

1960

# Republican factionalism in Burlington, Iowa, 1906-1908

David James Carey  
*The University of Iowa*

No known copyright restrictions.

This thesis is available at Iowa Research Online: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/5355>

---

## Recommended Citation

Carey, David James. "Republican factionalism in Burlington, Iowa, 1906-1908." MA (Master of Arts) thesis, State University of Iowa, 1960.  
<https://doi.org/10.17077/etd.bljn1m2v>

---

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>

Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

REPUBLICAN FACTIONALISM IN BURLINGTON, IOWA

1906 - 1908

by

David James Carey

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts,  
in the Department of History in the  
Graduate College of the  
State University  
of Iowa

February, 1960

Chairman: Assistant Professor Samuel P. Hays

26

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Burlington: The Environment of Factional Conflict...	9
Population.....	9
Transportation, Industry and Business.....	11
Urban Reform.....	13
Voting Patterns.....	17
Burlington Political Leadership.....	27
Joseph William Blythe.....	27
William W. Copeland.....	39
Secondary Leadership.....	45
Collective Biographical Information.....	49
Caucuses and Conventions, 1901 - 1912.....	59
The Quiet Years.....	61
An End to Harmony.....	65
Conflict Renewed.....	72
The Mending Years.....	76
The Bull Moose County Convention.....	78
Standpat and Progressive Participation in Politics.....	81

	Page
Occupational Analysis: Part One.....	90
The Sample.....	90
The "Y" Group.....	96
Occupational Analysis: Part Two.....	112
Analytical Perspectives.....	112
Occupations.....	114
Business Affiliations.....	122
The Standpat Hegemony in Banking, Lumber, Law, and Transportation and Communications.....	128
The Lumber-Railroad Axis.....	131
Railroad Rates as a Factor in Factionalism.....	136
Summary.....	140
Appendix I (Political Participation).....	144
Appendix II (Content and Composition of "Y" Category..	155
Appendix III (Business Representations).....	156
Appendix IV (Biographical).....	162
Thesis Bibliography.....	182

TABLE OF TABLES

Number	Page
1. Presidential Election Results for Burlington and Des Moines County, 1892 - 1912.....	19
2. Burlington and Non-Burlington Vote in Des Moines County for Cummins Progressive, Roosevelt Progressive and Regular Republican Candidates.....	20
3. Pluralities for Cummins Progressive, Roosevelt Progressive and Regular Republican Candidates in Each Ward and Precinct in Burlington, 1908 - 1912.....	22
4. Nativity of Burlington Population in 1905 by Wards.....	23
5. Average Age and Length of Burlington Residency.....	51
6. Church Affiliation.....	51
7. Nativity of Burlington Factional Leaders.....	52
8. Participation in Primary Elections by Burlington Progressives and Standpats, 1901 - 1912.....	84
9. Gross Breakdown of Progressive and Standpat Leadership.....	97
10. Composition of the "Y" Group by Categories.....	99
11. Composition of the "White Collar" Category in the "Y" Group.....	99
12. Composition of the "Blue Collar" Category in the "Y" Group.....	100

Number		Page
13.	Composition of the Unskilled Category in the "Y" Group.....	100
14.	Composition of the Skilled Worker Category in the "Y" Group.....	101
15.	Occupational Categories Represented by Persons in Group "X".....	116
16.	Occupational Representations by Persons in Group "X" Categorically Ranked by Numerical Difference from Greatest Standpat to Greatest Progressive Representation.....	118
17.	Representations in Group "X" Occupational Categories Expressed as Percents of Total Persons in Group "X" and Total Persons in Each Faction.....	120
18.	Business Categories Represented by Persons in Group "X".....	124
19.	Business Representations by Persons in Group "X" Categorically Ranked by Numerical Difference From Greatest Standpat to Greatest Progressive Representation.....	126
20.	Business Representations of the "X" Group Expressed as Percents of Total "X" Persons, and as Percents of Total Business Representations.....	127

## INTRODUCTION

Most studies of the Progressive movement which got underway in the first years of the twentieth century have dealt with its state-wide, regional, or nation-wide aspects, and have centered upon its most prominent and influential political and intellectual leaders, their ideas and actions.

This study approaches the Progressive movement from below, centering upon but one brick in the foundation that supported the movement's hierarchy of political and intellectual leadership. Its object is to determine the character of the Progressive movement, and of the leadership of the two opposing Republican factions central to it, on the grass-roots level of the precincts and wards of a particular urban environment.

Burlington, Iowa has been chosen for this study because there the factional conflict within the Republican party was especially clear-cut, providing a microcosm of the conflict between the Progressives and the politically established Standpats throughout the state of Iowa.

It is assumed that Burlington presents an individual case representative of the workings and leadership of the Progressive movement, in its broader aspects, on the local level. But it should be emphasized that this

study deals with only one community, and that until the approach employed here is extended to a larger sample of communities few safe generalizations pertaining to the Progressive movement as a whole can be drawn from it. This is a pioneer study, and if it will have demonstrated the usefulness and potential of the approach employed it will have served its purpose.

