


<h1>Property Law Qualifications and Social Class in American Politics</h1> <p>e:\government book\US Constitution\property law\property law qualifications.11dpc</p>	
<p>1. The Dream. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal. They are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Thomas Jefferson, <i>The Declaration of Independence</i>, 7/4/1776.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
<p>The famous event that Americans celebrate every Fourth of July was the formal beginning of the American Revolution. But the Declaration of Independence was more than a declaration of war. It was the first great document in the history of a nation whose name would come to be a symbol of freedom to all the world. Robert G. Athearn, Progressive Professor of History, University of Colorado, <i>American Heritage New Illustrated History of the United States, Volume 3, The Revolution</i> (New York: Fawcett Publications, 1971) 197.</p>	
<p>The foundation (of the Declaration of Independence) was the theory of natural rights-ones to which all men were entitled simply by reason of being human. These rights could not be taken from them: "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." Robert G. Athearn, 197.</p>	
<p>Progressive Historian George Bancroft said that the United States was the prime mover. The world spirit of liberty took up its abode in America. The American Revolution was not merely a national affair but an assertion of rights . . .for the entire world of mankind and all coming generations, without any exceptions whatsoever . . . America showed the world the way toward true liberty and democracy. Anthony Molho and Gordon Wood, Professors of History at Brown University, <i>Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past</i> (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998) 147.</p>	
<p>2. Religion. In 1787, the Georgia legislature consisted of one chamber under the constitution of 1777. Members of the house of representatives "Shall be of the Protestant religion, of the age of twenty-one years, and shall be</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>

<p>possessed in their own rights of two hundred and fifty acres of land or some property to the amount of two hundred and fifty pounds." Charles A. Beard, New Left Professor of History at Columbia University, <i>An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States</i> (New York: Free Press, 1935) 70-1.</p>	
<p>In seventeenth-century Massachusetts, only members of the Congregational church could vote; in the eighteenth century, Catholics were disfranchised in five states and Jews in four. Alexander Keyssar, Professor of History and Public Policy at Duke University, <i>The Right To Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States</i> (New York: Basic Books, 2000), 6.</p>	
<p>The Anglican Church had been disestablished in Virginia as early as 1778. During the Federalist regime, most of the states abolished religious qualifications for voting and office holding. Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Professor Of History at University Of Iowa, <i>New Viewpoints In American History</i> (New York: Macmillan Company, 1922) 83.</p>	
<p>In four of the southern provinces the Church of England was the established church, supported out of public funds, and in Virginia no one could be legally married except by a minister of the established church. Throughout the colonial period the Congregational Church occupied a similarly -privileged position in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Arthur Meier Schlesinger, 75.</p>	
<p>3. New England Property Qualifications. New York Senators were required to be landowners, and were chosen by freeholders "possessed of land of the value of one hundred pounds." With regard to the voter for members of the lower house, it was stipulated that "he shall have been a freeholder, possessing a freehold if the value of twenty pounds within said county, or have rented a tenement therein of the yearly value of forty shilling and been rated and actually paid taxes to this state. Charles A. Beard, 67.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
<p>These property qualifications prevented many white males from voting. "The census of 1790 shows that out of a population of thirty thousand [in New York City], there were but 1,209 freeholders of 100 pounds valuation or over; 1,221 of 20 pounds, and 2,661 'forty-shilling' freeholders. Property interests-a landed aristocracy-controlled municipal elections." Charles A. Beard, 67.</p>	
<p>In eastern Pennsylvania, voting laws, which excluded all but a small minority of the population. The right to vote</p>	

