FORWARD MOVEMENTS IN POLITICS SINCE THE CIVIL WAR

[Professor Haynes, the author of the paper which follows, is engaged in making a study of the third party movements in the history of Iowa. In order to understand the history of political parties in any given Commonwealth, however, it is necessary to bear in mind the main features of the history of national politics. Consequently, the present paper, which consists of a brief survey of political movements in the United States at large since the Civil War, may be regarded as a general introduction to the history of third party movements in Iowa. It should be stated that this paper was written before the election of November, 1912.— EDITOR.]

The great influence in favor of democracy in this country has come from the West. The experience on the frontier has developed the individual enterprise and sense of personal independence of the pioneers. The margin of free land on the frontier has formed an outlet for the more adventurous. Hence the West has been the seat of democratic ideas. The demand for more money — paper or silver — had its home on the frontiers of successive periods from 1783 to 1896. The Populists had their greatest strength in the newest regions of the Far West. The demand for tariff reform has come from the West chiefly and the "standpatters" have been the manufacturers and business men of the East. Agitation about the trusts has had its strongest support from the West.

Economic conditions and American democracy have acted and reacted upon each other throughout our national history. Early democratic manifestations appeared in Berkshire County in Massachusetts in the years from 1775 to 1780 in the contest over the formation of a constitution for the State. Berkshire County on the extreme western

frontier of the State opposed the plan of the old and wealthier parts of the State to continue for a time the form of government inherited from the period before independence. It demanded immediately a new instrument based upon the consent of the people. The more conservative classes urged the postponement of the work of constitution-making till the end of the war. But the democrats of Berkshire stood their ground till they forced compliance with their demands by almost open rebellion and threats of secession. The line of division was an economic one — the conservatives were the well-to-do of the older communities, the radicals were the poor farmers on the frontier.

The same line of division appeared in the contests over the ratification of the federal Constitution in Massachusetts in 1788. On one side were the ministers, the lawyers, the judges; on the other were the small farmers, the petty traders, and the inhabitants of the back-country villages and towns. The hostility of the latter was directed not so much against the Constitution as "against the men who made it and the men who praised it. They were sure some injury was plotted against them. They knew the system was the work of the ambitious and the rich." "These lawyers", exclaimed one of their representatives, "and men of learning and moneyed men that talk so finely and gloss over matters so smoothly to make us poor, illiterate people swallow down the pill, expect to get into Congress themselves. They mean to be the managers of the Constitution. They mean to get all the money into their hands and then they will swallow up us little folk like the great Leviathan; just as the whale swallowed up Jonah."[1]

The Berkshire Constitutionalists and Anti-Federalists were the fore-runners of the later Republicans who rallied around Jefferson. These divisions mark the beginnings of

[1] McMaster's *History of the People of the United States*, Vol. I, p. 477.

the party system in the United States. Party names and platforms have changed, but the fundamental differences have continued. The Whigs succeeded the Federalists and they in turn gave way to the Republicans. The Democrats are the direct descendants of the Anti-Federalists and the Republicans of Jefferson's day. The sentiments of 1788 sound strangely like those of the campaign of 1896. Differences based upon economic and industrial conditions determined on which side people should range themselves. We are more familiar with the difference based upon constitutional opinions. But the real explanation of that difference is to be found in economic and industrial conditions — at the foundation the dividing line in our politics has been and is an economic one.[2]

The early differences between Hamilton and Jefferson were in reality largely influenced by economic considerations. Hamilton was familiar with the commercial interests of New York and New England and appreciated the necessity of getting the support of those interests for the new government. Jefferson had grown up under the conditions of the South where agriculture was the chief interest. Hamilton's supporters, the Federalists, insisted upon the necessity of conservative financial policies, including a funding of the public debts, a regulation of the currency, and the establishment of a national bank. Jefferson and his party, the Republicans, opposed these plans and declared that Hamilton's strong government was dangerous and would develop into a monarchy.

