would be superseded by higher obligations which we could not hesitate to discharge.

Cleveland added some 44,000 places to the classified service. He and Olney negotiated a general arbitration treaty with England. His first administration had to handle a surplus, his second a deficit. Carlisle in his report to Congress in 1894 recommended a plan for a reform of the currency, but the party was hopelessly divided on the money question and nothing was done.

The record of no President is safer in the hands of history than Grover Cleveland's. Bold, blunt and frank, there were no after developments exposing consequencials or throwing a shade over any of his acts. He received the full attacks of criticism while he was in office and immediately after; the major part of criticism and praise came to him later. The more light thrown on him and his administration the greater and wiser both appear. He added, or restored, power and prestige to the President's office. He lived to see nearly all old enmities born of bitter days removed, and when standing on the platform at the St. Louis Exposition in 1894 he received even a warmer welcome from the vast crowd than was given Roosevelt, then President of the United States (who generously solicited him on the fact), he became, Mrs. Cleveland said, "a different man."

No party could have harbored both Cleveland and Bryan when the latter had gotten his growth. With the national convention of 1896 Cleveland, Whitney, Carlisle and a host of other notable Democrats laid down their batons of command and Bryan assumed the leadership to retain it many years. But Cleveland had stamped an indelible impress on the party, and the Cleveland Democracy remained a leaven in the body politic, which, however frozen out and neutralized at times, worked persistently and powerfully.

It is a question incapable of exact solution whether the Democratic or the Republican Party in 1896 was the most divided over the money question. Certainly, however, the latter turned the better able to hold its leaders in line with the party decision regardless of their individual views. Perhaps it was because the Democrats were impressed by the moral issue so insisted on, while the Republicans more apatently regarded only the economic issue involved.

When the 1896 conventions were over it was anybody's battle for the Presidency.

CHAPTER XXVII
THE BRYAN ERA BEGINS
1896-1901


The Seventeenth Democratic National Convention met at Chicago July 7, 1896, three weeks after the Republicans had nominated McKinley on a gold platform. Next to the Charleston convention in 1860 this was Democracy's most epoch-making convention. It was a contest of principles, not men, and had been long in preparing. During the year each state convention had been a skirmish leading up to the main battle; thirty of them had declared for free silver and fourteen against. Florida's convention alone expressing no views. Neithery wing had settled on a candidate, and while Bland, Boies and others had active friends they would not have allowed their candidate's interest to stand in the way of one thought better to represent the principle or more likely to succeed. Principle and desire for success were stronger than either personal or party feeling.

In January, 1896, the Democratic Party was so torn with dissensions that Republicans boasted that they could elect a rag baby that year. But as the silver sentiment crystallized it became a question where the Republican Party would stand, and what in the world would happen. McKinley's own state convention a few weeks before had straddled the question completely. Only the Populist Party was undivided on the subject.

The Democrats of New England and the Middle States, joined by Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin, favored the gold standard, and so uncompromisingly so that for some time before the convention met a bolt from the party had been frankly discussed in the newspapers. New York, and some other states had post-

posed naming electoral tickets in anticipation of a bolt.
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The fight started in the January meeting of the National Committee, the Silver Democrats wanting an early, the Gold Democrats a late convention. Thomas of Colorado moved for June 2nd; Cable of Illinois for July 14th. The call as usual was to all Democratic conservative citizens irrespective of past political associations. The committee divided on the temporary chairmanship, the North and East for David B. Hill, the West and South for John W. Daniel, yet Maine was for Daniel, Mississippi and Texas for Hill. Still on this as on most other matters before the convention the fight was the South and West against the North and East, with the Middle West in the balance.

Called to order by Chairman Harris, the convention promptly overruled the committee and chose Daniel for temporary chairman by a vote of 556 to 349. The battle was good-natured and many compliments exchanged; Daniel four years before had nominated Hill for President, and now with the exception of New York all the Hill men of 1892 were voting against him and all the Cleveland men of that year were for Hill. The credentials committee promptly seated the Bryan delegates from Nebraska, and four Silver contestants from Michigan, giving the Silver men control of the full votes of both these states and two-thirds of the convention.