The underlying premise of this approach to the study of the Progressive movement is that to gain a fuller understanding of the movement the historian must examine the people involved in it, their aspirations and interests, on the grass-roots level as well as on the level of state and national leadership and prominence.

The membership of any political movement prior to the advent of the opinion pollster is, at the grass-roots level, rather difficult to determine. Even more difficult is the task of determining concrete motivations for that membership and specific goals which that membership is designed to serve for specific individuals or groups of individuals. Prominent men are relatively easy to pursue through time, for they and their admirers leave some mark for their pursuers. The rank-and-file voter, on the other hand, is a bird of a different color--and that color is a rather uniform grey, blending almost inextricably



into the equally uniform background of the thickets of time.

We shall probably never become acquainted with the anonymous voters whose Progressive inclinations were confined to private conversations and the ballot box. But of those who were active on the lowest levels of party leadership, i.e., those who attended ward caucuses and county conventions, usually names and occupations can at least be learned. This group, during the Progressive era, comes closest to the grass-roots membership of the movement, and can be studied.

Russel B. Nye, in his Midwestern Progressive Politics, has pointed out that "perhaps the most characteristic trait of the Midwesterner in politics was his clear and direct desire to protect his own interests," and that "it was virtually impossible for a single man or small group of men to create a Midwestern movement."<sup>1</sup> Both of these points are part of the basic assumptions of this study.

While it may be true that the philosophic tap roots of Progressivism go back to Jefferson (or even to "the Hamiltonian concept of strong government as a tool by which to fashion Jeffersonian ends")<sup>2</sup> and extend to the New Nationalism of Herbert Croly, these tap roots lay deep and for the most part probably unseen by the precinct committeeman and

the anonymous voter. Those philosophic roots of the Progressive movement that lay closest to the surface, and thus closest to those who had it in their power to express themselves politically, were simple and ambiguous. Even a casual glance at newspapers at the time, the media through which most of the rank-and-file voters imbibed their Progressive "philosophy," indicates that the average voter probably could have had little more idea of the philosophy behind Progressivism than that it was for "the people" and against "the trusts" and "the bosses."

If it was difficult for a single man or small group of men to create a Midwestern movement, it was just as difficult for them to faithfully mirror in their own backgrounds the complex composition of their following. This is true not only because of the tremendous variety of persons and interests represented in a mass political movement but also because men are generally chosen leaders partially as a result of their being somewhat different from their followers, and are looked up to in the first place by reason of their special backgrounds, abilities, training, or accomplishments. Lawyers, for instance, seem to constitute a disproportionate share of any group of political leaders though there has been no major political movement in America the rank-and-file membership of which

has represented this disproportion. Moreover, the backgrounds of some prominent men are at complete odds with the major aspects of the movements which they lead. Tom Johnson, for instance, was reform mayor of Cleveland for three terms, and made his political reputation fighting the very foundations of the special privileges which he had used to become wealthy. Albert B. Cummins, Progressive Governor of Iowa for three terms, had been a prominent railroad attorney before becoming a leader of the battle against railroad domination of Iowa politics.

This is not to say, of course, that leaders and ideals supplied from above served no useful purpose in the Progressive movement. On the contrary, they had a crucial function in furthering and rationalizing the creation of political power, and seem to have served as acceptable symbols of a rather general nature around which specific actions towards specific goals could be safely clustered. As the editor of the arch-Standpat Burlington Hawk-Eye once observed:

[Governor Cummins] talks have the familiar ring of the old-time democracy. And then there is a charm in the word "progressive" and an allurements in the suggestion of "reform"....3

Those outside the circles of political position and power could find themselves drawn to a man who stood

against the established wielders of political power and to the ideal of a government more responsive to the needs and interests of "the people." Both man and ideal could, moreover, provide acceptable symbols around which various dissatisfactions could be grouped, and could therefore provide a generalized vehicle for particularistic opportunism.

Not that there was necessarily an element of cynicism involved in the Progressives' support of certain leaders and ideals, for there was probably little or no cynicism intended or felt. Machiavelli, however, probably came very close to the truth when he suggested that a man will bear the loss of his father much better than the loss of his patrimony. And the Progressive in politics seems to have felt keenly the loss of his political, economic and social patrimony. For many Progressivism probably went little further than allegiance to Progressive leaders and ideals. But for some this allegiance also provided an opportunity for the realization of specific personal and group goals.

This study assumes the reader's acquaintance with the literature of the Progressive movement in Iowa and in the nation. Only with such acquaintance can this work be put into proper perspective, and this in itself serves to demonstrate the usefulness of traditional approaches to the

Progressive movement. Given a basic background in the Progressive movement on the state and national level, however, the community approach, centering on the lower echelons of political action and leadership, can lead to a deeper and more thorough understanding of the main-springs and character of that movement.

