custom of self-nomination or nomination by friends for state and national legislative elections. In the first congressional election in 1788 a list of all the

potential candidates was published in the newspaper.¹⁸ William Loughton Smith's *de facto* campaign manager, David Campbell, announced Smith's candidacy for Congress in September 1794 with a letter in the newspaper followed by other articles that defended his actions during the previous legislative session.¹⁹ Individual nominations continued in the Charleston congressional district as party divisions formed between 1796 and 1800.²⁰ In 1800, Robert Simons announced his candidacy for the upcoming congressional election in the newspaper.²¹ The use of individual nominations was also true of candidate emergence for both chambers of the state legislature with anonymous articles presenting slightly different lists of candidates for the general assembly and state senate right up to the day of election.²² One anonymous author even mentioned in 1796 how it had become "the fashion to present the public with new lists" of candidates before each election.²³ Non Nemo described candidate emergence in 1800 as dominated by self-nominations and anonymous nomination by one's friends.²⁴

The first use of a party label I found appeared in 1798 when the anonymous author supported their list of candidates saying they were all "men of talents, firmness and federalism."²⁵ In the same newspaper, another anonymous article by An Elector attacked state legislative incumbents who used their positions to "find favor in the eyes of the federal government" and then presented their own list of candidates for the general assembly to replace them.²⁶ By 1800, an anonymous article claimed that nomination decisions for the general assembly and state senate were completely motivated by partisanship in direct connection to whom potential candidates were most likely to support when selecting presidential electors.²⁷ In the Federalist leaning *South-Carolina State-Gazette* two tickets for the general assembly, state senate, and congressional elections in 1800 for Charleston

were labeled as the “*Federal Ticket*” and “*Mr. C. P. ’s Ticket*,” the latter was in reference to the most prominent Democratic-Republican in South Carolina, Charles Pinckney.²⁸

The Federalist Party in South Carolina relied upon an informal party apparatus, instead of an external party organization, to structure candidate emergence and its existence is important for understanding party development in the South. As I stated above, previous scholarship points to the lack of any statewide popular election in South Carolina to explain the absence of any formal party organization in the state. I argue political culture also played an important role. The strength of the South’s deferential political culture, particularly in South Carolina, can explain why those interested in electoral politics relied upon an informal party apparatus, private correspondence between localized elites, when they coordinated candidate nomination. If local elites were the only individuals suited for political office, they were also the only persons necessary to coordinate with when trying to structure candidate emergence. McCormick used the lack of an external party organization to exclude South Carolina in his book on the development of the second party era.²⁹ However, it is inaccurate to assume that no coordination efforts occurred that were important for future party development. The informal party apparatus created by the Federalists is simply another way to structure candidate emergence and important to understand when considering questions on party development during the first party era.

The informal party apparatus of the Federalists was a continuation of deferential political practices of the colonial period. Low country elites, who led the Federalist Party, were bound to the new government and worked to support it.³⁰ This same group was connected by membership in the Society of Cincinnati in Charleston.³¹ As early as 1796, these elites structured candidate emergence through personal correspondence.³² Letters

from Federalists in Charleston to copartisan elites across the state instructed the recipients to run for state legislative office and use their local influence to encourage turnout in 1800.³³ Personal correspondence from leading Federalist in Charleston to copartisans across South Carolina constituted an informal party organization from 1796 to 1800 that structured candidate emergence.

It is possible that Charleston Federalists used the quarterly Society of Cincinnati meetings to organize for state and national legislative elections when they dominated the association. Every election year between 1792 and 1806, the final quarterly meeting of the society was on the first day of the election.³⁴ In South Carolina, they opened the polls for two days that allowed for rural individuals to make the trek to their polling place. I suggest that Federalists used the Society of Cincinnati November quarterly meeting on the first day of election to ensure that their members were present in the city to vote for their agreed upon candidates and to aid in voter turnout efforts. There is good reason to believe the members used the organization to further their political aims. An anonymous article in 1794 attacked the society for being political wherein it described how the group used their rites to pursue their interests and specific political measures.³⁵ Further, on two different occasions the Society of Cincinnati Fourth of July celebration was clearly used as a Federalist political event when the Federalist congressional incumbent, William Loughton Smith, gave the oration in 1796 and when Keating Lewis's oration in 1806 praised Washington and Hamilton while it also attacked the French.³⁶

There is evidence beyond Charleston that individual nominations created by the candidate themselves or a small group of local elites continued to dominate the candidate emergence process throughout the rest of the period for both parties. An extract of a letter

published in 1798 described the chances of Democratic-Republican candidates in three congressional districts and inaccurately commented “[i]n the other districts, as far as respects the election of republican members, there is little to doubt of a favorable result.”³⁷ John Rutledge nominated himself for another term in Congress in 1800 within his circular letter to constituents back in Orangeburgh and Beaufort Counties.³⁸ Another candidate was “brought forward by the republican interest” of Beaufort and Orangeburgh Counties and competed against Rutledge in the congressional election.³⁹ Local elites early in on South Carolina connected themselves to one of the two partisan groups either presented themselves or their friends for state and national legislative elections.

The political culture of deference shone through even in these individual nominations and articles that discussed candidate emergence outside of Charleston. One author argued it should be assumed that a sitting member of the legislature was automatically a candidate again unless they explicitly declined reelection as a clear sign of deference to the elite in office.⁴⁰ Another anonymous author described how the process of candidate emergence in the Camden congressional district began with a group of individuals who encouraged a potential candidate to run for office and then the potential candidate wrote his friends so they could spread word of his candidacy, “a measure indispensably necessary in the case of a man declaring himself a candidate for the first time.”⁴¹

While scholars have considered the lack of a two-party system in South Carolina axiomatic, there good reason to question this argument from my data on candidate emergence. First, many of the individual nominations included a partisan label. Further, announcements in the press clearly connected state legislative elections to the partisan

divide. At the Beaufort District Fourth of July celebration in 1808, the Euhaw Republican Light Infantry gathered and supported multiple resolutions which included “That we do approve of Mr. Madison for our next President, and are determined to support Representatives at our next election favorable to him.”⁴² An anonymous article to the electors of Pendleton District that same year railed against the rampant partisanship displayed in state and national legislative elections since 1800 when they wrote:

“call to your recollection to the representation of this district eight or ten years since; when the public mind was tranquil, and not agitated by Electioneering intrigues; when each man voted according to the dictates of his own mind; unbiased by threats or solicitations; and when each candidate depended on real merit for his success. View now the contrast! The public mind agitated; tossed to and fro by malicious reports; promises are made without intention of ability to perform; your vanities are flattered, and your prejudices and passions kept on the wing . . . Are thee . . . worthy of the name of Republicans?”⁴³

Lastly, William R. Theus nominated himself for the general assembly in the Clermont and Sumter District and the only information included to support this announcement was the fact that his politics “have uniformly been republican.”⁴⁴

When the Federalist Party receded from electoral politics following the election of 1800 the Democratic-Republican Party dominated legislative elections across most of the state. The lack of newspapers across the state limits my ability to speak on candidate emergence for the back country, but there is good reason to believe that local partisan elites maintained their hold on politics and nominations without the development of nomination procedures. From the data I have, it appears individual nominations, self-nominations and anonymous nominations, continued to structure candidate emergence in most of South Carolina for state legislative and congressional elections from 1802 through 1816.⁴⁵

Candidate Emergence in a Large Town: Federalists and Democratic-Republicans in Charleston

From here on I will focus on the development of candidate emergence in Charleston. As I stated above, I am limited in my ability to speak more precisely on candidate emergence of the back country. Nonetheless, I have shown there is good reason to believe candidate emergence was only loosely structured throughout the period with self-nominations or nominations by small groups. Despite this limitation, an in-depth analysis of South Carolina's leading city is valuable for understanding the development of political parties in the state and for larger comparative reasons. Charleston sent upwards of fifteen members to the general assembly during the period, and it remained a sizable portion of the chamber even after reapportionment in 1808. It is considered as one of the most politically organized cities in the entire South after 1800.⁴⁶ Further, understanding the development of candidate emergence in Charleston allows me to compare the trajectories of leading cities across all four case studies. Below, I will demonstrate how the political culture of deference explains the procedures in place for both parties between 1802 and 1806, that candidate nomination was not done in a vacuum during the period, and that renewed electoral competition after 1808 helps explain developments in candidate emergence.

Central to understanding the development of candidate emergence in Charleston is the knowledge that there were between 1803 and 1816 three dominant newspapers, each with a pronounced partisan orientation. The *Charleston Courier* began printing in 1803 as a Federalist newspaper to rouse the party and it can be considered as central to the continuation of Federalist Party politics through the period.⁴⁷ Already in circulation for the Democratic-Republicans was the *City Gazette* which would then be supplemented by the

printing of the *Investigator* in August 1812 through February 1814.⁴⁸ These presses were central for the distribution of information on candidate emergence and sometimes its structure.

The creation of a multitude of individual nominations, with lists of candidates sometimes only slightly different from the last, made the *Courier* the main venue for Federalist candidate emergence. This practice would lead to more candidates being proposed than seats up for election and the use of quite a bit of space in the newspaper to publish the information. The editor of the Federalist press quickly began encouraging the readership to support Federalist candidates and measures within the first couple months of its publication.⁴⁹ By 1806, he made it clear he was against the practice of list making claiming that “[w]riting out lists of competent persons for legislative duty is not the way to ensure the election of good and able Representatives” and instead the people should focus on turning in large numbers at the election itself.⁵⁰ Who should nominate candidates then? It appears the editor believed it should be the Federalist elite of Charleston who through informal gatherings would decide upon a ticket, solicit the potential candidates ascent to the nomination if their wishes were unknown, and the editor would publish this ticket alone in the *Charleston Courier*. The idea that a small group of Federalist elites controlled the nomination of legislative positions in Charleston actually dates back to 1798 when an anonymous author described sarcastically how nominations were controlled by an “enlightened few” in the city.⁵¹ From 1806 through 1816 the editor of the single Federalist paper in Charleston used his position to act as the gatekeeper of Federalist candidate emergence and only gave space in the paper for the ticket agreed upon by the Federalist elite.

After writing against the practice of printing numerous uncoordinated independent nominations the editor began to take agency in the candidate emergence process. First, he took all anonymous lists sent to the paper and consolidated them into a single list of thirty-three individuals named as candidates for fifteen seats in the general assembly excluding those who had publicly declined to run.⁵² The editor did not publish each proposed combination of names and actively excluded individuals despite their presence on an anonymous list because they had declined to run. Then, just four days before the general election, the editor published an explanation for an abrupt change in congressional candidacy with James Lowndes dropping out and William Loughton Smith announcing his candidacy. This provides evidence of a coordinated Federalist elite behind the change as well as a Federalist ticket for all state legislative elections. The editor described how Smith was solicited by “many of his fellow-citizens” to be a candidate for Congress and once he did James Lowndes dropped out of the election. Next to this description of events by the editor is a list of candidates for the general assembly, state senate, and Congress with Smith as the congressional candidate whom the editor was informed would receive the “support of a very considerable number of voters.”⁵³ Just two days later the editor published the same list with a heading which read “Federal Republican ticket” and two days after that the editor printed a full-page advertisement comparing the “Washington Republican Candidate” to the “Democratic Candidate,” which, as to be expected, painted a better picture of the former.⁵⁴ I argue the information on the change in congressional candidacy and the presentation of a single list for the state legislative elections came from an informal gathering of elite Federalists that nominated these candidates and the editor of the Courier agreed to act as a gatekeeper to candidate emergence by only publishing their ticket.

There is evidence that this pattern became solidified with the return of electoral competition in 1808. In the announcement of James Lowndes's candidacy for Congress in the *Courier* the editor noted he was "requested by several of the Electors of the district" to publish the nomination.⁵⁵ The Democratic-Republican *City Gazette* also noted how it was "a part of the federalists, who . . . brought forward Mr. Lowndes" as a congressional candidate when correcting an article from a New York press that inaccurately labeled Lowndes and Smith as both Federalist candidates for Congress.⁵⁶ The editor of the *Courier* would also work to make it clear that there was only one official Federalist candidate for Congress writing "The Editors of the *Courier* are requested to state, that THOMAS LOWNDES, Esq. Is the only candidate who will be supported by the Federal Republicans."⁵⁷ The only ticket published by the paper for the 1808 state and national legislative elections was submitted with a long opening address stating that it was "THE Federal Republicans" which created the ticket and it only included those who were "in their politicks Federal Republicans" and "attached to the election of Gen. PINCKNEY."⁵⁸

After the loss in 1808, the Federalists in Charleston would return in 1812 with renewed coordination efforts. They attempted to incorporate ordinary citizens into their nomination procedures with ward meetings and a delegate convention. Before this, the Federalists had not engaged in the 1810 elections. The editor of the *Courier* noted that "The Federalists neither held caucuses, nor formed a ticket for the election" that year.⁵⁹ This provides weight to the argument that a small group of Federalists would meet together to nominate candidates thus creating the sole ticket published in the newspaper. With a renewed partisan division over foreign policy in 1812 there is evidence that the Federalists held ward meetings in Charleston who nominated candidates for the general assembly,

state senate, and Congress. A month after the election, A Republican Planter published a description of the Federalist nomination procedures in Charleston and a copy of a Federalist circular letter so as to compare it with the Democratic-Republican procedures. The circular described how a convention of Federalist delegates from the various wards in Charleston met and nominated John Rutledge for Congress on September 24, 1812.⁶⁰ The existence of these ward delegates it supported in an anonymous article in the Federalist press that called for a “meeting of the Federal Delegates from the different wards” to decide how to investigate Democratic-Republican election interference.⁶¹ Further, the announcement that John Rutledge was a candidate for Congress did not appear in the Courier until September 26, 1812, two days after the Federalist delegate convention suggesting the editor received a copy of the circular letter himself and used it to publish his announcement.⁶² While the circular letter says nothing about the state legislative elections, there was only one list printed in the Courier for nine consecutive days until the day of election offered by “THE FRIENDS Of Union, Commerce, and honorable Peace.”⁶³

The boon in popular incorporation of the Federalist electorate into nomination procedures did not continue. In 1814 there is no mention of any ward meetings or delegate conventions. It appears there was a reversion to the Federalist elite simply nominating candidates for the state legislature and Congress while having their nominations alone published in the Courier before the election.⁶⁴ According to election returns, the apparent reversion in nomination procedures did not hinder their coordination efforts with the all of the Federalist general assembly candidates in the ticket receiving between eight hundred and thirty-three and seven hundred and seven votes each and the Democratic-Republicans winning with a twenty percent margin of victory. Then in 1816 the Federalists failed to

engage in electoral politics. Even though the Federalist paper published congressional candidacy information for nine of the ten congressional districts in mid-September and announced the candidacy of a leading Federalist for Congress just over a week before the election, the editor refused to publish an anonymous article critiquing the Democratic-Republican nomination procedures stating they had decided not to publish electioneering articles.⁶⁵

Coordination efforts by Democratic-Republicans in Charleston looked exactly the same as the Federalists early on. While numerous independent nominations filled the pages of the *City Gazette*, with various lists for the general assembly especially, there were multiple hints at a small group of elites coordinating in the background to nominate candidates for state and national legislative office. A Correspondent, responding to a Democratic-Republican slanted article critiquing a Federalist candidate's private life, wrote how the "Federalists will always be ready to meet the Democrats on this ground" and goes on to suggest that the private life of the "leaders of parties who recommend support, or who oppose and reject candidates" for upcoming elections should be thoroughly vetted as well since "the opinions of influential men often guide the public mind in the selection of candidates."⁶⁶ The author argues deferential politics was alive and well within the ranks of the Democratic-Republicans and resulted in a small group of partisan elites wielding the power of nomination for the party. Further, there were also claims that the group worked closely with the *City Gazette* to control nominations.⁶⁷ That next year during a special election for a vacancy in the city's representation in the state legislature's lower chamber, there was mention of a caucus that "consisted of certain gentlemen, who dining together, fell into a discourse on politics; the approaching election naturally became a topic,

and they agreed to support colonel Alston as a candidate.”⁶⁸ Democratic-Republican Party leaders gathered in similar informal meetings where they decided on party nominations.