<p>was contingent upon the possession of fifty pounds in personal property or a freehold. Neither was easy to secure. In Philadelphia in 1775 only 335 of 3,452 taxable males had estates large enough to give them the vote. Merrill Jensen, Allen Davis, Temple University, Harold D. Woodman, Purdue University, <i>Conflict and Consensus in Early American History</i> (Lexington, Massachusetts: DC Heath and Company, 1972) 121.</p>	
<p>As a result of the various limitations on the suffrage a large proportion of the people in each colony were deprived of the vote; and many who were entitled to that privilege failed to exercise it in elections. In the rural districts of Pennsylvania about one person in ten had the right to vote and in Philadelphia only about one in fifty owned enough property to qualify for the exercise of the suffrage. At times in Massachusetts and Connecticut, where approximately sixteen per cent of the population were enfranchised, only two per cent took the trouble to vote. Similar conditions prevailed elsewhere. Charles A. Beard, Mary R. Beard, and their son William Beard, <i>Beards New Basic History of the United States</i> (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1944) 82.</p>	

<p>4. Southern Property Qualifications. Property qualifications probably disfranchised from one-quarter to one-half of adult white males in all the states. Not all of them took their nonvoter status quietly. One Maryland man wondered what was so special about being worth £30: "Every poor man has a life, a personal liberty, and a right to his earnings; and is in danger of being injured by government in a variety of ways." Why then restrict such a man from voting? Others pointed out that propertyless men were fighting and dying in the Revolutionary War; surely they were expressing an active concern about politics. Finally, a few radical voices challenged the notion that owning property transformed men into good citizens. Perhaps it did the opposite: The richest men might well be greedy and selfish and therefore bad citizens. But ideas like this were clearly outside the mainstream. The writers of the new constitution themselves men of property, viewed the right to own and preserve property as a central principle of the Revolution. James L. Roark, Professor of History at Emory University, Michael P Johnson, Johns Hopkins University, Patricia Cline Cohen, University of California, Santa Barbara, Sarah Stage, Arizona State University, Alan Lawson,</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
--	--

<p>Boston College, and Susan M. Hartmann, Ohio State University, <i>The American Promise: A Compact History Third Edition Volume I: To 1877</i> (Boston, Massachusetts: St. Martin's, 2007) 190.</p>	
<p>In South Carolina, a man had to own 500 acres and 20 slaves to qualify for membership in the assembly. Samuel Eliot Morison, Progressive Professor of History at Harvard, <i>The Oxford History of the American People</i> (New York, Oxford University Press, 1965) 195.</p>	
<p>Each member of the North Carolina Senate was required to possess "not less than three hundred acres of land in fee," and each member of the lower house "not less than one hundred acres of land in fee or for the term of his own life." A freehold qualification of fifty acres of land was required of voters for senators, and the suffrage for voters for members of the lower house was extended to all freemen who paid "public taxes." In the towns entitled to representation the possession of a freehold or the payment of a public tax qualified for voting in the election of members of the lower house. Charles A. Beard, 70.</p>	
<p>In Delaware the franchise was so restricted by a high property qualification that not half the white men could vote. The landed gentry controlled elections. Samuel Eliot Morison, 176.</p>	

<p>5. Decline. "Property requirements for voting eroded: by 1800, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Delaware had granted the vote to virtually every adult white male taxpayer, and Vermont had granted universal manhood suffrage." Linda K. Kerber, Professor of History at the University of Iowa, "The Revolutionary Generation: Ideology, Politics, and Culture in the Early Republic," Eric Foner, editor, <i>The New American History</i> (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press, 1997) 52.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
<p>New Jersey was particularly free and easy. From 1776 it had given the vote to all "worth" 50 pounds after a year's residence and election officials even permitted women to vote if they thus qualified (until 1809). The wartime inflation made the old property qualification pretty meaningless anyway, and states like North Carolina and New Hampshire, with poll-taxes and taxpayer qualifications, adopted near universal male suffrage as a matter of course. By 1783 the eligible electorate in the states ran from 60 to 90 percent, with most states edging towards the 100 percent mark. Paul Johnson, American</p>	

