

1-18-1977

A Prospographical Study of State Legislators from Middletown, 1860-1910

Timothy S. Hollister

Follow this and additional works at: <http://wescholar.wesleyan.edu/middletownpapers>

Recommended Citation

Hollister, Timothy S., "A Prospographical Study of State Legislators from Middletown, 1860-1910" (1977). *Middletown Papers*. Paper 55.

<http://wescholar.wesleyan.edu/middletownpapers/55>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Local History at WesScholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Middletown Papers by an authorized administrator of WesScholar. For more information, please contact dschnaidt@wesleyan.edu, ljohnson@wesleyan.edu.

A PROSOPOGRAPHICAL STUDY OF STATE LEGISLATORS

FROM MIDDLETOWN, 1860-1910

Timothy S. Hollister '78

History 325
Mr. Kahn
January 18, 1977

A Proposographical Study of State Legislators from Middletown,
1860 - 1910

A study of the men who participated in Middletown politics in the late nineteenth century at a first glance appears to deal with men engaged in unimportant, uninteresting business. Politics during the age of business and laissez-faire government policies was not the locus of power. Political conflict and inter-party controversy were nowhere to be found, and the local newspapers reflected this quietude by reporting little on local politics and elections. And if one assumes that, particularly from 1860 to 1890, local government exceeded state government in the importance of its actions, then state legislators might appear as the "politicians" most removed from power and least useful for the historian of Middletown. Yet this is not the case.

It has been said often that politics reflects society, and a lack of interest in politics highlights the importance of other aspects of the social structure. This essay, through studying the backgrounds of the men who represented Middletown in the state legislature from 1860 to 1880, attempts to discover what tied men together in political parties, given the relative lack of controversy and competition of interest groups; from examining the social bonds, one may make inferences on the relation of business to political and social power, the emergence of the social and professional group as a unit of organization and identity, the division of wealth, status, and political power, the structure of local government and its relation to the state, and the development of urban democracy in Middletown, relative to other cities. The backgrounds of these men suggest a range of attitudes and motivations that go

far in explaining the social structure of the era.

* * * * *

Before presenting the data on the state legislators, several problems on sources need mentioning. First, I could not find information on the representatives of the 1890-1900 period. My sources were the Hartford Evening Post Annual, which covers 1882 to 1889 and 1895; Taylor's Legislative History, which appeared bi-annually from 1900 to 1910; and the History of Middlesex County, which was published in 1884. Thus, I have data on only three representatives for the 1890's.

Second, there is no way to check the data collected for inaccuracies; it is quite likely that some dates and parties were reported incorrectly. Where there was conflicting data, I tried to deduce which facts were correct; where I felt that I had enough other evidence to fill in a missing fact (such as party affiliation), I took the liberty of doing so.

This study, furthermore, is not comparative. Neither elites and the masses, politicians and non-politicians, Middletown and other cities, nor state legislators and other elected officials will be compared. This study will deal only with the legislative representatives and their relation to Middletown,

It is most important, however, that the reader bear in mind an assumption that underlies the organization of the data, namely, that political party affiliation served as the dividing line between business interests, ethnic groups, religions, occupations, or any other social orientation. Although the data are arranged

in terms of Democratic-Republican-Party Unknown, this paper will show that party was not the most important affiliation, but rather that one cannot divide the men in the study into two or three distinct groups. Politics in Middletown was an amorphous world of cross alliances and coalitions carried on orally, ~~and~~ unrecorded, and personally. Party seems to have been a label of questionable import; we will come back to this topic later. (N.B. In the following section, in which data on backgrounds is presented, I have only mentioned a few points on what the data mean. The last section of the paper will tie together the significance of all the tables).

* * * * *

To begin with, a simple breakdown of the elections, by party, men elected, and elections per se:

TABLE 1

A.	Representatives in this study, 1860- 1909	-	72		
	Number who served more than one term	-	10		
	Number of different men elected	-	62		
B.	Breakdown by men elected:				
	Democrats	-	24		
	Repubs.	-	24		
	Party Unk	-	14		
C.	By election:				
	Democrats	-	32		
	Republicans	-	26		
	Unknown	-	14		
D.	By decade:				
	N	<u>Democrats</u>	<u>Republicans</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	
	1860-70	20	9	7	4
	1870-80	20	7	4	9
	1880-90	19	13	5	1
	1890-00	3	0	3	0
	1900-10	10	3	7	0