Before the convention met there had been rumors that the two-thirds rule was to be set aside; the New York Times canvassed the delegates and reported 518 to 412 in favor of abolishing the rule. However, there was no need of such action and the old rules were adopted. It was reported that the credentials committee were unanimous in seating the Nebraska delegation headed by Bryan. The Michigan contestants were seated by vote of 558 to 365, but not with steam-roller methods. There were many delegations and lobbies of Silver Republicans, Populists and Silver men generally, including James B. Weaver, around convention hall. They wanted Senator Teller nominated. Weaver's refusal to support Bosies practically ended Bosies chances. An interview published on the eve of the convention showed that Bryan had just returned from Europe, which stated that Europe was indifferent toward international bimetallism, added to the Republican gold plank, clinched the determination to come out absolutely for free silver.

Senator Stephen M. White of California was permanent president, and made a harmony, not a keynote speech. W. A. Clark of Montana presented a silver-gavel from the miners of his State. A newspaper reporter described Bryan as wearing a black alpaca coat, string tie and trousers bagging at the knees; that was news in 1896.

When the platform was reported the money plank was demanded, with great cheering, to be read again. Sixteen signed a minority report declaring free coinage dangerous and favoring international bimetallism, demanding the old Democratic policy of "hard money" and criticizing the failure to endorse the existing Democratic administration. Hill, Vilas, Gray and representatives on the committee from Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Vermont, South Dakota, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania and Alaska signed the minority report.

Davidson of North Dakota moved a provision that any change in the money standard should not apply to existing contracts, and that if free coinage failed to effect parity between gold and silver in one year from enactment such coinage should be suspended. Tillman opened the debate in a long and bitter speech; he had his pitchfork with him and used it on the money power, the Republican Party, Cleveland, Carlisle and John Sherman. Jones of Arkansas argued briefly and passionately for the majority report. Hill spoke for the minority, cold, logical and able, and respectful toward his opponents; he defended the Cleveland administration, deprecated the attack on the Supreme Court, commented on the presence in a Democratic convention of Populists and Populists on the platform, organizing, he said, this convention and procuring Democrats. Vilas and Governor Russell of Massachusetts followed on Hill's side. Bryan of Nebraska, for the majority, closed the debate.

Bryan is justly credited with making two of the most famous, if not the most effective speeches in all American convention history, this one in 1896 and his speech in the Baltimore convention sixteen years later. Conkling's nomination of Grant, Ingersoll of Blaine, neither won the battle. Both of Bryan's brought about nominations. Bryan's Baltimore speech changed many votes and made Woodrow Wilson President, while it is doubtful if in 1896 and more famous speech changed a single vote on the matter under debate, and did not make him President, although gaining him the nomination and making him the leader and practical dictator of the Democratic Party for sixteen years, with a nation-wide influence all that time second only to that of the actual President.

Addressed a mass meeting of two-thirds of which sympathized with the agricultural element of the country, now owing some.
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billions of dollars in farm mortgages, and the debtor class generally, and thoroughly convinced of the rightousness, wisdom and efficiency of free silver as a remedy for the political ills of the country, Bryan's speech was marvelously adapted to its hearers and its purpose.

"The humblest citizen in all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than the whole hosts of error. I come to speak to you in defense of a cause as holy as the cause of liberty—the cause of humanity... This is a contest of principle. The man who is employed for wages is as much a business man as his employer. The merchant at the crossroads store is as much a businessman as the merchant of New York. The farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day, begins in the spring and toils all summer, and by the application of brains and muscle to the natural resources of the country creates wealth as much as any business man as the man who goes upon the Board of Trade and bets upon the price of grain. The miners who go a thousand feet into the earth to bring forth the precious metals to be poured forth in the channels of trade are as much business men as the few financial magnates who in a back room corner the money of the world.

"We have petitioned and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged and they have mocked when our calamity came. We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them..."

"They say that the government ought to go out of the banking business. I stand with Jefferson rather than with them, and tell them as he did that the issue of money is a function of the government and that the banks should go out of the governing business."

"If protection has slain its thousands, the gold standard has slain its tens of thousands..."