While the appearance of coordination behind closed doors by the Democratic-Republicans in Charleston was enough to ensure electoral victories for state and national legislative elections after 1800, the presidential election cycle in 1808 is an important shift in candidate emergence and nomination decisions to the public-sphere. Between 1808 and 1816, the Democratic-Republicans in Charleston organized what might be the earliest combination of a delegate convention with ordinary citizens engaging in something akin to a closed party primary in the United States to nominate candidates for state legislative and congressional elections. While elite influence was still apparent in the organization of these closed party primaries in Charleston, the inclusion of those at the grassroots is meaningful for two reasons. First, ordinary citizens were now invited to gather and hear speeches connecting issues and policies to electoral politics. This transference of information increased the capabilities of ordinary citizens to engage in politics and think more critically about electoral politics in general. Second, votes by those at the grassroots level determined party nominations. After 1808, Democratic-Republicans in Charleston took what their copartisans were doing in Philadelphia and went one step further with the use of a closed party primary to provide even greater legitimacy to their party nomination procedures.

The uncertainty surrounding the presidential election of 1808 motivated Democratic-Republican party leaders in Charleston to create a formal, public organization that mobilized ordinary citizens to nominate candidates for Congress, the state senate, and state assembly. As in 1800, contemporary politicians and party organizers thought South

Carolina would be a key battleground state to determine Jefferson's successor. The uncertainty surrounding the election was greater than we might expect, since few histories cover the 1808 presidential election. Newspapers in South Carolina presented the election as an important turning point in American history because it embodied the best chance the Federalist Party had at regaining the presidency. With the eminent South Carolina native Charles C. Pinckney at the head of the Federalist presidential ticket, South Carolina could swing back to the Federalists and, in their minds, give the Federalists a slight majority in the Electoral College.

To provide party unity and coordination at the ballot box, Democratic-Republicans in Charleston organized party ward meetings shortly before the election. These ward meetings selected delegates to represent them at a city convention and sent along a list of nominations. The official ticket was created at the city delegate convention on October 1, 1808.⁶⁹ The meeting did not appear to have made any meaningful decision when it came to nominations for Congress. Back in July, *A Carolinian* mentioned that the Democratic-Republican congressional incumbent, Robert Marion, for the Charleston District had "consented to serve again if elected."⁷⁰ In early September, *A Voter* reminded the Charleston electorate that Marion was seeking reelection to Congress.⁷¹ When the ticket was published by the city delegate convention Marion was the party's candidate.

The real coordination effort of the new organization appears entirely focused on the election of members for the state legislature from a desire to see James Madison win the presidential election. In South Carolina, presidential electors were selected by the state legislature until after the Civil War. Legislative selection of electors meant party majorities in the state lower and upper chambers mattered even more during presidential election

years. In an address to Democratic-Republicans in Charleston to accompany the official party nominations, the delegates framed the state legislative election according to the presidential competition and national politics. The address began by connecting the election of state legislators to the selection “of men who are to choose the Chief Magistrate of the union” and ends making the connection abundantly clear writing a vote for the “republican ticket . . . will ensure you the election of the tried, wise, honest and equalled [sic] JAMES MADISON.”⁷² There was no discussion of individual state legislative candidates, their virtues or politics. Rather, they were to be supported because their election would bring about the selection of presidential electors who would vote for a Democratic-Republican candidate.

A line from the address gives the best hint at what the nomination process looked like and why only nominations for the lower chamber were necessary for party coordination. The delegates write that the wards “furnished to us more names than the number of Representatives this city is entitled to send to the House of Representatives” and because of this excess the delegates using their own judgment were “obliged to leave the names of some very respectable citizens off the ticket.”⁷³ Charleston elected fifteen members to the lower chamber. This provided the city a bit of leverage in the state legislature—the chamber had one hundred and twenty-four members—especially when considering the selection of presidential electors. It appears, that the lists from each ward meeting did not include the same fifteen men requiring a nomination by the city delegate convention to ensure an efficient number of candidates were supported. Party discipline was required to keep the electorate in Charleston focused on the official Democratic-Republican ticket in 1808. The delegates communicated such expectations mentioning in

their address that the prospective candidates who did not earn a nomination would “support the ticket with the same cheerfulness as if they were named.”⁷⁴ In the following week, prospective candidates appeared to publicly abide by such wishes with announcements in the newspaper that they were no longer candidates for the state senate or house of representatives.⁷⁵ According to election returns, only the candidates from the party ticket received votes and they won every lower chamber seat and the state senate seat for Charleston. Therefore, the new party organization of ward meetings leading to a city delegate convention that nominated candidates was able to successfully coordinate the Democratic-Republican electorate around a limited number of candidates.

Without the presidential election to spur party organizers to greater organization of legislative nominations in 1810 it was doubted whether such procedures would be resorted to again. A Voter towards the end of September wrote a brief defense of the ward meetings in 1808 claiming they “were the cause of the great unanimity which prevailed amongst the republicans then” and that if there was the possibility of a division of the party in the upcoming elections then “they will again be resorted to.”⁷⁶ In early October, right before the election, ward meetings were held and an official nomination was announced by the city delegate convention. There was an important difference in the nomination procedure in 1810; the power of nomination was shifted to the grassroots level with the organization of something akin to a closed party primary.

In the lead up to the ward meetings, multiple lists appeared in the newspaper nominating various candidates for the state legislative lower chamber and two competing candidates for the state senate.⁷⁷ For the fifteen lower chamber seats up for election there were roughly thirty potential candidates from these lists. Therefore, the Democratic-

Republicans did in fact appear divided in the lead up to the 1810 election cycle. Ward meetings were announced for October 4, 1810, and just two days later the official ticket appeared in the newspaper.⁷⁸

An address from the city delegates of Charleston describes the nomination procedure providing evidence that the Democratic-Republicans held what could be considered as a forerunner to the closed party primary in 1810. The delegates described how they created the ticket using the “returns made to them” by the various ward meetings. To determine the nominees for Congress “the Delegates had scarcely any thing [sic] more to do than to collect the different returns” and that the congressional nomination was almost unanimous. When “summing up the different returns” for state senate and the lower chamber, candidates likewise received clear majorities which “required no interference of the Delegates.”⁷⁹ Nominations were made according to the votes of ordinary citizens who attended the ward meetings. The city delegates were only charged with receiving these returns and presenting the winners. Their emphasis on majorities, hints that there was a majority threshold requirement for earning the party nomination and the delegates had the power to nominate if no candidate earned a majority.

Party discipline was again necessary to ensure successful coordination around the official party nominees. An article by Aristides called for those prospective candidates who did not earn a nomination to support the ticket whole-heartedly.⁸⁰ One such hopeful, Jacob Belser, made an announcement in the newspaper that since his name did not appear on the official ticket he was no longer a candidate for the state assembly.⁸¹ This did not prevent some individuals from publishing their own tickets for the upper and lower chamber

different from the official party nominations.⁸² Despite their appearance, each candidate on the official party ballot won their respective elections.

Nominations in 1812 for Democratic-Republicans were more complicated and provide more of a window into the process. In the lead up to an official nomination, three rounds of ward meetings occurred in Charleston, two official tickets were published, and a breakdown in party discipline threatened Democratic-Republican unity at the ballot box. Party organizers attempted to mobilize the party electorate much sooner, announcing ward meeting a little over a month before the election in mid-October. A resurgence of Federalists after the declaration of War in June 1812 and the presence of Democratic-Republicans unfaithful to Madison put pressure on the Democratic-Republican party in Charleston to maintain party unity. Ward meeting were first called for August 25, 1812, and this time there appeared to be a clear attempt by party organizers to influence balloting at the ward level. In the first announcement it was mentioned that those who attend without “printed tickets . . . shall be furnished” with one.⁸³ In the second announcement a proposed ticket preceded the information on the location for the various meetings.⁸⁴ A later article mentioned how printed tickets were provided at the ward meetings and that this had occurred in ward meetings in prior years.⁸⁵ However, these ward meeting were essentially postponed upon convening because they were overrun with Quids, conservative leaning Democratic-Republicans who were generally against re-electing Madison and supported DeWitt Clinton.⁸⁶

Before the second round of ward meetings the editor of the *City Gazette* published a full list of all the prospective Democratic-Republican candidates for the lower chamber. The editor remarked that the list of twenty-six names should enable the citizens to create

their own ticket of sixteen names for the ward meetings.⁸⁷ The editor updated this list in the following two papers as individuals announced they were either no longer candidates or never wanted to be considered.⁸⁸ The *Investigator* published another ticket before the second round of ward meetings with five of the sixteen names replaced with new prospective candidates.⁸⁹ The ward delegates attempted to meet at least twice in mid-September before producing an official party ticket that was published on September 21, 1812.⁹⁰ The address by the delegates again described a process of determining which prospective candidates received a majority of votes by the ward meetings to craft the official nomination.

This ticket was quickly criticized because of a lack of attendance at the ward meetings. Before the official party ticket made it to print, an article by Many Citizens described how “scarcely one fifth of the republican party of Charleston attended” the ward meetings.⁹¹ A Republican Soldier expressed dissatisfaction with the ward meetings as well, criticizing how early they were held and that this sentiment was “universally expressed by the Charleston quota of militia.”⁹² After the death of one of the lower chamber nominees and another declining his lower chamber nomination a third round of ward meetings were called for October 5, 1812.⁹³ The announcement encouraged Democratic-Republicans of Charleston to attend to “harmonize and amalgamate the Republican interests in the city and its vicinity.”⁹⁴

The final round of ward meetings proved to be the most controversial of all. Roughly thirty names appeared in editor lists of prospective candidates for the Democratic-Republican lower chamber ticket that could only include sixteen names.⁹⁵ When presenting the lower chamber list of sixteen candidates, the delegates mentioned that the order they

appear on the party ticket is emblematic of their vote returns writing, “[w]e have placed them in that order which they stand in your regard.”⁹⁶ However, the new Democratic-Republican ticket did more than just fill the lower chamber two vacancies, two additional candidates on the first ticket were dropped from the party ballot, providing a glimpse into the factional divide in the party.

There were those after the official nomination that followed the precedent of party discipline and announced the end of their candidacies. Eight candidates communicated through the *City Gazette* after the publication of the official nomination an end to their candidacy for the state legislature.⁹⁷ One candidate mentioned that they were ending their candidacy because they did not receive the support of the ward meetings.⁹⁸ The Democratic-Republican Party in Charleston did more than rely upon precedent to enforce party discipline upon prospective candidates to honor the ward meeting nominations by distributing and having each of them sign a pledge that if they “NOT BE RETURNED on the Republican Ticket, we will also PUBLICKLY [sic] DECLINE being candidates at the ensuing Election.”⁹⁹ The institutionalization of party discipline with this pledge would be immediately strained by the factional divide in the Democratic-Republican Party and the two candidates whose names were removed from the official list.

According to one author the divide in the Democratic-Republican Party in Charleston came down to a local split on an issue of patronage and ethnicity. Those behind an article signed People, had to turn to the leading Federalist newspaper to publish their article describing the circumstances behind Benjamin A. Markley and John Horlbeck being left off the party list despite being returned in the second round of ward meetings. They claimed most of the electorate were under the impression that they were only meeting to

fill the vacancies and not to create a new ticket and therefore “thought their attendance unnecessary.”¹⁰⁰ They then claimed that a group of party elites determined at an “Electioneering Dinner Party” that they would use the third round of ward meetings to remove these two men from the party ticket because they represented the German interest in Charleston and were in favor of retaining the “present worthy Comptroller in office,” which is appointed by the state legislature.¹⁰¹ This description of the third ward meetings demonstrates the lack of clarity that still existed in nomination procedures that allowed for the possible manipulation by party elites.

Another author came to the defense of the third round of ward meetings rejecting claims of elite control and argued that they were more representative of party sentiment. An author using the pseudonym Detector mentioned that the latest round of ward meetings was more representative than the preceding rounds using information on the number of votes received by the highest vote earner in each. They claimed there were roughly fifteen hundred Democratic-Republicans in Charleston. Of this number, the highest vote total for a single candidate was two hundred and ninety-five in the second round and four hundred and sixty-six in the third round of ward meetings. Therefore, “the republican sentiment could not have been ascertained at the [second] Ward meetings.”¹⁰² The author continued, arguing that no elite pressure could have been exerted on the process because it was a republican process and the attacks on the recent ward meetings were solely attempt to cause the “disunion of the republican party of this community.”¹⁰³ The nomination process was not an elite ruse to remove specific men from the ticket, but a more accurate expression of the Democratic-Republican electorate.

Despite attempts by the Quids and Federalists to use this division for their own advantage, party discipline within the Democratic-Republican electorate held firm. A “Union Ticket” was created in an attempt to divide the Democratic-Republican party enough to give the group enough votes to place one or two of their own candidates in office in the state assembly.¹⁰⁴ An article signed Truth rebuked Horlbeck and Markley for allowing their names on the ticket and called on Germans and mechanics to vote for the official Democratic-Republican ticket.¹⁰⁵ One anonymous article even offered a reward of five hundred dollars for evidence against individuals that were creating counterfeit Democratic-Republican tickets that listed Horlbeck and Markley instead of the official nomination list.¹⁰⁶ In the end, all of the candidates on the Democratic-Republican ticket won election to the lower chamber proving, as one editor notes, “the utility of WARD MEETING and the majority who compose them.”¹⁰⁷ A special election for a vacancy to the state lower chamber in 1813 demonstrates the continuity of the ward delegate position and their power, or lack thereof, in party nomination politics. Thomas Lehre became the Commissioner of Loans for the United States in South Carolina and resigned his seat in the state assembly in August 1813. Democratic-Republicans turned to ward meetings to coordinate for the election to ensure the electorate backed only one candidate. The announcement made it clear that the ward delegates themselves act as a committee and called for new ward meetings. The “[d]elegates from the different wards met at Reilly’s agreeably to notice when” it was agreed to call “ward meetings . . . on Friday next, the 3d September, at eight o’clock, for the purpose of fixing on a republican candidate for the Legislature in the place of Col. Lehre.”¹⁰⁸ The ward meetings were to decide between two potential candidates: Caleb Ellis and John J. Bulow.

A pseudonymous author presents one possible reading of the intra-party politics at play before the special election. The pseudonymous author A Republican supported Elliot for the position because he was willing to withdraw his candidacy if not nominated by the ward meetings.¹⁰⁹ He then attacked Bulow for being a quid and for refusing to submit himself to the nomination procedure and to “run at all hazards.”¹¹⁰ The power and legitimacy of the Democratic-Republican nomination procedure was threatened by Bulow and his supporters in the lead up to the 1813 special election.

It appears the Democratic-Republican ward delegates worked out a solution to this challenge to the party’s power and legitimacy with Charles Elliot before the election. Another meeting of the delegates occurred on September 3, 1813, where they were notified that Elliot was withdrawing his candidacy “in order to avoid a division in the republican ticket.”¹¹¹ Further, the delegates canceled the ward meetings because “in the opinion of the delegates there is no necessity for the republicans to assemble, there being but one republican candidate, viz major J. J. Bulow.”¹¹² An individual or group using the pseudonym Many Republicans praised Elliot, adding that his action “cannot be too highly appreciated by the Republican party” and that there was good reason to believe he would be supported by the party next year.¹¹³ With the cancellation, party organizers and Elliot most likely came to an agreement to protect the legitimacy of party nomination procedures and to provide coordination for the upcoming special election around a single candidate. Despite their efforts, Federalist candidate William Crafts jr. won the special election with a fifty-two percent of the vote.