E. The following served more than one term:

Democrats:	A.W. Bacon, 1867, 69, 70, 74	Republicans:	J.M. Douglas, 1864-5
	D. W. Northrop, 1871, 81, 82		B.W. Doulgas, 1854, 72
	Michael Griffin, 1867, 68		W.W. Wilcox, 1878, 80
	George W. Guy, 1856, 1870		W.U. Pearne, 1901, 05
	James Lawton 1881, 82		
	Horace R. Butler, 1883, 84	<u>Unknown:</u>	
	Michael Lawton, 1884-5		B.W. Coe, 1853, 54, 62

Besides the even party distribution, the most interesting information in Table 1 is the high turnover rate for the legislators, 62 men in 50 years and 100 elections (and adding the missing men from the 1890's the figure is higher). This suggests two possibilities for the question of the function of the state representatives: obviously since they were not elected to represent the city by gaining power and influence, their positions were either service to the party, or rewards for political work at the local level. Data on age and wealth will illuminate this question further.

TABLE 2

Age at election of state legislators, 1860- 1910

A.	Total Average age	N	Years			
	Democrats	60	44.6			
	Republicans	29	41.9			
	Party Unknown	23	51.6			
		8	39.5			
B.	Age Distribution	Age	Total	Democrats	Republican	Unk
		20's	6	2	3	1
		30's	19	12	3	4
		40's	12	8	3	1
		50's	13	3	8	2
		60's	9	3	6	0
		70's	1	0	1	0
C.	By Decade	Years	N	Total Avg.	N - Democs.	N- Repubs
		1860-70	11	42.8	5 44.4	6 40.3
		187-80	10	43.3	7 41.3	3 48.0
		1880-90	18	43.4	13 40.2	5 51.8
		1890-00	3	55.0	0 ---	3 55.0
		1900-00	10	51.7	3 46.6	7 54.3

TABLE 3

Average working years in Middletown prior to election

A.	Total	N= 50	Avg. = 30.72	
	Dems.	26	22.03	B. By Decade
	Repubs.	23	29.56	
	unknown	1	4.0	

B. By Decade:	<u>Years</u>	<u>N - Democs.</u>		<u>N - Repubs.</u>	
	1860-70	4	19.7	5	11.8
	1870-80	7	23.0	4	14.3
	1880-90	12	23.8	6	36.3
	1890-00	0		3	20.3
	1900-10	3	25.0	5	38.0

The datum in Table 3C, which shows that the Democrats in 1860-70 were older than their Republican colleagues, and that the Republicans grew older relatively during the next few decades, fits with the general idea that the Republicans were older and thus wealthier and more conservative than the Democrats, and that more old-line Republicans influenced the choice of candidates.

The tables on length of residence in Middletown prior to election help answer the question on the political function of the office of state legislator. Democrats were elected earlier in their careers (except for the 1860-70 period), indicating that for them the office was service to the party, while it was more of a reward or final service for the Republicans. Further evidence for this important fact appears in the chart on political careers.

Yet age and residency alone do not tell the function of the office, for one cannot assume that representatives were well paid (regardless of any prestige attached to the job), so that for a Republican to receive a "reward," and a Democrat serve the party, it would follow that Republicans would have to be wealthier than Democrats. Table 4 shows this to be true, and provides other data as well.

Financial Data on State Legislators, 1860-1910, Figures in Dollars

<u>Year</u>	<u>Avg. Tax Per City Taxpayer</u>	<u>Avg. Tax Per Legislators in 5 Yr. period</u>	<u>Total N</u>	<u>Democ. N</u>	<u>Democ. Avg.</u>	<u>Repub. N</u>	<u>Repub. Avg.</u>	<u>Unk N</u>	<u>Unk Avg.</u>
1860	\$1,721	1,963	8	2	1,100	4	5,220	2	1,545
1865	2,041	15,653	5	3	14,101	1	30,380	1	5,583
1870	1,732	6,990	7	3	5,360	2	12,100	2	4,115
1875	1,667	10,070	6	1	3,325	2	20,515	3	5,356
1880	1,946	2,506	4	4	2,506	0			
1885	3,723	8,412	4	2	2,800	2	14,025		
1895		6,008	3	0		3	6,008		
1900		6,418	3	0		3	6,418		
1905		4,585	4	2	2,732	2	6,437		
Totals	\$ 7,106		44	17	\$5,000	19	\$10,247	8	4,121

As the table shows, those elected were wealthier than the average Middletown resident, with the Republicans averaging out twice as rich as the Democrats for the fifty year period. Another interesting aspect of the table is that those listed under "Party Unknown" were poorer than those whose party was identified. This apparent link between wealth and notoriety, though based on a small sample, suggests that wealth and business were important elements in one's political career.