journalist who lives in London, <i>A History of the American People</i> (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997) 200-1.	
The War of 1812 intensified the pressure, since it made clear how unjust the restrictions were. Loudoun County [Virginia], for instance, there were twelve hundred men on militia rolls but only two hundred had enough property to be able to vote. Marchette Chute, literary scholar, <i>The First Liberty, A History of the Right to Vote in America, 1619-1850</i> (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1969) 300.	
"By 1830 the vast majority the states had either adopted or moved decisively toward universal adult white male suffrage. Considerable pressure at the grass roots-particularly from the plebeian back country-often instigated democratic reform." Sean Wilentz, Professor of History at Princeton University, "Society, Politics, and the Market Revolution, 1815-1848," Eric Foner, editor, <i>The New American History</i> , 75.	
In 1829 pressure from fast-growing, bustling middle class-entrepreneurs, mechanics, artisans, and farmer's - had forced all but 5 of the 24 States to abandon the property requirements that had so effectively denied the vote to the common man. Carroll C. Calkins, editor, <i>The Story of America</i> (Pleasantville, New York: Reader's Digest Association, 1975), 58.	
6. Social Class and the US Constitution. The impulse behind it [US Constitution] was aristocratic and middle-class. The common people had little or nothing to say about it (the US Constitution). William E. Woodward, Consensus Historian, <i>A New American History</i> (New York: Literary Guild, 1937) 230.	
The fifty-five delegates all came from the higher social and financial classes. William E. Woodward, 231-2.	
The motivating spirit of the convention, not expressed but clearly understood--was to make the nation safe from democracy . . . "The people," said Roger Sherman, "should have as little to do as may be with government." William E. Woodward, 232-3.	
7. Social Class in Early America. Merchants occupied the top stratum of Philadelphia society. In a city where only 2 percent of the residents owned enough property to qualify to vote, merchants built grand homes and dominated local government. Many of Philadelphia's	

<p>wealthiest merchants were Quakers. Quaker traits of industry, thrift, honesty, and sobriety encouraged the accumulation of wealth. A colonist complained that a Quaker "prays for his neighbor on First Days [the Sabbath] and then preys on him the other six." James L. Roark, 110.</p>	
<p>The slaveholding gentry dominated the politics and economy of the southern colonies. In Virginia, only adult white men who owned at least one hundred acres of unimproved land or twenty-five acres of land with a house could vote. This property-holding requirement prevented about 40 percent of white men in Virginia from voting for representatives to the House of Burgesses. In South Carolina, only fifty acres of land were required to vote, and most adult white men qualified. But in both colonies, voters elected members of the gentry to serve in the colonial legislature. The gentry passed elected political offices from generation to generation, almost as if they were hereditary. Politically, the gentry built a self-perpetuating oligarchy-rule by the elite few-with the votes of their many humble neighbors. James L. Roark, 116-7.</p>	
<p>As Big Business grew bigger and profits mounted, many Americans felt that they were not sharing sufficiently in this growth. Two thirds of American workers were receiving less than \$12.50 per week in wages. Eighty percent of the people barely subsisted. It was estimated that 1% of the American families owned more than half of the nation's wealth. James Munves, <i>A Short Illustrated History of the United States</i> (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1965) 211.</p>	
<p>"In 1800, John Alexander has found, the top 0.5 percent of Philadelphia's taxpayers 'owned more in taxable property than the bottom 75%." Linda K. Kerber, New Left Professor of History at the University of Iowa, "The Revolutionary Generation: Ideology, Politics, and Culture in the Early Republic," Eric Foner, editor, <i>The New American History</i>, 40.</p>	
<p>8. Lower Classes. By 1830, the eight mills in Lowell employed more than 5,000 young women, who lived in closely supervised company-owned boardinghouses. Corporation rules required church attendance and prohibited drinking and unsupervised courtship; dorm lockdown came at 10 p.m. Typical mill workers averaged \$2 to \$3 for a seventy-hour workweek, more than a seamstress or domestic servant could earn but less than a</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>