The challenge to the legitimacy of the nomination procedures during the special election in 1813 did not hinder their continued use. Just as in 1812, newspapers published

lists of prospective candidates for Congress, state senate, and state assembly. According to the first list in the *City Gazette* there were two prospective candidates each for one seat in Congress and one seat in the state legislative upper chamber as well as thirty-one prospective candidates for the sixteen seats in the lower chamber.¹¹⁴ The lower chamber list was altered as the paper received updated information on candidates declining or some making their candidacy known with the final list including twenty-six names.¹¹⁵ As part of this process, the editors of the *City Gazette* demonstrated the power they wielded in nomination politics. While they generally published all candidacy announcements, they received without any indication of whom the information came from, whether it was a self-nomination or a nomination by the prospective candidate's friends, they would not publish anonymous nominations.¹¹⁶ As I have already described, the nomination process was fertile ground for partisan manipulation. This measure was one way to ensure that Federalists were not putting forward an individual's name as a candidate only to split the Democratic-Republican electorate.

With more prospective candidates than seats up for election in all the upcoming legislative elections one pseudonymous author argued that ward meetings should be held to nominate candidates. Conciliator understood that if the Democratic-Republicans did not narrow down the number of candidates that the Federalists would win the upcoming elections. The solution, understood by "[e]very reasonable and reflecting man" was ward meetings.¹¹⁷ The author argued that this nomination method was the reason for the "Republican ascendancy in Charleston . . . And it is the only method, where so many candidates offer, to continue that ascendancy."¹¹⁸ Further, any candidate who did not abide by the official nominations would be treated with "neglect and contempt by their fellow-

citizens” as they claimed had occurred “on former occasions.”¹¹⁹ The author presented nomination procedures in Charleston as both legitimate and highly effective in organizing the Democratic-Republican electorate.

Ward meetings were held in 1816 and once again placed the power of nomination in the hands of ordinary Charleston citizens. Ward meetings were called for September 26, 1816, between six and ten in the evening to nominate for Congress, state senate, and state assembly.¹²⁰ Before this time one subsection of the city, Charleston Neck, held a local general meeting on September 25, 1816, and agreed upon three men to support for the lower chamber and published their names in an effort to ensure their area within Charleston was represented in the sixteen person delegation.¹²¹ The official party list appeared on September 28, 1816, and highlighted how the nominations came from “[t]he citizens of Charleston and the Neck assembled in their respective Wards . . . for the purpose of selecting by ballot from the general list that had been published” and that the following list, “on counting the votes, were found to have been returned.”¹²²

Despite the description of *Conciliator* on the strength of party discipline before the ward meetings, more than one candidate made it clear they were not going to conform to the decision of ward meetings and would continue their candidacy. A few days after the publication of the official nominations, it was announced that Joseph Kirkland was still a candidate for the state senate and that he “previous to the ward meetings” made it clear “he would not abide by their decision.”¹²³ Friends of Daniel Ravenel announced that he “refused to bind himself” to the decision of the ward meetings and would continue his candidacy for the lower chamber.¹²⁴ Party unity was in serious danger in the election of a state senator and the full party list for the lower chamber.

In an attempt to control the fallout of prospective candidates blatantly disavowing party discipline, the ward delegates published an address to the Democratic-Republican electorate in Charleston. They argued that the nomination procedure was a “legitimate means to secure the union, and consequently, perpetuate the sway and influence of the Republican party, in the councils of the country.”¹²⁵ Prospective candidates and their supporters should “bury the feuds that threatened to divide you” and should come together to ensure that “unanimity” for “those who are attached to the Republican councils of your country.”¹²⁶ The plea for party unity by the party organizers did not translate into perfect party discipline at the polls. One candidate not on the official ballot, Daniel Ravenel, was elected to the lower chamber earning more votes than William Lance who was on the official party ticket.

In Charleston candidate emergence developed along a different path than the rest of the state. The continued presence of Federalists the potential electoral competition they posed beginning in 1808 led to the creation of nomination procedures by both parties that incorporated ordinary citizens like never before seen in South Carolina. The Federalists held general meetings that incorporated citizens into the nomination process to a more limited degree than their opponents. Democratic-Republicans created nomination procedures that placed the power of nomination in the hands of the people through a process akin to the closed party primary. Both groups created relatively durable organizations for the nomination of candidates between 1808 and 1816.

Party Politics in South Carolina and the Nation

Nomination procedures did not occur in a political vacuum in the South. While there is a general sense of isolation and separation when considering Southern States during the early

republic, party politics were considered on a national scale. Information on nomination procedures was shared among the states through the partisan press. Again, it is helpful to think of the partisan press as national organizations of the two political parties in the way they created “political linkages among different regions of the country and levels of government.”¹²⁷ This was true for South Carolina, and it is integral for understanding the development of nomination procedures in the period between 1808 and 1816.

The Charleston based *City Gazette* reprinted information on nomination procedures from Pennsylvania early on. Among news from that state there was an article on the process of selecting conferees for the nomination of congressional candidates in 1792 when they were elected in a statewide general election.¹²⁸ A few years later, the paper reprinted the announcement of a Federalist general meeting in Allegheny County that nominated a candidate for Congress.¹²⁹ Most likely, the editor had taken advantage of the fact that editors could send each other newspapers without paying postage and took this information from the major Pennsylvania presses they subscribed to.

The ability of Democratic-Republican and Federalist editors, as well as party leaders who were likely subscribers to major partisan presses in other states, to access this network meant it is reasonable to assume they continued to consume information on nomination procedures organized by copartisans in other states throughout the period. This would help explain the development of nomination procedures in Charleston between 1808 and 1816. Local party organizers learned from copartisans in other states how to successfully structure the candidate emergence process for the proper selection of potential candidates and the coordination of their partisan electorate around these candidates. In the lead up to the competitive election of 1808, an article signed A Voter called on Federalists

to organize their nomination procedures like those in New York with the organization of “ward meetings by public advertisement” that would then nominate candidates, mobilize the electorate, and ensure the continuation of the organization to structure nominations into the future.¹³⁰ They called for an end to waiting to nominate candidates until shortly before the election each year. The author connected Charleston to the nation writing, “[t]he election of a Member of Congress from every commercial city, is an object of too much importance to be left to chance. Adequate exertions should be used to ensure success” of “a Federal Candidate” in the “important commercial city of Charleston.”¹³¹ Federalists were informed and drew inspiration from their copartisans in the mid-Atlantic when discussing nomination procedures.

This was also true of the Democratic-Republicans in Charleston. After adopting a similar nomination procedure to other metropolises in 1808, it was made clear the party understood themselves in relation to their copartisans to the north. Before the election of 1812, the pseudonymous author Republican warned against the danger of intra-party factionalism and referenced this problem for their copartisans in Philadelphia and New York at the time.¹³² During the party’s organizational struggles that same year, Detector mentioned in their defense of the nomination procedures that its legitimacy came in part from the fact that “the precedent was formed in the cities of Philadelphia and New York,” specifically having “ward meetings called, and a ticket formed for members of the State Legislature.”¹³³ Democratic-Republicans looked to their copartisans in the mid-Atlantic to inform their own understanding on party procedures and sense of organizational legitimacy. Both parties were clearly influenced by the nomination procedures created by

their copartisans to the north and this point can help explain the introduction of more popularly oriented nomination procedures by both parties after 1808.

Ohio's Developmental Story

The development of candidate emergence in Ohio between 1799 and 1816 was decentralized and clearly influenced by the combination of political cultures of those moving into the state from the mid-Atlantic and South. While nomination procedures developed before Ohio entered the Union in 1803, the decentralized nature of political parties and combination of different political cultures in Ohio led to the coexistence of structured procedures and individual nominations. While both groups implemented nomination procedures to coordinate nominations beginning in 1802, the Federalists exited electoral politics across the state after 1803. Democratic-Republicans used the county delegate conventions and general meetings as their foundational organizations between 1802 and 1809. After 1810, Democratic-Republican factional politics encouraged continued organization of nomination procedures through the creation of electoral competition and the continued necessity of coordination. Individual nominations, even self-nomination, persisted during the entire period, which can in part be explained by their perceived legitimacy through the lens of southern political culture that Virginian immigrants brought with them. By the end of the period, clear nomination procedures structured candidate emergence across most of Ohio that incorporated those at the grassroots-level while individual nominations persisted in areas, sometimes even alongside them.

Pre-Party and Decentralized Party Formation Periods, 1799-1809

The development of candidate emergence began during the territorial days of became the state of Ohio. Between 1799 and 1802, two groups formed over a division on what statehood should look like and these groups also reflected the partisan divide of the nation they were in the process of joining. The Territorial Governor Arthur St. Clair believed that the territory surpassed the population threshold in 1798 and issued a proclamation for the people to elect representatives to a territorial general assembly in 1799. Representatives were elected at the county-level. The territorial government also included legislative council, or upper chamber, but the members were nominated by the general assembly and appointed by the President of the United States, not popularly elected.¹³⁴

For the first few years, there was a lack of any coordination efforts and individual nominations in the newspapers presented a multitude of potential candidates to various constituencies. These included all the same qualities of individual nominations as in other regions, but more so the South because of the presence of clear self-nominations. Hamilton County was home to Cincinnati, the leading town of the territory and where the first territorial legislature would convene. Anonymous authors using pseudonyms like An Elector, A Citizen, and A Farmer presented their own favored candidates to represent the county for the first time.¹³⁵ A Constant Reader the next year mentioned how “communicating ideas thro’ the medium of the press” like pointing “out such characters as an obscure individual might think are likely are to do good to their country” was an “unquestionable right.”¹³⁶ Before presenting their ticket, the pseudonymous author Tom Thumb wrote that “publishing tickets appear[ed] to be the order of the day.”¹³⁷ In Ross

County three different individuals nominated themselves in the newspaper supporting their own candidacies with mentions of their oratory abilities, their opinion on recent political topics, and one pledging to support the happiness of his constituents.¹³⁸ The editor of the *Western Spy*, published in Cincinnati, mentioned after the Hamilton County election in 1800 that thirty-five individuals were nominated through the press during the election cycle for seven open seats.¹³⁹

The pursuit of statehood would alter this pattern and present the first attempts to structure candidate emergence. Ratcliffe sees the pursuit of statehood and the national partisan division going on at the same time as so inherently connected within Ohio that he described the transition as a transference of power from an established Federalist elite to the Democratic-Republicans. The issue came to a head in 1802 when a group of men pursuing statehood “resorted to extra-legal actions sanctioned by public opinion and adopted extra-constitutional organizational devices” like those from the Revolutionary period.¹⁴⁰ Popularly oriented politics came about in Ohio during this time because of intentional efforts by local elites to coordinate candidate nominations and the use of newspapers to transmit partisanship and party information.¹⁴¹

The election cycle of 1802 was an important turning point in the development of candidate emergence. Not only were representatives to the general assembly up for election, but delegates to a constitutional convention were as well. Beginning in March 1802, Democratic-Republicans in Cincinnati organized a Republican Society to compete in the upcoming election that was followed by the creation of nineteen other societies in townships across Hamilton County.¹⁴² This culminated in a county delegate convention on August 13, 1802 with delegates from each Republican Society present to nominate

candidates for the territorial legislature and the constitutional convention.¹⁴³ Federalists in Hamilton County appear to have reacted to this organization by calling their own general meeting to organize their nominations. The “Feds . . . advertised a county meeting” for September 4, 1802, where “a numerous and respectable multitude of not less than one hundred of the inhabitants of Hamilton County” gathered to form their own ticket. Those in attendance were allowed to propose a number of candidates over double the seats up for election and then voted by ballot to make the final nominations. For the constitutional convention delegates, they nominated fifteen individuals for ten open seats and nominated seven individuals for seven seats in the general assembly. A proposition forbidding the nomination of an individual “mentioned in a former ticket,” as in the Democratic-Republican ticket, failed and there was quite a bit of overlap between the two tickets.¹⁴⁴

Coordination efforts occurred in other counties as well. A county delegate convention was called in Ross County with each election district sending two delegates so that individuals could be nominated that were congenial “to the wishes of a majority of the citizens of Ross county.”¹⁴⁵ However, this convention never happened and self-nominations filled the newspaper before the election.¹⁴⁶ Duncan McArthur, one of the individuals who signed the address calling for a county delegate convention, discussed the coordination challenge ahead for the Democratic-Republicans noting, “[t]here are so many republican candidates that of course the votes must be divided, and unless we concentrate our force to one point, the federal schemes may succeed.”¹⁴⁷ This plea makes it clear that nomination procedures were encouraged by local elites in Ross County to limit the number of candidates nominated who could credibly claim votes from the Democratic-Republican

electorate so as not to spread their votes too thinly and allow for the success of a coordinated opposition.

Democratic-Republicans in Belmont County coordinated a county delegate convention with twenty-six delegates in attendance representing nine townships on September 21, 1802. The convention only nominated candidates for two open delegate positions for the upcoming constitutional convention. It appears that each convention delegate was allowed two votes when they balloted to nominate candidates. A total of eight individuals received at least one vote and the two highest individuals who received the nomination of the convention both earned a plurality.¹⁴⁸ Both Federalists and Democratic-Republicans competed in the selection of township delegates for a county convention in Washington County. Ten delegates were present at the convention and supported the Federalist ticket by a vote of seven to three.¹⁴⁹

There was variation across the state in the amount of organization created by groups to structure candidate emergence in 1802. In Western Reserve and Fairfield Counties the creation of nomination procedures did not occur.¹⁵⁰ In contrast, Federalists matched the efforts of the Democratic-Republicans where they were strong. In Washington County, Federalists organized a county delegate convention with representation from seven towns at Marietta on August 4, 1802. The convention nominated candidates for the constitutional convention who would go on to succeed against a ticket created by Democratic-Republicans.¹⁵¹

Between 1803 and 1809, the Democratic-Republican Party would come to dominate Ohio politics. During this time, the party continued to use the county delegate convention system across the state to structure candidate emergence for the lower and

upper chamber state legislative elections. Federalist electoral activities would become sparse during the period, but where an attempt was made the general meeting was used. Lastly, Democratic-Republicans would organize state legislative caucuses to nominate candidates for Congress as a response to the statewide general election law in place to elect Ohio's one representative to Congress between 1803 and 1810. As we will see, these nomination procedures were not always successful at limiting candidate emergence and individual nominations remained an important avenue for potential candidates throughout this period.

Democratic-Republicans in Hamilton County consistently used the county delegate convention system to nominate candidates for the general assembly and state senate between 1803 and 1809.¹⁵² The party was able to successfully limit candidate access to the polls during this time and encourage voter support around their candidates. The organization appears to be just as organized as county delegate convention systems in Pennsylvania. Township meetings instructed their delegates and provided them with certificates of their being duly selected to attend the county convention.¹⁵³ Ratcliffe considers the Democratic-Republican organization in Hamilton County as the most powerful organization in the state when it came to control over political nominations.¹⁵⁴

Democratic-Republicans in other counties also created organizations to structure candidate emergence between 1803 and 1809. Democratic-Republicans used the county delegate convention system in Jefferson (1806), Muskingum (1806), and Ross (1807, 1809).¹⁵⁵ Some of these conventions had township delegates come with explicit instructions on whom to nominate.¹⁵⁶ Other counties used a general meeting to nominate candidates as in Lebanon (1806), Montgomery (1806), and Ross (1805, 1806).¹⁵⁷ There is

even evidence of district-level conventions occurring when a state senate district encompassed multiple counties.¹⁵⁸ Ratcliffe explains the variation in Democratic-Republican organization across Ohio referencing the potential for Federalist electoral competitiveness within each county.¹⁵⁹ Where the Federalists were more of a threat, the Democratic-Republicans provided more structure to the candidate emergence process because greater coordination efforts were necessary.

With statehood came the need to nominate and elect a member of Congress and Democratic-Republicans used their majority in the new state legislature to coordinate. Between 1803 and 1810 the Democratic-Republicans organized a legislative caucus to nominate candidates for Congress. During this period the state only had one representative to the lower chamber of the national legislature and the position was elected by a statewide general election. Democratic-Republicans successfully used a legislative caucus to nominate a candidate for Congress in 1803 and 1804.¹⁶⁰ However, the legislative caucuses in 1806 and 1808 failed to result in a nomination because of internal divisions within the party.¹⁶¹ When the legislative caucus failed, Democratic-Republicans in Cincinnati held their own general meetings to nominate congressional candidates to make up for this organizational failure.¹⁶² While it is unclear if a legislative caucus nominated a candidate for Congress in 1810, the eventual winner was the Democratic-Republican incumbent Jeremiah Morrow with little to no opposition across Ohio according to the election returns that exist. As a reaction to the electoral system in place, Democratic-Republicans used a state-level nomination procedure from 1803 to 1810 and when this failed the most organized county stepped into the breach to provide coordination for the party.