Directly correlated to wealth, of course, was occupation; the data on jobs particularly the last chart, indicate a difference in the kinds on people each party attracted, but not as clear a division as the financial and age charts might lead one to expect. The table shows an equality in several kinds of jobs, between the parties.

TABLE 5 - OCCUPATIONS

Occupation types (an arbitrary list)	<u>Number</u>	
#1- Professionals	8	
#2- White Collar, Head of business or institution	11	
#3- small white collar business, or employee of large firm	8	
#4- Small business, blue collar e.g. grocer, store owner	16	
#5- Manual laborer	8	Total = 51

Breakdown within type

#1- Lawyers -6	#2- Pres., Manufacturing - 3	
Doctor 1	Pres., Construction - 2	
Editor 1	Bank Pres., - 1	
	Real Estate - 2	
	Undertaker - 2	
	"Broker" - 1	
#3- Store owner -3	#4- Small store -5	#5- Farmer - 3
Bookeeper 3	Contractor 5	Laborer 1
Tax assessor 1	Grocer 3	Mason 4
Military 1	Horse Breeder 1	
	Machinist 1	
	Sea Capt. 1	

Table 5 (cont.)

C. Breakdown by party

<u>Job type</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Democrats</u>	<u>Republicans</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
#1	8	3	3	2
#2	11	3	7	1
#3	8	1	6	1
#4	16	12	3	1
#5	8	5	2	1

The most fascinating datum in the above table is the distribution of occupations within the parties. The table shows an equal number of professionals in each party, and the totals within the #2, 3, and 4 job types are equal. Overall, however, the chart shows the Republicans held more high prestige jobs than did the Democrats. The point is that the difference between the parties was clear but not great.

Another aspect of the data is the large percentage of legislators who were blue collar workers or manual laborers. This phenomenon might be the result of Middletown's being a predominantly lower-class city; but it might also indicate that the political power of the wealthy businessmen and elites was not oppressive ^{or} ~~or~~ overwhelming, but, as Gutman argued in the case of Paterson, New Jersey, that the elites depended in great part on the lower status people for political as well as business support. We will examine this relationship of politics and business after all the data are presented.

Two of the most important sets of data on the business-political structure in Middletown involve the roles of the legislators in other businesses — i.e., the directorships and trusteeships they held, and from which they exerted power — and their political

careers. Multiple roles in the community were measures of power, and one may infer from the extensive financial interconnections shown below, and the political offices held, that the political and business elites were indeed intertwined, but that the less wealthy and "unconnected" still had key roles in politics. (N.B. Appendices I and II contain the complete lists of trustee and directorships and political offices for each representative.)

TABLE 6

Trustee and Directorships

N for this table = 43 (There are overlaps in the numbers, e.g. some were Bank and Railroad trustees)

A. Business roles:	Bank President, Director, or Trustee	-	12
	Railroad " " " "	-	7
	Insurance " " " "	-	6
	Institutions (Wesleyan, Russell Library, Conn. Hospital, etc.)	-	6

B. Social affiliations:

Pre 1880, only B.W. Douglas was in a non-political club, that being a Temperance Union

Post 1880:	Masons --	7	
	Temperance	5	
	Other	10	(includes I.O.O.F., Knights of Pythias and Columbus, Odd Fellows, etc.)

A key consideration here is the emergence of the fraternal organization as a kind of ~~necessary~~ sanction or accreditation necessary to political success. Before 1880, only One man was a member of such a club. Almost all of the legislators elected after 1880 were members of either a fraternal organization or a social club such as a Temperance Union.

Finally, in the above table, the party and occupational distribution is surprisingly even: 19 Republicans, 17 Democrats, 7 Unknowns. Job type #1 - 5; #2 - 12; #3 - 8; #4 - 13; and #5 - 5.