NOTES

1. Russel B. Nye, Midwestern Progressive Politics, p. 14.
2. Ibid., p. 190.
3. Burlington Hawk-Eye, May 30, 1906, p. 4.

## BURLINGTON: THE ENVIRONMENT OF FACTIONAL CONFLICT

In 1906 the Republican party in Burlington was rocked for the first time by bitter internecine warfare over the issue of which of the two wings of the party--the conservative and established Standpats or the newly-formed and reform-minded Progressives--was to control the Republican political machinery.

This chapter centers upon three aspects of the setting and background of Burlington factionalism: 1) The main features of Burlington's demographic and economic environment; 2) the local reform movements preceding the outbreak of factionalism; 3) the voting behavior of Burlington and Des Moines county residents prior to the outbreak of factionalism, and the main areas of Progressive strength after the outbreak of factionalism.

### Population

Burlington is a southeast Iowa town located in Des Moines county. Its main east-west streets start at the very edge of the Mississippi River, and its hills and bluffs provide a better view of the Illinois prairies across the river than they do of Iowa.

In 1900 Des Moines county was dominated by her only urban\* center. Burlington, with a population of 23,201, contained some 64% of the people of the county. Ten years later, thanks partly to the fact that the rural population of the county was decreasing at a rate of 7% a year, Burlington accounted for 67% of the county's people.<sup>1</sup> Burlington's own growth, however, was relatively slow, and she dropped from seventh largest city in the state in 1900 to ninth largest in 1910.<sup>2</sup>

Foreign-born and first-generation native-born persons formed a large part of Burlington's population. In 1905 only 42.9% of the city's people were native-born of native-born parents.<sup>3</sup> Des Moines county in 1905 ranked eighth among Iowa counties in total number of foreign-born.<sup>4</sup> Of those in Des Moines county who were foreign-born or first-generation Americans by far the largest portion (37.2%) were of German descent. Next came those of Swedish descent (14.6%), followed by those of Irish descent (4.4%). The remainder were mainly of north-European descent also.<sup>5</sup>

Des Moines county was Protestant in its religious affiliations. Catholics accounted for 31.6% of the county's

---

\* The Federal Census lists as "urban" any city with a population of 2,500 or more.



church membership in 1905; 20.0% were Methodist (Episcopal) and 16.7% were Lutheran, with Baptists and Presbyterians next, but falling far behind.<sup>6</sup>

Though undoubtedly a small town, and a provincial one at that, in the eyes of urban sophisticates in the East,\* Burlington was one of the foremost urban areas in Iowa in the first decade of the twentieth century, whose population, like that of her eastern sisters, strongly reflected the impact of European immigration.

#### Transportation, Industry and Business

Five railroads served Burlington in 1900, and in the same year the city directory lists four separate river transportation companies with ticket offices in the city.

Burlington businessmen showed a keen interest in the development of a year-round six-foot channel for the Mississippi, and were active in the Upper Mississippi River Improvement Association as early as 1904.<sup>7</sup> They felt a lack, however, of inter-urban transportation facilities, and for seven years vainly campaigned for and subscribed money to

---

\* When Joseph W. Blythe, chief counsel for the C. B. & Q., died in 1909 the Boston Transcript, for instance, found it "remarkable of Mr. Blythe that even after placed in the highest legal position in the company he continued to reside in Burlington, the little Iowa city after which the road was named...." (Quoted in Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 12, 1909, p. 4.)

an inter-urban line from Muscatine to Burlington, starting in 1905 under the urging of fruit jobber William W. Copeland, chairman of the Commercial Exchange.<sup>8</sup>

With an abundance of rail and river transportation it is perhaps natural that Burlington businessmen turned to manufacturing and wholesaling. The state census for 1905 placed Burlington seventh in the state in terms of the value of its manufactured product,\* which was estimated at \$4,779,337.<sup>9</sup> Burlington manufacturers in 1905 employed almost 3,000 wage-earners.<sup>10</sup>

One of the largest of Burlington's industries at this time was the Murray Iron Works Company, with 400 employees. The company made Corliss steam engines and boilers, selling all over the United States, in China, Europe and South America.<sup>11</sup> Burlington also did a thriving lumber milling and wholesaling business, one mill employing 300 men during the rush season and another company 100 men.<sup>12</sup> In 1906 Burlington boasted the largest cigar factory in Iowa and the largest unionized cigar factory west of the Mississippi, with an annual output of six million cigars.<sup>13</sup>

---

\* "Only those establishments doing an exclusive manufacturing business and producing an annual product worth at least \$500.00 were enumerated." (Executive Council, Census of Iowa for the Year 1905, pp. lxxxvii-lxxxviii.)