"You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard. I tell you that the great cities rest on these broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms and your cities will spring up again as if by magic. But destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in this country."

"We shall declare that this nation is able to legislate for its own people—on every question, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation on earth. Upon that issue we expect to carry every single state in the Union..."

"It is the issue of 1776 over again. Our ancestors when but three million had the courage to declare their political independence of every other nation upon earth. Shall we throw away our million on a battle and then turn around and say that we are not yet prepared to fight another battle?"
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descendants when we have grown to seventy million declare that we are less independent than our forefathers? No, my friends, it will never be the judgment of this people. . . .

"Therefore we care not upon what lines the battle is fought. If they say bimetallism is good but we cannot have it till some nation helps us, we reply that instead of having a gold standard, because England has, we shall restore bimetallism and then let England have bimetallism because the United States have."

"If they dare to come out in the open and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we shall fight them to the uttermost, having behind us the producing masses of the Nation and the world. Having behind us the commercial interests and the laboring interests and all the toiling masses, we shall answer their demands for a gold standard by saying to them, 'You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.'"

When the wild and long-continued cheering had subdued the minority money amendment was rejected 626 to 303, and the amendment endorsing the Cleveland administration voted down 546 to 357. Hill's two amendments were rejected by vita voce vote. Tillman abandoned his resolution denouncing the administration. The majority report on platform was then adopted 628 to 301, Florida, Minnesota, South Dakota, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming and Alaska supplying 61, the North and East 240, of the nay vote.

It was believed that if the convention had proceeded to nominate immediately Bryan would have won on first ballot; but the nominations were postponed until the morning.

Richard P. Bland of Missouri, Bryan, Boies of Iowa, Claude Matthews of Indiana, Blackburn of Kentucky, McLean of Ohio, Pattison of Pennsylvania, and Penoyer of Oregon were placed in nomination.

Governor William E. Russell of Massachusetts, for whom his delegation was instructed, declined to allow his name to be presented. New Jersey and New York when called stated shortly that they had no candidate to present to this convention or to run on the platform adopted.

Virginia, under W. Daniel, for whom the delegation was instructed, had requested that his name be not presented. Wisconsin through General Bragg announced that state could not participate in a nomination on the platform adopted.

There was a tremendous amount of oratory in this convention, especially in the nominating speeches, but most of it went with the enthusiasm which was all on the silver side. Therefore
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references not only to Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson and Lincoln, but to Cincinnati, Tiberius Gracchus, Cato, Cicero, Catiline, Leonidas, Ivanhoe, Henry of Navarre, Peter the Hermit, Cromwell, Danton, Murat, Robespierre, Napoleon, Wellington, Lodi, Austerlitz, Waterloo, Yorktown and Thermopylae, but, oddly, none to Moses or Joshua and no one seemed to think of Armageddon.

In the balloting many states voting under the unit rule announced the preferences of the minority of the delegations. Connecticut announced 2 delegates not voting, Massachusetts passed, Michigan announced 10 not voting, New York, New Jersey and Wisconsin declined to vote. A Bryan member of the last-named state's delegation demanded the right to vote and the chair ruled that the unit rule did not permit the majority of a delegation to stiff the vote of the minority, so 5 of Wisconsin's votes were cast and counted. Massachusetts announced 18 not voting.

The first ballot showed 930 delegates; of those voting Bryan received 137, Bland, 235, Boies, 67, Matthews, 37, McLean, 54, Pattison, 97, Blackburn, 82, scattering, 43, not voting, 178. Bryan's and Bland's votes came from every section; Pattison, the only Gold candidate, got all his votes from the East except 1 from Florida and 3 from Minnesota and South Dakota. The non-voting delegates were practically all from the East and Wisconsin.

On the second ballot the favorite son vote fell off and Bryan receiving 97, 162 not voting; the fourth ballot was, Bryan, 280, this vote was announced Marston of Louisiana moved that the two-thirds rule was a cowardly subterfuge and should be repealed; Blanchard stated that Marston's motion did not represent the sentiment of the Louisiana delegation. The motion was disposed of on a point of order. Bryan on the third ballot rose to 219, Bland to 291, Pattison receiving 97, 162 not voting; the fourth ballot was Bryan, 280, Bland, 241, Pattison, 97, not voting, 161. The chair at this point announced a ruling that, following a precedent of 1852, two-thirds of the whole number of votes given was necessary to a choice; this indicated that the number not voting would not figure in the count.