Table 7
Political careers

The most important consideration in this table is when in their political careers these men were elected to the legislature. Was the office a political dead end, or a stepping stone to higher office? Our previous ideas on whether the office was a reward for service or a "training post" find further illumination in the following tables:

A. Total N - 57
 Democ. - 21
 Repub. - 21
 Unknown - 15

B.	Held Office before <u>Legislature</u>		After	Held no <u>Offices</u>
	Total			
Total	15		11	31
Democrats	5		5	11
Republicans	10		3	8
Unknown	0		3	12

C. Office	Total		Democ.		Repub.	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Mayor - 7	4	3	0	2	4	1
City Coun. 15	11	4	5	3	6	1
Judges 6	2	4	1	1	2	2
State Off. 6	2	4	0	2	2	2
City Off. 6	4	2	0	0	2	1
Party Off. 4	2	2	0	1	2	1
	<u>26</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>9</u>

The totals in table 7c are instructive. They indicate that the Democrats held fewer offices than the Republicans; when correlated with wealth, one might well make a connection between money and interest in politics. Second, the table shows that while the office of legislator was more likely to come earlier in one's career if one were a Democrat, the Republicans clearly served most of their careers before venturing to Hartford. This fact suggests that Republicans held the office in higher esteem than did the Democrats.

Two minor pieces of data remain to be listed, education and marriages and genealogy. Information on education was hard to find, but in what was reported there turned out to be few men who went to college (not a surprising discovery), and most graduated from high school. Moreover, there was little difference between the parties in level of education.

Table 8 - Education

			<u>Dem.</u>	<u>Rep.</u>
Total	-	62		
Post Coll.	7	Law school -5, Medicine -1, Business - 1	4	3
College	11	Wesleyan-5 Yale -2, other - 4	6	5
High Sch.	17		11	6
Apprenticed	3		2	1
Unknown	24			

Marital and genealogical data are interesting in that they show that the richest men in Middletown, five of whom were elected to the state legislature, were related:

Table 9 - Genealogy

(state legislators underlined)

1. Charles Hubbard's daughter married Horace R. Butler, and then Joseph Wilcox.
2. Joseph Wilcox's brother, William W. Wilcox, sr., married Elizabeth Shepard Crittenden, who came from a long line of British wealth and nobility and was the daughter of Wilcox's business partner. Their son was William W. Wilcox, jr.
3. Thomas McDonough Russell, son of Hon. Samuel Russell and Lucy McDonough Hubbard (daughter of Henry G. Hubbard, President of the Russell Manufacturing Co.)
4. William T. Elmer, the most prominent Republican politician in Middletown during the 1880-1900 years, married the daughter of William S. Camp, the wealthy store owner.

The main concern of this essay is to delineate the important aspects of the structure of Middletown politics. That structure, however, cannot even be approached without recognizing that politics and business were inseparable. One cannot be understood without reference to the other.

But to begin with the political data itself, one finds these key facts: 1) the state legislators had an extremely high turnover rate, ^a meaning at least that each party nominated a different man almost every year; 2) the Democratic and Republican parties had equal rates of success in the elections; 3) the Democrats were younger, less wealthy, more likely to serve in the legislature earlier in their careers, and held more low prestige jobs, and yet still had among their ranks some of the town's wealthiest and most powerful men (such as James K. Guy and Horace R. Butler); 4) the two parties were comparable in their occupational distribution; 5) the Democrats were slightly better educated; 6) the Republicans were not only older and richer, but controlled most of the large businesses and banks in Middletown; 7) both parties had a considerable number of men (31) whose only political office was state legislator (substantiating the idea that the job was a service or reward rather than a political stepping stone or prestigious position); and 8) as was mentioned, the parties appeared to have had little controversy between them.

On the surface, the above evidence seems to pose some unusual questions. Why would a Republican accept or run for the job of state legislator as a reward? How, more importantly, if there were no real controversies, competing interests, or sides to take, did the parties sustain their ranks and competition? Indeed, if the

parties'men were so similar, what divided them into Republicans and Democrats? Was it a mere coincidence that the parties fared equally well in the general election? The element of business — an integral part of politics — answers most of these questions.