Federalist attempts to organize candidate emergence during this period were limited to a few counties and often party members took advantage of the burgeoning divide within the Democratic-Republican Party to engage in nomination procedures. The editor of the *Scioto Gazette* found it possible to label state legislative candidates as Federalists when reporting election returns in 1803 in various counties.¹⁶³ In the lead up to the second state legislative election in 1803 one Ross County resident warned of the division of the Democratic-Republicans because of the threat of the Federalists “who are generally united in their plans.”¹⁶⁴ There was a Federalist meeting in Chillicothe the next year that nominated a candidate for Congress and created a committee of correspondence “to communicate with those societies in the state disposed to” support their candidate.¹⁶⁵ Taking the opportunity created by the embargo issue in 1808, Federalists in Cincinnati held a general meeting where they nominated a candidate for Congress as well as for the general assembly and state senate.¹⁶⁶ As Democratic-Republican factions in numerous counties cropped up, Federalist elites and electorates were able to operate within these nomination procedures.¹⁶⁷

The practice of individual nominations, even self-nomination, remained a persistent practice across Ohio despite efforts by both parties between 1803 and 1809 to structure candidate emergence and limit candidate entry. During the first congressional election, William Goforth, an unsuccessful Democratic-Republican candidate, published a letter in the press that mentioned a small group had encouraged him to run and that he would allow himself to be a candidate.¹⁶⁸ In Ross County in 1804 there were numerous self-nominations for the general assembly and state senate elections.¹⁶⁹ In a special election for the state senate in 1805, William Askew supported his own candidacy mentioning how he was

encouraged to do so by “solicitations of my friends.”¹⁷⁰ Further, it was mentioned that anonymous nominations in the press were sometimes the “oblique manner” used by gentlemen to recommend themselves.¹⁷¹ Despite originating outside of any party machinery, individual nominations still connected their candidates to a specific party or partisan principles.¹⁷² The persistence of individual nominations, especially self-nominations, demonstrates the relative weakness of the organizations in Ohio to successfully limit candidate emergence.

Factional Party Period, 1810-1816

While the origins of Democratic-Republican factionalism occur prior to 1810, it is not until this time that there is a hard break within the party between its more conservative and its radically democratic wings. Between 1810 and 1816 the use of county delegate conventions by both factions of the Democratic-Republican Party persisted. Further, Federalists united with the conservative wing to engage in electoral politics in some areas or take advantage of foreign policy divisions to organize their own nomination procedures between 1810 and 1816. Again, these nomination procedures did not preclude the continuation of individual nominations across Ohio through 1816. Lastly, the division of the state into districts for congressional elections from 1812 on meant the nomination of congressional candidates shifted to the more organized county organizations and opened up more opportunities for potential candidates to nominate themselves in the press.

In Hamilton County two clear Democratic-Republican factions competed against one another between 1810 and 1816 in state and national legislative elections. There was the Cincinnati based radical Democrats who continued to use the Republican Society label to coordinate their nomination procedures. The more conservative faction created the

Republican Association in 1811 and used that label to coordinate their nomination procedures. Both groups used county delegate conventions to nominate candidates for the general assembly, state senate, and Congress most years between 1810 and 1816.¹⁷³ Township delegates were still instructed and provided with certificates to ensure their admission to the nomination procedures.¹⁷⁴ The major difference between the procedures was that the Republican Association allowed Federalists to vote in township delegate elections and even be elected township delegates.¹⁷⁵ This practice was a continuation of factional nomination procedures in Hamilton County from before the hard break in 1810.

The radical Democratic faction of the party in Cincinnati and in various other counties across the state created Tammany Societies to organize coordinate themselves. Tammany Societies became the root of elite organization for radical Democrats and the foundation for their nomination procedures.¹⁷⁶ A potential congressional candidate in 1812 for the new first congressional district wrote an open letter declining to run and suggested the Tammany Society had attempted to control congressional nominations statewide that year. He claimed that the “night before the Ohio legislature rose, last winter, a Tammany caucus was held at Zanesville; certain characters were then nominated for the important posts in this state. Mr. M’CLean was then held forth as the proper candidate for this district.”¹⁷⁷ Therefore, it appears that during the first congressional election cycle the single-member district plurality electoral system was in place, the radical Democratic wing of the party held a statewide caucus to control the nomination of congressional candidates throughout all six districts.

The Tammany Society in Hamilton County was attacked for its heavy-handed control over nomination procedures and its failure to truly reflect public opinion as a result.

An article signed An Elector claimed that “the little band of Tammanies in Cincinnati” secretly selected delegates to represent the town at the county delegate convention they called for in 1811 and created “little squads . . . in other townships through the county” to control the selection of delegates in five or six other towns.¹⁷⁸ A general meeting of Whitewater and Crosby townships, both in Hamilton County, claimed that the county delegate convention organized in 1814 by the radical Democrats was dominated by the Cincinnati Tammany Society. They attacked the proceedings claiming that the Cincinnati delegates were not elected but simply appointed by the Tammany Society and that a delegate for another town was not elected but simply received a letter from the secretary of the Tammany Society instructing him to attend.¹⁷⁹

Democratic-Republican factionalism across Ohio brought with it the continued use of the county delegate convention by one or both groups. In 1810, when the party split occurred, the conservative wing successfully co-opted the county delegate convention in Washington, Jefferson, and Muskingum Counties while the radicals were able to retain control of party machinery in Belmont County.¹⁸⁰ In Butler County, conservatives appeared to hold county delegate conventions while the radical wing organized their nominations with “midnight caucuses.”¹⁸¹ Democratic-Republicans in Muskingum County used a delegate convention in 1813 to nominate state legislative candidates but found themselves unsuccessful at election time.¹⁸² In 1814, both the Tammany and “opponents to ‘the Great Council Fire’” nominated candidates using the county delegate convention system.¹⁸³

The use of the county delegate convention system was not universal and other avenues for candidate emergence continued during this period. In Montgomery County a general meeting nominated candidates for the state legislature in 1811 and 1812.¹⁸⁴

Individual nominations continued as well providing for the continued practice of self-nomination. Anonymous nominations for the state legislature and Congress supported their candidates using partisan language as an attempt to claim the potential candidate had a legitimate claim to that electorate's support.¹⁸⁵ Potential candidates or their anonymous supporters would sometimes simply state in the newspaper their candidacy or include some open letter describing their politics.¹⁸⁶

During the 1816 election cycle, potential candidates published open letters declaring their candidacy as well as their opinion on political issues in a way not seen since the lead up to statehood in 1802. The passage of the Compensation Act by Congress led to a public backlash and a call for potential candidates to declare their feelings on the issue. William Schenck published an open letter in the press in August declaring his candidacy for Congress in the first district and his distaste for the increase in salary created by the Compensation Act.¹⁸⁷ Part of this pattern is the more famous open letter by William Henry Harrison declaring his candidacy for Congress in the first congressional district that was rooted in a desire to repeal the Compensation Act and to change national law on the organization of the militia.¹⁸⁸ This occurred outside the first district, with Thomas S. Foote who used an open letter to declare his candidacy for Congress in the second district, quite unsuccessfully, and used the letter to reject of the Compensation Act and refute claims he was a Federalist.¹⁸⁹ An Eagle township meeting in Adams County of Democratic-Republicans rebuked the Compensation Act and resolved they would not support anyone who would "not publicly declare his sentiments" were similar to their own.¹⁹⁰

A Federalist resurgence in Ohio occurred after the beginning of the War of 1812, but it was limited compared to the Federalist return in New England. The return to electoral

politics and independent organization was limited to the southeastern counties in Ohio where there were localized Federalist electorates large enough to create an expectation of electoral competitiveness.¹⁹¹ Clear Federalist candidates returned to state legislative and congressional elections after local party leaders saw the success of New England Federalists in 1812.¹⁹² Democratic-Republican factionalism in Ross County allowed for long-time Federalist, Philemon Beecher, to win a seat in Congress in 1816. Federalists in Washington County, an old New England settlement area, had a clear party ticket every election between 1810 and 1816 that was either created by a general meeting or a local elite gathering.¹⁹³ The coordination efforts of the Federalists encouraged the Democratic-Republicans in Washington County to implement the county delegate convention system from 1812 to 1815 with township delegates popularly elected, charging the township delegates with encouraging turnout, and providing for coordination with Athens County when nominating a candidate for the state senate.¹⁹⁴

Party Politics in Ohio and the Nation

The connection between Ohio and national partisan politics was an important development that occurred well before 1816. One of Ratcliffe's main points in his early political history of Ohio is that partisan electorates focused on national policy issues and organized with symbolic language and that nomination procedures were present in the state well before the second party system.¹⁹⁵ As early as 1802, a pseudonymous author Fair Play rejected a call for a nonpartisan method of candidate nomination in Ross County by listing the political sentiments of two groups he labels as "Federal" and "Anti-federal" that covered topics from the national debt to taxation.¹⁹⁶ Before statehood, partisan divisions and their accompanying ideals were organizing how elites and, most likely to a lesser degree, the

burgeoning partisan electorates thought about electoral politics. This pattern continued and solidified as Ohio elected state legislators and members of Congress. An anonymous author warned those in Ross County against electing the political trimmer William Patton to the state senate by connecting him to the policies of federalism including the national taxes of 1798, support for standing armies, and aristocracy.¹⁹⁷

The connection between local elections and national politics became even more prominent with the War of 1812 and the backlash caused by the Compensation Act in 1816. An anonymous author supports a candidate for the general assembly in Hamilton County in 1814 stating he will support every measure in the state legislature for successfully prosecuting the war.¹⁹⁸ The editor of the *Western American* asked his subscribers, “[o]ught we not require the candidate whom we shall ultimately support for congress to pledge himself that he will use his best exertions to obtain a repeal of the Excise law as well as the Compensation law?”¹⁹⁹ The pseudonymous author An Elector encouraged the organization of a county delegate convention in Clermont County to nominate a candidate for Congress referencing how “[o]ur sister states have thought that” the Compensation Act was an abuse of power and they have organized to “secure the election of such men to the next Congress, who would be most likely to disavow that obnoxious principle.”²⁰⁰ Those in the West understood their state and national legislative elections within the context of national partisan politics and the major national political issues most pressing at various times during the period.

Conclusion: Institutionalization and Democratization in South Carolina and Ohio

The development of candidate emergence in South Carolina uncovers varying processes when it comes to questions on party institutionalization in the South. The introduction of clear procedures occurred later in South Carolina, and in the South generally. Both parties before 1808 had informal party procedures guiding the nomination process. While these were not complex procedures, they were still consistent patterns for candidate nomination. The Federalist Party, coordinated by elites with Charleston, were connected through correspondence with one another. Federalists in Charleston used their personal connections to elites throughout South Carolina to coordinate efforts to compete in state and national legislative elections across the state. This was reflected in the practice of individual nominations through the press where local elites would nominate their friends or themselves for political office. Federalists in Charleston could be considered as the most organized group in the entire South towards the end of the period. Their origins in the Society of Cincinnati and continued coordination efforts through party elite and/or mass meetings meant Federalists in Charleston were competing in elections well past the Revolution of 1800. Lastly, at the height of party competition in 1812 Federalists added the most amount of complexity to their organization with the holding of separate ward meetings that selected delegates to a convention for the nomination of candidates.

The most impressive story of institutionalization comes from the Democratic-Republicans in Charleston. The organization used informal means to nominate candidates for the state legislature and Congress just like the Federalists before 1808. Party leaders would gather and submit their own party tickets in the press among numerous other

anonymous tickets. That all changed in 1808 when the party reacted to increased electoral competition and created a system of complex structures for the nomination of candidates akin to the modern closed primary nomination procedure. Ward meetings gathered the party adherents to hold elections on who the party nominees would be. Delegates from each ward gathered in a convention to tally the votes from all the wards and presented to the whole who the nomination winners were. The delegates themselves did not have any agency in the nomination process except in the case of a tie in the wardship vote totals. Democratic-Republicans in Charleston from 1808 through 1816 display an impressive amount of party institutionalization with the organization they create to structure candidate emergence for state and national legislative elections.

The Democratic-Republican Party across Ohio appeared to institutionalize quickly as the state entered the union in 1803. In multiple counties across the state the county delegate convention system was implemented to nominate candidates. This appears to have occurred where local Democratic-Republican elites feared or encountered greater Federalist electoral competition. In other areas, a county general meeting was sufficient to organize the nomination of state legislative candidates. The continuation of party organizations through 1816 greatly depended upon the threat of intra-party factionalism in the western part of the state or the Federalists in the eastern, especially southeastern, part of Ohio. The party also consistently organized a legislative caucus to nominate congressional candidates from 1803 through 1810, but it is important to note that the procedure failed to produce a nomination just as many times as it worked successfully.

The Federalists largely receded from electoral politics across most of the state after Ohio entered the Union and the creation of independent party organizations at the county

level was limited between 1803 and 1816. In western counties they could successfully coordinate with the conservative faction of the Democratic-Republican Party and took part in their nomination procedures from voting in township delegate elections to even being chosen as a delegate or having a Federalist nominated for office. Where there was a localized Federalist majority in western Ohio, specifically in Washington County, the group consistently nominated candidates for state and national legislative elections from 1810 to 1815, using general meetings or local elite private meetings. Therefore, party institutionalization for the Federalist Party was lacking except in the areas where they were competitive for local offices, and they demonstrated their ability to coordinate as the party had a resurgence nationwide after 1808.

Political parties in South Carolina did not, for the most part, encourage democratization between 1788 and 1816. The informal organizations created to structure candidate emergence were not attempts to incorporate ordinary citizens and bring them into discussions of issues or potential candidates. For most of the state, the emerging political parties were not agents of democratization. However, this was not the case in Charleston. There, both parties looked to incorporate ordinary citizens and mobilize them around political issues. Democratic-Republicans in Charleston went further than the Federalists in creating nomination procedures that integrated their partisan electorate in meaningful ways. Within Charleston, parties were agents of democratization.

Lastly, political parties in Ohio were agents of democratization during the period. The county-level organizations developed nomination procedures across the state that were popularly oriented to varying degrees. At their best, county delegate conventions sought the inclusion of the partisan electorate at the grassroots level to select delegates that were

then instructed on whom to support as candidates. The organizations were structured in a way to transmit the popular opinions of those at the local level. The Democratic-Republicans went farther than the Federalists in their efforts to do so, but where Federalists had independent organizations structuring candidate emergence, they too sought popular support and mobilization.

Notes

1. Broussard 1978, 88-89; Cunningham 1963, 176.
2. Park 2018, 83.
3. Squire 2017, 102-104.
4. Park 2018, 88-95.
5. Park 2018, 191-192.
6. Maulden 2019, 77.
7. Park 2018, 129.
8. Park 2018, 44.
9. McCormick 1966, 16; Broussard 1978, 263; Wilentz 2005, 50-51.
10. Dallinger 1897, 4; Squire 2017, 108
11. Fischer 1965, 56
12. Turner 1983, 166
13. *City Gazette* Sept 14, 1790.
14. Wolfe 1940, 70.
15. Wolfe 1973, 76-77.
16. Rose 1968, 4 and 20.
17. Wolfe 1973, 79.
18. *City Gazette* Nov 8, 1788.
19. Rogers 1962, 264.
20. *State Gazette of South-Carolina* Jan 17, 1793; *City Gazette* Sept 20, 1794, Aug 10, 1797, Sept 29, Oct 1, 6, 1798, Sept 20, Oct 4, 6, 9, 1800; *South-Carolina State-Gazette* Oct 3, 4, 8, 9, 1800.
21. *Carolina Gazette* Oct 2, 1800.

