

DIVISION!
THE CRISIS OF THE COMMONWEALTH
IN BEVERLY'S CIVIL WAR

Honors Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in History

In the College of Arts and Sciences
at Salem State University

By

Matthew G. Swindell

Dr. Donna A. Seger
Faculty Advisor
Department of History

Commonwealth Honors Program
Salem State University
2021

Table of Contents

I. Table of Contents.....i

II. Acknowledgments.....ii

III. Introduction.....1

IV. Local Background.....3

V. National Context.....6

VI. The Horsecar Impetus.....10

VII. The Rise of Division.....14

VIII. The Legislature of 1886.....16

IX. The Climax in 1887.....21

X. Conclusion.....26

XI. Bibliography.....27

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank associate director Abby Battis and all my friends at Historic Beverly (Beverly Historical Society) for their overwhelming support and ready permission to access the collection during a global pandemic, without which this paper may not have been possible.

At Salem State, I would like extend my gratitude to Dr. Seger, for her role in this paper's creation from its beginning; to Dr. Nowka of the Commonwealth Program for his interest and support; and to Drs. Louro and Theis for the help provided in seminars leading to the completion of the paper.

Finally, thank you to my mother, father, and sister for their constant support.

Introduction

Division is a complex term. At its simplest definition, beyond mathematical application, it is, “the act or process of dividing: the state of being divided.”¹ But, in a related sense, division also refers to, “the condition or an instance of being divided in opinion or interest.”² If one were to find themselves over one hundred and forty years in the past, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts during the 1880s, they would find both meanings presently in effect. Within this state, a movement existed to divide the town of Beverly, on Boston's North Shore, and grant a village within the town its own municipality. From this act of dividing towns emerged a a great sense of disagreement and disunity of interest. Both definitions of division fulfilled, the threat of dividing Beverly, fought in the press and legislature, divided the sentiments of the entire Commonwealth.

The reasons why the division of Beverly so troubled the sanctity of Massachusetts lie, in its origins, among the issues of class division, tax evasion, and cheap public transportation. The village that desired its independence was the village of Beverly Farms, but it was unclear at the time how many farmers still lived there. A demographic shift transpired over the nineteenth century that made a segment of its permanent population economically dependent on a class of wealthy seasonal residents who spent their summers and money along a section of Boston's North Shore called the “Gold Coast.” The main town of Beverly, meanwhile, grew as a manufacturing center, and its population grew as the factories needed labor. A sense of disunity existed in Beverly, but

1 *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, s.v. “division.”

2 *Ibid.*

laid dormant with each section in isolation.

The emergence of cheap public transportation, provided by a horse-drawn street railway, threatened to cause a clash of classes that in turn threatened to tear the town apart. This emergence of transportation availability would not be isolated to Beverly and neither would be the class divide that it exposed. The whole industrialized portion of the United States was embroiled in a divide between the rich and poor with income inequality on the rise alongside political consciousness. On Boston's North Shore, the wealthy sought to distance their places of repose from the blue-collar and middle-class workers, everyday cogs of industry, from which the elite used their money to escape. If the native lower classes, other than servants of their estates, were given means to breach their coast, then their peace (and land values) would be gone forever. So with vast capital, the wealthy generally opposed cheap transportation, and generally supported (even whilst only in the background of such efforts) new towns that would prevent its encroachment.

On a large scope, the division issue emerged from the issue of cheap transportation to become a sensation with the charge of tax-dodging. Not only would the wealthy hole up in their own Gold Coast towns, it was feared by opponents, but they would create legal tax havens. With the capacity to make taxes in the town of Beverly Farms lower than the taxes paid by their permanent residences in industrial centers, it would seem natural that the wealthy would move their permanent residences to Beverly Farms. If this process of creating tax havens succeeded there, it was then thought, it would happen across the Gold Coast.

Making matters worse, in efforts to both further and stop (made by “divisionists”

and “anti-divisionists,” respectively) the division of Beverly, an extensive system of lobbying became apparent to the populace. The reveal that the wealthy could not only set themselves away from the rabble, and not only reside in tax havens, but too put their capital to use in the sacred halls of government to achieve this effect made the issue all the more sensational. It was a stepping stone in the public perception of money's power in government, an issue which remains to this day.

The issue of dividing Beverly was one of local geography and Boston elites, class division and cheap transportation, charges of dodging taxes and possible corruption. Ultimately, the division issue became a crisis in the Commonwealth because it exposed fears of the growing heavy hand of capital in Massachusetts society, and its threat upon the purity of good government and old towns.

Local Background

The background of the division issue lies in the growth of Boston's Gold Coast, including Beverly Farms as an integral section, and Beverly Farms' disconnect from interests of Beverly's industrializing old town.

At its core, the Gold Coast refers to a section of coastline north of Boston where affluent summer residents make their mark. In an ancient and rural piece of New England, the local economy shifted to serving the needs of those wealthy outsiders drawn by natural beauty, who established mansions, clubs, and vast grounds that needed maintenance.

The origins of the Gold Coast lie in the years before the Civil War, starting in the peninsular community of Nahant. In the 1820s, the wealthy Colonel Thomas Handasyd

Perkins of Boston, spurred on by the arrival of steamship service between Boston and Nahant and the building of the Salem Turnpike, occupied the first summer cottage there.³ So in love with the scenic shore, Perkins then opened a hotel there to attract more of his fellow wealthy Bostonians. Over the next two decades, Nahant grew as a destination for the Boston elite that included Frederic Tudor,⁴ king of the ice business, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.⁵

From Nahant, the Gold Coast grew north and beyond to Beverly Farms. Perkin's Nahant Hotel burned in 1861, marking the end of an era, while the number of summer cottages continued to grow. The growth of the railroad starting in the 1830s would allow for wealthy Bostonians to access the areas north of Boston that were far-flung by coach alone but close at hand by rail. Swampscott and Marblehead, to the north of Nahant, grew as summer retreats. And further northward, Beverly and Manchester lay at he taking for the curious Bostonians, brought by the rail line that came in 1847, and summer homes began there too. While traditionally rural, Beverly Farms's coastal beauty⁶ made it ripe for summering. While the first summer residents arrived in the antebellum era, after the Civil War summer residency in this region became quite fashionable by the 1870s.

Meanwhile, during the same time period down in Nahant, a phenomenon that would come to be a significant portion of the division issue first emerged: tax-dodging.

The town set its tax-rate noticeably lower than in Boston, and, suddenly, many rich Bostonians with houses there were making Nahant their permanent residence. This

3 Joseph E. Garland, *The North Shore: A Social History of Summers Among the Noteworthy, Fashionable, Rich, Eccentric, and Ordinary on Boston's Gold Coast*, (Beverly, Mass.: Commonwealth Editions, 1998), 5.