The two most striking features of Jefferson's administration, the Louisiana Purchase and the Embargo, were opposed by the Federalists especially because of economic reasons. They feared population and prosperity would be drawn away from the older parts of the country to the new

[2] Ghent's *Mass and Class*, pp. 24, 25.

regions of the West. The Embargo struck directly at the chief interest of New England, its commerce and trade. The Federalist ship-owner saw ruin staring him in the face. Hence his hatred for Jefferson. Jefferson himself seems to have believed thoroughly in the wisdom of the Embargo — a belief to be explained by his lack of knowledge of commercial affairs. His purchase of Louisiana, on the other hand, was in direct defiance of his ideas in regard to the nature of the Constitution. His understanding of the needs of the frontier regions enabled him to appreciate the importance of the control of the Mississippi River as the Federalists of New England did not. He was anxious, however, that his violation of the Constitution should be ratified by an amendment. It is curious that what seemed to be a wide departure from democracy in the beginning should have led later to a great extension of democracy. The growth and settlement of the Far West has resulted in a far greater development of democracy than was ever dreamed of by Jefferson himself. Had he lived to witness that development, he might have urged that the results justified the means.

The democratic influence of the new West was first felt conspicuously in national affairs in the contests for the presidency in 1824 and 1828. Adams represented the conservative, commercial interests of the East, while Jackson personified the new democracy of the West of his day, just coming to political consciousness. The ideas of the Berkshire Constitutionalists and the Anti-Federalists had found a new and larger field in the West. Adams, an ideal President, was accused of aristocracy and of corruption. The new democracy wanted a man of the people — one of themselves — in the White House, and Jackson was swept into office on the top of this democratic wave.

The Spoils System came in with the attempt to sweep

out of office every supporter of Adams and every opponent of the people. Then followed the war on the National Bank, an institution in league with the moneyed and business interests that were felt to be hostile to Jackson and the people. The "money power" in changing forms seems to have been an object of attack on the part of the radicals throughout our history — it appeared in 1788, in 1828, and again in 1896.

The rise of a new democracy requires some further comment. We are supposed to have had a perfectly democratic government in the United States ever since 1776. But during the early years of the Republic the government was in the hands of the aristocracies of Virginia and New England. While theoretically sovereign, the people were "deferential" enough (to use a phrase of Bagehot's) to allow the control of affairs to remain in the hands of their superiors in birth and position. The first serious change of attitude came with the accession of Andrew Jackson to power. The great middle class, so called, the people with no pretensions to birth and no inherited wealth, were gradually roused to a point where they demanded a voice in public affairs. From 1830 to 1865 large classes, before indifferent or unable to exert an influence, began to take an effective part in governmental affairs. All property qualifications were swept away. Officials, formerly appointed, were made subjects for election directly by the people. Even the judges came to be elected in the same way and for limited terms. State constitutions were changed in accordance with the new democratic ideas. Legally there was a government by the people in a completer sense than had ever existed. This new democracy naturally turned its attention to slavery which came to be a subject for discussion after 1840. As a matter of course it became anti-slavery. The new anti-slavery democracy of the West

reinforced the moral and religious leaders, Garrison, Phillips, and Whittier, who in the East were denouncing slavery. In fact, the real decisive battle with slavery was fought and won on the plains of the West. Without the West, the issue might have been doubtful. With nine free States in that section added to the free States of the East, the victory for freedom was assured. The Civil War and the abolition of slavery mark the crest of the democratic wave in the United States.

The great industrial development since the Civil War has had an anti-democratic influence. The small employer, working with his men, has given place to the great factory or mill with its hundreds of hands. The captain of industry has come to be the most striking feature of modern business and the individual worker has shrunk into insignificance. Autocracy in industry has replaced the comparative democracy of earlier times. The trust is only the latest manifestation of the autocratic tendency in industry. Side by side with political democracy there has developed one-man rule in industry. It was inevitable that this development should react on government and law. The business man's influence in politics has been for the most part hostile to democracy. The business man wants a safe, conservative government that will not interfere with the use of the most effective business methods. He finds it more convenient to deal with a boss in a given community than with the members of the local legislature. It is simpler and surer in its results. Much of our political corruption is due to the business man's liking for the shortest way to his object. It also makes clear in a suggestive way the business man's loss of faith in democracy. He has little confidence in the soundness of real democratic government. He thinks it safer to pay for what he wants.