<p>young man's wages. The job consisted of tending noisy power looms in rooms kept hot and humid, ideal for thread but not for people. James L. Roark, 262.</p>	
<p>In 1851 Horace Greeley, editor of the <i>New York Tribune</i>, estimated the minimum weekly budget needed to support a family of five. Essential expenditures for rent, food, fuel, and clothing amounted to \$10.37 a week. In that year, a shoemaker or a printer earned just \$4 to \$6 a week, a male textile operative \$6.50 a week, and an unskilled laborer just \$1 a week. The only manual laborers able to earn Greeley's minimum were blacksmiths and machinists. James Kirby Martin, University of Houston, Randy Roberts, Purdue University, Steven Mintz, University of Houston, Linda O. McMurry, North Carolina State University, James H. Jones, University of Houston and Sam W. Haynes, University of Texas at Arlington, <i>A Concise History of America and Its People</i> (New York: HarperCollins College Publishers, 1997) 385.</p>	
<p>Typically, a male laborer earned just two-thirds of his family's income. The other third was earned by wives and children. Many married women performed work in the home, such as embroidery and making artificial flowers, tailoring garments, or doing laundry. The wages of children were critical for a family's standard of living. Children under the age of 15 contributed 20 percent of the income of many working-class families. These children worked not because their parents were heartless, but because children's earnings were absolutely essential to the family's survival. James Kirby Martin, 385.</p>	
<p>"For those at the bottom--immigrant and black day laborers, outwork seamstresses, the casual poor--a combination of overstocked labor markets and intense competition among employers kept wages and earnings near or below subsistence levels." Sean Wilentz, Professor of History at Princeton University, "Society, Politics, and the Market Revolution, 1815-1848," Eric Foner, editor, <i>The New American History</i>, 64.</p>	
<p>In 1890, the national wealth was \$65,037,091,197. The United States had 63 million people. 11 million of its 12 million families lived on an average income of \$380 a year. Roger Butterfield, <i>The American Past</i> (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1947) 257.</p>	
<p>9. British Social Classes. In nineteenth century England, social class determined dress, manner, appearance, gait, speech, recreation, socialization, and religion. It</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>

<p>influenced even the physical size of their children. Children of the rich in England were 5" inches taller than those of the poor on average, largely due to superior nutrition). Richard L. Greaves, Robert Zaller, Jennifer Tolbert Roberts, <i>Civilizations of the West</i> (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1992) 745.</p>	
<p>The upper classes of the labor force: peasants, craftsmen, mariners went on relatively unchanged. Even at the end of our period, Roger North tells us, the common people walked barefoot "All over the north." Children of the poor, John Locke observed, se seldom got more than bread and water up to the age of three years, and little enough of that. Rickets was known as "the English disease." Three out of every four Englishmen, the Quaker philanthropist John Bellers wrote in the last year of our period, could not afford medical advice or treatment. Three out of every four babies born in one London parish died almost immediately. Christopher Hill, Professor of History at Oxford, <i>The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714</i> (New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1961) 309.</p>	

<p>10. Social Class in Modern America. Social class is probably the single most important variable in society. From womb to tomb, it correlates with almost all other social characteristics of people that we can measure. Affluent expectant mothers are more likely to get prenatal care, receive current medical advice, and enjoy general health, fitness, and nutrition. Many poor and working-class mothers-to-be first contact the medical profession in the last month, sometimes the last hours, of their pregnancies. Rich babies come out healthier and weighing more than poor babies. The infants go home to very different situations. Poor babies are more likely to have high levels of poisonous lead in their environments and their bodies. Rich babies get more time and verbal interaction with their parents and higher quality day care when not with their parents. When they enter kindergarten, and through the twelve years that follow, rich children benefit from suburban schools that spend two to three times as much money per student as schools in inner cities or impoverished rural areas. Poor children are taught in classes that are often 50 percent larger than the classes of affluent children. Differences such as these help account for the higher school-dropout rate among poor children. James W. Loewen, Professor of Sociology at the University of Vermont, <i>Lies My Teacher Told Me:</i></p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
--	--