4 Ibid, 16.

5 Ibid, 19.

6 Katharine P. Loring, "The Earliest Summer Residents of the North Shore and Their Houses," *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, vol. 68, no. 3 (July 1932): 193.

process was legal, so the Boston assessor could do nothing about it. Up in Beverly, the tax was, in contrast, about the same as in Boston, but summer settlers continued to descend upon the town even when Nahant possessed a tax advantage. Nahant after all, was of small size, and the best lots were already taken.⁷ Beverly Farms remained leafy, rural, and prime for taking.

Opposite Beverly Farms, the main part of Beverly reacted to the demise of rural industry by embracing mechanization. The coming of the railroad brought to the core section of Beverly the transportation needed to make exportation feasible and helped eliminate the rural character of the area. Poetess Lucy Larcom, native to the old town, lamented in her *New England Girlhood* that on the fields she once played among as a child in the 1820s, “the cars rush into the station now, right over our riverside playground.”⁸ Shoemaking was the old cottage industry of Beverly, and while it simply declined at the Farms, it turned mechanized along the railroad line of the old town. Beverly's downtown became dense in residences, compared to the Farms, supporting the factories along the Bass River. In addition, it was connected to Peabody and Salem too by the cheap transportation of the horse railroad. A divide had formed in more than distance.

From their shared identity as two parts of a united New England town, Beverly and Beverly Farms grew apart. The Farms transformed into central part of Boston's Gold Coast, while the main part of town grew to become a place of manufacturing. In the years leading up to the division issue's explosion in the 1880s, the business of wealthy

⁷ "Effect of Town Division On The State." *The Beverly Citizen*, February 26, 1887.

⁸ *Ibid*, 33.

summer residents in the Farms divided that village from the old town's mechanization. Their interests divided by class and industry, old Beverly and the Farms just needed the right incident to put a wedge into the crack of their schism.

National Context

The issues facing Beverly, the Gold Coast, and all of Massachusetts for the matter, can be found as a microcosmic example of the issues facing the nation in that era after the American Civil War, the “Gilded Age.” In the years following the great conflict between the states, the industrial north grew in wealth and prominence. Yet, this wealth was not equally distributed, for income inequality equality was on the rise and the poor benefited little from the growth in wealth benefiting the elite. At the same time, there was widespread growth in political and social consciousness in contrast to the growing influence of the capital sin in government. Labor unions like the Knights of Labor gained prominence in the fight for workers rights and with hope to close the wealth gap. In an industrializing country, tensions were high and politics engaged between the classes. The demographic shift to industrialization, high political consciousness contrasted with growing political corruption, and widespread class divisions on a national and regional level made the division issue's potency as a Massachusetts crisis all the greater, as the outcome would set the example for the Commonwealth's conduct in the new age.

The demographic shift that occurred in Beverly with the growth in population and economic relevance of its manufacturing and commercial center, at the expense of rural industry, may be found in the demographic shift of the entire northeastern United States. According to law professor Zephyr Teachout, “The country had changed from a largely

agrarian to an increasingly urban society and grew five times greater in population from 1830 to 1880 (from 12 million to 50 million).”⁹ In the northeast, the growth in urban population translated to the growth in manufacturing. The northeast already possessed a solid industrial base by the time of the Civil War, but agriculture still maintained its hold in antebellum society. But the region, with largely rocky soil and hilly geography, was one inefficient to the larger-scale agriculture needed to feed a growing population and, as such, it declined in favor of more fertile regions out West. The de-agriculturalization of the northeast would not fully be realized until the twentieth century, but the process was fully underway during this postbellum age of the nineteenth. At the same time, the great industrial cities of America, like New York and Boston, grew in prominence as the “growth as a center of capitalism—investment in industry, real estate, and banking began to overshadow even manufacturing, mining, and railroad banking.”¹⁰ These centers of capitalism would, in turn, cast their shadow over entire regions, like Boston with Beverly.

The industrialization of the United States led to the growing wealth of an elite bourgeois class at the expense of those below. The American economy grew at, according to historian Alan Axelrod, “the fastest rate in history,”¹¹ with the caveat that “great wealth became increasingly concentrated in a relatively few families.”¹² Income inequality bred class division as the poorer majority little saw the benefits afforded by the wealth of the American elite. The widespread belief in the tenets of social Darwinism, the concept that the economic failings of the poor were linked to their moral failings,

9 Zephyr Teachout. "The Gilded Age." In *Corruption in America: From Benjamin Franklin's Snuff Box to Citizens United*, 174-82. Harvard University Press, 2014.

10 Alan Axelrod, *The Gilded Age: 1876-1912, Overture to the American Century*. (Sterling Publishing Co., 2017), 6.

11 Ibid, 7.

12 Ibid, 6.

reinforced the notion of a social strata wealthy in both capital and wisdom. As such, the “so-called robber barons ruled over the working class sometimes ruthlessly, sometimes paternalistically, and often, even philanthropically.”¹³ The relationship between rich and poor threatened to become one of lord and subject.

Nevertheless, rebellion against the principles of social Darwinism and wealth superiority were underway in the labor movement and anti-monopolism, making ostentatious patronizing unwise for the elite. In the agriculturally-focused Midwest, the Grange movement had sprung in the 1870s in an effort to “combat what it saw as railroad monopoly and unconscionable markups by manufacturers and middlemen”¹⁴ in the East exerting their influence from the centers of capitalism on the places of raw production. The Knights of Labor, a labor union and reform group, became “the most powerful labor organization in the country”¹⁵ on a platform against the wage system of capitalist labor and against monopoly (to the unfortunate tune of discrimination against and exclusion of the Chinese). The Knights were the vanguard in conducting one of the largest strikes yet in American history, coined the “Great Upheaval” and to top strikes conducted in 1877, on May Day, 1886, in pursuit of the eight-hour workday as over 600,000 workers stepped off the job in pursuit of reform.¹⁶ The central principle of social Darwinism was under erosion in the national consciousness as more and more workers joined movements to fight against the interests of the upper class in pursuit of rights for producers on the bottom of the ladder.

13 Ibid, 7.

14 Richard White, *The Republic For Which It Stands: The United States During Reconstruction and the Gilded Age, 1865-1896*, (New York City: Oxford University Press, 2017), 258.

15 Ibid, 519.

16 Ibid, 518.

Politics in the era were volatile, with the government seeing high popular involvement in the political system but also under high threat of corruption by the capitalist elite. According to historian Worth Robert Miller, the constant clash between parties in the Gilded Age produced a sort of equilibrium, with a majority of the popular vote unattainable in national elections and a continual reversal of party dominance in Congress. "The sustained political equilibrium of the period suggests Americans were sharply divided, but engaged and committed to the democratic process. The common voter understood that his ballot really mattered."¹⁷ At the same time, as large capitalist interests grew, the role of business in politics seemed to grow contrary to the demands of the popular voter. In the election of 1884, James G. Blaine of Maine, Republican, ran against Governor Grover Cleveland, Democrat, for the presidency. Blaine ran on the issue of protective tariffs to promote national business against foreign industry but his detractors claimed that protectionism would favor only the select few. Blaine's campaign was blighted by connection to big business and scandal, and a moralistic wing of his own party, called "Mugwumps," broke their party allegiance and supported Cleveland. The tainting of Blaine lost him, by a narrow margin of 1200 votes, the election.¹⁸ With rising influence of money in politics, politicians needed to be discrete in revealing capital influence lest their campaign be seen as tainted by party and electorate.