The Chittenden-Eastman Company was reputed to be the largest manufacturer and jobber of furniture in the United States in 1905.<sup>14</sup>

Burlington also laid claim, in 1906, to the largest wholesale grocery house and the largest wholesale drug house in the state.<sup>15</sup> John Blaul's Sons Company was reported doing a wholesale grocer business "close on to \$2,000,000 annually, perhaps more."<sup>16</sup> The Churchill Drug Company, incorporated in 1889, was by 1915 "one of the largest wholesale drug houses in the middle west."<sup>17</sup>

There were other business enterprises of a smaller character in Burlington, to be sure, but those mentioned above show quite clearly that Burlington, unlike many Iowa towns, was no mere entrepreneurial outpost or Saturday-night city, existing only to serve the surrounding rural areas. It was, in the first decade of the twentieth century, one of the state's ten leading urban-manufacturing centers, and faced not those problems common to most small midwestern towns at the turn of the century, but problems arising from its urban-industrial character as well.

### Urban Reform

Like many midwestern communities Burlington was dominated politically and economically by its railroad.

The Chicago, Burlington and Quincy road first reached Burlington in 1855.<sup>18</sup> Not quite fifty years later it had 1,370 miles of main line track in Iowa and ranked fourth among the railroads in the state in terms of main line mileage.<sup>19</sup> Of the five railroads serving Burlington in 1900 four were owned or controlled by the C. B. & Q., as were 41 of the 62 miles of line in the county.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, Burlington and the surrounding territory, including most of Iowa's First Congressional District, were known as the "Q Reservation" during the latter part of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This distinction was a tribute to the power and influence of the C. B. & Q. (then known as the "Q") in that section of the state.

Prior to 1906, however, there is little or no hint of anti-railroad sentiment or nascent Progressivism to be found in the Burlington newspapers. Both seem to have appeared on the local scene almost full-grown.

In 1904 one citizen was moved to grumble about the local government when asked by Burlington's Republican newspaper, the Hawk-Eye, what he thought would be "best for Burlington," declaring:

"The best thing that could happen... would be the placing of the city's business affairs in the hands of honest, careful, representative business men, who would grapple with the 'octopus' which seems to be throttling the life out of us,

and deliver the city into the hands of its citizens....The street railway company, railroad company, construction companies, labor unions, and what not seem to do as they please with us, and it is no wonder that Burlington capital goes out in all directions for safe investment."<sup>21</sup>

This general condemnation of corporate influence in local government might have arisen partly, however, from the fact that Burlington had long been under a Democratic administration. The advent of a Republican city government later that year was considered something of a minor miracle by both parties,<sup>22</sup> and the Democrats were firmly in control again by 1906.<sup>23</sup>

The Hawk-Eye, perhaps quite naturally, placed "better city government" at the head of its list of sixteen suggestions for city improvements in 1904. This list also included several physical improvements, "equal" corporate taxes, "a fit of economy," and an end to gambling, drinking, and vice.<sup>24</sup>

There was a minor sensation in early 1904, before the city elections, over the possibility of graft in the city council. On February 3 the Hawk-Eye reported rumors of graft in the letting of the city's garbage contract, but the Democrats quickly ordered an investigation, and by February 9 the Hawk-Eye was forced to report that no graft had been brought to light.<sup>25</sup>

When an organized movement did get underway against local vice in 1906, it was directed and controlled by the non-partisan Civic Federation rather than either of the established political parties. In January of 1906, with the "re-birth" of the Civic Federation,<sup>26</sup> the attack centered on gambling houses and brothels, and the Federation gave these an ultimatum to close up by March 3 or be prosecuted under state law.<sup>27</sup> The Federation strongly implied that the Republican administration under Mayor Caster was much too soft in its attitude and actions toward the centers of local vice.<sup>28</sup> There may have been some substance to the implication, for it appears that Burlington had been relying strongly on brothels and gambling houses as sources of revenue. In 1910 the mayor of Burlington explained to the Commercial Exchange that city finances had been a real problem since "revenue to the amount of \$13,000 annually had been lost by the closing of the brothels and gambling houses."<sup>29</sup>

The Civic Federation put up its own candidate for mayor in 1906 and he appears to have cut heavily into the Republican vote, running only 82 votes behind the Republican candidate, while the Democrats won easily with a 501 plurality over both their opponents.<sup>30</sup>

In short, the reform sentiment in the Republican party in Burlington prior to 1906 was not only hard to find but, when found, of somewhat doubtful motivation. By 1906 reform minded citizens of Burlington were evidently working outside the Republican party in their effort to obtain better city government and a better community environment.

### Voting Patterns

If indications of a radical or reform spirit are scanty prior to 1906 on the level of city government they are even harder to find in the voting record of Burlington for state and national reform candidates.