<p><i>Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong</i> (New York: The New Press, 1995) 197-8.</p>	
<p>In 1860, Abraham Lincoln's wealth of \$17,000 easily placed him in the top 5 percent of the population. The opportunities presented by the expanding economy made a few men much, much richer. In 1860, the nation had about forty millionaires. Most Americans, however, measured success in far more modest terms. The average wealth of adult white men in the North in 1860 barely topped \$2,000. Nearly half of American men had no wealth at all; about 60 percent owned no land. Because property possessed by married women was normally considered to belong to their husbands, women had less wealth than men. Free African Americans had still less; 90 percent of them were propertyless. James L. Roark, 305-6.</p>	
<p>By 1910 the top 1 percent of the United States population received more than a third of all personal income. The bottom fifth got less than one-eighth. James W. Loewen, 204.</p>	
<p>One's class position in good part determines the probability of getting killed in war. Poorer families are more likely to enlist in the military, or alternatively are less likely to avoid the draft. They are more likely to find themselves as foot soldiers once in the army. A study of who died in Vietnam showed that soldiers of poor families were 1.8 times as likely to get killed in Vietnam as the average (Zeitlin, 1977, 146). Albert Szymanski, <i>Class Structure: A Critical Perspective</i> (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1983) 305.</p>	
<p>11. Social Mobility. While some multimillionaires started in poverty, most did not. A study of the origins of 303 textile, railroad, and steel executives of the 1870s showed that 90 percent came from middle- or upper-class families. The Horatio Alger stories of "rags to riches" were true for a few men, but mostly a myth, and a useful myth for control. Howard Zinn, Professor of Political Science at Boston University, <i>A People's History of the United States</i> (New York: HarperPerennial, 1980) 248.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
<p>Ninety-five percent of the executives and financiers in America around the turn of the century came from upper-class or upper-middle-class backgrounds. Fewer than 3 percent started as poor immigrants or farm children. Throughout the nineteenth century, just 2 percent of American industrialists came from working-class origins. James W. Loewen, 203.</p>	

Chart 11.2 Economic Stratification and the Origins of the Richest Persons in the Major Cities, 1828-60

City	Rich And/Or Eminent-Parents	Parents Of Middling Status	Poor Or Humble Parents.
New York	95 %	3 %	2%
Philadelphia	92	6	2
Boston	94	4	2

Source: Edward Pessen, *Riches, Class and Power*, 85. Kevin Phillips, *Wealth And Democracy: A Political History Of The American Rich* (New York: Broadway Books, 2002) 23.

"One half of the wealth of this city is owned by men who wear leather aprons," a contributor to a Philadelphia newspaper claimed in the 1770s, "and the other half by those whose fathers or grandfathers wore leather aprons." However valid as a statement of personal belief, the logic was deceptive and the remark misleading. Those who had benefited substantially from the labor of their parents numbered only 10 percent of the population, and this small group of wealthy taxpayers controlled 54 percent of the city's wealth in 1774. Moreover, even the present generation of artisans and shopkeepers constituted only half of the residents of the community. Below both of these relatively privileged groups were 40 percent of the free adult inhabitants; the members of this sizeable fraction of the society owned a pitiful 4 percent of the total wealth. However skewed in their depiction of reality, these myths of social mobility and economic affluence were of crucial importance. They expressed, in an intangible, abstract form, the values and aspirations of the leading part of the community. Grudgingly acquiesced in by ordinary laborers . . . they constituted a set of shared beliefs, which obscured (or perhaps justified) the acute differences in their respective material conditions. James A. Henretta, "Wealth, Authority, and Power," (1973), Allen F. Davis, Temple University, Harold D. Woodman, Purdue University, *Conflict And Consensus In Early American History* (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath And Company, 1976) 27.