No mention of Gilded Age politics would be complete without mention of the ethnic division brought on by immigration. Politicians of the era gave it generally little notice, but animosity, particularly on the part of Yankee Protestants against Catholic

17 Worth Robert Miller, "The Lost World of Gilded Age Politics," *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 1, no. 1 (2002), 52.

18 Ibid, 56.

immigrants, lasted through the Civil War. A contentious and violent issue in the antebellum period, nativists in the country feared being made irrelevant in the country by these immigrants who largely settled in the urban centers and manufacturing areas.¹⁹ Discrimination against Catholics continued alongside espousal of Yankee superiority. It was an item always lurking in the background of other social issues.

With the national context of the division movement established, it is time to delve into the issue and determine the course of crisis.

The Horsecar Impetus

As with most great events, the causes are cumulative. At the inciting point of the division issue, the gap between rich and poor was growing in the United States and Massachusetts, but so too was access to an an empowering service: efficient public transportation. The catalyst for the division issue's rise began neither with a politician, nor a factory, nor bloodshed, but with a horsecar.

The company behind the horsecar in Beverly was the Naumkeag Street Railway.²⁰ Based in Salem, this private entity was the provider of the area public transportation network. Horses trod along paths dictated by the rails, pulling people, many belonging to lower classes without coupes and carriages of their own, to destinations both intra and interurban in cars tethered to the horse-backs. The horsecars had no friend in wealthy landowners in expansion of service, as they were hesitant to allow the lower classes easy access to their leafy domains.²¹

The year was 1885, and, in Beverly, Massachusetts, the street railway was plotting

19 Ibid, 57.

20 "The Extension," *Beverly Times*, April 22, 1885.

21 Ibid.

expansion of their line eastward on town's Hale Street. In Beverly, there was a certain intersection, at the corner of the city's Hale St. and Boyles St, called Chapman's Corner. This corner functioned as a border between the Cove village of Beverly, and Beverly Farms. Below this corner, down a hill on Hale, lies a small stream and swamp, further marking this boundary between the districts. This was a boundary that the street railway, in their expansion, threatened: the company, with their horses, cars, and rails, would, if they had their way, bring service to the Cove at Chapman's Corner,²² to the threshold of Beverly Farms.²³ By doing so, cheap and accessible public transportation to the Farms, or approaching it at the least, seemed poised to become the reality that already existed in the main portion of the town westward. In May, a "large majority" in Beverly voted at town meeting to extend the horsecar to the Cove,²⁴ and the company's plans for extension were underway.

It was in the expansion of the horsecar line, however, that the street railway would find opposition in the persons of Thornton Kirkland Lothrop and John Torrey Morse, Jr. The epitome of the Boston residents who made their homes in Beverly Farms, these men shared qualities befitting the status of "gentlemen of leisure." Both were Boston lawyers retired from their active practice and from the highest and most noble families of New England. In their leisure and with their wealth, Morse came to the Farms to pursue life as a scholar and Lothrop to enjoy a peaceful life among the seashore.²⁵

22 *Arguments of Fred H. Williams: And Testimony of Petitioners and Remonstrants Presented Before the Committee on Towns of the Massachusetts Legislature, Relative to the Incorporation of the Town of "Beverly Farms," Jan. 20 to Feb. 8, 1886. For Petitioners, Fred H. Williams. For Remonstrants, H.P. Moulton, D.W. Quill, Joseph Bennett [and] W.D. Sohier,* (Boston: Stanley & Usher, 1886), 129.

23 Garland, *The North Shore*, 122

24 "Beverly's Town Meeting." *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, May 10, 1885.

25 Richard Harmond, "The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly," *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, vol. 104 (1968): 20.

On April 18, 1885, Thornton K. Lothrop wrote a communication from Boston to the editor of the *Beverly Times* with his grievances, the manifesto of division (published in the April 22 issue). First, as money seemed to be at the root of all issues, he wrote on behalf of summer residents believing that they were being unfairly taxed: “The great weight of the taxes has been thrown on the land in order to shift as much of this burden as possible on people who are land owners, but do not pay their personal taxes in Beverly.”²⁶ Also present in his writing was the issue of Beverly Farms's having less amenities than the main town owing to its distance. But the most immediate of issue was that of the horsecar extension. The arrival of horsecars anywhere near their estates would, if it came to bear, threaten their placid existence, and Lothrop feared that the extension to the Cove would precipitate extension into the exclusive Farms. “A mere entering wedge,”²⁷ said he of the horsecars to the papers, for he feared that the feared expansion to the Farms would be of “vital injury to the town.”²⁸ Lothrop apparently determined that the intrusion of these less-desirable Beverlyites would trample on Farmers' land values; he would accept no compromise in stamping out service expansion.²⁹ To guarantee the stymieing of horsecars, he made the ultimate suggestion: independence of Beverly Farms.³⁰ “Perhaps, after all,” stated Lothrop, “the vest solution of the whole difficulty would be the division of the town with a line drawn at or about Chapman's Corner.” In the cause to make this proposal a reality, Lothrop would involve Morse³¹ in his cause, and the men, stirred by the horsecar to Chapman's Corner, set off to secure division.

26 Ibid.

27 Ibid.

28 Thornton K. Lothrop, “Communication,” *Beverly Times*, April 22, 1885.

29 Harmond, “The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly,” 20.

30 Ibid, 20.

31 Garland, *The North Shore*, 122.

Lothrop and Morse could find credence for their fears of the horsecar in the recent state of affairs elsewhere on the North Shore of Boston, in the Farms district of Marblehead and Swampscott, where a similar succession movement had begun with similar justification. In that locality, the Lynn and Boston Street Railroad extended its lines in June 1884. The horsecars provided service every fifteen minutes, and as many as three thousand passengers a day were conveyed up the coast to a town graced with beaches and drives. This concerned summer residents there, and, to heighten their fears, a “popular ditty” was making the rounds:

*Hail! Today cheap transportation
Comes in triumph to our station
Bearing in its train the story
Anti-monopoly, the people's glory!
Roll it along, through all the town,
The people's right—cheap transportation!
See the people come to meet us!
All take seats with exultation.
Glory in cheap transportation.*³²

This “cheap transportation” would not do without dissension, and the issue of low-class outsiders coming in droves added fire to an existing grievance for succession. A prominent man there by the name of Benjamin Ware, hotelier, led the charge for succession, with the charge that his proposed town (composing of large rural sections of Marblehead, including the grand peninsula of Marblehead Neck, and a section of Swampscott adjacent to the south) took on twenty-four percent of the tax load but received scant services from their respective towns. Yet succession never came to serious realization. The Massachusetts Legislature's Committee on Towns stomped it out in 1885 due to the fact that the area of division in Marblehead only contributed 61 of 1,930 voters

³² Garland, *The North Shore*, 66.

and sent only 19 students to the (Marblehead) Farms school while the total Marblehead student population numbered 1,405.³³ There was hardly population for a new town within the extensive borders claimed, and, despite whatever hardship these petitioners were faced with in an influx of outsiders, their cause lost credence with the legislature. Nevertheless, up in Beverly Farms, Lothrop and Morse were just getting started. No “Cove horse-car, loaded with smiling factory workers,”³⁴ as would be described in a later satire of their efforts, would intrude their sanctity while they paid their taxes there in the Farms. In spite of Marblehead Farms' recent failure, Beverly Farms would embark on its endeavor of division, to greater success and greater infamy.