There is little indication that Burlington or Des Moines county had joined in the Populist movement of the 1890's, for instance. (See Table 1) Only once after the election of Cleveland in 1892 did Burlington vote Democratic prior to Wilson's election in 1912: in 1908 Bryan won over Taft with 51.3% of the Burlington vote. The county, excluding Burlington, didn't give a plurality to a Democratic candidate for President for 20 years after the 1892 election, and a glance at Table 2 shows they weren't voting for Progressive Republicans in the state during this time, either. Such "radicalism" as existed in Des Moines county centered in Burlington, and then only in

1906 and after. And even there it was a hit-or-miss proposition, where big names like Cummins and Roosevelt could come through in a pinch while Progressives of lesser stature failed miserably.

Thus, for instance, Cummins won over Standpat William B. Allison in the crucial 1908 Senatorial preference primary by nine votes and Roosevelt won over Taft in the Presidential election of 1912 by 54 votes while Cummins Progressive Garst and Roosevelt Progressive Stevens failed to carry Burlington, losing by margins ranging from 125 to 660 votes. (See Table 3) Nor are the precinct votes for Cummins and Roosevelt entirely consistent. The Second precinct of the Fourth ward, for instance, voted against Cummins in both Senatorial preference primaries in 1908 but gave a plurality and the ward to Roosevelt in 1912. The only precincts that voted for Cummins and Roosevelt with consistency were the Second precinct of the First ward and both precincts of the Fifth ward.

George Mowry, in The California Progressives, found that with only "two notable exceptions" the forty-seven California Progressive leaders in his study were of old American stock.<sup>31</sup> Only nine of the 260 Roosevelt Progressives studied by Chandler were foreign-born.<sup>32</sup> Generalizing from the nativity of the Progressives in these two



TABLE 1

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION RESULTS FOR BURLINGTON  
AND DES MOINES COUNTY 1892 - 1912

Election year and candidates	Burlington vote	Percent of total Burlington vote for candidates listed	Non-Burlington county vote	Percent of total Non-Burlington county vote for candidates listed	Total county vote
1892:					
Harrison	2,037	40.3%	1,323	46.9%	3,360
Cleveland	3,021	59.7	1,500	53.1	4,521
1896:					
McKinley	2,776	53.6%	1,773	57.1%	4,549
Bryan	2,407	46.4	1,334	42.9	3,741
1900:					
McKinley	2,668	51.4%	1,647	54.3%	4,315
Bryan	2,521	48.6	1,338	43.7	3,909
1904:					
Roosevelt	2,878	58.3%	1,618	62.2%	4,496
Parker	2,060	41.7	983	37.8	3,043
1908:					
Taft	2,661	48.7%	1,492	56.0%	4,153
Bryan	2,805	51.3	1,170	44.0	3,975
1912:					
Roosevelt	1,388	26.9%	702	28.9%	2,090
Taft	1,334	26.8	802	33.1	2,136
Wilson	2,251	46.3	918	38.0	3,169

TABLE 2

BURLINGTON AND NON-BURLINGTON VOTE IN DES MOINES COUNTY FOR CUMMINS  
PROGRESSIVE, ROOSEVELT PROGRESSIVE, AND REGULAR REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES

Election	Candidates	Burlington vote	Percent total city vote	Percent Total Non- Burlington vote	Non- Burlington vote	Total County vote
Senatorial Preference Primary, June 1908	CUMMINS*	731	50.3%	26.2%	183	914
	ALLISON	722	49.7%	73.8%	515	1,234
Senatorial Preference Primary, Nov. 1908	CUMMINS*	1,112	58.4%	35.3%	380	1,492
	LACEY	792	41.6%	64.7%	698	1,490
Gubernatorial Primary, June 1908	CARROLL	592	55.9%	76.7%	413	1,005
	GARST*	467	44.1%	23.3%	125	592
Gubernatorial Primary, June 1910	CARROLL	847	71.0%	79.2%	470	1,317
	GARST*	345	29.0%	20.8%	118	463
Gubernatorial Primary, June 1912	CLARKE	1,674	62.2%	61.8%	910	2,584
	STEVENS**	1,014	37.8%	38.2%	562	1,576
Presidential Election, Nov. 1912	TAFT	1,334	49.0%	53.3%	802	2,136
	ROOSEVELT**	1,388	51.0%	46.7%	702	2,090

\* Cummins Progressive.

\*\* Roosevelt Progressive

studies one might expect the strongest support for Progressive candidates to come from areas with the greatest concentrations of native-born whites of native-born parents.

In Burlington no such pattern appears when the vote by wards for Progressive candidates is compared to nativity data. (See Table 4) The First ward had the highest proportion of foreign-born persons and the lowest proportion of "old stock" Americans (i.e., native-born of native-born parents) of any of the wards. Yet this ward was one of only three to give Cummins a plurality over Allison in 1908, and one of only two in which both precincts showed a plurality for Cummins. The other two wards which gave Cummins a plurality in the first 1908 primary included relatively high proportions of "old stock" Americans. Roosevelt, on the other hand, received his pluralities from precincts in the four wards with the lowest proportions of "old stock" Americans.