12. Social Class and Voting. Affluent people in the United States are voting at rates much higher than everyone else, not much lower. In 1996, for instance, 76 percent of voters in families making at least \$75,000 a

Main Ideas:
Analysis:
Evaluation:

<p>year voted. Voters from families earning under \$10,000 cast ballots at just a 38 percent rate.¹⁵⁵ Sam Pizzigati, <i>Greed and Good: Understanding and Overcoming the Inequality That Limits Our Lives</i> (New York: Apex Press, 2004) 407.</p> <p>155. Holly Sklar, "States Have Growing Income Gaps and Shrinking Voter Turnout," <i>San Diego Union-Tribune</i>, January 20, 2000.</p>	
<p>Voter participation rates reflected these class divisions, with lowest percentage of voting occur in those congressional districts where the poorest people live and the highest percentage in affluent suburbs. William H. Chaffe, Professor of History at Duke University, Eric Foner, editor, <i>The New American History</i>, 172.</p>	
<p>These voting gaps, adds economist Paul Krugman, quickly generate "disproportionate political weight" for well-off people. America's major political parties do not compete for the votes of average Americans. They compete for the votes of those who vote. They compete, notes Krugman, "to serve the interests of families near the 90th percentile or higher, families that mostly earning \$100,000 or more per year."¹⁵⁸ Sam Pizzigati, 407.</p> <p>158 Paul Krugman, "The Spiral of Inequality," <i>Mother Jones</i>, November/December 1996.</p>	

<p>13. Agricultural Wealth and Political Power. Table 13.1 Percent Of Slaveholders And Planters In Southern Legislatures, 1860</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="240 1234 987 1801"> <thead> <tr> <th>Legislature</th> <th>Slaveholders</th> <th>Planters*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Virginia</td> <td>67.3%</td> <td>24.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maryland</td> <td>53.4</td> <td>19.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>North Carolina</td> <td>85.8</td> <td>36.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kentucky</td> <td>60.6</td> <td>8.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tennessee</td> <td>66.0</td> <td>14.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Missouri</td> <td>41.2</td> <td>5.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arkansas</td> <td>42.0</td> <td>13.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South Carolina</td> <td>81.7</td> <td>55.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Georgia</td> <td>71.6</td> <td>29.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Florida</td> <td>55.4</td> <td>20.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alabama</td> <td>76.3</td> <td>40.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mississippi</td> <td>73.4</td> <td>49.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Louisiana</td> <td>63.8</td> <td>23.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Texas</td> <td>54.1</td> <td>18.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Planters: Owned 20 or more slaves. Source: Adapted from Ralph A. Wooster, <i>The People in Power</i>:</p>	Legislature	Slaveholders	Planters*	Virginia	67.3%	24.2%	Maryland	53.4	19.3	North Carolina	85.8	36.6	Kentucky	60.6	8.4	Tennessee	66.0	14.0	Missouri	41.2	5.3	Arkansas	42.0	13.0	South Carolina	81.7	55.4	Georgia	71.6	29.0	Florida	55.4	20.0	Alabama	76.3	40.8	Mississippi	73.4	49.5	Louisiana	63.8	23.5	Texas	54.1	18.1	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
Legislature	Slaveholders	Planters*																																												
Virginia	67.3%	24.2%																																												
Maryland	53.4	19.3																																												
North Carolina	85.8	36.6																																												
Kentucky	60.6	8.4																																												
Tennessee	66.0	14.0																																												
Missouri	41.2	5.3																																												
Arkansas	42.0	13.0																																												
South Carolina	81.7	55.4																																												
Georgia	71.6	29.0																																												
Florida	55.4	20.0																																												
Alabama	76.3	40.8																																												
Mississippi	73.4	49.5																																												
Louisiana	63.8	23.5																																												
Texas	54.1	18.1																																												