The Rise of Division

Once an effort's impetus provides for movement, action is requisite to success. Lothrop and Morse, as prime instigators, ensured that their effort would be a serious one. While natives of the Farms may have floated the idea of division in the past, nothing serious occurred until the action of these two gentlemen. They would build the foundation for the division movement, one which both native Beverly Farmers and wealthy summer residents would play their part. They would downplay wealthy interests as a justification, and, with pocketbooks at the ready, slip into the shadows alongside their fellow summer residents.

Indeed, the summer people would not be those working for division on the ground. In securing division, the first aspect pursued by Lothrop and Morse was to secure the support of the native Beverly Farmers. In August of 1885, Morse assembled at

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ “Millionaires On Strike!!” *The Beverly Citizen*, February 26, 1887.

his home talk of division with permanent residents; unfortunately, this first action was to little result. Lothrop and Morse fared better the following month with an assemblage of thirty persons, and “the general sentiment of division seemed to take shape.”³⁵ Following that September meeting, on October 8 a group of two hundred native Farmers met at the local assembly place, Marshall's Hall. Lothrop gave an address for division, and Morse called for a vote on the incorporation of Beverly Farms.³⁶ Though it was reported in Salem that the Beverly Farmers were merely “coquettish” and that attendees “seemed to be opposed to division provided the town would act fairly in the matter of valuation,”³⁷ Lothrop and Morse must have successfully argued that this this would not be the case. The vote overwhelmingly passed,³⁸ and in this month of October, 1885, the Farms division effort of Lothrop and Morse now had the backing of the permanent residents.

Why would most native Beverly Farmers, not sharing the wealth nor the obvious purpose of the “gentlemen of leisure” before them, come to support the division *en masse*? The issue is complicated. As North Shore historian Joseph Garland blithely put it, “The natives were all for lower taxes; many of them, having bartered their birthrights to the lords, were by way of being their lieges anyway.”³⁹ The thought may have been that the permanent residents would enjoy a much smaller tax load due to an expectation that their rich summer neighbors would be footing the bill for much of the new town's expenses. At the same time, they had the age-old (but rarely acted upon) grievances and complaints of distance from the old town center (over four miles) and limited voice in

35 Harmond, “The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly,” 21.

36 Ibid.

37 “Coquettish Beverly Farms.” *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Oct 09, 1885.

38 Harmond, “The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly,” 21.

39 Garland, *The North Shore*, 122.

town affairs owing to isolation.⁴⁰ In the end, they were all too willing to go along with the cause of Lothrop and Morse, and become the foot soldiers for succession in Beverly's Civil War. Following the securing of support among the Beverly Farms natives, Lothrop and Morse slipped into the background; the person of Daniel W. Hardy, Farms builder and contractor, was left to become head of newly-formed forty man committee of permanent Beverly Farms residents. The petition, their battle plan, was established, and money was raised. With that money, the petitioners hired Fred Homer Williams as their counsel, a young and dynamic lawyer who just had secured the independence of the town of Millis just that year.⁴¹ With Williams and petitions in hand, they prepared to march before the legislature in the following year.⁴²

The Legislature of 1886

Before the House of 1886, counsel Fred H. Williams made an eloquent effort in favor of the petitioners. He spoke about how setting off new towns was a Massachusetts tradition.⁴³ He claimed that since the New England fishing industry died, the inhabitants of Beverly Farms engaged in the humble pursuits of “farming, rural occupations, and [as] mechanics” while the old old town soared with its “manufacturing of shoes by machinery.”⁴⁴ He reinforced that Beverly Farms was four and a half miles from the old town.⁴⁵ He played down the involvement of the summer residents in the issue's impetus. And he portrayed the outbreak of division not as the result of a few elite men wanting a place for themselves, but as the cause of a unified village seeking its self governance in

40 Harmond, “The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly,” 26.

41 *Arguments of Fred H. Williams: And Testimony of Petitioners and Remonstrants*, (1886), 1.

42 *Ibid*, 27.

43 *Arguments of Fred H. Williams: And Testimony of Petitioners and Remonstrants*, (1886), 1.

44 *Arguments of Fred H. Williams: And Testimony of Petitioners and Remonstrants*, (1886), 3.

45 *Ibid*, 5.

face of a distant town center.

On the inciting incident of the horsecar, Mr. Williams was quite neglectful. In gathering testimony for the petitioners, Williams questioned John H. Watson, a builder and contractor from the Farms (whose business involved the summer residents) and a supporter of division, for the purpose of strengthening the petitioners' argument. In his examination, Williams extracted from Watson that the movement was due to long-held grievances in the Farms's distance from town affairs, distance from education, and lack of representation in Beverly,⁴⁶ independent from the interests of summer residents and not mentioning the names of Lothrop or Morse. Watson was in turn cross-examined by counsel for the remonstrants, Henry P. Moulton, who tried to extract the immediate origin for the issue, the reason why the petition appeared before the legislature in this year rather than years past: the proposed extension of the horse railroad. Though Williams interjected, "I hardly see how this is material,"⁴⁷ Moulton probed Watson about the issue of the horsecar extension's. When challenged that the origin of the petition was immaterial due to the amount of signatures in favor of division, Moulton responded:

I do not suppose that that prevents us from showing what the actual facts were in regard to the origin of this petition, and I think we have a right to the benefit of any facts that may come out in pursuance of that inquiry. I do not propose to worry the committee with it, or take up any considerable portion of your time, but it seems to me that we have the right, and that it is an important part of our case to show what this movement is, and who started it. I do not believe that the real parties in interest here are the parties that appear here to-day advocating this petition. I think we have a right to show it.⁴⁸

With this statement, opposition by the Chairman of the Committee on Towns retracted,

46 Ibid, 27-29.

47 Ibid, 35.

48 Ibid, 36.

and Moulton continued. When he pressed Watson further regarding the horsecar as the immediate reason for division, Watson responded that at the Beverly Farms meetings, the horse railroad was framed as such that, “it would bring rum into the district, and that it would rouse the temperance element of Beverly Farms so they would ask for a division.”⁴⁹ When Moulton asked whether others (like Mr. Lothrop) expressed similar sentiments, Mr. Watson said that he could not remember.