The recent "progressive movement" has manifested

itself in two main forms: (1) in warfare against political bosses; (2) in discontent with social and industrial conditions. In reality these two issues are one. They are the result of the relations that have grown up between politics and business. The political boss seems to be a necessary factor in the conduct of business on a large scale. He is the logical development of business conditions in which special privilege plays an important part. The political boss and special privilege corporations are typical features of present-day industry. Consequently the "progressive" aims at their elimination. The direct primary, the referendum, and the recall are the means by which he is trying to regain control of the government. The regulation of railroads and corporations is merely the other side of the same problem. We are beginning to realize that the task that "confronts every modern nation is how to make the great industrial, commercial & financial forces the servants and not the masters of society."[3]

To understand present-day conditions and tendencies we must go back to the Civil War. The succession of third parties from 1872 to 1896 — the Greenback, Granger, Free Silver, and Populist parties — were the expression of repeated efforts on the part of the democratic citizens of the West to assert themselves against the prevailing characteristics of the industrial and social development since the Civil War. Often shortsighted and visionary in their specific remedies, these leaders of the people were fundamentally sound in their opposition to the growing power of plutocracy. Their instincts opened their eyes to features in the contemporary development that were not discovered for many years by the people in the older parts of the country. Read the platforms of these parties and you will

[3] Hobhouse's *The New Spirit in America* in *The Contemporary Review,* Vol. 100, p. 3.

find many of the planks that are now prominent in the proposals of the Democratic and Republican parties. These shortlived parties represent *forward movements* in the development of government of the people, for the people, and by the people, rather than the outbursts of fanatical reformers, based upon the imaginings of poorly balanced minds.[4]

From 1866 to 1878 there was an almost constant controversy in regard to the greenbacks issued during the Civil War. One group urged retirement as soon as possible. Another group believed retirement a mistake and the cause of falling prices and business depression. They urged the use of greenbacks as a permanent part of the currency. The issue cut through party lines. Among the Republicans many favored the continued use of greenbacks, while the Democratic party was thoroughly permeated with the idea.

Congress first authorized gradual retirement, then forbade retirement and later passed the Inflation Bill. After the veto of that bill by President Grant, Congress passed the Resumption Act. Finally, in 1878, further retirement was forbidden and the amount in circulation at the time was made permanent.

The first expression of the Greenback view as a national political issue was in the platform of the Labor Reform party adopted at Columbus, Ohio, on February 22, 1872. After the crisis of 1873 and the trade depression that followed, the "Greenback movement" assumed large proportions. A national party, the Independent National or Greenback Party, was formed at Indianapolis, May 17–18, 1876. Two hundred and thirty-nine delegates from nineteen States were present. The platform demanded (1)

[4] Turner's *Social Forces in American History* in *The American Historical Review*, Vol. XVI, pp. 217–233.

immediate repeal of the Resumption Act and the abandonment of the policy of contraction, (2) declared notes issued by the government the best circulating medium and demanded suppression of "bank paper", (3) declared the "paramount duty of government to keep in view full development of all legitimate business", (4) protested against the further issue of gold bonds for sale in foreign markets, (5) objected to the sale of government bonds for the purchase of silver as substitute for currency, as it would enrich silver-mine owners and burden "an already overburdened people".[5]

The Greenbackers nominated Peter Cooper of New York and Samuel F. Cary of Ohio for President and Vice-President. Eighty-one thousand seven hundred and forty votes were cast for these candidates. Of these, five States, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, and Kansas, furnished nearly 65 per cent — 52,603 out of 81,740. In 1880 the party broadened its platform to include industrial issues, and nominated James B. Weaver of Iowa and B. J. Chambers of Texas. Three hundred and eight thousand five hundred and seventy-eight votes were cast for these candidates. Each of the five States just mentioned increased its vote and two States, Missouri and Texas, contributed 35,000 and 27,000 votes — altogether nearly two-thirds of the votes cast for the Greenback candidates came from seven western States. In 1884 the party nominated B. F. Butler of Massachusetts and A. M. West of Mississippi. These candidates received 175,365 votes. In 1888 the party gave way to the so-called Union Labor party. It had been absorbed into the agitation for free silver and other radical issues of the day.

The years following the Civil War saw a great development of the then Far West — the Upper Mississippi Valley.

[5] McKee's *National Conventions and Platforms of all Political Parties*, 1789–1900, pp. 174, 175.

The demand was for railroads to open up the country. The speculative spirit of the period favored it. The natural result was that railroads and population went West too fast, while debts piled up in an inflated currency. There was little traffic except in grain. Prices began to fall as a result of the increased production. Transportation charges remained unchanged. The railroads began to appear as obstacles between the farmers and their eastern markets. The ownership of most of the stock of the railroads gave color to talk about "absentee ownership". Moreover, the railroads were not always wisely managed. They felt the pinch of hard times and were compelled to fight for traffic at competing points, while they charged all the traffic would bear where there was no competition. As a result, the "farmers' movement" became one *against* the railroads.