22. *City Gazette* Oct 10, 13, 1794, Sept 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 1796, Sept 29, Oct 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 1798, Oct 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 1800; *Columbian Herald* Oct 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 1796; *South-Carolina State-Gazette* Oct 3, 8, 9, 1800.
23. *City Gazette* Sept 29, 1796.
24. *City Gazette* Sept 30, 1800.
25. *City Gazette* Oct 1, 1798.
26. *City Gazette* Oct 1, 1798.
27. *City Gazette* Oct 13, 1800.
28. *South-Carolina State-Gazette* Oct 13, 1800; Wolfe 1973, 81.
29. McCormick 1966, 7 fn 1.
30. Rose 1968, 51-52.
31. Rose 1968, 58.
32. Rose 1968, 137.
33. Rogers 1962, 348-349; Rose 1968, 244, 248, and 268.
34. *City Gazette* Sept 18, 1792, Sept 24, 1794, Sept 26, Oct 10, 1796, Oct 1, 1798, Oct 6, 1800, Oct 8, 1802, Sept 24, 1804, Sept 24, 1806.
35. *City Gazette* Dec 20, 1794.
36. "An oration, delivered in the Independent Circular Church . . ." 1806.
37. *City Gazette* Oct 5, 1798.
38. *South-Carolina State-Gazette* June 21, 1800.
39. *City Gazette* Sept 3, 1800.
40. *City Gazette* Oct 1, 1800.
41. *City Gazette* Oct 17, 1800.
42. *Carolina Gazette* July 22, 1808.
43. *Miller's Weekly Messenger* Sept 10, 1808.

44. *Camden Gazette* Sept 19, 1816.
45. *Camden Gazette* Aug 1, Sept 5, 9, 1816; *Carolina Gazette* July 22, 1808, Aug 31, 1810; *Charleston Courier* Oct 4, 1810, Sept 17, 29, Oct 2, 1812, Sept 20, 1814; *City Gazette* Nov 27, Dec 23, 1802, July 26, Aug 13, 20, 22, Sept 8, 12, 1806, Sept 28, Oct 6, 1812, Aug 7, 12, 26, Sept 13, 1816; *Investigator* Oct 6, 1812; *Miller's Weekly Messenger* July 23, 1808, June 23, July 14, 1810.
46. Broussard 1978, 271.
47. Ratzlaff 1982, 242.
48. Wolfe 1940, 259-260; Pasley 2001, 262-263.
49. *Charleston Courier* Jan 31, Feb 1, 1803.
50. *Charleston Courier* Sept 23, 1806.
51. *City Gazette* Oct 1, 1798.
52. *Charleston Courier* Oct 7, 1806.
53. *Charleston Courier* Oct 9, 1806.
54. *Charleston Courier* Oct 11, 13, 1806.
55. *Charleston Courier* Aug 23, 1808.
56. *City Gazette* Sept 15, 1808. William Loughton Smith switched parties sometime in the Spring of 1807 (Rogers 1962, 381).
57. *Charleston Courier* Sept 16, 1808.
58. *Charleston Courier* Oct 7, 1808.
59. *Charleston Courier* Oct 12, 1810.
60. *Investigator* Nov 17, 1812.
61. *Charleston Courier* Oct 15, 1812.
62. *Charleston Courier* Sept 26, 1812.
63. *Charleston Courier* Oct 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 1812. The list was not printed on October 11, 1812, because it was a Sunday, and the paper did not publish on

Sundays. That is why I state it was printed consecutively for nine days despite the fact the eleventh is not listed.

64. *Charleston Courier* Sept 28, 29, 30, Oct 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 1814.
65. *Charleston Courier* Sept 16, Oct 4, 5, 1816.
66. *South-Carolina State-Gazette* Oct 2, 1800.
67. *South-Carolina State-Gazette* Oct 4, 7, 1800.
68. *City Gazette* Aug 15, 1801.
69. *City Gazette* Oct 4, 1808.
70. *City Gazette* July 20, 1808.
71. *City Gazette* Sept 8, 1808.
72. *City Gazette* Sept 8, 1808.
73. *City Gazette* Sept 8, 1808.
74. *City Gazette* Sept 8, 1808.
75. *City Gazette* Oct 11, 1808.
76. *City Gazette* Sept 22, 1810.
77. *City Gazette* Sept 22, 24, 27, 28, 29, Oct 1, 2, 1810.
78. *City Gazette* Oct 4, 6, 1810
79. *City Gazette* Oct 8, 1810.
80. *City Gazette* Oct 6, 1810.
81. *City Gazette* Oct 6, 1810.
82. *City Gazette* Oct 8, 1810.
83. *Investigator* Aug 22, 1812.
84. *Investigator* Aug 24, 1812.
85. *Investigator* Aug 27, 1812

86. *Investigator* Aug 25, 27, 1812.
87. *City Gazette* Sept 7, 1812.
88. *City Gazette* Sept 8, 9, 1812.
89. *Investigator* Sept 8, 1812.
90. *Investigator* Sept 11, 17, 21, 1812.
91. *Investigator* Sept 17, 1812.
92. *Investigator* Sept 28, 1812.
93. *City Gazette* Oct 2, 1812.
94. *City Gazette* Oct 2, 1812.
95. *City Gazette* Oct 3, 5, 1812; *Investigator* Oct 3, 5, 1812.
96. *Investigator* Oct 8, 1812.
97. *City Gazette* Oct 9, 10, 1812.
98. *Investigator* Oct 8, 1812.
99. *City Gazette* Oct 12, 1812.
100. *Charleston Courier* Oct 12, 1812.
101. *Charleston Courier* Oct 12, 1812.
102. *Investigator* Oct 12, 1812.
103. *Investigator* Oct 12, 1812.
104. *Investigator* Oct 10, 1812.
105. *Investigator* Oct 12, 1812.
106. *Investigator* Oct 12, 1812.
107. *City Gazette* Oct 16, 1812.
108. *Investigator* Sept 2, 1813.

109. *Investigator* Sept 3, 1813.
110. *Investigator* Sept 3, 1813.
111. *Investigator* Sept 4, 1813.
112. *Investigator* Sept 4, 1813.
113. *Investigator* Sept 4, 1813.
114. *City Gazette* Sept 5, 1816.
115. *City Gazette* Sept 26, 1816.
116. *City Gazette* Sept 14, 1816.
117. *City Gazette* Sept 18, 1816.
118. *City Gazette* Sept 18, 1816.
119. *City Gazette* Sept 18, 1816.
120. *City Gazette* Sept 23, 1816.
121. *City Gazette* Sept 25, 26 1816.
122. *City Gazette* Sept 28, 1816.
123. *City Gazette* Oct 3, 1816.
124. *City Gazette* Oct 1, 3, 1816.
125. *City Gazette* Oct 14, 1816.
126. *City Gazette* Oct 14, 1816.
127. Pasley 2001, 8.
128. *City Gazette* Aug 8, 1792.
129. *City Gazette* Sept 4, 1798.
130. Poulson's American Daily Advertiser Aug 2, 1808. This article was attributed to the *Charleston Courier* when it was republished in the Federalist, Philadelphia based paper I cite.

131. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* Aug 2, 1808.
132. *City Gazette* Sept 1, 1812.
133. *Investigator* Oct 12, 1812.
134. Halley and Maynard 1917, 199.
135. *Western Spy* Sept 2, 10, 1799.
136. *Western Spy* Sept 17, 1800.
137. *Western Spy* Sept 24, 1800
138. *Scioto Gazette* Sept 5, 26, 1800.
139. *Western Spy* Oct 15, 1800.
140. Ratcliffe 1998, 44.
141. Ratcliffe 1998, 51.
142. Ratcliffe 1998, 56.
143. *Western Spy* Aug 21, 28 1802.
144. *Scioto Gazette* Sept 25, 1802.
145. *Scioto Gazette* Aug 28, 1802.
146. *Scioto Gazette* Sept 11, 18, 25, Oct 2, 1802.
147. *Scioto Gazette* Sept 11, 1802.
148. *Scioto Gazette* Oct 9, 1802.
149. Brown 1979, 273-273.
150. Ratcliffe 1998, 62.
151. Cutler 1890, 65-66.
152. *Liberty Hall* Aug 17, 1807, Sept 17, 1808; *Western Spy* Jan 5, Sept 7, 1803, Aug 7, 14, 21, 28, Sept 4, 1805, June 24, July 22, 1806, Aug 31, 1807.
153. *Liberty Hall* Aug 17, 1807; *Western Spy* Aug 21, Sept 4, 1805.

154. Ratcliffe 1998, 128.
155. *Scioto Gazette* Sept 4, 1806, Aug 20, Sept 3, 1807; Pocock 1994, 61; Ratcliffe 1998, 126.
156. *Scioto Gazette* Sept 3, 1807; Ratcliffe 1998, 126.
157. *Liberty Hall* Sept 23, Oct 7, 1806; *Scioto Gazette* Sept 30, 1805, May 15, 1806.
158. *Scioto Gazette* Aug 27, 1807; Ratcliffe 1998, 126.
159. Ratcliffe 1998, 126.
160. Ratcliffe 1998, 77 and 81-82.
161. Ratcliffe 1998, 123.
162. *Western Spy* March 18, 1806, Aug 13, 1808.
163. *Scioto Gazette* Jan 29, 1803.
164. *Scioto Gazette* May 14, 1803.
165. *Scioto Gazette* Oct 1, 1804.
166. *Liberty Hall* Oct 8, 1808.
167. *Scioto Gazette* May 1, July 10, Sept 4, 1806; *Western Spy* Oct 5, 1807; Ratcliffe 1998, 131.
168. *Western Spy* May 18, 1803.
169. *Scioto Gazette* Sept 10, Oct 1, 8, 29, 1804.
170. *Scioto Gazette* Oct 31, 1805.
171. *Scioto Gazette* Oct 1, 1807.
172. *Liberty Hall* Sept 15, 1806.
173. *Liberty Hall* Aug 28, Sept 4, 11, 14, 1811, Sept 15, Oct 3, 1812, Aug 26, Sept 23, 1816; *Western Spy* Sept 15, 22, 1810, Aug 3, 24, 1811, Aug 20, Sept 17, Oct 2, 8, 1814, Aug 8, Sept 6, 27, 1816.
174. *Western Spy* Sept 22, 1810, Sept 14, 1811, Oct 8, 1814, Aug 8, 1816.

175. *Western Spy* Sept 22, 1810; Ratcliffe 1998, 160-161.
176. Ratcliffe 1998, 152-153 and 156-157.
177. *Liberty Hall* Sept 8, 1812.
178. *Liberty Hall* Sept 18, 1811.
179. *Western Spy* Oct 8, 1814.
180. Ratcliffe 1998, 154.
181. *Liberty Hall* Oct 2, 1811; *Western Spy* Sept 28, 1811.
182. Ratcliffe 1998, 183.
183. Ratcliffe 1998, 176.
184. *Liberty Hall* Oct 2, 1811, Oct 6, 1812.
185. *Liberty Hall* Sept 22, 1812; *Western American* Nov 7, 1815; *Western Spy* Oct 9, 1813, Oct 8, 1814.
186. *Liberty Hall* Sept 22, 1812, Sept 27, 1814, Sept 11, 1815, Aug 26, 1816; *Western American* Sept 16, 23, Nov 7, 1815, Aug 10, 1816; *Western Spy* Sept 26, Oct 3, 1812, Oct 2, 1813, Oct 8, 1814, Oct 6, 1815, Sept 20, 1816.
187. *Western Spy* Aug 30, 1816.
188. *Western Spy* Aug 30, 1816.
189. *Western American* Aug 17, 1816.
190. *Western American* Sept 7, 1816.
191. Ratcliffe 1998, 179.
192. Ratcliffe 1997, 182-183.
193. Ratcliffe 1998, 186.
194. Ratcliffe 1998, 187.
195. Ratcliffe 1998, 12.
196. *Scioto Gazette* May 29, June 5, 1802.

197. *Scioto Gazette* Oct 7, 1805.

198. *Western Spy* Oct 8, 1814.

199. *Western American* Aug 10, 1816.

200. *Western American* Aug 10, 1816.

Chapter 5

Conclusion: Candidate Emergence, Political Parties, and American Democratization

The process through which potential candidates present themselves to a particular constituency to run for political office became structured and partisan between 1788 and 1816. The development of candidate emergence in Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Ohio taken together provides several important takeaways. In this chapter I present a summary of the development and highlighting the general trends of candidate emergence in each case study. With this foundation, I compare the findings from each case study to demonstrate the importance of my three factors (political culture, electoral systems, and electoral competition) and discuss their ability to help one understand the nature of candidate emergence and its development across space and time. I then relate my findings to questions on political party development and the role of political parties in the story of American democratization during the period. Lastly, I conclude with avenues for future research based off my findings.

Summary of Case Studies

The Mid-Atlantic: Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania goes through three distinct states of development when I analyze candidate emergence. With a long history of participatory politics and electioneering practices, between 1788 and 1795 there were already attempts to structure candidate emergence and provide for coordination during the nomination process beyond individual nominations. There was widespread use of the general meeting and even reference to the county delegate convention system before the introduction of the clear partisan divide. In district elections for the state senators, precedents were created to rotate the power of original

nomination to distribute representation across the multiple counties within the district. During the decentralized party formation period individual counties created their own party organizations to nominate candidates for the general assembly while at the same time added delegate convention organizations to preexisting geographic precedents to structure state senate and congressional nominations that occurred in districts containing multiple counties. Federalists used the county general meeting as their base organization where local party leaders organized general meetings and ordinary citizens were allowed to attend. The Democratic-Republicans generally used the county delegate convention that encouraged ordinary citizens to elect township delegates who gathered and made nominations. By 1802, both parties had clearly defined procedures to nominate candidates for state and national legislative elections across the state.

The rest of the period can be best understood through the factional politics which split the Democratic-Republican Party and offered the Federalist Party a chance to find electoral success. Continued organization was uneven for the Federalists. In those areas where they could produce a majority on their own, the party continued to organize nomination procedures independently through general meetings and eventually switching to the county delegate convention system. In other areas, the Federalist electorate were able to engage in nomination procedures through the conservative Democratic-Republican faction procedures, specifically township delegate elections. Democratic-Republicans continued to use the county delegate convention as their foundational organization. Both parties continued to use district delegate conventions and precedents of geographic rotation of the nomination power to structure candidate emergence for state senate and congressional elections.

Pennsylvania displays the most sophisticated and continues nomination procedures during the first party that I explore. With the extensive use of the county delegate convention throughout the state, ordinary citizens at the township level were invited into partisan politics and the nomination of state and national legislative candidates. Further, the organizations and precedents created to structure state senate and congressional district elections to ensure the inclusion of various geographic regions in the nomination process is unique to Pennsylvania so early on. Both parties created nomination procedures to structure the candidate emergence process that incorporated ordinary citizens and successfully coordinated elites and the electorate alike for state and national legislative elections.

New England: New Hampshire

Candidate emergence in New Hampshire goes through three distinct stages of development. During the pre-party period from 1788-1795, local elites and ordinary citizens presented their preferred potential candidate or list of preferred potential candidates with individual nominations in the press for state senate and congressional elections. These individual nominations were done anonymously through pseudonymous authored articles. This trend continued early in the second period between 1796 and 1804 as the use of partisan labels were introduced to the individual nominations and party tickets appear in the ever clearly delineated partisan press. Federalist editors even operated as agents of coordination for the candidate emergence process before the creation of a party organization to structure candidate emergence. The use of individual nominations corresponds with a lack of efforts to coordinate the candidate emergence process best

exemplified in the number of times a runoff election was necessary to fill at least one congressional seat between 1788 and 1800 due to the majority threshold.

Both parties in New Hampshire developed centralized party organizations, the Federalists in 1800 and the Democratic-Republicans in 1803, to structure candidate emergence for state senate and congressional elections. Both used legislative caucuses to nominate their entire slate of state senate and congressional candidates. These caucuses were more often described as mixed-legislative caucuses where not only partisan legislators but also leading party members from across the state met together and provided their partisan electorates with official party nominations. During the party formation period, both political parties developed statewide electioneering organizations that could structure and mobilize local constituencies down to the township and school district level.