Moving onward, the divisionist petition faced setbacks in the legislature from its most prominent opponent, the Honorable John I. Baker, head of the Beverly selectmen. On both January 22 and 25, Baker, long in beard and years of public service, described as “the veteran, blue-eyed philosopher... connected with [Beverly's] public affairs for fifty years,”⁵⁰ took the stand before the House in favor of his beloved old town. According to his account, he first heard of division following Lothrop's public opposition to the horsecar; Baker, a former candidate for Governor on behalf of the Prohibitionist party,⁵¹ stood firm in proclaiming the old town's opposition to Lothrop's plan.⁵² Proceeding further, in a, “direct and emphatic manner,”⁵³ it was Baker who made the greatest charge of the division issue, one that would frame it both legislatively and in the public imagination from start to finish: that the divisionists represented the interests of an elite few on a mission of wealthy interests and tax-dodging. “An objection I have,” Baker said, “to [dividing the town] is this epidemic of Boston tax-dodgers, that began at Nahant... which is to go along the whole shore if the Legislature yields.”⁵⁴ Furthermore, in Baker's

49 Ibid.

50 “John I. Baker Talks.” *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Jan 23, 1886.

51 Garland, *The North Shore: A Social History*, 123.

52 *Arguments of Fred H. Williams: And Testimony of Petitioners and Remonstrants*, (1886), 129-130.

53 “John I. Baker Talks.” *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Jan 23, 1886.

54 *Arguments of Fred H. Williams: And Testimony of Petitioners and Remonstrants*, (1886), 132.

view, Beverly provided the best services it could to the Farms. Baker stated that it was bad faith of the Farmers to try to secede when Beverly had provided so much to them, namely providing them with ample town water at considerable expense, and with them now trying to forego the bill.⁵⁵ With his grip on the pulse of the old town, Baker's opposition called him "King of Beverly,"⁵⁶ and, in his refusal to allow for Beverly's division, he became the Farmer's greatest enemy.

Moving forward a couple months, when the petition went to the cusp of voting, it received opposition from other members of the House in Essex County like Mr. Samuel Roads, Jr., of Marblehead, on similar grounds to Mr. Baker, with the issue of the horsecar emerging again as a strike against the divisionists. Like Baker, Roads saw the movement to divide Beverly as a ploy by rich men to establish tax havens for themselves, with the permanent (and dependent) residents duped into assistance. He also saw it as a way to deprive the old town's enjoyment of Beverly's scenic beauty, as an example of selfish greed on behalf of rich property owners. The opposition to the horsecar, the impetus for division, served as a case in point. In his native Marblehead, he witnessed how the horsecar had provided impetus for division efforts before. He had no tolerance in his speech for the prime grievance of Thornton K. Lothrop and his associates:

"'But,' they say, 'there was a proposition to extend a horse railroad into our sacred precincts.' This track was not to come within two miles of the residence of the principal objecter [sic], and yet this appears to be the only semblance of a reason these people can give us as to why they should be allowed to secede from the old town. The horse car would seem to possess a terror for people of that class. They objected to it at Marblehead Neck two years ago, and now the fastidious Nahanters are asking for a steam ferry from Boston to Nahant, because they fear an invasion by the shoemakers of Lynn should a horse railroad route from that

⁵⁵ Ibid, 130-132.

⁵⁶ Harmond, "The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly," 22.

city be established. Herein lies one motive underlying this petition for division. It is a desire to form an exclusive and aristocratic township where the rich, in the enjoyment of its fine drives, invigorating sea breezes and matchless scenery, may be free from the intrusion of their less fortunate neighbors. It is a sad commentary on the selfishness of human nature. Not content with the advantages which wealth has already given them, they seek to deprive the native residents of Beverly of any share whatever in the privileges which they themselves prize so highly.⁵⁷

Both laughter and applause emerged from Roads' speech, as the lines in favor and opposing division were drawn. Roads shared the sentiment of his colleagues opposing the petitioners. In speaking out against their cause as orchestrated by summer residents, motivated by exclusivity and wealth protection as evidenced by their opposition to the horsecar, he implied they were in alliance with elitists across the North Shore threatening to upend every fabric of their old New England towns. It was a crisis in the making.

When the issue finally came to a vote on March 3, 1886, the charges of the remonstrants won out over the defense of the petitioners as the issue became a sensation. If division went through to fruition, it was feared among opponents that Baker's prediction would come true and that wealthy interests would create a rash of town separations threatening the sanctity of the Commonwealth. In the House chamber on that day, the *Boston Globe* reported:

The three galleries were crowded, and the mock marble walls surrounding the representatives' seats were lined with the agitated citizenry of old Essex, among whom the town division fever has become epidemic. The boundary lines of not only Beverly and Wenham, but Swampscott, Marblehead, Amesbury, and Salisbury are threatened.⁵⁸

It was clear that the vast public opinion, outside Beverly Farms, was against division, and it saw the petitioners' arguments as null. Representative Sillars of Gloucester echoed the

57 "Dividing Beverly" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922), Mar 03, 1886.

58 "The Farms Shall Not Go." *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922), Mar 04, 1886.

sentiment with ridicule, arguing that (in opposition to the argument of Fred H. Williams, that the Farmers remained farmers) the death of the fishing industry made the permanent residents of the Farms servants to an influx of wealthy summer residents. The Beverly Farmers were no farmers, he argued, and the “exclusive people” ought to take the name of the town from their rail depot at Pride's Crossing, or better yet adopt the practice of the Manchester elite and call it “Pride-by-the-Sea.”⁵⁹ In contrast, the petition had the support of men like Representative Mellen of Worcester, who ruled that curtailing the wealthy was not to be decided in opposing the petition, and Representative Upham of Salem (who, in opposition to the general sentiment of his constituents, was the only Essex County man to support the petition in the House) on the basis that all petitions' for town division are just under the New England system. Despite support, the effort failed nevertheless, on a vote of 78 for and 131 against.⁶⁰

The Climax in 1887

While the divisionists were down, they were not out. In 1887, they came back from their “shipwreck on the shoals of Legislature”⁶¹ with renewed vigor and eager to achieve their goals with defiance.

As evidenced in Lothrop's initial manifesto, the perception that the summer residents held an unfair burden of the tax load was present on the Gold Coast. The actions of the Beverly assessors after the failure of the 1886 division bill would heighten rather than assuage their fears. Throughout the shore, they would raise valuations.⁶² In

59 Ibid.

60 Ibid.

61 *Opening Argument of Fred H. Williams, Testimony, and Closing Argument of Hon. George M. Stearns, Before the Legislative Committee on Towns, 1887, (Feb 1-18), in Favor of the Incorporation of the Town of Beverly Farms.* (Boston: Rand Avery Company, 1887), 3.