The agitation, usually known as the "Granger Movement", first attracted the attention of the country in Illinois. The new State Constitution of 1870 declared that railroads were "public highways" and demanded laws "establishing maximum rates". The next year the legislature passed an act establishing maximum rates and making provision for a commission to regulate the railroads. Judge Lawrence of the State Supreme Court declared this law unconstitutional, and at the next election he was defeated by a combination of farmers. By 1874 seven States had passed similar laws. Later the laws were tested before the Supreme Court of the United States. The Court declared in the case of *Munn vs. Illinois* that when "one devotes his property to a use in which the public has an interest, he, in effect, grants to the public an interest in that use, and must submit to be controlled by the public for the common good, to the extent of the interest he has thus created." Much of the Granger legislation worked badly and was later modified considerably. But public control of railroads was

established, many abuses were corrected, and to this movement we owe the State railroad commissions and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The demand for free silver was first heard about 1876. The silver dollar had been dropped from the list of legal tender coins in 1873. Just at this time the greenback controversy was practically settled by the passage of the Resumption Act. Changes in the value of silver attracted the attention of the people, who felt that the currency was responsible for many of their ills. These changes came at the same time as did the demonetization of silver by several European nations and the discovery of new mines in the West. Ignoring the latter influence, the popular mind fastened upon the legislative action as the chief cause of the fall in the value of silver. The Act of 1873 became the "Crime of 1873", and free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 became the watchword of large numbers whose constant demand for many years had been for more money to carry on the business of the country.

The Compromise Act of 1878 did not check the agitation. After twelve years another compromise yielded more ground, but still failed to satisfy the demands of those who believed that free coinage would be a panacea for all their troubles. The crisis of 1893 brought things to a point where further compromise was seen to be impossible. The purchase clause of the act of 1890 was repealed after a desperate struggle, and the final settlement of the long controversy came as a result of the famous campaign of 1896. The Currency Act of 1900 registered the result in a legislative way.

The name "Granger Movement" is applied to the earlier farmers' movement during the years from 1870–1880. A later "farmers' movement" has come to be known as the "Populist Movement".

Organizations of farmers were formed in the West and South between 1880 and 1890. They grew gradually and entered into combinations until in 1890 they were ready to act in a national campaign. In the congressional and State elections of that year, they exerted so great an influence as to startle the country. They elected governors in Georgia, Texas, South Dakota, and South Carolina, carried State tickets in Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota, and also elected a number of Congressmen.

These successes encouraged the advocates of independent political action. A call for a national convention was issued, and at Cincinnati in May, 1891, the Peoples Party was formed. Arrangements were made for another convention in 1892 to nominate candidates for President and Vice President. This convention met in Omaha in July, 1892, and nominated J. B. Weaver of Iowa and J. G. Field of Virginia. The platform contained the following points: (1) free coinage of silver, (2) government paper money in place of bank notes, and the increase of the amount in circulation to $50 per capita, (3) opposition to the issue of bonds, (4) postal savings banks, (5) a graduated income tax, (6) government ownership and operation of railroads, telegraphs, and telephones, (7) reclamation by the government of all lands held by railroads, corporations, and aliens in excess of actual needs and their opening to settlement. In the election that followed 1,041,028 votes were cast for the candidates, giving them twenty-two votes in the electoral college, and dividing these votes for the only time since 1860 among three candidates.

The successes of the Populist Party in 1892 gave it a position that no other third party has occupied since the Civil War. Its representation in Congress was considerably increased. Its influence was made greater by the effect of its victories over the two old parties. Both were anxious

to conciliate the new power. This "permeating" influence was the strongest positive force exerted by the new party. Through it, its representatives affected legislation in a much greater degree than they could have done directly. "It was merely a question of time", declares one student of the period, "until the Republicans or Democrats would admit its principles in order to absorb its strength. That it should capture the Democratic organization rather than the Republican may be looked upon as a political accident."[6] Such an outcome was made easier by the disappearance of vital issues between the parties. Before the election of 1892 Populist leaders tried to get the consent of Judge Walter Gresham, a leading Republican, to be their candidate for President. He afterwards became Secretary of State in the Democratic administration of President Cleveland. We have, therefore, an instance of a prominent Republican asked to be a candidate of the Populists, and actually becoming premier under a Democratic President. Such a case could only happen as a result of the lack of real issues.