"During the roll call on the fifth ballot the names of Bland, Boies, Blackburn and Matthews were withdrawn, all in favor of Bryan, and the ballot was, Bryan, 632, Pattison, 96, scattering, 21, not voting 162. This gave Bryan more than two-thirds of the full convention; the nomination was made unanimous.

The nominations for Vice-Presidential candidates were made next day. McLean of Ohio, Daniel of Virginia and Ethian of Illinois were named but withdrew. Judge Walter Clark of North Carolina, ex-Governor Pennyr of Oregon, Joseph C. Sibley of Pennsylvania, George Fred Williams of Massachusetts and Bland of Missouri were placed in nomination. Sixteen men were voted for on first ballot, Sibley leading with 163 votes, McLean next with 111, Sewall, 100, Williams, 76 and Bland, 62, Clark, 50, 260 delegates, among them 55 of Pennsylvania's 64, not voting although a Pennsylvaniaan was in the race, and Massachusetts, not voting although Williams of that state was a candidate. The increase of the number not voting was due to many delegates leaving, and to Nebraska's not voting from motives of delicacy. Massachusetts, sarcastically, or as stated by the chairman "magnanimously left the fortunes of her distinguished son to the convention." The approved official proceedings give the vote as 882, thus excluding the 260 not voting, and state 455 as necessary to a choice, which indicates the chair holding that two-thirds of a quorum present and voting was sufficient to nominate.

Bland and McLean withdrew and on the fifth ballot Sewall of Maine received 568 votes, against 111 scattering, 251 not voting. Sewall received two-thirds of those voting, but not two-thirds of a full convention. However, the nomination was made unanimous.

The Democratic National Committee contained many new members. Urey Woodson, Kentucky; James Smith, Jr., New Jersey; Josephus Daniels, North Carolina; John R. McLean, Ohio; Ben R. Tillman, South Carolina; Hugh C. Wallace, Washington, and Marcus Smith, Arizona. James K. Jones of Arkansas was made chairman of the executive committee, and Daniel J. Cam- pa of Michigan chairman of the campaign committee.

Bryan was formally notified of his nomination at Madison Square Garden, New York City. The great crowd assembled there were woefully disappointed for instead of a wonderfully eloquent speech they heard Bryan read a carefully prepared argument. Many left the hall thinking Bryan a vastly over-estimated man. They were quickly and thoroughly unhelved so soon as he really began his campaign.

His speech of acceptance was one of the most thoughtful and statesmanlike utterances of his whole career. Quoting Lincoln,
Jefferson and Jackson in support, he endorsed and defended the Democratic platform in all its features. He devoted most of his argument to the money question and maintained that free coinage would restore silver to parity with gold at sixteen to one throughout the world, and that the mint price would control the bullion price, in fact fix the price, and that there was no repudiation involved.

Bryan’s letter of acceptance was short, endorsing each plank in the platform seriatim, and plainly saying that tariff legislation should wait upon the settlement of the financial question.

—The Prohibition Party split in 1896, the Narrow-Gaugers who controlled the convention devoting the platform solely to prohibition, added, however, a resolution favoring woman suffrage. Joshua Levering of Maryland and Hale Johnson of Illinois were their candidates.

The Braid-Gaugers bolted and nominated Charles E. Bentley of Nebraska, and James E. Southgate of North Carolina, on a platform condemning the Narrow-Gaugers’ declaration of principles into one plank, and adding a woman suffrage plank, and free silver plank and some Populist principles.

The Socialist Labor Party nominated Charles H. Mattchett of New York and Matthew Maguire of New Jersey on a Socialist Labor platform. This convention thought that in twenty years its party would control the government.

The People’s Party, commonly spoken of as the Populist, and the Silver Party held conventions the same day at St. Louis, July 22. The “Middle-of-the-Road” Populists wished no alliance with either of the old parties. The convention on first ballots nominated Bryan and Thomas E. Watson, but S. F. Norton received 321 votes for first place and Sewall 237 for second.