62 Harmond, *The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly*, 28.

paper assets, they would find a hidden amount of two million dollars, with \$900,000 of this amount belonging to Thornton K. Lothrop.⁶³ With Lothrop and Morse as leaders of the cause for independence, the assessors' sweep was perceived as revenge in the Farms and prompted previously-indifferent shore residents to act.⁶⁴

As the plan for division was reformulated, the summer people, inspired by this perceived attack, lent their pocketbooks to the cause of division while the natives would aid in lobbying as the face of the movement. The divisionists formed a Boston committee for the aim of fundraising, and the movement gained \$18,000⁶⁵. In essence, for 1887, greater background support of the wealthy would ensure that resources of the divisionists were emboldened. The divisionists would also set up another committee of Beverly Farms residents that went to work on extensive lobbying of the legislature,⁶⁶ including paying to wine and dine legislators, while Lothrop and Morse took background positions.⁶⁷

Mr. Williams would resume his counseling of the divisionists with vigor, using all the tricks at his disposal to ensure of the bill's success. Making use of the large sum raised for the cause, Williams employed legal advisors, started a newspaper called the *Beverly Farms Advocate*, and passed out writings in their favor. In addition he used the morally questionable practice of dispatching a horde of lobbyists to persuade the men of the General Court to support division, and an army of lawyers served him across the state.⁶⁸

63 Garland, *The North Shore*, 122.

64 Harmond, *The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly*, 26–27.

65 Harmond, *The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly*, 28.

66 Garland, *The North Shore*, 123.

67 Harmond, *The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly*, 27.

68 Harmond, *The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly*, 28.

The result of the divisionists' plan for 1887, with its lobbying and swelled funds, was that the legislature, which had been the scene of opposition to division in 1886, changed its tune to a majority in favor. Passing the Committee on Towns, the division bill passed both the House and the Senate of the Massachusetts legislature in March 1887.⁶⁹ As stated by Joseph Garland, "That spring of 1887 a thoroughly cozened legislature bestowed its tentative blessing on this second fierce campaign to keep the horsecars off Hale Street."⁷⁰

The anti-divisionists had tried to apply similar methods to combat the empowered division movement, but limited resources proved their actions were in vain in that cause. The campaign waged by John I. Baker raised \$3,500, a paltry sum compared to that of the divisionists, which was able to go toward only a few lobbyists.⁷¹

As the divisionists finally seemed sure of success, a turn of events to further shock the Commonwealth would transpire in the form of a bribery investigation of the parties involved, principally in regard to the activities of the divisionists, in the House and Senate. As a sensational example of the charges made, a lobbyist for the Farmers was accused of betting representatives that they wouldn't vote for division (with a vote for division accordingly providing a kickback). Despite significant controversy, hearings in both branches the investigation did not come up with any evidence, however. And despite opposition, the General Court refused to reconsider the bill, and so it was sent to the governor, Oliver Ames, for approval.⁷²

In the end, despite being known to favor the bill, Governor Ames vetoed it.

69 Ibid.

70 Garland, *The North Shore*, 123.

71 Ibid.

72 Ibid.

Likely motivated to do so due to his potential approval of it threatening his chances of reelection in the next cycle,⁷³ his decision would cite opposition to the malignancy evinced by the bill. His decision provides an encapsulation of the bill's reason for outrage:

I herewith return to the House of Representatives, where it originated, a bill entitled "An act to incorporate the town of Beverly Farms," together with my objections thereto.

If it involved only the question of the division of the town of Beverly, I should hesitate to set up my opinion against that of the Legislature; but under your recent investigation, now familiar to the public, it appears that very large sums of money, altogether disproportionate to the honest necessities of the case, have been raised and expended in the promotion of the passage of the bill.

While, of course, no member of the Legislature has taken, or would take, money for his vote, yet some \$20,000 have been spent to indirectly influence the action of the legislature. It is no excuse that such things, or worse, have happened before without exposure. This time the abuse has been investigated, exposed and rebuked in scathing terms by the committees of both Houses. I regard it as my duty to the Commonwealth and to the maintenance of a wholesome public sentiment in behalf of the legislation which shall be above suspicion, to set upon the reports made by those committees and adopted by their respective Houses, and to strike emphatically at the evil thus unearthed. Not to do so is to excuse and encourage a monstrously bad and corrupting practice.

I believe that the Legislature, which had committed itself to the bill before exposure of the methods of its promotion, will agree with me that it is better that the Executive, approaching it for the first time and finding it tainted with offensive furtherances, should veto it. I cannot doubt, too, that on reflection the committee which seeks division, and to which we look for so many of the elements of good citizenship, will gladly sacrifice, or at least delay, any present convenience for the sake of an empathetic lesson in the public behalf.

If, as seems to be true, both sides have been guilty (which almost makes me sympathize with the judge who wanted to decide against both parties), so much the worse; two wrongs do not make a right. It is a just, as well as an equitable maxim, that those on whom is the burden of making out a case shall come with clean hands, and not seek to excuse the lack of them on the ground that an opponent's are soiled. It seems a fitting opportunity to enforce the principle that,

73 Ibid.

in order to ensure legislation, the thing to do is to show a good case on its merits; and that it is not only not necessary, but detrimental, to rely on pecuniary influences such as have been disclosed in the committees' reports.

I am sure that the pernicious system therein set forth is offensive to nobody so much as to the members of the Legislature, and that you will heartily co-operate with me in hitting it a blow in the interest of more decent methods, and in furtherance of the suggestion in your own reports on the subject to which I call attention.

Your committee closes its report with these words: "Legislation cannot be pure unless free and untrammelled by insidious influences. These influences, however, wherever, or by whomsoever exerted, should be and *must* be emphatically and sternly condemned."

The Senate committee say: It is to be greatly regretted that there has been a growing demoralization in the methods pursued in promoting private bills and private interests before the General Court, deserving the strongest condemnation and the most effective remedy."

"The strongest condemnation and the most effective remedy" I can apply is a veto.

If the system, thus condemned, is to prevail and to be justified by executive approval of bills to which it has been notoriously and offensively applied, then the lobbyist will understand it is an accepted and permissible system, involving no risk except that of being called hard names in a report.

The reputation of the Legislature of Massachusetts for honesty and probity is deservedly so high, that it should not miss this opportunity for reconsideration, with a view to denounce and condemn in the most emphatic manner anything that tends to discredit it.⁷⁴

With the governor's veto, the anti-divisionists snatched victory from the claws of defeat

and so died the 1887 attempt for Beverly's division. Following the climatic failure of

1887, Beverly Farms nonetheless continued to petition for division through to 1890.

However, the issue became tainted by scandal, and latter day attempts never achieved the

⁷⁴ Oliver Ames, *Communication From Executive Department Regarding Proposed Legislation, An Act To Incorporate The Town Of Beverly Farms*, House No. 439., Boston, May 21, 1887, 1–3.

same success.⁷⁵

Conclusion

The division of Beverly was an issue that truly became the crisis of the Commonwealth in the late 1880s due to money's influence becoming apparent in politics. Furthermore, the issue had roots in the class divisions embodied by the issue over cheap transportation to Boston's Gold Coast, provided by the horsecar, and in fear over tax evasion. Coming to head on Beacon Hill, the issue became framed by opponents as a decision on the power of the wealthy to bankroll their own towns. It was a local example of the issue of money in politics, and was influenced by wider shifts in demography and the wider political and socioeconomic environment. The issue of Beverly's division was, at the time, the matter to decide upon the future course of the Commonwealth.