In a fairly small, industrial city like Middletown, certainly most of the major businessmen and politicians knew each other personally; furthermore, in a town without too many grocery stores, pharmacies, contractors, lawyers, and other workers, it seems likely that rich men knew many of their poorer contemporaries because they depended on the services that they provided. It might follow that such business ties were at times translated into political ties. And here is the crucial point: politics is a system of dependencies — the basic one being dependence on the votes of others for election — and so, particularly in the early stages of industrialization and the division of labor, was business. Despite party affiliation, a Republican like Benjamin Douglas probably bought food from a Democratic grocer; the directors of the banks, both Democrat and Republican, had to weather times of deflation and economic crisis. The interdependencies were endless, and endemic to the structure of politics.

Party affiliation, then, was not a simple matter of poor, uneducated masses against rich, powerful business elites. Party, as we have said, was not terribly important, and the possible criteria for affiliation back up this assertion: where and for whom one worked, age, the party of one's family, the party in power during one's youth, or the party of one's friends seem more likely

criteria than which party best represented one's economic interests or policy goals. The level of sophistication was not that high.

Combining this notion with the ideas that Middletown businessmen functioned within a system of dependence, that the parties elected many different men to state office, and that the parties won an equal number of elections, an interesting picture of Middletown politics emerges. Politics was a vehicle for business, social, and personal associations; participation was an act of good faith in support of the division of labor and the growth of business. It was no coincidence that the success levels were equal. Without going so far as to say that the elections were fixed, the evidence suggests that the parties made trade-offs and tried to maintain a harmonious political balance of power within which they could concentrate on their businesses. The key political process for the parties was probably nominations, for party lines seem to have broken down in the general election. Politics was a game of give and take with minimal risks and an apparent goal of preserving good interpersonal relationships. Politics, in a sense, furnished the environment for business.

Given this idea, it is easy to see why the fraternal and social organizations became so popular and a part of the political system. These organizations were yet another means for the non-business side of life but still provided an outlet for keeping business contacts. And of course, out of business-related activities grew the organizations' place in politics. These groups were "sanctions" for candidates, proof of the nominee's belief in "the system."

If Middletown politics seemed arbitrary and systematized, the next logical question is how democratic and politically advanced was Middletown, particularly in relation to other towns. Apparently, Middletown did not have a very open political system, but rather one resembling a modern machine. However, in Middletown the machine was bipartisan and covered all occupations and statuses. The only qualification for gaining a measure of power seems to have been some connection to business. Middletown was like Gutman's Paterson, New Jersey, where the industrialists and businessmen established political power, but only through the aid of the lower and middle classes.

The political system, then, was small, closed, undemocratic, oriented toward the preservation and growth of business and the economy, personal, an interest mainly for its participants, perpetuated by word of mouth in the Masonic halls and the meetings of the Knights of Pythias, and finally, self-centered in relation to state politics.

To conclude, one might twist an old cliché to state that one can tell a political system by the company it keeps. By looking at the men in the political system and their backgrounds and interrelationships, one can piece together their motivations, attitudes, and thus their political orientations. In Middletown, business was the order of the day in the late nineteenth century, and that fact stands out clearly from the data.

I would add a final point for the sake of future research. It would probably be highly instructive to collect similar data as I have gathered on the state legislators for other officeholders and see if the data point to similar conclusions. Even though I believe prosopography to be a superior method of research, it seems

that to look at the political system from one just one side and to draw conclusions might well mislead one's thinking.

* * * * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dahl, Robert, Who Governs?, pp. 11-51, chapter 2, 3, and 4

Gutman, Herbert G., "Class, Status, and Community Power in Nineteenth Century American Industrial Cities" Bobbs-Merrill reprint, H-400

History of Middlesex County, Chicago, J.H. Beers & Co., 1884

Hartford Evening Post Annual, Hartford, the Hartford Evening Post, 1882, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, and 1895

Stone, Lawrence, Prosopography, class article

Taylor's Connecticut Legislative History and Souvenir, Putnam, Conn, vols. I - VII, 1900 to 1910