The platform declared for free silver at sixteen to one, an immediate increase in the volume of money, prohibition of demonetization of lawful money by private contract, and many features of the Omaha platform. It condemned suffrage methods in the South.

The National Silver Party nominated Bryan and Sewall, and confined its platform to the silver issue.

The Republican national convention met at St. Louis June 16. Mark Hanna had made the nomination of McKinley a foregone conclusion, but the position the party was to take on the money question was not sure. The Silver Republicans could expect nothing better than a saddle. And McKinley and Hanna had a plan for a bimetallism plank. But it was soon evident that the majority of the convention was determined on a gold platform.

When the platform was adopted Senator Henry M. Teller of Colorado, former cabinet member, left the convention with thirty-three other Silver men, including four Senators. His double standard plank had been voted down 818 to 103, practically all its supporters coming from the West and South.

William McKinley of Ohio and Garrett A. Hobart of New Jersey were nominated on first ballot.

The last convention to be held in 1896 was that of the National Democrats, or Gold Democrats, at Indianapolis September 2nd. Forty-one states and three territories were represented, Idaho, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming sending no delegates. Ex-Governor Flower of New York was permanent presiding officer. General John M. Palmer of Illinois, former Union, and General Simon B. Buckner of Kentucky, former Confederate general, were nominated.

The platform of the Gold Democrats criticized the platform of the regulars for its money views and its abandonment of the tariff issue. It declared for sound money and opposition to paternalism. Arraigning also the Republican and Populist Parties, it declared for tariff for revenue only, liberal policies toward American shipping, liberal pensions, and most of all for a sound money system. It praised the fidelity, patriotism and courage of President Cleveland, advocated civil service reform and deprecated attacks on the Supreme Court.

Both the major parties endorsed the Monroe Doctrine and extended sympathy to Cuba, the Republicans hinting at intervention. The Democrats declared for a revenue tariff, but postponing any change until the money question was settled. They denounced federal interference with local affairs and government by injunction and opposed life tenure of offices.

The Republicans declared for a protective tariff upholding American standard of wages, and reciprocity.

Democratic Platform, 1896

Money Plank. “We demand the free and unlimited coinage of both silver and gold at the present legal ratio of sixteen to one without waiting for the sanction of any other nation. We demand that the standard silver dollar shall be full legal tender, equally with gold for all debts.”

Republican Platform, 1896

Money Plank. “We are unreservedly for sound money and opposed to free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading silver nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved.”
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The campaign which ensued had in it the intense enthusiasm for a cause and a leader that marked the Jackson campaign in 1828, the bitterness and animosity (though not so personal) that characterized the Cleveland-Blaine race, and also the solid economic earnestness and seriousness which was such a feature in the 1892 campaign.

Republicans may point with partisan vinglory to their party's fight for sound money in 1896, but the indisputable fact is that the lines of the Battle of the Standards were laid down by two Democrats, Grover Cleveland and William Jennings Bryan. The Republicans after much wailing simply took up the fight at the point where Cleveland was deposed of command and occupied the position he had chosen to make the fight on. Long before the Republican Party had taken its ground, Cleveland had declared and waged war, and seized the position which was the center of the battle.

Republican historians right now are contending as to who put the gold plank in their 1896 platform, while everyone knows that Cleveland really placed it there. After his own, but before Bryan's nomination, McKinley remarked to his friend and subsequent Secretary of State, William R. Day, "I am a Tariff man standing on a Tariff platform. This money question is unduly prominent. In thirty days you won't hear anything about it," Day, less enthusiastic and more apelent, replied, "In my opinion in thirty days you won't hear of anything else." Hanna, too, until the convention met was a chaser of the phantom "International Bimetallism" and came to the convention with a straddling plank in his pocket.