Between 1809 and 1816 both political parties in New Hampshire decentralized the power of nomination and brought the process of candidate emergence closer to ordinary citizens at the local level. The Federalists and Democratic-Republicans alike, shifted the power of nomination for state senate candidates to the county and state senate district level party organizations they created in the earlier period for mobilization efforts. These were frequently general meetings, but after 1812 delegate conventions came into more frequent use. The Federalist Party continued to nominate congressional candidates using a mixed-legislative caucus through 1816 and allowed for local organizations to use mass meetings or delegate conventions at the county or state senate district level to nominate state senate districts. On the other hand, Democratic-Republicans instituted a uniform procedure for nominating state senators through state senate district delegate conventions in 1816. The

party then shifted the power of nomination for congressional candidates away from the legislative caucus for the first time in 1816 and gave it to county delegate conventions.

Lastly, the best information I can offer on the development of candidate emergence for state legislative lower chamber members in New Hampshire elected at the township level presents a detailed analysis of nomination procedures created by the Democratic-Republicans in the city of Portsmouth. When the Democratic-Republicans held their first legislative caucus in 1803 they also began constructing their party mobilization apparatus across the state all the way down to the township level. In their circular letters they made it clear that the election of general assembly members was important, and the appointed township part organizers should do their best to ensure a member of their party was elected to this position. Between 1809 and 1816, Democratic-Republicans in Portsmouth created a nomination procedure that mobilized ordinary citizens down to the wardship level to select delegates for a convention that would nominate candidates for the general assembly.

In New Hampshire, both political parties began structuring the candidate emergence process with clear organizations that over time became more popularly oriented. When it came to the nomination of state senate and congressional candidates, the legislative caucus centralized the power of nomination in the hands of party leaders. Then both parties shifted some or all of this power to organizations closer to the people and used nomination procedures, delegate conventions or mass meetings, that incorporated ordinary citizens into the process. It is likely that local party leaders controlled candidate nominations for general assembly elections across most of the state, but in Portsmouth the Democratic-Republicans instituted a delegate convention system.

The South: South Carolina

The development of candidate emergence in South Carolina is not as clear as the two previous case studies. Individual nominations filled the newspapers as potential candidates nominated themselves, had their friends nominate them through an anonymous article, or found themselves nominated in the press by an unknown source. Candidate emergence was only structured by the pattern of deference. As political parties formed beginning in 1806, both groups created informal party organizations to structure candidate emergence. Local partisan elites communicated through dinners and private correspondence to organize candidate emergence across the state. Candidate emergence was still done through individual nominations, and this remained the dominant method across most of the state through 1816.

Charleston, South Carolina offers a different, untold, and important pattern of development from 1808-1816. The Federalists during this period organized general meetings to support nominations. This demonstrated an important shift towards the incorporation of ordinary citizens in nomination procedures. In 1812, they even went so far as to organize ward meetings to send delegates to a convention that nominated state and national legislative candidates. More importantly, Democratic-Republicans formal organization began in 1808 with a nomination procedure that combined a delegate convention with something akin to a closed party primary. Ordinary citizens were called to meet across Charleston in the various wards where they voted for the candidates they wanted to nominate for the upcoming state and national legislative elections. The votes were then brought together at the city delegate convention where they were tallied up and the party nominations went to the highest vote earners. The delegates themselves had no control over party nominations except in the case of a tie.

My analysis of candidate emergence allows me to speak to the informal as well as formal party organizations at work in South Carolina structuring nominations for both parties. Individual nominations in South Carolina, self-nominations, and those from anonymous sources, are likely the public facing expressions of local elites operating within a politics of deference that kept politics in the hands of local elites. Within Charleston this was pattern was upset. Federalists and Democratic-Republicans alike implemented nomination procedures that brought ordinary citizens into the process of partisan nominations. The Democratic-Republican Party in Charleston went further than their opposition, and any of their copartisans in the states I analyze, to bring ordinary citizens into party nomination procedures.

The West: Ohio

The development of candidate emergence in Ohio is as decentralized as Pennsylvania and looks like the mid-Atlantic and the South. My analysis of candidate emergence begins when Ohio called its first territorial legislature in 1799. Individual nomination in the press was the dominant avenue for potential candidates, both self-nominations and anonymous nominations alike. Political parties were already structuring politics across the original colonies and these divisions find their way into Ohio before it joins the Union in 1803. Federalists implemented general meetings in a few counties to compete in elections in the lead up to statehood but fell out of formal politics through 1809. Democratic-Republicans implemented general meetings and county delegate conventions across the state in the lead up to and following statehood. They even organized legislative caucuses to structure candidate emergence for congressional elections from 1803-1810, but its success was limited. In state senate districts, there is suggestive evidence that Democratic-Republicans

created district nomination procedures that incorporated each geographic region. Despite the presence of nomination procedures, individual nominations persisted in the press.

The hard split in the Democratic-Republican Party beginning in 1810 helps explain the development of candidate emergence through 1816. The organization of general meetings and county delegate conventions by the conservative Democratic-Republican faction allowed for Federalists to engage in all aspects of state legislative nomination procedures. The more radically democratic wing of the Democratic-Republican Party continued to use general meetings and county delegate conventions. There again is suggestive evidence that Democratic-Republicans continued to use district meetings to nominate state senate candidates and it appears that the most organized counties within congressional districts took on the power of nominating congressional candidates for the entire geographic area. Through factional politics, a limited Federalist resurgence, and the creation of new organizations to structure candidate emergence because of these prior occurrence, individual nominations persisted. Self-nominations and anonymous nominations continued to occur alongside party nomination procedures.

Local partisan elites in Ohio structured candidate emergence like the regions they came from. Popularly oriented nomination procedures were organized before statehood and continued, unevenly, to structure candidate emergence across the state throughout the period. At the same time, potential candidates, their friends, and anonymous individuals or groups continued to use the press to present themselves or their favored candidates to constituencies. Ohio's organizations were decentralized for a majority of the period with only a short period where the Democratic-Republicans used a legislative caucus to nominate, sometimes attempt to nominate, a candidate for the state's single member of the

U.S. House of Representatives. After 1812, congressional nominations were decentralized to the counties with the most organization with the new congressional districts.

Understanding the Development of Candidate Emergence

I presented my own theory for understanding the development of candidate emergence in the first party era. Work by Gary Cox explains why I anticipate elites will coordinate with one another to structure the candidate emergence process.¹ The group-centered theory of party development further supports this expectation as it places candidate nomination as the foundation and key function of newly emergent political parties.² Building off of these theories, I present my own argument for understanding why certain types of formal or informal practices and organizations were implemented by various groups across the U.S. and why they develop the way they do over time. I have highlighted in each case study the influence of three factors: political culture, the electoral system, and electoral competition. Each of these factors helps explain the characteristics and development of candidate emergence across space and time as exemplified in my case studies. I presented clear expectations for how each of these factors should influence the development of candidate emergence and I will discuss my findings in relation to each factor below.

Regional Political Culture and Political Legitimacy

I argue that regional political culture can help explain the nature of candidate emergence. What is considered as politically legitimate is, at least early on, mainly determined by the preexisting political culture and histories of each region. Therefore, the avenues for or structures of candidate emergence deemed acceptable in each region was determined by political culture. This is important to understand because I conceptualize development as

durable shifts in political legitimacy. What groups or procedures are deemed politically legitimate at the onset of my analysis and changes in understandings of what is politically legitimate is central to my analysis of candidate emergence. Specifically, I argue that regions with participatory political cultures and positive histories of popularly oriented political organizations during the Revolutionary and Articles periods are likely to adopt similarly oriented organizations to structure candidate emergence. Where this is lacking, the creation of popularly oriented organizations to structure candidate emergence is unlikely. However, this aspect of political culture is not immovable. The noted rise of participatory politics across the U.S. during the first party era and a drive towards an ever more democratic politics noted by historians can help explain when regions lacking in a history of participatory politics or positive experiences with extra-constitutional political organizations might later adopt popularly oriented nomination procedures.

The two states I analyze with participatory political cultures and positive experiences with extra-constitutional organizations are Pennsylvania and Ohio. The mid-Atlantic political culture is best known for its participatory nature, especially in Pennsylvania and New York. I understand Ohio's political culture according to immigration patterns into the area which includes those from Pennsylvania. In both states, popularly oriented organizations were created to structure candidate emergence very early. In Pennsylvania, there is evidence of general meetings nominating legislative candidates at the county level before the creation of a clear partisan divide in 1796. Shortly thereafter, delegate conventions spread across the state, which brought candidate nominations even closer to ordinary citizens at the grassroots level. Before statehood, partisan leaders in Ohio adopted popularly oriented nomination procedures to structure candidate emergence.

New Hampshire and South Carolina are lacking in a participatory political culture and do not have a positive history with extra-constitutional organizations like Pennsylvania. Both states instead have a deferential political culture. Potential candidates should only be the local elites and the realm of politics was to be controlled by these local elites. In both states, this meant that elites operated in the background to influence candidate emergence and brought forward their preferred candidates through individual nominations in the press. Despite this commonality early on, the trajectories of these two states diverges in 1800 when New Hampshire develops organizations to nominate candidates and South Carolina continues to use informal structures through 1816. This divergence can be explained by another aspect of New Hampshire's political culture, an emphasis on centralized authority.

In New England, centralized authority in the state government itself made it the only source of legitimate political authority. Those engaging in organized politics outside of the state were seen as self-interested, illegitimate, and dangerous. This desire to centralize all political authority in the state itself explains why a caucus of Federalist state legislators in 1800 formed a formal nomination procedure. Their place in the government meant they could legitimately organize to nominate candidates whereas any other extra-governmental organization would not be seen in such a light. The Democratic-Republicans would also use the legislative caucus as their first formal nomination procedure in 1803. The fact that a legislative caucus was created in New Hampshire and not in South Carolina can also be explained in part by the electoral rules determining the boundaries of politics and I will explore this more below.

Despite the deferential component of both New Hampshire and South Carolina's political cultures, participatory politics and popularly oriented nomination procedures eventually developed in both states. Both the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans created statewide electioneering apparatuses in New Hampshire and to an extent devolved the power of nomination to these organizations that then instituted nomination procedures meant to incorporate those at the grassroots level. In Charleston, both parties implemented nomination procedures that were popularly oriented. The Federalists held general meetings and the Democratic-Republicans organized a process akin to a closed party primary. Eventually, both states incorporated participatory politics and such organizations came to be understood as politically legitimate.

The impact of political culture on what is understood as politically legitimate within a constituency is uniquely displayed in the case of Ohio. Immigration patterns into Ohio shows that there were sizable groups from the mid-Atlantic as well the South. When I mentioned above that Ohio had a participatory political culture this was only true in part. This does not explain why individual nominations persisted throughout the entire period across the state. The continued presence of self-nominations and anonymous nominations can be explained by the deferential political culture of the South that brought with it an acceptance of self-nominations and the practice of potential candidates electioneering for themselves. Self-nominations and anonymous nominations in the press were politically legitimate pathways for potential candidates in Ohio. I am not the first to suggest this. Cunningham mentions that self-nominations appeared to be more common in those areas of Ohio settled by Virginians.³ Therefore, the multifaceted nature of Ohio's political culture helps explain the creation of organizations to structure candidate emergence, the

continuation of self-nominations, and how both were understood to be politically legitimate.

Lastly, perceptions of what is considered politically legitimate is bounded by the political ideology of the parties within each region. The common understanding of Federalist ideology in the 1790s in part limited the role of ordinary citizens in politics to the election day itself. Citizens were only meant to give a simple yes or no on how they thought the government was doing on election day and not engage in any kind of policy debate or organize outside of this narrow window. On the other hand, Democratic-Republican ideology was generally more open to the incorporation of public opinion in politics and considered political organization for the accurate expression of public opinion as politically legitimate. The limited Federalist vision and expansive Democratic-Republican vision for the role of public opinion in everyday politics helps explain the different procedures used by each party within each state.

In all four of my case studies the Federalists generally limited the role for ordinary citizens comparative to the Democratic-Republicans. Federalists in Pennsylvania did more to incorporate ordinary citizens in nomination procedures early on compared to Federalists in the other states under analysis demonstrating the ability of regional political culture to trump our common understanding of the Federalists ideology. At the same time, Democratic-Republicans generally created more sophisticated procedures to ensure the meaningful incorporation of ordinary citizens than the Federalists in Pennsylvania. This principle also applies later. In New Hampshire, Federalists were only willing to decentralize state senate nominations and allowed for a mixture of general meetings and delegate conventions whereas the Democratic-Republicans decentralized state senate and

congressional nominations and instituted the delegate convention systems to ensure popular participation in these nominations. Federalists in Charleston generally organized mass meetings after 1808 and the Democratic-Republicans organized procedures akin to a closed party primary. Just like today, connecting to one's political party and their ideology appears to be contingent upon and altered by the political culture operative within the given state.⁴

Electoral Systems and the Boundaries of Politics

Electoral systems influence the development of candidate emergence by the political boundaries these rules create within a state. The influence of electoral systems is a central finding in the political science literature. In the US, we have consistently implemented majoritarian electoral systems that encourage the development of two parties. Winner-take-all systems encourage the development of two competing parties over time because of mechanical and strategic effects. However, none of this necessarily tells us the type of structures that these two parties will create to organize themselves. I argue that electoral rules determine the scale of politics. Some boundaries were determined and in operation well before the ratification of the U.S. Constitution like township elections in New Hampshire for their general assembly. Some were created with the adoption of new state constitutions like state senate districts in Pennsylvania in 1790 and Ohio in 1803. On top of this, the ratification of the U.S. Constitution required the creation of new boundaries within states for connecting the people to the national government through elections to the U.S. House of Representatives. Some states adopted legislation requiring statewide at-large elections like in New Hampshire, Pennsylvania in 1788 and 1792, and in Ohio from 1803-1810. Other states created congressional districts to elect their national representatives. In

Pennsylvania this included a mixture of single- and multi-member districts in 1790 and from 1794 on while South Carolina used single-member districts the entire period. The political boundaries created by the electoral rules in place can make it easier or harder to create organizations to structure candidate emergence for particular political boundaries.

The way electoral rules influenced the development of candidate emergence is clear in each of my case studies. The county was a meaningful political boundary in Pennsylvania and the way state and national districts mapped onto this meaningful boundary helps explain why organizations developed at this level to structure candidate emergence. It was in the Pennsylvania State Constitution that the state senate district boundaries could not subdivide parts of one county into multiple districts demonstrating the amount of meaning the county had in Pennsylvania before 1790. The crafting of congressional districts followed this precedent despite no requirement to until redistricting in 1822. Compare this to the lack of organizations created early on in New Hampshire to structure state senate district elections. Not only was extra-governmental organization frowned upon, but the county was not a politically meaningful boundary in New Hampshire where township representation reigned as the most integral political boundary.

District elections for the state senate or Congress increased the political scale for the election and generally made the candidate emergence process more difficult to structure with procedures. This difficulty was overcome in Pennsylvania where both parties created clear procedures for the selection of delegates to district conventions and precedents for a rotation of the power of nomination that ensured input by each geographic region. However, these organizations did not always operate successfully. For Cumberland County, the congressional district delegate convention failed to nominate or did not even

organize in 1804, 1806, and 1808. As early as 1810, the Democratic-Republicans showed signs of state senate and congressional organization breakdowns when these bodies failed to produce a nomination or disregarded precedents.

Lastly, the use of statewide electoral rules for Congress within a state appears to have encouraged the use of what could be considered state-level nomination procedures Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Ohio. The two times Pennsylvania elected members of congress in statewide at-large elections tickets were created through informal organizations of elite correspondence or a limited delegate convention that all aimed to be geographically inclusive of the state. Seats to the U.S. House of Representatives were elected on a statewide basis in New Hampshire the entire period and each party nominated their candidates using legislative caucuses every year except for 1816 when the Democratic-Republicans created informal congressional districts that nominated a full slate of candidates to be supported in the statewide election. The legislative caucus was also utilized in Ohio by the Democratic-Republicans to nominate congressional candidates when they were only apportioned one member who was elected in a statewide election. This procedure failed as many times as it successfully designated a potential candidate as the Democratic-Republican nominee. More importantly, when the state shifted to district elections in 1812 the party did not attempt to continue the practice and instead allowed the power of nomination to shift to the districts or to counties within the districts.