⁷⁵ Harmond, *The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly*, 31–32.

Bibliography: Primary Sources—Newspapers

“Coquettish Beverly Farms.” *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Oct 09, 1885.

"Effect of Town Divisions on The State..."*The Beverly Citizen*, February 26, 1887.

The Beverly Citizen was the leading newspaper of the old town of Beverly, Massachusetts. During the Divisionist crisis, it was the premier mouthpiece against division. In this article, the paper's editor publicly presents testimony of Mr. Thomas Hills, Chairman of the Boston Assessors, before the Committee on Towns as evidence of how the “the State loses the taxes and the state is made larger for every town in the commonwealth” if the divisionist cause bears fruit. This is only one of many articles in the *Citizen* to report on the divisionist crisis.

"Dividing Beverly” *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Mar 03, 1886.

"Effect of Town Division On The State." *The Beverly Citizen*, February 26, 1887.

"Essex Aflame About the Charges of Bribing Made in The Beverly Meeting..." *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Apr 11, 1887.

<https://corvette.salemstate.edu:5208/docview/493377951?accountid=13661>.

The Boston Daily Globe was a daily regional newspaper, centered in the head-town of the Commonwealth and well-posed to report upon news from Beacon Hill, Boston, and around the area and the nation. The newspaper re-publishes works from other regional newspapers, and takes a keen interest in the political scandal and crisis inflaming the Massachusetts. This article re-publishes one from Salem, describing the sad mood among anti-divisionists in wake of the House and Senate passing the divisionist petition. This is only one of many articles in the Daily Globe to report on the divisionist crisis.

“John I. Baker Talks.” *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Jan 23, 1886.

Lothrop, Thornton K., “Communication,” *Beverly Times*, April 22, 1885.

“Millionaires On Strike!!” *The Beverly Citizen*, February 26, 1887.

“The Farms Shall Not Go.” *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Mar 04, 1886.

“The Line.” *The Divisionist*, c. 1889 (no date given).

The Beverly Farms Advocate seems to have ceased publication by the end of 1888, after failure in the legislature of the divisionist cause, but subsequent attempts retained a mouthpiece in *The Divisionist*, apparently founded in 1889

(based on the content of an article). This paper's motto was “To Call a Spade A Spade” and, like the Advocate, they aimed to position the secession of Beverly Farms as the only reasonable discourse. In “The Line,” the newspaper retaliates against a proposed amendment to the divisionist petition that would move the line of division eastward from Mackerel Cove to Plum Cove, and leave a parcel of land titled the “Gore” to old Beverly. *The Divisionist* claims that amendment will hurt Beverly Farms in its valuation, and that all Beverly “wants is blood.” This is only one of many articles in *The Divisionist* to report on the divisionist crisis.

“The Old Town.” *The Beverly Farms Advocate*, January 1, 1887.

The Beverly Farms Advocate was a newspaper founded at the start of 1887 by the divisionist effort in Beverly Farms. The paper, with its motto, “Come Now, Let Us Reason Together,” portrays itself as the voice for the reasonable party in the divisionist debate motivated by the effort of the Farmers. It distances itself from the motivation of wealthy summer residents as principal behind the effort. In this article, the editor retaliates against an argument by anti-divisionists that division would demolish the ancient sanctity of Beverly. He counters by arguing that they are hypocrites, due to Beverly's own secession from Salem, and their treatment of their old Puritan graveyard (the Abbott Street Burial Ground) by running a street through it (Abbott Street), building a fire house atop, and dumping trash upon it, but telling strangers to be respectful. This is only one of many articles in the *Advocate* to report on the divisionist crisis.

Bibliography: Primary Sources—Legislative

Ames, Oliver. *Communication From Executive Department Regarding Proposed Legislation, An Act To Incorporate The Town Of Beverly Farms*, House No. 439., Boston, May 21, 1887, 1–3.

Arguments of Fred H. Williams: And Testimony of Petitioners and Remonstrants Presented Before the Committee on Towns of the Massachusetts Legislature, Relative to the Incorporation of the Town of "Beverly Farms," Jan. 20 to Feb. 8, 1886. For Petitioners, Fred H. Williams. For Remonstrants, H.P. Moulton, D.W. Quill, Joseph Bennett [and] W.D. Sohler, (Boston: Stanley & Usher, 1886)

Massachusetts General Court. "Speeches in the Senate and House of Representatives on the Division of Beverly," 1889.

The petitioners to divide Beverly did not give up after their climatic defeat in 1887, but their later attempts would be less successful as their cause became more toxic. The Massachusetts General Court compiles here speeches in the legislature's Senate and House, primarily against division. From the Senate are the

speeches of Senator Levi L. Whitney, Chairman of the Committee on Towns; Senator Pike of Merrimac; Senator E. J. Hathorne of Boston; Senator Jubal C. Gleason of Rockland; Senator William A. Clark, Jr., of Lynn; Hon David Walker of Lynn. From the House are the speeches of Hon. Chester F. Sanger, Justice of the District Court of Middlesex; Robert O. Harris, Esq. of East Bridgewater; John H. McDonough, Esq. of Boston; J. Otis Wardwell, Esq. of Haverhill; Mr. Simeon Dodge of Wenham; and Samuel W. McCall, Esq., of Winchester (Chairman of the Judiciary Committee).

Opening Argument of Fred H. Williams, Testimony, and Closing Argument of Hon. George M. Stearns, Before the Legislative Committee on Towns, 1887, (Feb 1-18), in Favor of the Incorporation of the Town of Beverly Farms. Boston : Rand, Avery, 1887.

Fred Homer Williams was the chief counsel for the divisionist cause on behalf of the petitioners and on their bankroll. Here he give the opening argument, with the George M. Stearns closing, in favor of the petitioners before the Legislative Committee on Towns in 1887, the most serious attempt at division that ultimately passed the House and the Senate, following an unsuccessful attempt in 1886.

Opening Argument of Henry P. Moulton, Esq. and Testimony of Petitioners and Remonstrants, and Closing Argument of Hon. George D. Robinson Before the Legislative Committee on Towns, on Behalf of the Town of Beverly, Against the Division of the Town, [S.l.: s.n.], 1890.

This is an extensive 288-page compendium on the legislative action performed by the anti-divisionist effort before the Massachusetts Legislative Committee on Towns, including the arguments of counsels George D. Robinson and Henry P. Moulton and the testimony “of petitioners and remonstrants.” At this point in 1890, the petitioners for Beverly Farms had already attempted division of Beverly four times previous. Despite their persistent, attempts following their near victory in 1887 were nowhere near as successful.