Cleveland and Bryan, the real prophets of the two schools, were both disciples of Calvin and Knox, though neither would ever have written a book praising the beauties of tolerance such as Calvin's De Clementia. Wisdom or unwisdom, expediency or inexpediency counted for nothing with either when a principle was believed involved; there was no compromise with evil in either's program. They applied to the money question, and to each other, as rigid and stern tests as Calvin applied to the Anabaptists and Knox to the court of Mary Queen of Scots. It was these two Presbyterian Democrat, not McKinley, the "Advance Agent of Prosperity," nor Hanna with his "Full Dinner Pail" appeal, who laid out the plan of battle, forced the fighting and supplied the moral spirit and force which animated the contending squadrions. Hanna furnished the commissariat, drummed up recruits and organized the camp followers in 1896. It was later that he developed into a statesman.

John Sharp Williams, in his keynote speech as temporary chairman of the 1896 Democratic national convention, was greatly applauded when he said, "This fact of a gold basis was accomplished not by the Republican Party but by the dogged persistence and indomitable will of Grover Cleveland," not so much because the fact he stated was pleasant to all his hearers, but because it was an indisputable fact.

The campaign was a stirring one. Both sides had money, although the Republicans had and used much more. Hanna fairly deluged the country with literature and his forces were organized: wherever there was the slightest chance of success. W. H. Harvey's book, Coin's Financial School, was the favorite piece of Silver literature and was widely circulated by the Democrats. It was written in readable "popular science style." Coin took the stage and demolished the easiest and most completely satisfactory way each main argument of the "Plutocrats," and so ingenious and plausible were his arguments that the book gave the Republicans no end of alarm and trouble.

The cartoonists pictured with assears' ears the folly of free coinage, but the most striking and enduring caricature of the campaign was the "Plutocrat," a baboon-like man clad in dalmatian clothes. The campaign in the main, however, was one of education and at its close there were near a hundred fiscal experts among our population to every one in being at its beginning.

McKinley reluctantly accepting the money question and not the tariff as the great issue, remained at home, speaking each day from his front porch to visiting delegations of citizens, some days to as many as twenty sets of visitors. Impressing his hearers with his honesty, eloquent in a calm way and very convincing, he was an ideal candidate for his party at this crisis. The marked advance in the price of wheat before election helped his candidacy and all the conservatism in the nature of the average American inclined toward his cause. Bryan was a true crusader. Covering eighteen thousand miles in his speech-making tours he addressed thousands and tens of thousands of his fellow citizens every day of the campaign. He bore the mental and physical strain of this as easily as his great mission's great burden. Not Clay nor Blaine, so enchanted his followers, for added to those magnetic qualities his great fore-runners possessed, Bryan so appealed to religious feels.
ing that to many he was as a prophet and moral leader as well as statesman and advocate of a great cause.

Reading now the Democratic platform of the year and Bryan's speeches, there seems nothing revolutionary, certainly nothing anarchistic in them. Yet he appeared to appeal so to the masses against the classes that he had to defend himself against the charge of anarchism, which Altgeld's alliance with him added force to in the public mind. That the issue involved was an economic rather than a moral one is plain enough now, but Bryan had to defend his party and his cause from charges of dishonesty. To him and to nearly half of the American people exactly the reverse was true.

As Democrats had forced the issue so Democrat votes settled it. The Palmer and Buckner followers enlisted under their own banner, but voted for McKinley. Of the seven million votes he received probably a full third were from Democrats, while Bryan's vote was swelled by Republican and Populist supporters. He carried Western Republican states while Kentucky, West Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware went into the McKinley column. It was not a partisan contest. The Tammany Democracy were as loyal in support of the ticket as any other element of the Eastern wing of the party.

The persistent charge that Tammany has not been loyal to Democratic nominees seems not tenable, on careful examination. The accusation that it knifed Cleveland in 1888 is utterly disproved. It bitterly opposed the nominations of Cleveland and Tilden, but was loyal on election day to Cleveland and Tilden. It appears to be better at the polls than, at times, in conventions. The organization has been as loyal to Bryan, to Wilson and to other Democrats as other cross-section of the party have been to candidates whom they did not fancy— as loyal to the Westerners in 1896, 1900 and 1908, as the Westerners were to the Easterners in 1892, 1920.