<p><i>Courthouse and Statehouse in the Lower South, 1850-1860</i> (1969), 41; Wooster, <i>Politicians, Planters, and Plain Folks: Courthouse and Statehouse in the Upper South</i> (1975), 40. Courtesy of the University of Tennessee Press. James L. Roark, 338.</p>	
<p>By 1860, the percentage of slave owners in state legislatures ranged from 41 percent in Missouri to nearly 86 percent in North Carolina. Legislators not only tended to own slaves-they often owned large numbers. The percentage of planters (individuals with twenty or more slaves) in southern legislatures in 1860 ranged from 5.3 percent in Missouri to 55.4 percent in South Carolina. In North Carolina, where only 3 percent of the state's white families belonged to the planter class, more than 36 percent of the legislature were planters. The democratization of politics in the nineteenth century meant that more ordinary citizens participated in elections, but yeomen and artisans remained rare sights in the halls of southern legislatures. James L. Roark, 337-8.</p>	
<p>Georgia politics illustrate how well planters protected their interests in state legislatures. In 1850, about half of the state's revenues came from taxes on slaves, the characteristic form of planter wealth. However, the tax rate on slaves was trifling, only about one-fifth the rate on land. Moreover, planters benefited far more than other groups from public spending. Financing railroads-which carried cotton to market-was the largest state expenditure. The legislature also established low tax rates on land, the characteristic form of yeoman wealth, which meant that the typical yeoman's annual tax bill was small. Still, relative to their wealth, large slaveholders paid less than did other whites. Relative to their numbers, they got more in return. A sympathetic slaveholding legislature protected planters' interests and gave the impression of protecting the small farmers' interests as well. James L. Roark, 338.</p>	
<p>"The [Southern] conscription law convinced many yeomen that this was a 'rich man's war and a poor man's fight. Provisions that a draftee could avoid service by producing a substitute and that one able-bodied white male would be exempted for every twenty slaves were deeply resented in the upcountry. The result, by 1863, was widespread draft resistance and desertion--a virtual civil war within the Civil War, which sapped the military power of the Confederacy and hastened its defeat." Eric Foner, New Left Professor of History at Columbia University, "Slavery, The Civil War, and Reconstruction,"</p>	

Eric Foner, editor, <i>The New American History</i> , 94.	
---	--

<p>14. Industrial Wealth and Political Power. The power of the new corporations, seemingly impervious to democratic control, raised equally disturbing questions for the definition of freedom as popular self-government. Concentrated wealth degraded the political process, declared Henry Demarest Lloyd in <i>Wealth Against Commonwealth</i> (1894), a book that demonstrated how the Standard Oil Company not only manipulated the market to drive out competition but bribed legislators and in other ways made a mockery of political democracy. "Liberty and monopoly," Lloyd concluded, "cannot live together."³ Eric Foner, New Left Professor of History at Columbia University, <i>The Story of American Freedom</i> (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1998) 117.</p> <p>3. Montgomery, <i>Fall of the House of Labor</i>, 46-48, 138-40; Garraty, <i>New Commonwealth</i>, 128-40; Alan Trachtenberg, <i>The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age</i> (New York, 1982), 99; Henry Demarest Lloyd, <i>Wealth Against Commonwealth</i> (New York, 1899), 517-19.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
--	--

<p>Our governing system was established by rich men, following theories that emphasized government as a bulwark of the propertied class, although rich himself, James Madison worried about social inequality and wrote <i>The Federalist #10</i> to explain how the proposed government would not succumb to the influence of the affluent. Madison did not fully succeed, According to Edward Pessen, who examined the social-class backgrounds of all American presidents through Reagan. Pessen found that more than 40 percent hailed from the upper class, mostly from the upper fringes of that elite group, and another 15 percent originated in families located between the upper and upper-middle classes. More than 25 percent came from a solid upper-middle- class background leaving just six presidents, or 15 percent, to come from the middle and lower middle classes and just one, Andrew Johnson, representing any part of the lower class. James W. Loewen, 200.</p>	
--	--

<p>Men of substance were evidently quite willing to fabricate in order to save money. (Moses Yale Beach's estate was assessed at \$90,000 in 1855, although he listed it publicly at \$350,000.) Rufus Story could succeed in changing the valuation of his personal property at Rivington Street from \$20,000 to \$1,000 on his own say-so. Hundreds of men who were directors—and therefore compelled by law to</p>	
--	--

own substantial portions of the stock of many banks, insurance companies, and other corporations—were assessed for minuscule amounts of personal property or for no personal wealth whatsoever. In Brooklyn, such large real-estate owners and men of corporate affairs as H. B. Pierrepont and his son Henry (the son-in-law of the great and wealthy John Jay), Charles Hoyt, David Leavitt, Joseph D. Beers, Henry C. Murphy, Joseph A. Perry—who two years earlier had personally advanced \$25,000 to the faltering Brooklyn Ferry Company—Joseph Sprague, Nathan B. Morse, Seth Low, Samuel Garrison, and many other substantial men were ostensibly worth little or nothing—at least according to the information they gave the assessors. Edward Pessen, Professor of History City University of New York, *Riches, Class, And Power Before The Civil War* (Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath And Company, 1973) 15.