Robinson, George D. Argument of Hon. George D. Robinson against the division of the town of Beverly, before the Legislative Committee on Towns, 1888.

Here the Hon. George D. Robinson, counsel for the anti-divisionists and former Governor of Massachusetts, makes his argument against dividing Beverly Farms in 1888. He utilizes extensive evidence to prove against the validity of the division effort.

Bibliography: Primary Sources—Personal

Addison, Daniel Dulany Addison. *Lucy Larcom: Life, Letters, and Diary*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., 1895.

Lucy Larcom was a well-known poetess at the time of the division crisis, and was a vocal voice against the division. The book is a posthumously published account of her life and includes a large quantity of her personal writings. Here, in an April 22, 1887, letter to her sister Emeline, she describes her reaction to the “Senate bribery investigation,” her actions against division, and her hope that the legislature would prevent the measure from coming to pass.

Dow, Mary Larcom. *Old Days at Beverly Farms.* Beverly, Mass.: North Shore Printing Co., 1921. Reprint, Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2007.

Retired schoolteacher Mary Larcom Ober Dow (1835-1920), cousin of poetess Lucy Larcom, in 1916 writes a reminiscence of life in the Beverly Farms of her youth in the “old days” (antebellum period) when the village was more agrarian and before the village took on its role as a summer colony (that it had fully embraced by the time of her writing). She wrote her account a good many decades following the divisionist crisis, but it provides information regard the person of Ober Dow herself as well. Mary Larcom Ober Dow was for years the headmistress at the Farms school, putting her in a influential position for a woman of the time, and was still in that role during the divisionist crisis. Dow does not mention the crisis at all in this book, but other sources reveal that she was a proponent of division in contrast to her cousin.

Bibliography: Secondary Sources

Axelrod, Alan. *The Gilded Age: 1876-1912, Overture to the American Century*. Sterling Publishing Co., 2017.

In *The Gilded Age: 1876-1912, Overture to the American Century*, Alan Axelrod delves into the impact of the Gilded Age on wider American history. In this work, he discusses how the United States changed socially and economically after the civil war, with growing industrialization and income inequality becoming greater issues in a changing America. My events of my topic take place in the context of the shifting American discussed, and I intend to be utilizing Axelrod's research in discussion.

City of Beverly. "Beverly's Civil War – Secession or Bust." City of Beverly, March 26, 2015. <http://www.beverlyma.gov/residents/beverlys-civil-war-secession-or-bust/>.

Published by the city of Beverly itself for the aid of perspective residents, the Beverly government composes a short history here of that pivotal sensation within Beverly history where half the town threatened to tear itself apart. It provides a good run-down of the concerned events regarding the divisionist crisis from its impetus to the resolution. The city regrettably does not list its sources so, from an academic point of view, is most useful in judging what the modern city has to say about the divisionist crisis that rocked its borders so long ago.

Coffey, Nancy. "Beverly's Common Land Evolves." *Wicked Local*. March 21, 2009. <https://www.wickedlocal.com/x599206648/Beverlys-common-land-evolves>.

An Informal History of Beverly Farms. Beverly, MA : The Friends of the Beverly Farms Library, 1980.

In 1980, a committee of the Friends of the Beverly Farms Library composed a book on the history of their neighborhood, titled an "informal" history. Within this history, they included a seven-page section on the issue of division that rocked their district in the 1880s. Utilizing primary sources from contemporary newspapers and the divisionist petitioners themselves, they write from the perspective of a neighborhood now regretful of those "bitter years" in its history.

Garland, Joseph E. "The North Shore: A Social History of Summers Among the Noteworthy, Fashionable, Rich, Eccentric, and Ordinary on Boston's Gold Coast." Beverly, Mass.: Commonwealth Editions, 1998.

In this grand compendium of North Shore history, historian Joseph E. Garland composes a masterful "social history" about the growth of summer resorts on Boston's North Shore from the early nineteenth century into the early twentieth. In

doing so, he proceeds from the early summer pioneers at Nahant, to the establishment of estates up Swampscott, Marblehead, Beverly, Manchester, Gloucester, Ipswich and Rockport. As part of Boston's growing "Gold Coast," Garland discusses the moneyed intentions of the summer residents in their bid for secession at Beverly Farms.

Harmond, Richard. "The Time They Tried to Divide Beverly," *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, vol. 104 (1968): 19-33.

In this volume of *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, published by the Essex Institute of Salem, Richard Harmond writes a vastly informative article on the Beverly divisionist crisis of the 1880s. Harmond not only provides a chronological narrative of the events involved, but also signifies the importance of the issue in regard to its political importance. He notes that the political scandal involved brought to light the growing issue of corruption in Massachusetts' traditionally esteemed legislature. Harmond extensively references the primary sources available to him in his research.

Loring, Katharine P. "The Earliest Summer Residents of the North Shore and Their Houses," *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, vol. 68, no. 3. (July 1932): 193–208.

Miller, Worth Robert. "The Lost World of Gilded Age Politics." *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 1, no. 1 (2002): 49-67.
www.jstor.org/stable/25144285.

Robert Miller Worth, writing in *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, provides a case for Gilded Age politics as not only a period of greed and corruption as often historically portrayed but also a period of great public participation in politics.

Worth's research provides a national context for the Gilded Age politics at play in Massachusetts relevant to the late-1880s divisionist issue.

Teachout, Zephyr. "The Gilded Age." In *Corruption in America: From Benjamin Franklin's Snuff Box to Citizens United*, 174-82. Harvard University Press, 2014.
www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7zswx5.11.

Focused primarily on the issue of corruption and United States politics, law professor Zephyr Teachout provides a history from Benjamin Franklin's receipt of Louis XVI's snuffbox to Citizens United in its analysis. While the overall book is broad in scope, it touches the issue at hand of money-in-politics which so permeated the divisionist struggle. The concerned chapter is "The Gilded Age," which provides some useful background on the demographic shifts

in America leading to the 19th century “Gilded Age” that were witnessed on a local level on Boston's North Shore.

White, Richard. "The Republic For Which It Stands: The United States During Reconstruction and the Gilded Age, 1865-1896." New York City: Oxford University Press, 2017.

A broadly-focused and extensive history on a national level, focusing on the great changes witnessed in the United States following the Civil War and growing inequality between the rich and poor witnessed during the Gilded Age. As it documents the national environment in which the issues of growing Boston Gold Coast and the divisionist crisis transpire, I hope that it may provide some broader contextual information to aid in composition.

Williams, Blakeslee. “Attempted Separation from Beverly” in *The History of Beverly Farms, Massachusetts*." Beverly, MA : Blakeslee Williams, 1967.

Writing in 1967, Blakeslee Williams creates his history of Beverly Farms under the assistance of the Beverly Historical Society and the Beverly Farms Library. Two pages of this work, under this title, are dedicated to the divisionist crisis. Using primary sources, Williams describes the movement relative to its impact on the Beverly Farms community.