About the only consistent pattern that emerges from a study of precinct voting behavior is that the second precincts in each ward tended to be more Progressive in their voting behavior than did the first precincts. In cases where only one precinct in a ward gave a plurality to a Progressive candidate only two occurred in the first precincts, while eleven were in the second precincts. On the

TABLE 3

PLURALITIES FOR CUMMINS PROGRESSIVE, ROOSEVELT PROGRESSIVE AND REGULAR REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES IN EACH WARD AND PRECINCT IN BURLINGTON, 1908 - 1912

Ward	Precinct	Senatorial Primary 1908 (June)		Senatorial Primary 1908 (Nov.)		Gubernatorial Primary 1908		Gubernatorial Primary 1910		Gubernatorial Primary 1912		Presidential Election 1912	
		CUMMINS*	ALLISON	CUMMINS*	LACEY	GARST*	CARROLL	GARST*	CARROLL	STEVENS**	CLARKE	ROOSEVELT**	TAFT
1	1	6					4		8		7		26
	2	15		42		3		37		16		60	
Total		21		42		3	1	45		9		86	
2	1		14		5		20		54		127		41
	2		1		3		4		13		5		14
Total			15		2		24		67		132		27
3	1		8		43		3		64		90		60
	2	35		74		14		29		59		11	
Total		27		117		11		93		149		71	
4	1			20			15		23		50		9
	2		30		15		51		75		54		63
Total			30		5		66		98		104		52
5	1	41		82		21		14		29		22	
	2	7		22			10		39	8		54	
Total		48		104		11		53		21		76	
6	1		17				13		36		56		6
	2		6		13		17		26		57		7
Total			23		13		30		62		113		13
7	1		21		18		12		39		71		15
	2		2		23		16		45		79		34
Total			19		41		28		84		150		49
CITY TOTAL		9		320		125		502		660		54	

\* CUMMINS PROGRESSIVE

\*\* ROOSEVELT PROGRESSIVE

TABLE 4

NATIVITY OF BURLINGTON POPULATION IN 1905 BY WARDS<sup>@</sup>

Ward	FOREIGN-BORN		NATIVE - BORN OF FOREIGN PARENTS		NATIVE - BORN OF NATIVE PARENTS		TOTAL PERSONS ALL NATIVITIES
	Persons	Percent total persons	Persons	Percent total persons	Persons	Percent total persons	
1	903	23.6%	1,887	49.2%	1,029	27.2%	3,829
2	714	17.5	1,746	42.8	1,576	39.7	4,078
3	642	16.3	1,326	33.7	1,798	50.0	3,938
4	610	20.8	1,069	36.4	1,223	42.8	2,933
5	529	17.4	1,070	35.2	1,393	47.4	3,036
6	514	14.3	1,047	29.2	1,943	56.5	3,584
7	580	14.8	1,350	34.4	1,891	50.8	3,920
TOTAL	4,492	17.7%	9,495	37.5%	10,853	44.8%*	25,318**

<sup>@</sup> From Census of Iowa For The Year 1905, pp. 107-110. Percentages and totals extrapolated.

\* Figure includes the 1.9% of total Burlington population listed as colored.

\*\* Figure (assuming uniform population growth) does not agree with Federal Census, which lists Burlington's population as 23,201 and 24,324 in 1900 and 1910, respectively. (Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910, Vol. II, pp. 622-623.)

whole, then, about all that can be said of Progressive strength at the polls is that it was inconsistent in regard to all Progressive candidates, but that it did tend to center in the second precincts of each ward.

Burlington precinct lines divide the wards on an east-west basis. The city developed westward from the river and its eastern precincts were, for the most part, the older sections of town and included the larger and finer residences, many of which are still to be seen today. Non-Progressive (i.e., Standpat and regular Republican) strength tended to center in the eastern precincts where there was a division of allegiance in a ward. In the northern half of the city the western precincts are cut by the railroad tracks, and shade off into the area of the C. B. & Q. shops. It is reasonable to assume that the residents of this area were the newer and less "well-fixed" people of Burlington and that a larger proportion of them were wage-earners. These seem to have been the bases of Progressive strength.

N O T E S

1. Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910, Vol. II, pp. 622-623.
2. Ibid., p. 613.
3. Census for Iowa For the Year 1905, p. 686.
4. Ibid., pp. 517-520.
5. Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910, Vol. II, p. 622.
6. Census for Iowa for the Year 1905, p. 876.
7. Burlington Hawk-Eye, August 30, 1904, p. 6.
8. Ibid., August 3, 1905, p. 4. By June 1910 the directors of the Muscatine North & South claimed only \$25,000 more would be needed to finish the job of financing the road (Hawk-Eye, June 25, 1910, p. 7), and by September hopes were high once again that the road would soon be completed (Hawk-Eye, September 25, 1910, p. 6.)
9. Census for Iowa For the Year 1905, p. 706.
10. Ibid., p. 686.
11. Augustine M. Antrobus, (ed.), History of Des Moines County, Iowa, and Its People, Vol. II, pp. 10-17.
12. Burlington Evening Gazette, March 24, 1906, p. 11.
13. Ibid., March 24, 1906, sec. 3, p. 6.
14. Burlington Hawk-Eye, May 27, 1905, p. 4.
15. Burlington Evening Gazette, March 24, 1906, p. 1.
16. Ibid., March 24, 1906, sec. 3, p. 2.
17. Antrobus, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 228-229.

18. Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 5, 1905, p. 7.
19. Ibid., July 29, 1904, p. 4.
20. Iowa Official Register, No. 16 (1901), p. 192.
21. Burlington Hawk-Eye, January 2, 1904, p. 6.
22. Ibid., March 29, 1904, p. 4. (The Burlington Evening Gazette, March 24, 1906, refers back to the Republican victory in 1904 as unusual because Burlington is normally 500-800 votes Democratic in city elections.)
23. Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 27, 1906, p. 7.
24. Ibid., January 2, 1904, p. 6.
25. Ibid., February 3, 1904, p. 4, to February 9, 1904, p. 9.
26. Ibid., January 10, 1906, p. 7.
27. Ibid., February 24, 1906, p. 6.
28. Ibid., March 1, 1906, p. 7.
29. Ibid., June 21, 1910, p. 8.
30. Ibid., March 27, 1906, p. 7.
31. George Mowry, The California Progressives, p. 87.
32. Alfred Chandler, Jr., "The Origins of Progressive Leadership," The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt, eds.. Elting E. Morison, John M. Blum, Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., and Sylvia Rice, Vol. VIII, Appendix III, p. 1462.



## BURLINGTON POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

Several men were prominent in the leadership of the Republican factions in Burlington. One man in each faction, however, clearly stood out as its commander-in-chief, while others assumed roles as loyal lieutenants and the majority served as non-commissioned officers.

J. W. Blythe was clearly the top man in the Standpat command. W. W. Copeland was just as clearly, if less spectacularly, the commander-in-chief of the Progressives. In order to gain a clearer picture of the Burlington factional leaders the background and political roles of Blythe, Copeland, and some of their lieutenants will be discussed. For those members of both factions for whom biographical information was available a collective picture of their age, nativity, length of residence in Burlington, Church membership, and membership in fraternal organizations will be drawn.

Joseph William Blythe

"Burlington," the Des Moines Register and Leader wrote in 1908, "is famous for many things, but in Iowa its chief reputation rests upon the fact that it is the home of J. W. Blythe."<sup>1</sup> Blythe in 1908 was general counsel for the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, a railroad

whose influence in Burlington and southeastern Iowa has already been mentioned.

Burlington was also the home of Charles Elliott Perkins, president of the C. B. & Q. from 1881 to 1901, who lived there until his death in 1907.<sup>2</sup> Perkins was not without influence in the nation's capitol during Cleveland's second term,<sup>3</sup> and his lieutenants wielded considerable influence for the C. B. & Q. in both major parties in Iowa.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century this influence was exercised by Ed Hunter, powerful Democratic politician, and in the late nineteenth and early twentieth by Joseph W. Blythe in the Republican ranks, where he is said to have exercised "dictatorial influence" until Governor Albert B. Cummins challenged his power.<sup>4</sup>

In the heat of the pre-primary election battle of 1908 the Progressive Register and Leader described Blythe as having been "conceded for many years to be the great political boss of the state, and the real brains and directing power of corporation activity in Iowa politics." In Burlington and Des Moines county, the Register and Leader continued,

Mr. Blythe has for many years, a generation almost, been absolutely supreme, not merely in his own party, but in the opposition party as well. Wielding the immense power of the Burlington Railroad, its favors and disfavours, its passes and its special concessions, he established himself long ago as an absolute dictator. His activities were not alone in politics, but his rule there was supported by similar domination in business, in banking, and even indirectly in society....

For years no man was nominated for important office without first seeing Blythe or Blythe's representatives....For years not a caucus or county convention was held whose programme was not submitted in advance to Blythe or Blythe's representatives....

The machine in Burlington had many ways of reaching men. If a recalcitrant republican or democrat who threatened trouble happened to be a business man requiring credit from the banks, he was made to understand that he might find it unpleasant, possibly disastrous, to be denied credit some time....<sup>5</sup>

Blythe was born in 1850 in Cranberry, New Jersey, the son and grandson of Presbyterian ministers. He received his B. A. and M. A. degrees from Princeton, and later received LL. D. degrees from Bethany College, Kansas, and Hanover College Indiana. The latter institution was at one time under the presidency of his grandfather, the Reverend James E. Blythe.<sup>6</sup>

In 1874 Blythe moved to Burlington, where he started a law practice and a year later formed a law partnership with Thomas Hedge, whom he helped elect to Congress in 1897.<sup>7</sup>