Electoral Competition and Development

Electoral competition is central for understanding some of the most important developments in candidate emergence during this period. The power of electoral competition in the development of political organizations and procedures is littered

throughout the historical literature but rarely explored in-depth. Luetscher mentions the influence of electoral competition briefly in his work on the development of party organizations, specifically the convention system.⁵ In McCormick's brief overview of the first party era he mentions how the "elaborateness of the party apparatus varied and was generally related to the intensity of party competition."⁶ This same understanding is referenced in Cunningham's work like when he mentions how "Federalists gains prodded the Republicans into increased activity; party leaders . . . recognized the necessity of a more aggressive program."⁷ When analyzing the second party era William N. Chambers and Phillip C. Davis argued that the relationship is actually the opposite and the creation of party organizations caused increases in electoral competition.⁸ Despite references to the importance of electoral competition, no one has attempted to show the relationship at work.

I argue that electoral competition explains various changes in candidate emergence over time. My argument is twofold. First, increases in (potential) electoral competition will push local political leaders to structure the candidate emergence process with procedures that will increase their ability to successfully coordinate their fellow elites and their partisan electorate. Second, decreases in electoral competition will encourage a subsequent lapse in the use of organizational structures that encourage the coordination of elites and the electorate. More concretely, I anticipate increases in electoral competition, perceived and actual, to encourage the adoption of more popularly oriented nomination procedures that are both understood to be politically legitimate but also could reasonably be expected to increase the coordination and mobilization efforts of party leaders. Conversely, when electoral competition decreases, I expect the organizations already in place will lapse in their use and individual nominations will reemerge in use.

I find supportive evidence for my expectations on the way electoral competition influences the development of candidate emergence. While there is already an accepted understanding that the minority party is incentivized to create more organizations to engage in political competition, I demonstrate that the existing majority will react to this increase in electoral competition with the development of organizations themselves. In New Hampshire, Federalists responded to increases in electoral competition with their first organized effort to structure candidate emergence for state senate and congressional elections in 1800. I show in Pennsylvania that local Federalists leaders reacted to the pressure of electoral competition with the development of their nomination procedures. During the party formation period between 1796 and 1802, Federalists in Lancaster and Chester Counties reacted to increases in electoral competition by adopting the county delegate convention nomination procedure.

I show how decreases in electoral competitiveness can result in the decay of organizations structuring candidate emergence. When the Federalists removed themselves from electoral politics between 1806 and early-1808 there was a corresponding decline in coordination efforts by the Democratic-Republican Party in 1807 and 1808 state senate elections leading to individual nominations in the press. After successfully attaining statehood, Federalists in most of Ohio receded from electoral politics, especially national-level politics between 1803 and 1810. During this time the Democratic-Republican legislative caucus failed to nominate candidates half the time causing potential candidates, their friends, or anonymous individuals to turn to individual nominations in the press. The decrease in electoral competition in by the Federalist Party in central Pennsylvania can help

explain the failure of congressional nomination procedures in the district Cumberland County was a part of between 1804 and 1808.

Democratic-Republican intra-party factionalism can help explain when the lapse in two-party electoral competition failed to produce a subsequent degeneration in organizational efforts to structure candidate emergence. This was present in county-level organizations in Pennsylvania and Ohio. Electoral competition created by Democratic-Republican factional politics rather than the two-party system electoral competition of the 1790s or after 1808 created the pressure for a continuation of organizational efforts. Further, factional politics like this did not occur in New Hampshire. The factional politics of the period was, therefore, had a positive impact on the politics of the early republic by encouraging the continuation of local-level organizations to structure candidate emergence.⁹

Across most of the United States there was a return of electoral competition or at least the potential for competitive elections between 1808 and 1816. Multiple authors note the return of the Federalists Party and two-party competition between 1808 and 1816 was the result of the salience of economic issues and renewed trans-Atlantic rivalries over support for the British or the French in foreign affairs.¹⁰ The opportunity for the Federalist Party to engage in competitive elections once more during this time helps explain the decentralization of state senate nominations beginning as early as 1809 in New Hampshire. The opportunity for success also helps explain the return of independent Federalist nomination procedures in Washington County, Ohio and in the popularly oriented nomination procedures for Federalists in Philadelphia City, Philadelphia County, and Luzerne County in Pennsylvania. The potential for a Federalists resurgence beginning in

1808 helps explain the development of radically popularly oriented nomination procedures in Charleston, South Carolina as well.

In all, my in-depth analysis of electoral competition and its relationship to organizational efforts within my case studies provides supportive evidence for my expectations. I show with clear examples when electoral competition or the perception of coming competitiveness can lead to the development of popularly oriented nomination procedures as a response to this competition. I go beyond previous discussions of electoral competition showing what happens to party structures when two-party electoral competition lapses and the positive effect of Democratic-Republican factional politics.

Beyond Candidate Emergence: Institutionalization and Democratization

My research on the development of candidate emergence in the first party era provides important incites for major questions in political science and American political history. The common narrative in political science on American political party development doesn't consider the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans as political parties that attempted to organize outside the halls Washington DC. Falling in line with Aldrich's work on party development, these parties are understood to have only been "primarily parties-in-government" and were not attempting to organize the partisan electorate.¹¹ Further, strict institutionalist definitions of political parties drawn from the twentieth-century political world make the existence of political parties impossible from a conceptual standpoint and it even a problematic standard to hold political parties to today.¹² While political historians went along with political scientists for a time calling them "proto-parties" or ignoring the question altogether.¹³ More recently, political historians have shown that partisan politics

thrived at the grassroots level during the first party era breaking with the conclusions from political science.¹⁴ Therefore, questions on political party development and institutionalization during the first party ear needs reassessing from political science.

To engage in this critical reassessment of the first party era I broaden the scope of analysis compared to previous research, present my own definition of political parties, and adopt the group-centered theoretical framework of party development. With my analysis of candidate emergence and a definition of political parties that does not require specific organizations, I am able to understand what attempts were made to coordinate elites and ordinary citizens at the state and grassroots level during the first party era. The group-centered theory of party development then places candidate nomination as the key function for political parties making my research central to understanding the validity of this theory during the period. I present a fuller story of political party development that connects the formal and informal organizational efforts of local elites during the pre-party period to the formal and informal organizational efforts of these same local elites through 1816. Policy-demanders at the state- and local-level pursued their policy goals through the creation of nomination procedures that identified a potential candidate for office that agreed with their policy positions and connected them with an electorate.

I demonstrate that the Federalists and Democratic-Republicans constructed nomination procedures earlier than previously thought and that these were quickly institutionalized. In Pennsylvania and New Hampshire, clear and consistent nomination procedures were put into practice by both parties between 1796 and 1804. Nomination procedures in Pennsylvania had clear precedents in place like the practice of rotating the power of nomination between geographic areas within the same district and consistent

meeting locations. Partisan nomination procedures were quickly adopted in Ohio resulting in their first state and national legislative elections in 1803 being organized affairs. While formal organizations did not develop in South Carolina for most of the state, I show how informal organizations expressed through individual nominations in the press appeared between 1796 and 1800 constituting an intentional effort to coordinate elites across the state. I argue that these informal methods are important practices and part of the story of party development. At the same time, I show how both parties used formal nomination procedures in Charleston later in the period. Nomination procedures were created by those at the state and local level outside the halls of Washington DC and were in fact interested in organizing the electorate.

My research on candidate emergence also speaks to the debate surrounding the role of political parties in American democratization. E. E. Schattschneider argued that political parties were agents of democratization writing that “the political parties created democracy.”¹⁵ This was also the assumption made by most political historians of the 1950s and 60s who wrote on the development of the Federalist and Democratic-Republican parties.¹⁶ This assumption was criticized by historians in the 1970s and more recently the role of political parties as agents of democratization is refuted by historian Daniel Peart.¹⁷ Peart’s work on the politics of the early republic places associations and social organizations as the main actors in the story of American democratization and even describes political parties as unsupportive or hindrances to the process.

My research contributes to this debate following Johann N. Neem’s approach to understanding democracy and democratization through capabilities. This approach requires researchers to discover the extent to which institutions, like political parties,

increased the capabilities of “citizens to deliberate and then influence public policy.”¹⁸ After making this charge, Neem goes on to assume that the first two political parties were developed from the top down precluding them from increasing the capabilities of ordinary citizens to engage in everyday party politics and therefore unable to be agents of democratization. I demonstrate that the Federalist and Democratic-Republican parties were created from the middle out by state and local level elites who then, over time, created nomination procedures that were participatory and sought the incorporation of ordinary citizens into party politics.

The organization of wardship delegate elections, township delegate elections, and county general meetings by local party organizers provided the opportunity for ordinary citizens to increase their political capabilities. At these gatherings oriented towards drawing in as many people as possible, debates surrounding public policies occurred as party leaders would present resolutions drawing the party line on state and national policy issues. There is good reason to assume these resolutions brought about debates within the ranks of those in attendance in favor and against. Further, one would be hard pressed to find a more powerful tool for influencing public policy than the ability to engage in choosing the party nominee for state and national legislative elections. The use of delegate conventions to nominate candidates should not be seen as a hindrance to this ability because of the widespread practice of instructing one’s delegates on whom they should support at the convention. Therefore, political parties were agents of democratization.

Across each of my case studies the extent to which you can call political parties agents of democratization varies widely. This statement applies best to Pennsylvania where both political parties created popularly oriented nomination procedures that sought the

meaningful inclusion of ordinary citizens into party procedures. This was also true of the Democratic-Republican Party in Ohio and especially over time as more counties utilized the county delegate convention system. In New Hampshire, both parties became increasingly popularly oriented after 1808 with the Democratic-Republicans going farther to create opportunities for their partisan electorate to develop political capabilities. Lastly, political parties in South Carolina fail to meet this mark except in Charleston. After 1808, however, both parties created nomination procedures that sought out popular participation with the Democratic-Republicans doing the most to provide for the meaningful inclusion of ordinary citizens in the nomination process. The story of American democratization during the early republic was uneven across the U.S. matching the decentralized nature of political parties and their varying roles as agents of democratization.

Future Research

The data I have collected on candidate emergence and my findings offer a few avenues for future research on important questions surrounding political parties, campaigns and elections, legislatures, and nature of American democracy during the early republic. First, a similar project could explore the period between 1817 and 1824, essentially what is called the “era of good feelings.” Daniel Peart's work on this period demonstrates that there were still electoral battles and not political harmony as the name for the period suggests.¹⁹ More importantly, this period offers a glimpse into one of the few examples of party system decay in the United States. From my research, there was already the beginnings of this process beginning in 1815 in Pennsylvania and Ohio. The comparative party system literature offers a theoretical foundation for what to anticipate as two-party competition falls away across most of the country.

Second, my data on candidate emergence and the organizations created to structure the process can be further mined for information and combined with other data sources. Announcements about party general meetings or county delegate conventions generally included information about who oversaw those meetings, who the delegates were, who were selected as delegates for other conventions, and lists of names appointed for various committees. This offers an opportunity to investigate who was involved in party organizations in terms of class, occupation, and whether they were potential candidates themselves. The rhetoric used to support candidates from these announcements also offers an opportunity to explore state and national legislative campaigns. Specifically, what would a party say to support their preferred candidates? Would they extol their virtues, highlight their previous service in war or politics, or connect them to state and national policy issues? Lastly, this information could be connected to the legislators themselves to explore whether there was an electoral connection during the period. Would the delegate convention system encourage the development of an electoral connection between a legislator and their constituency? Do complex and popularly oriented nomination procedures allow a constituency to hold their legislator accountable?

Lastly, Richard Hofstadter's "Constitution Against Parties" thesis influenced generations by arguing that the U.S. Constitution's design meant to protect liberty by preventing the creation of political parties.²⁰ Further, he uses anti-partyism rhetoric to argue that through the 1830s political parties were widely understood as illegitimate political organizations and only a means to an end to save the republic. However, Gerald Leonard's work on the development of Jacksonian politics in Illinois argues that this anti-partyism rhetoric is in fact strategic political rhetoric used against one's political opposition and not

what Hofstadter suggests.²¹ The development of nomination procedures and the debates surrounding these organizations offer an opportunity to explore whether those during the early republic understood political parties as illegitimate organizations or as legitimate extensions of the republican government itself. My preliminary work on this question suggests that Martin Van Buren's theory of a legitimate opposition was, as he suggested, simply a look back at the first party era and a synthesis of what was and had died away during the 1820s. Nomination procedures and debates surrounding them demonstrates they were understood as integral organizations meant to be extensions of republican government itself to the people and therefore were held accountable to the same principles like representation, majoritarianism, and limited government.

Notes

1. Cox 1997.
2. Cohen et al. 2008; Bawn et al. 2012.
3. Cunningham 1963, 276-281.
4. Historian Andrew W. Robertson goes so far to write that “The first party system was in actuality twenty-four state party systems . . .” when stressing the diversity of the American political experience during the early republic (Robertson 2015, 100).
5. Luetscher 1903.
6. McCormick 1966, 23.
7. Cunningham 1957, 135.
8. Chambers and Davis 1978, 196.
9. I am not the first to view Democratic-Republican factionalism in a positive light. Historian Alfred F. Young mentions how factionalism within the growing Democratic-Republican Party in New York was in fact a healthy competition for power and good for the burgeoning party (Young 1967, 578).
10. Lampi 2013; Robertson 2015, 111-112.
11. Aldrich 1995, 95.
12. Hoadley 1986, 189-190.
13. Sharp 1993, 8; Freeman 2001, xix.
14. e.g., Pasley et al. 2004; Huston 2015.
15. Schattschneider 1942, 1.
16. e.g., Charles 1956; Chambers 1963.
17. Formisano 1974; Peart 2014.
18. Neem 2015, 248.
19. Peart 2014.
20. Hofstadter 1969.

21. Leonard 2002.

Appendix: Additional Tables

Table A1: Cumberland County Democratic-Republican Party Organization and Legislative Nomination Procedures, 1800-1816

Year	Standing Committee Meeting	Township Delegate Election	County Delegate Convention	Mentions Presenting Certificates	# Delegates Present	# Townships Represented	Standing Committee Size	Offices Nominated/ Delegates Selected
1800		-	September 23		-	10	6	LC
1801	April 1, August 17	May 30, September 5	September 11	X	-	-	7	LC, UC
1802	August 7	September 11	September 25	X	36	18	7	LC
1803	September 1	September 17	September 26	X	28	15	8	LC
1804	June 23, August 3	August 25	August 29	X	32	-	8	LC, CDD (5)
1805	June 5	August 31	September 17	X	31	16	9	LC, UC, CDD (3)
1806	May 1, 28	June 14/ September 13	June 21/ September 24	X	-/32	-/16	7	CDD (3)/LC
1807	June 18, August 5	September 19	September 30	X	28	14	9	LC
1808	June 7	August 27	September 2	X	32	17	9	LC, C
1809	August 8	September 2	September 5		27	14	9	LC
1810	July 28, August 7	August 18	August 24		23	12	9	LC, CDD (3)
1811	early-June, August 6	July 20, September 7	September 17	X	-	-	9	LC, UC
1812	August 19	August 29	September 2		34	17	9	LC, CDD (3)
1813	early-August	September 11	September 18	X	38	19	44	LC, UC
1814	August 6	September 17	September 24	X	~17	-	-	LC
1815	August 10	September 9	September 16	X	24	14	15	LC
1816	August 7	August 24	August 30	X	29	15	15	LC, CDD (3)

Table A1: *Cumberland County Democratic-Republican . . . continued*

Notes: The size of the standing committee reflects the committee appointed at that year's convention that would then be in charge the following year.