There is another side to the picture—how the national Democracy has treated Tammany. In convention assembled Democracy has treated Southern bourbons with respect, if bored, toleration; Western aims with polite, if sarcastic, consideration; and Eastern reaction with deferential, if hostile, attention. But with Tammany in the minority, it has been an angry look and harsh word, the strong arm and the booted foot. Witness General Bragg in 1884 and the party press generally. There was justice in Bourke Cockran's complaint in 1892 that the New York Democracy was treated as regular soldiers.

The Bryan and Watson ticket received 222,000 votes, included in above figures, and Watson received 27 electoral votes for Vice-President, Sewall receiving 149. McKinley's majority over all other contestants was 286,000; his plurality over Bryan 602,555. The Fifty-fifth Congress elected at the same time was Republican in both branches, but the Silver forces still dominated the Senate. The Republicans promptly enacted a tariff law, the Nelson Dingley tariff. The McKinley bill rates had been around 49 per cent, the Wilson rates around 41; the Dingley rates ran from 50 to 52. As it left the House, it was more moderate, but in the Senate the representatives of various interests were allowed practically to write their own rates. Hanna had brought the powerful and intelligent big-business section in, and Tama'sy's behavior appeared to be better at the Republican Party. Now was inaugurated the beginning of 'invincible government.' Worthington C. Ford, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, asserted that in many cases the duties of the Dingley bill were prohibitive and the law would lessen the revenue; that the fiscal policy of the government had distinctly become one for protection with incidental revenue. Pending changes in the Senate which would permit financial reform McKinley continued Cleveland's and Carlisle's policies while he made a fruitless attempt to secure international bimetallism. He endeavored to have the Senate approve the Olney-Pauncefote arbitration treaty, but failed.

McKinley followed his predecessors footsteps in Cuban affairs also, until his hand was forced. No amount of statescraft, diplomatic traditions, international courtesy or foreign policy could stay the hands of the American people when they beheld tens of thousands of fellow creatures, our near neighbors, crowded in
concentration camps, starved, mistreated and killed by a European power. The destruction of the battleship Maine in Havana harbor was the match to the powder.

Champ Clark always claimed that the Democrats forced the Republicans to declare war, but the evidence seems to show that there was no partisanship in bringing on the war and that the Republicans were as militant as the Democrats, only more careful and conservative as it behooved the party in power, and therefore responsible, to be, as compared with the opposition.

The war was nonpartisan. Democratic and Republican soldiers and sailors, admirals and generals won victories on sea and land, and suffered from Spanish bullets, but much more from disease, mismanagement. Twenty years later the country was to become engaged in a war a hundred times greater and more serious, and under a Democratic administration was to suffer incomparably less from corruption, inefficiency, mismanagement—and politics. Time will establish these facts, but they have not yet been separated from the mass of misrepresentation and propaganda and favoritism. One can read the story of the destruction of the Spanish fleet out of Santiago harbor written by one of America's most distinguished historians and find Commodore Schley's name not once mentioned, although his flagship, the Brooklyn, is named as participating.

The great purely political result of the Spanish-American War was the eventual making of Theodore Roosevelt President of the United States. No one can doubt that. Its immediate political effect was to strengthen the Republican hold on the government, and the Fifty-sixth Congress was Republican in both Houses by increased majorities.

The Democratic minority, however, had much to do with the settlement of the problems growing out of the war. The retention of the Philippines was the greatest question. George Gray of Delaware was the only Democrat of the five peace commissioners sent to treat with Spain, and he alone of them held to American traditions and the announced spirit and purpose with which the United States entered the war. McKinley in his war message had said that forcible annexation would be, by our code of humanity, criminal aggression. Gray maintained the same principle.

Admirals Dewey and Chadwick approved Judge Gray's position; to demand the Philippines was to alter the moral position of our country. Dewey declared he knew both races and that the Filipinos were more capable of self-government than the Cubans.

McKinley's position as stated by himself was that we could not turn the islands back to Spain, nor to France or Germany, nor leave them, unfit for self-government as they were, to themselves, so there was nothing left to do but to take them, and educate, uplift, civilize and Christianize the people.