APPENDIX I - TRUSTEE AND DIRECTORSHIPS

<u>Name</u>	<u>Years</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>Trustee, Directorships</u>	<u>Clubs</u>
E.A. Russell	1861	R	Railroad President	
Chas. Hubbard	1861, 63	D	Pres- Hubbard Hdwe. " - Agriculture Soc. Dir. - Gas Light Co.	
J.M. Douglas	1864, 65	R	Pres- W&B Douglas Railroad Commissioner Pres-Farmers and Mechanics Bank Pres- Street Railway Dir- First Natl. Bank " Middletown Banking Co.	
G.S. Hubbard	1864	R	Pres-Shaler & Hall Quarry Dir- Central Natl. Bank Trs-Middletown Savings Bank " -People's Insurance Co. Pres-Middletown Natl. Bank Pres-Metro Washing Machine	
J. Watkinson	1866		Railroad builder	
M. Terrill	1866	R	Pres-Tuttle Brick Co.	
M.H. Griffin	1867-68	D	Dir- Bank	
Geo. Tuttle	1868	D	Dir-Middlesex County Natl. Bank	
Ed. Scoville	1869		Editor- <u>Sentinel & Witness</u>	
G.W. Guy	1870	D	Trs-Wesleyan	
S.J. Starr	1871		Pres-Century Club, 1886	
D.W. Norhtrop	1871, 81, 82	D	Large land holder	
A. Roberts	1872	D	Pres- Middletown Natl Bank " Farmers and Mechanics Bk. Trs-Middletown Banking Co. Dir-First Natl Bank Trs- Wesleyan " - Asylum Railroad line	Conn. Bible Soc. Temperance Union
Benj. Douglas	1872	R	Trs- Hospital for Insane " - Russell Library	
J.W. Alsop	1873	R	Employee-Hubbard Hdwe. Bacon Insurance Pres- Middlesex County Natl. Bank Dir - " " "	
J.K. Guy	1874	D	Inc - Street Railway - Middlesex Mutual Assurance C. Dir- Farmers and Mechanics Bank Dir- Lumber Co. Employee- Hubbard & Roberts	
G.W. Roberts	1875		Pres-Wilcox and Crittendne	
C.H. Williams	1877		Dir- Middletown Natl Bank	
W.W. Wilcox	1878, 80	R	Empl. Wilcox& Crittenden	
G.W. Atkins	1879	R	Pres- Lawton & Wall (grocers)	
J. Lawton	1882	D		Middletown Club
H.R. Butler	1884	D	Empl-Middletown Savings Dir-Columbus Insurance Board of Trade	M Middletown Lodge

<u>Name</u>	<u>Years</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>Trustee, Directorships</u>	<u>Clubs</u>
J.T. Walsh	1883	D		Temperance
M.W. Lawton	1884	D		Temperance
J. Carroll	1885	D	Pres-Bd. of Relief	
G. Southmayd	1886	R	Dir-Horse Railway	Temperance G.A.R. F. & A.M.
J.M. Hubbard	1886	R		
J.H. Griffin	1887	D	Voter-railway stock	
J.C. Broatch	1887	R	Fire insurance Supt- waterworks	
T.W. O'Keefe	1889	D		Temperance Forest City Cncl K. of Columbus
W.K. Bacon	1889	D	Dir-Middlesex County Natl Bank Pres- Bd. of Underwriteers	Mason F. & A.M.
C. WARNER	1889	R	Proprietor-graniteworks	K. of Pythias
C.R. Lewis	1894	R	Pres-Bldg & Loan Assoc.	I.O.O.F.
W.T. Elmer	1894	R	Bd. of Education	
R. PIKE	1899	R	Owner-Sentinel & Witness Pres-Bd of Education	
T.M. Russell	1901	R	Trs-Middletown Savings Bank	
W.U. Pearne	1901	R	Trs- Wesleyan	Temperance Mason K. of C.
Bacon	1903	R	Central Pomona Grange Dairy farm owner Sec'y- Patron's Mutual Fire Insurance	
B.C. Stone	1903	D		Mason Odd Fellow B.P.O.E. Yacht club- commodore
F.C. Smith	1905	R	Real estate	
A.D. Williams	1907	D	Empl- Middletown Natl. Bank	Mason Sons of Amer Rev Mason Odd Fellow Patrons of Husbandry Loyal Legion
C.A. Appel	1909	R		