Carlisle Gazette Sept 24, 1800, Aug 19, Sept 16, 1801, Aug 11, Sept 29, 1802, Sept 7, 28, 1803, June 13, July 20, Aug 10, 31, 1804, May 24, June 14, July 26, Sept 20, 1805, May 16, 30, June 27, Aug 15, Sept 19, 26, 1806, June 12, July 10, Aug 14, Oct 2, 1807, May 13, June 10, Sept 9, 1808, July 7, Aug 11, Sept 8, 1809, July 20, Aug 10, 24, 1810, June 14, Aug 9, Sept 20, 1811, Aug 7, 21, Sept 4, 1812, Aug 6, Sept 24, 1813, Aug 12, Sept 30, 1814, Aug 23, Sept 20, 1815. Aug 14, Sept 4, 1816.

C- Congressional candidates

CDD- Congressional district delegates and number sent

LC- State legislative lower chamber candidates

UC- State legislative upper chamber candidates

Bibliography

Newspapers, Broadsides, and Other Resources

Pennsylvania

Readex

<i>American Telegraph</i>	(Brownsville, PA)
<i>Aurora General Advertiser</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Carey's United States' Recorder</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Carlisle Gazette</i>	(Carlisle, PA)
<i>Claypoole's American Daily Advertiser</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Claypoole's Daily Advertiser</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Democratic Republican</i>	(Chambersburg, PA)
<i>Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Farmers' Register</i>	(Chambersburg, PA)
<i>Federal Gazette</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Gazette of the United States</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>General Advertiser</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Gleaner</i>	(Wilkes-Barre, PA)
<i>Greensburg and Indiana Register</i>	(Greensburg, PA)
<i>Harrisburgh Visitor</i>	(Harrisburg, PA)
<i>Herald of Liberty</i>	(Washington, PA)
<i>Independent Gazetteer</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Independent Whig</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Northumberland Republicaner</i>	(German; Sunbury, PA)
<i>Oracle of Dauphin</i>	(Harrisburg, PA)
<i>Philadelphia Gazette</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Pennsylvania Correspondent</i>	(Doylestown, PA)
<i>Pennsylvania Herald</i>	(Easton, PA)
<i>Pennsylvania Packet</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)

<i>Porcupine's Gazette</i>	(Bussleton, PA)
<i>Porcupine's Gazette</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Poulson's American Daily Advertiser</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Reading Adler</i>	(German; Reading, PA)
<i>True American</i>	(Bedford, PA)
<i>United States' Gazette</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Universal Gazette</i>	(Philadelphia, PA)
<i>Wahre Amerikaner</i>	(German; Lancaster, PA)
<i>Weekly Advertiser of Reading</i>	(Reading, PA)

New Hampshire

Readex

<i>American Patriot</i>	(Concord, NH)
<i>Concord Gazette</i>	(Concord, NH)
<i>Concord Herald</i>	(Concord, NH)
<i>Constitutionalist</i>	(Exeter, NH)
<i>Courier of New Hampshire</i>	(Concord, NH)
<i>Democratic Republican</i>	(Walpole, NH)
<i>Farmer's Cabinet</i>	(Amherst, NH)
<i>Farmer's Weekly Museum</i>	(Walpole, NH)
<i>Federal Observer</i>	(Portsmouth, NH)
<i>Mirror</i>	(Concord, NH)
<i>New Hampshire Patriot</i>	(Concord, NH)
<i>New Hampshire Sentinel</i>	(Keene, NH)
<i>New-Hampshire Gazette</i>	(Portsmouth, NH)
<i>New-Hampshire Spy</i>	(Portsmouth, NH)
<i>Oracle of the Day</i>	(Portsmouth, NH)
<i>People's Advocate</i>	(Portsmouth, NH)
<i>Political and Sentimental Repository</i>	(Dover, NH)

Political Observatory(Walpole, NH)
Portsmouth Gazette(Portsmouth, NH)
Portsmouth Oracle(Portsmouth, NH)
Rising Sun(Keene, NH)
United States Oracle(Portsmouth, NH)

South Carolina

Readex

Camden Gazette(Camden, SC)
Carolina Gazette(Charleston, SC)
City Gazette(Charleston, SC)
Columbian Herald(Charleston, SC)
Investigator(Charleston, SC)
Miller's Weekly Messenger(Pendleton, SC)
South-Carolina State-Gazette(Charleston, SC)
State Gazette of South-Carolina(Charleston, SC)

University of South Carolina

Charleston Courier(Charleston, SC)

Ohio

Readex

Western American(Williamsburg, OH)

Ohio History Connection

Liberty Hall(Cincinnati, OH)
Scioto Gazette(Chillicothe, OH)

Center for Research Libraries

Western Spy(Cincinnati, OH)

Broadsides

“Address of the Society of Constitutional Republicans 1805.” 1805. Philadelphia:

William McKorkle. *Readex: Early American Imprints* 8246. Accessed: May 25, 2020.

“An oration, delivered in the Independent Circular Church . . .” 1806. Charleston: W. P.

Young. *Readex: Early American Imprints* 11365. Accessed April 30, 2021.

“To the [. . .] At a Meeting of the Federal Citizens . . .” 1800. Pennsylvania: n.p. *Readex:*

Early American Imprints 37775. Accessed: August 15, 2019.

“To the electors of the borough and county of Lancaster . . .” 1813. Lancaster: n.p.

Readex: Early American Imprints 5168. Accessed: May 27, 2020.

Electronic Resources

A New Nation Votes Database. Tufts University. <https://elections.lib.tufts.edu/>.

Early American Newspapers. Series I. Readex. [https://infoweb-newsbank-com.proxy.](https://infoweb-newsbank-com.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/apps/readex/product-help/eanx?p=EANX)

[mul.missouri.edu/apps/readex/product-help/eanx?p=EANX](https://infoweb-newsbank-com.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/apps/readex/product-help/eanx?p=EANX).

Early American Imprints. Series I & II. Readex. [https://infoweb-newsbank-com.proxy.](https://infoweb-newsbank-com.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/iw-search/we/Evans/?p_product=EAIX)

[mul.missouri.edu/iw-search/we/Evans/?p_product=EAIX](https://infoweb-newsbank-com.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/iw-search/we/Evans/?p_product=EAIX).

Secondary Sources

Aldrich, John H. 1995. *Why Parties?: The Organization and Transformation of Party*

Politics in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Banner Jr., James M. 1970. *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins*

of Party Politics in Massachusetts, 1789-1815. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Bawn, Kathleen, Martin Cohen, David Karol, Seth Masket, Hans Noel, and John Zaller. 2012. "A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 10(3): 571-597.
- Broussard, James H. 1977. "Party and Partisanship in American Legislatures: The South Atlantic States, 1800-1812." *Journal of Southern History* 43(1): 39-58.
- Broussard, James H. 1978. *The Southern Federalists, 1800-1816*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Brown, Jeffrey P. 1979. "Frontier Politics: The Evolution of a Political Society in Ohio, 1788-1814." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Butler, Pierce. 2007. *The Letters of Pierce Butler, 1790-1794: Nation Building and Enterprise in the New American Republic*. ed. Terry Lipscomb. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Chambers, William Nisbet. 1963. *Political Parties in a New Nation: The American Experience, 1776-1809*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Chambers, William Nisbet. 1975. "Party Development and the American Mainstream" in *The American Party System: Stages of Political Development*, ed. William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham. New York: Oxford University Press. 3-32.
- Chambers, William Nisbet and Phillip C. Davis. 1978. "Party Competition and Mass Participation: The Case of the Democratizing Party System, 1824-1852" in *The History of American Electoral Behavior* ed. Joel H. Silbey, Allan G. Bogue, and William H. Flanigan. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 174-197.

- Charles, Joseph. 1956. *The Origins of the American Party System*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cohen, Marty, David Karol, Hans Noel, and John Zaller. 2008. *The Party Decides: Presidential Nominations Before and After Reform*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cox, Gary. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningham Jr., Nobel E. 1957. *The Jeffersonian Republicans: The Formation of Party Organization, 1789-1801*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Cunningham Jr., Nobel E. 1963. *The Jeffersonian Republicans in Power: Party Operations, 1801-1809*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Cutler, Julia P. 1890. *Life and Times of Ephraim Cutler Prepared from his Journals and Correspondence*. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co.
- Dallinger, Frederick W. 1897. *Nominations for Elective Office in the United States*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Daniell, Jere R. 1970. *Experiment in Republicanism: New Hampshire Politics and the American Revolution, 1721-1794*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Dow, Jay K. 2017. *Electing the House: The Adoption and Performance of the US Single-Member District Electoral System*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Duverger, Maurice. 1954. *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Fischer, David Hackett. 1965. *The Revolution of American Conservatism: The Federalist Party in the Era of Jeffersonian Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Formisano, Ronald P. 1974. "Deferential-Participant Politics: The Early Republic's Political Culture, 1789-1840." *American Political Science Review* 68(2): 473-487.
- Formisano, Ronald P. 1981. "Federalists and Democratic-Republicans: Parties, Yes-System, No" in *The Evolution of American Electoral Systems*, ed. Paul Kleppner. Westport: Greenwood Press. 33-76.
- Formisano, Ronald P. 1983. *The Transition of Political Culture: Massachusetts Parties, 1790s-1840s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, Joanne B. 2002. *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Halley, W. E. and John P. Maynard. 1917. *Legislative Manual of the State of Ohio, 1915-1916*. Columbus: The F. J. Heer Printing Co.
- Higginbotham, Sandford Wilson. 1952. *The Keystone in the Democratic Arch: Pennsylvania Politics, 1800-1816*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission.
- Hoadley, John F. 1986. *Origins of American Political Parties, 1789-1803*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Hofstadter, Richard. 1969. *The Idea of a Party System: The Rise of Legitimate Opposition in the United States, 1780-1840*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Huston, Reeve. 2015. "Rethinking the Origins of Partisan Democracy in the United States, 1795-1840" in *Practicing Democracy: Popular Politics in the United States from the Constitution to the Civil War*, eds. Daniel Peart and Adam I. P. Smith. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press. 46-71.
- Keller, Kenneth W. 1982. "Rural Politics and the Collapse of Pennsylvania Federalism." *The American Philosophical Society* 72(6): 1-73.
- Krutz, Glen. 2019. *American Government 2e*. Houston: OpenStax. (Accessed January 28, 2022) <https://openstax.org/details/books/american-government-2e>.
- Lafferty, Ben P. 2020. *American Intelligence: Small-Town News and Political Culture in Federalist New Hampshire*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Lampi, Philip J. 2013. "The Federalist Party Resurgence, 1808–1816: Evidence from the New Nation Votes Database." *Journal of the Early Republic* 33(2): 255–81.
- Leonard, Gerald. 2002. *The Invention of Party Politics: Federalism, Popular Sovereignty, and Constitutional Development in Jacksonian Illinois*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Luetscher, George E. 1903. *Early Political Machinery in the United States*. Philadelphia: Kessinger Publishing.
- Main, Jackson Turner. 1973. *Political Parties before the Constitution*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Maulden, Kristopher. 2019. *The Federalist Frontier: Settler Politics in the Old Northwest, 1783-1840*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

- McCormick, Richard P. 1966. *The Second American Party System: Party Formation in the Jacksonian Era*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mickey, Robert. 2015. *Paths Out of Dixie: The Democratization of Authoritarian Enclaves in America's Deep South, 1944-1972*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Miller, Richard G. 1976. *Philadelphia-The Federalist City: A Study of Urban Politics, 1789-1801*. Port Washington: Kennikat Press.
- Neem, Johann N. 2015. "Two Approaches to Democratization: Engagement versus Capability" in *Practicing Democracy: Popular Politics in the United States from the Constitution to the Civil War*, eds. Daniel Peart and Adam I. P. Smith. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press. 247-280.
- Newman, Simon P. 1997. *Parades and the Politics of the Street: Festive Culture in the Early American Republic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Orren, Karen and Stephen Skowronek. 2004. *The Search for American Political Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Owen, Kenneth. 2018. *Political Community in Revolutionary Pennsylvania, 1774-1800*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Park, Benjamin E. 2018. *American Nationalisms: Imagining Union in the Age of Revolutions, 1783-1833*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pasley, Jeffrey L. 2001. *The Tyranny of the Printers: Newspaper Politics in the Early Republic*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia Press.

- Pasley, Jeffrey L. 2013. *The First Presidential Contest: 1796 and the Founding of American Democracy*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.
- Pasley, Jeffrey L., Andrew W. Robertson, and David Waldstreicher. 2004. *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early Republic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Peart, Daniel. 2014. *Era of Experimentation: American Political Practices in the Early Republic*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Pocock, Emil. 1994. ““A Candidate I’ll Surely Be”: Election Practices in Early Ohio, 1798-1825” in *The Pursuit of Public Power: Political Culture in Ohio, 1787-1861* eds. Jeffrey P. Brown and Andrew R. L. Cayton. Ashland: Kent State University Press. 49-68.
- Prince, Charles E. 1967. *New Jersey’s Jeffersonian Republicans: Genesis of an Early Party Machine, 1789-1817*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Ratcliffe, Donald J. 1998. *Party Spirit in a Frontier Republic: Democratic Politics in Ohio, 1793-1821*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Ratzlaff, Robert K. 1982. *John Rutledge, Jr.: South Carolina Federalist, 1766-1819*. New York: Arno Press.
- Risjord, Norman K. and Gordon DenBoer. 1974. “The Evolution of Political Parties in Virginia, 1782-1800.” *Journal of American History* 60(4): 961-984.
- Robertson, Andrew W. 2015. “Jefferson Parties, Politics, and Participation: The Tortuous Trajectory of American Democracy” in *Practicing Democracy: Popular Politics*

- in the United States from the Constitution to the Civil War*, eds. Daniel Peart and Adam I. P. Smith. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press. 99-122.
- Rogers Jr., George C. 1962. *Evolution of a Federalist: William Loughton Smith of Charleston (1758-1812)*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Rose, Lisle A. 1968. *Prologue to Democracy: The Federalists in the South, 1789-1800*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- Rosman, David. ““Think for yourself” billboard makes a statement without attribution.” *Missourian*. May 5, 2021. <https://www.columbiamissourian.com>.
- Ryan, Mary P. 1971. “Party Formation in the United States Congress, 1789 to 1796: A Quantitative Analysis.” *William and Mary Quarterly* 28(4): 523-542.
- Schattschneider, E. E. 1942. *Party Government*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development As Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sharp, James Roger. 1993. *American Politics in the Early Republic: The New Nation in Crisis*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Silbey, Joel H. 1981. “Congressional and State Legislative Roll-Call Studies by U.S. Historians.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 6(4): 597-607.
- Sorauf, Frank J. 1975. “Political Parties and Political Analysis” in *The American Party System: Stages of Political Development*, ed. William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham. New York: Oxford University Press. 33-55.
- Squire, Peverill. 2017. *The Rise of the Representative: Lawmakers and Constituents in Colonial America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Tinkcom, Harry Marlin. 1950. *The Republicans and Federalists in Pennsylvania: 1790-1801*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.
- Turner, Lynn W. 1983. *The Ninth State: New Hampshire's Formative Years*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Waldstreicher, David. 1997. *The Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Walton, Joseph S. 1897. "Nominating Conventions in Pennsylvania." *The American Historical Review* 2(2): 262-278.
- Wilentz, Sean. 2005. *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Wolfe, John Harold. 1940. *Jeffersonian Democracy in South Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wolfe, John Harold. 1973. "Jeffersonian Democracy in South Carolina" in *Perspectives in South Carolina History: The First 300 Years*, eds. Lander Jr., Ernest M. and Robert K. Ackerman. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press. 75-85.
- Young, Alfred E. 1967. *The Democratic Republicans of New York: The Origins, 1763-1797*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Vita

Aric Dale Gooch grew up in Bolivar, Missouri. He earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in Social Sciences Education and Political Science at Southwest Baptist University. Immediately after graduation, he began pursuing his PhD in Political Science at University of Missouri, Columbia. During the course of his degree, he married, had his first child, and is expecting a second after graduation. Aric research interests are interdisciplinary across the fields of political science and history. He studies the development of political parties, elections, and legislatures during the American Revolution and American early republic periods.