The nomination of Bryan in 1896 and the adoption of free coinage as a party issue by the Democrats marks a new period in our political life. Economic issues, instead of battling for recognition through new or third parties, have conquered the attention of the two great parties and have captured one of them. The years since 1896 have been occupied with the efforts of these parties to deal with the issues forced upon them. Bryan's capture of the Democratic party has been followed by Roosevelt's attempt to transform the Republican party. The Insurgents represent the same forces at work in our political life.

The nomination of Bryan by the Democrats in 1896 was the most dramatic event in our politics since the Civil War.

[6] Wildman's *Money Inflation in the United States*, pp. 195, 196.

He had served in Congress from 1891 to 1895, where he had made a reputation as an orator. After his retirement, he was connected with a Democratic newspaper in Omaha, and engaged by the silver miners in their agitation through the South and West. His strength rested upon his ability as a speaker rather than upon his knowledge of the money question.

The Democratic convention met under very difficult conditions. The West and South were heavily in debt. Colorado and other far western States were seriously affected by the great decline in the price of silver. Coming to the convention at the head of a contesting delegation from Nebraska, Bryan stirred the assembly by the same kind of a speech that he had been using in the silver propaganda. The convention broke away from the control of the regular party leaders and nominated him on a free silver platform. He made a marvellous campaign, and, in spite of the fact that the eastern Democrats, led by the Cleveland administration, refused to support him, and nominated candidates of their own, lost only by a margin of about half a million in a total popular vote of over thirteen millions. The electoral vote was less evenly divided. Bryan carried all the States south of Virginia and Tennessee and all west of the Mississippi River except Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, Oregon, and California. The sectional character of the vote is noteworthy, and indicates the continued existence of a radical sentiment in the West such as has been referred to in connection with the third party movements. That influence in 1896 was given chiefly to Bryan.

His renomination in 1900 proved that he had the gift of leadership. The accidental issue of 1896 had given him his opportunity. His retention of the leadership during the intervening four years showed his possession of something more than mere oratorical ability. Again in 1900 his cam-

paign was a difficult one. The Spanish War gave rise to "imperialism" as an issue. Bryan gave it first place in his platform. It was apparent that the people were not enthusiastic over the retention of the Philippines, but there seemed to be no other solution of the problems growing out of the war. In addition, Bryan made opposition to the trusts his second great issue, and also insisted upon free coinage as firmly as in 1896. The return of prosperity made people less inclined to change. The result was a gain for the Republicans and a loss for the Democrats. Bryan gained Kentucky, but lost Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

His strength was again effectively shown in 1904, when he refused to be a candidate, and allowed the conservative Democrats of the East to name a candidate. In the convention, according to the testimony of independent observers, he was by far the most impressive figure, and he compelled the conservative leaders to accept his revision of the platform. The results of the campaign showed conclusively that the radicals were stronger than the conservatives in their appeal to popular support.

In 1908 there was general agreement that Bryan was the only possible candidate. Many leading Democrats, who had formerly been opposed to him, openly declared their support. On his return from a trip around the world in 1906, he was given a great reception in New York, and his nomination two years later was conceded. The outcome was an increase of 1,315,211 votes over the number cast for Parker in 1904, but a falling off of 109,743 votes compared with that of 1896. What is the explanation of such a result of twelve years' campaigning under circumstances that seem to indicate increased and confidential support by his own party and greater respect on the part of the public generally? The answer is to be found by an analysis of his

policies and a consideration of his significance as a leader.

"Bryan makes a strong appeal to the moral sense of his sympathetic hearers. He does not make his protests effective with men who think clearly for he offers no practical remedy." He declares that elections are won by the use of large campaign funds. These funds come from our great business interests. Our parties and public men are under obligations to them, and they pay their obligations by tariff favors and other kinds of special privilege. We are now convinced that there is only too much truth in his statements, but we are not clear as to the best course to pursue to change conditions. People accept his seriousness and his devotion to the average man, but they distrust a judgment that has failed to find sound remedies for the evils it has truthfully described. As a result we have his rejection as a presidential candidate, while his reputation as prophet and preacher has grown immensely.[7]

The succession of Theodore Roosevelt to the presidency in 1901 marked the advent to national leadership of the most interesting and influential personality since Lincoln. He announced his intention of continuing the policy of his predecessor, but it was soon apparent that a new spirit had been introduced into our political life. He began a campaign against the trusts in 1902 by a series of speeches delivered in important cities. The policy of appealing from Congress and the politicians to the people, used so effectively by him, was invoked thus early. The immediate result was the establishment of a Bureau of Corporations as a part of the new Department of Commerce and Labor in 1903. The great coal strike of 1902 gave him another opportunity to use his influence in the interests of the people against a great natural monopoly. In 1904 came his election in his own right to the office to which the act of an assassin had

[7] *The World's Work*, Vol. VII, p. 4504.

brought him. His great personal popularity, set over against the colorless candidacy of Parker, resulted in a great popular endorsement.