15. Campaign Contributions. Wealth, our nation's most savvy political thinkers have from time to time noted, has always played a central role in American political life. "There are two things that are important in politics " as Mark Hanna the top GOP strategist of the first Gilded Age, quipped over a century ago. "The first is money, and I can't remember what the other one is."³³ Sam Pizzigati, 383.

33. Michael Kazin, "One Political Constant," *New York Times*, April 1, 2001.

Main Ideas:
Analysis:
Evaluation:


\$1,000 and over donors in the 1999-2000 Election Cycle

Campaign Contribution	Number of Donors	Amount Given
\$1,000-\$9,999	325,747	\$619,040,837
\$10,000 plus	14,888	\$444,617,244
\$100,000 plus	719	\$151,642,813
\$1 million plus	6	\$7,770,700
Total	340,345	\$1,063,658,141

Center for Responsive Politics, Capital Eye, Summer 2001, Dennis Braun, Sociologist from Mankato State University, *The Rich Get Richer: The Rise of Income Inequality in the United States and the World* (Chicago, Illinois: Nelson-Hall Publishers, 1997) 328.

Family Income of Congressional Election Donors, 1997.	Percentage
\$500,000 or more	20%
\$250,000-\$499,999	26

\$100,000-\$249,999	35	
\$50,000-\$99,999	14	
\$49,999 or less	5	
Random sampling of donors by the University of Akron funded by the Joyce Foundation in 1997, Dennis Braun, 328.		
<p>In contemporary American politics, those candidates who spend more win more. A candidate's odds of winning, researchers have shown, increase in direct proportion to the money the candidate has available to spend. House candidates who campaigned on less than \$100,000 in 1992, for instance, did not win a single race. Those who spent between \$250,000 and \$500,000 won one race in four. Those who spent over \$500,000 won half the time.³⁵ And those candidates who spend lofty sums against opponents less amply funded win almost all the time. In the 1996 elections, House candidates who spent more than their opponents won 90 percent of their bids for office.³⁶ Sam Pizzigati, 383.</p> <p>35 The study was conducted by the Center for Responsive Politics in Washington, D.C. Richard Morin, "Playing the Odds," <i>Washington Post</i>, November 6, 1994.</p> <p>36 David Donnelly, Janice Fine, and Ellen S. Miller, Going Public, Boston Review. Accessed from www-polisci.mit.edu/bostonreview/br22.2/Connelly.html.</p>		
<p>Rich people have become quite accustomed to chatting regularly with America's most important elected leaders. In 1996, according to a study conducted for <i>Worth</i> magazine, 11 percent of America's richest 1 percent met personally with President Clinton. Nine percent of these affluent Americans met personally with his Republican challenger, Robert Dole.⁴⁹ Sam Pizzigati, 385.</p> <p>49. Roper Starch Worldwide surveyed a sample of five hundred people making at least \$250,000 in income or holding at least \$2.5 million in assets. "Richard Todd, Who Me, Rich?" <i>Worth</i>, September 1997.</p>		

<p>I. Socratic Questions:</p>	
<p>1. Is the United States a class-less society?</p>	
<p>2. How does the accumulation of economic power lead to political power?</p>	
<p>3. How does money buy political access and influence?</p>	
<p>4. US Democratic nominee John Edwards talked about Two Americas, the rich and powerful vs. the underclass, while the One percenters (versus the 99%ers), Occupy Wall Street Protestors and Bernie Sanders talk about economic inequality, What effect does this have upon American politics?</p>	