APPENDIX II Political Offices

<u>Name</u>	<u>Offices held before first election</u>	<u>After</u>	<u>None</u>
Culver		Judge, Superior Ct. City atty	
Hubbard Russell	Mayor Deleg to Natl Conv.		yes
Hubbard Bent		Mayor Common Council Mayor Postmaster Repub Cent Committee	
B. Coe			yes
Savage			yes
Douglas		State Senator Pres elector	
Hubbard Barry			yes yse
Watkinson			yes
Terrill		Selectman Justice of Peace	
Griffin	City Council		
Bacon			yes
Tuttle			yes
Scoville			yse
Guy			yes
Starr			yes
Northrop		Probate Judge City Council Super Ct. Sec'y of state Dem. Cent Comm. Justice of Peace	
Roberts Douglas	Mayor Lt. Gov.		
Alsop	City Council	State Senator	
Bidwell			yes
Guy			yes
Roberts			yes
Fagan			yse
Strong			yes
Newhall			yse
Williams		Mayor	
Wilcox			yes
Hubbard			yes
Woodward		Mayor Selectman City Council	
Atkins			yes
Burrows			yes
Lawton			yes
Butler		State Senator City Council	
Walsh			yes

<u>Name</u>	<u>Before</u>	<u>After</u>	<u>None</u>
Lawton	Justice of peace Selectman City Council		
Carroll			yes
Southmayd	City Council		
Hubbard			yes
Griffin			yes
Broatch	Tax assessor		
O'Keefe	City Council		
Bacon	City Council	City Council	
Warner			yes
Lewis	City Council Mayor Selectman		
Elmer	Probatejudge House of Rep State Senate	Judge-Superior Ct. State Senate	
city atty	Judge-City ct. mayor City Council		
Pike	City Council City Council Repub. Committee		
Russell			yes
Pearne	Clerk and Judge, City Ct. City Council		
Bacon	Tax Assessor City atty		
Stone	City Council		
Moore, Smith, Williams, Appel	- Unknown		

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Age at election</u>
1860	Moses Culver		Judge	43
	Asa Hubbard	D		60
1861	Edward Russell	R		64
	Charles Hubbard	D	Horse Breeder	52
1862	Bartlett Bent	R	merchant	38
	Benjamin Coe			50
1863	G. Hubbard	D		54
	david Savage			59
1864	George Hubbard	R	Pres-Quarry	51
	John Douglas	R	Business	25
1865	" "			
	John Barry	D	Laborer	
1866	John Watkinson	R	Pres- Bank	
	Moses Terrill	R	Clothier	40
1867	Michael Griffin	D	Railroad builder	
	Arthur Bacon	D	Lawyer	31
1868	Griffin			
	George Tuttle	D	Brick Co.	46
1869	Edwin Scovile			
	Bacon			
1870	"			
	George Guy	D	Grocer	57
1871	SamualStarr		Editor	36
	D. Ward Northrop	D	Lawyer	27
1872	Abner Roberts	D	Farmer/mason	61
	Benjamin Douglas	R	Business	56
1973	Joseph Alsop	R	Doctor	35
	Ashbel Bidwell			
1874	James Guy	D	Bookkeeper	25
	Bacon			
1875	George Roberts			26
	Charles Fagan			34
1876	" "			
	Daniel Strong			33
1877	Richard New Hall		lawyer	
	C.H. Williams		mechanic	
1878	William Wilcox	R	Manufacturer	53
	Samual Hubbard		machinist	
1879	Charles Woodward	D	druggist	47
	George Atkins	R	clerk	
1880	Wilcox			
	Otis Burrows			
1880	James Lawton	D	Grocer	39
	Norhtrop			
1882	"			
	Lawton			
1883	Horace Butler	D	Mason	38
	John Walsh	D	Horse Dealer	43
1884	Butler			
	Michael Lawton	D	Shoe seller	45
1885	" "			
	John Carroll	D	Sea captain	48
1886	George Southmayd	R	Undertaker	62
	Josiah Hubbard	R	carpenter	54
1887	John Griffin	D	clothier	32

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Age at election</u>
1887	John Broatch	R	Supt-waterworks	53
1888	Thlmas O'Keefe	D	undertaker	35
	Wallace Bacon	D	Shoe seller	43
1889	Charles Warner	R	Owner, graniteworks	35
1894	Charles Lewis	R	Toolmaker	63
	William Elmer	R	Lawyer	60
1899	Robert Pike7	R	Real estate	42
1901	Thomas Russell	R	Militia Capt.	27
	Wesley Pearne	R	Lawyer	50
1903	Charles Bacon	R	Farmer	52
	Berkeley Stone	D	Contractor	30
1905	Pearne			
	Frank Smith	R	Bank Employee	61
1907	Arthur Williams	D	Real estate	46
	Smith			
1909	Charles Appel	R	Contractor	73