His second term was even more noteworthy in its achievments and in its influence upon popular opinion. It is no exaggeration to say that a revolution in policy and opinion had been accomplished by its close. In 1905 he took up the problem of railroad regulation. Defeated in his first efforts, a combination of favorable circumstances enabled him during the next year to force from a reluctant Congress a stronger measure than he had at first expected, and also to drive through two other acts of great importance — the pure meat and pure food bills.

During these years, too, he was constantly making speeches in which he took advanced positions. His speech on the "man with the muck rake" delivered in April, 1906, declared his personal conviction that some form of inheritance tax must sooner or later be adopted to limit the growth of fortunes "swollen beyond all healthy limits". Again in his annual message of December, 1906, he discussed the desirability of both income and inheritance taxes, "the prime object of which should be to put a constantly increasing burden on the inheritance of those swollen fortunes which it is certainly of no benefit to perpetuate". As the end of his term approached, he became still more emphatic in his denunciation of unscrupulous greed. His description of a certain multi-millionaire "as a man of whom it has been well said that his face has grown hard and cruel while his body has grown soft; whose son is a fool and his daughter a foreign princess" was perhaps unnecessarily vehement. It was nevertheless a characteristic utterance. His warfare against concentrated wealth could not be waged effectively by soft phrases and gloved hands.

His prosecution of illegal combinations under the Sher-

man Anti-Trust Act compelled attention to legislation that had been disregarded for many years. Whether the law is a wise one, and whether its strict enforcement accomplishes really useful results, may be open to question. Many people had accepted the opinion that it could not be enforced against the power of great combinations of capital. Roosevelt proved that it could be done, and by that very fact showed the strength of a government based upon real popular support.

Opposition to the dominance of Speaker Cannon in the House of Representatives, and to the methods used in the Senate in the revision of the tariff during the extra session of Congress in 1909, led to a division in the Republican party: a number of Senators and Representatives became known as "Insurgents". The most conspicuous at first were Senators LaFollette of Wisconsin, Dolliver and Cummins of Iowa, Beveridge of Indiana, Bristow of Kansas, Clapp of Minnesota, Bourne of Oregon, Borah of Idaho, and Dixon of Montana. The failure of the Taft administration to continue the Roosevelt policies in a decisive way gradually crystallized a progressive or radical sentiment in the country. Roosevelt seemed to have converted the Republican party from an organization closely identified with the great business interests to a popular party. His retirement gave the old leaders a chance to reassert themselves, with the outcome of serious division in the party. That division has increased as the policy of President Taft has become clearly hostile to the progressive wing of his party. The break came at the national convention of 1912.

LaFollette was the "first among the Republicans to comprehend the character of the irrepressible conflict within the party", declared Senator Dolliver in a speech delivered in Wisconsin a few months before his death. He began his reform work in 1894. He was elected Governor in 1900,

1902, 1904, and United States Senator in 1905, and reëlected in 1910 by a great popular vote. His measures of reform were the primary, equalization of railroad taxes, and regulation of railroad rates. In the Senate he compelled recognition by his great ability in the face of bitter opposition. His speeches are not of the popular kind — he makes the longest speeches of any political leader in the country. His work among the chautauquas serves the double purpose of providing him with funds for his campaigns, and also as an effective method of reaching his opponents in their own constituencies. Publicity and the campaign of education are his favorite methods.

The insurgent or progressive movement has had its greatest strength in the agricultural States of the Middle West. These States have been the seats of all the "forward movements" since the Civil War. Insurgency is really only the latest manifestation of the democratic tendencies that have been characteristic of the West throughout its development.

The progressive movement is by no means confined to a section or a party. It cuts through party lines. There are progressive Democrats as well as Republicans. So widespread is the division that predictions have been frequent for some time that a new alignment of parties is inevitable. The real division in American political life to-day is between "progressives" and "standpatters": whether Republican or Democrat is merely an accident. Recent events indicate that the re-arrangement of parties has really begun. For the permanent results, we must await further development.

FRED E. HAYNES

MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE
SIOUX CITY IOWA