Republicans and Democrats in Congress opposed the treaty with Spain. George F. Hearst, Republican, in the Senate, and John Sharp Williams, Democratic minority leader in the House, made notable speeches against annexation, as did others of both parties. It was thought that the treaty would have failed but that Bryan came to Washington and induced Democrats to yield. His position was that the question could better be dealt with as a domestic than an international problem, and he made it the paramount issue in the next campaign.

The Democratic policy was well expressed in the resolutions introduced by Senator A. O. Bacon of Georgia, stating that it was not the purpose of the United States to secure or maintain dominion over the Philippine Islands as part of the territory of the United States, or to incorporate the inhabitants as citizens or to hold them as vassals or subject, or to exercise permanent sovereignty or jurisdiction over the islands.

Hanna, with his usual frankness, voiced the sentiment of the controlling influences of the Republican Party.

"We make no hypercritical pretense of being interested in the Philippines solely on account of others. While we regard the welfare of those people as a sacred trust, we regard the welfare of the American people first. We see our duty to ourselves as well as to others. We believe in trade expansion. By every legitimate means within the province of government and constitution we mean to stimulate the expansion of our trade and open new markets."

On March 14, 1900, a law was enacted making the gold dollar the standard unit of value for the United States and providing that greenbacks and all treasury notes should be redeemed in gold. This put this country definitely, and finally it seemed, on the gold standard.

The Democrats had taken office in 1893 on the verge of an unavoidable period of hard times. They had carried on for four years and laid the foundation for prosperity which was sure to come once the money question was settled. The election of 1896 settled it and the Republicans came in power under the most fortunate conditions, and not last, among these favored...
conditions was the vastly increased gold production throughout the world which began in 1896 with the gold discoveries in Alaska. A year later the Klondike rush was on, and soon from Alaska, from South Africa and Australia there poured into the channels of trade a flood of gold, bringing with it an increased supply of money and better prices. The evils for which free silver had been deemed the remedy were largely cured by this influx of gold.

The Democrats in 1900 faced an almost invincible Republican Party. Their opponents were solidified, harmonious and entrenched in power; they had conducted a successful war and the country was prosperous—a powerful aid to this last year, the American electorate are strong for letting well enough alone. Their own party, on the other hand, was neither united nor harmonious. Many old leaders, national and state, had been discarded and new men were in control. There had been a great change throughout the whole party in the personnel both of the leaders and of the rank and file. In the South with the cause of difference removed the lines soon closed up again; in the Silver Panic the 1896 lines held only in a few states; in all the rest of the country, states like Kansas returned to the Republican fold and Delaware, Maryland and West Virginia became doubtful, while states normally Republican became more so. The Eastern Democracy, which had been such a powerful factor in making the Cleveland era great and successful, had not only been depopulated, but many of its members alienated, some for good and all, while their places had been taken by men Democratic only on one issue and that a temporary one. Yet Bryan in 1900 was to receive over six million votes.

CHAPTER XXVIII

DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATION UNDER ROOSEVELT
1901-1909


The history of the Democratic Party from 1886 to the election of Woodrow Wilson in 1912 is mostly internal. Not once in all that period did it have the Executive or Senate and only the last two years did it have a majority in the House. Luke E. Wright of Tennessee, and Jacob McGavock Dickinson, who said that he “had never voted a Republican ticket and never would,” were the only candidates of the Roosevelt and Taft cabinets, and every Democratic holding high executive positions during the whole period.

Yet there were some noble and able men in the Democratic ranks in both Houses of Congress, men who, if ever a Congressional history of the United States is written, will figure conspicuously. There was Senator John T. Morgan of Alabama, chairman of the canal committee by a Republican Senate, who for twenty years labored the idea of an interoceanic canal into the American mind, and is accounted by many the father of our canal policy. Newlands of Nevada was the pioneer in irrigation and reclamation legislation, and John Sharp Williams was as sound and broad a scholar, as clear-headed and honest-minded a statesman as ever sat in either House, and the most famous of all minority leaders. It would be a long list that contained the names of all deserving distinguished mention.

The Eighteenth Democratic National Convention met at Kansas City, July 4, 1900. The call was addressed to all Democratic, conservative, reform citizens irrespective of past political