Blythe's service with the C. B. & Q. began in 1876 when he became an assistant attorney for the line. He soon caught the eye of president Perkins, and moved up the ladder to become general solicitor and, in 1901, general counsel for the whole Burlington system.<sup>8</sup>

A contemporary described him in 1906 as a "brusque, plain spoken citizen, modest in demeanor, ordinarily rather quiet, but when excited rather emphatic." Physically, Blythe was of "good height, . . . ruddy faced, slightly grizzled by his years, but more by his work, compactly built, yet powerful of frame, . . . his eyes deep set."<sup>9</sup>

Another contemporary testified that Blythe was "one of the most sociable, genial, pleasant, approachable men in our county."<sup>10</sup> A reporter for the Democratic Evening Gazette of Burlington evidently concurred, for he wrote that

He loves to unbend, to be friendly, genial; the quiet, unaffected simplicity of the man then comes to the surface and he becomes a rarely fascinating conversationalist, scholarly, witty, and at times caustic, but impersonally so, as he has a fund of incident, anecdote and observation practically inexhaustible, culled from wide personal experience. He can entertain to the point of forgetfulness his auditors.<sup>11</sup>

Blythe, however, was a busy man, and the reporter declared that "directorships in mercantile and financial

concerns he has put aside. Clubs, lodges, societies he has no time for."<sup>12</sup> His obituary in the Hawk-Eye, however, mentions that he was a member of the Elks.<sup>13</sup>

Blythe indeed had much to keep himself occupied, for as a railroad attorney he acted as watchdog for his company's interests in matters political and legislative. The consensus has been that he was immensely successful in this task, and by 1894 he was said to have "an influence on legislation for railroads. . . more remarkable than that of any other person."<sup>14</sup>

In that year Blythe undertook the management of the campaign for U. S. Senator of his father-in-law, John Henry Gear, who also had the backing of Judge Nathaniel M. Hubbard of the Chicago and Northwestern road. The contest in the state senate quickly boiled down to a battle between Gear, one-time president of the Burlington & Southwestern and the Burlington & Northwestern railroads, and Albert B. Cummins, one-time attorney for the Chicago & Great Western road. In the hard-fought campaign Gear managed to scrape through on the third ballot by two votes--"a clear-cut victory for J. W. Blythe and the railroad managers."<sup>15</sup>

Twelve years later, in answer to a question put by a reporter as to whether he had observed "any evidence of railroad influence in Mr. Blythe's political activity,"

a friend of Blythe's quite candidly remarked:

"At the time of the Gear-Cummins senatorial fight, it was understood and accepted in our locality as a strictly railroad fight and was naturally lined up for the local interests."<sup>16</sup>

The 1894 senatorial contest seems to have marked the emergence of Blythe as a really potent factor in the Republican party of the state; and at the same time it served notice of the impending struggle between Blythe and Cummins, and the political forces the two represented, for political control of the state.

By the time Gear sought re-election to the senate in 1900 Blythe had become one of a powerful group of Allison-Gear leaders known as "The Regency." The other members, or "Regents," were Judge Hubbard of Cedar Rapids, and Blythe's brother, James E. Blythe of Mason City.<sup>17</sup> Cummins again opposed Gear for the nomination but his supporters, assessing the power of Gear and his backers, withdrew his name from consideration before a vote was taken.<sup>18</sup>

The Des Moines Register credited Gear's victory to a combination of Blythe and the C. B. & Q.--"a railroad with millions backing the biggest 'boss' the state ever knew."<sup>19</sup> This judgement, writes Leland Sage in his biography of Senator Allison, was "not the reaction of a

radical but the calm judgement of the state's largest and most influential Republican newspaper."<sup>20</sup>

Senator Gear died three months after his election, on July 14, 1900, and Blythe took over the leadership of the Gear forces in the state--the group that later came to be known as the "Standpats."<sup>21</sup> There is some evidence that Governor Shaw offered Blythe the Senate seat vacated by Gear's death, only to be refused because Blythe "said that he had been so long in the railway service that he felt he could not look at public questions from the proper standpoint."<sup>22</sup>

Blythe's refusal to take the Senate seat offered him does not appear to have diminished his political power, however. A short year after Gear's death, at the time of the 1901 state Republican convention in Cedar Rapids, the Burlington Evening Gazette could write that "J. W. Blythe, . . .representing the Burlington road, and Judge N. M. Hubbard, . . .representing the Chicago & Northwestern, are the recognized leaders of the dominant clique in Iowa politics." The Gazette went on to warn, however, that "these will be shelved if Cummins is elected."<sup>23</sup> Cummins, of course, was nominated at the convention, and subsequently elected governor. But Blythe took a long time a-shelving.

By the time the presidential election of 1904 rolled around Blythe had gained enough prestige and prominence to be mentioned as a possible successor to Mark Hanna as chairman of the Republican National Committee. Toward the end of February the Hawk-Eye carried page one articles touting Blythe, but also said that he had declared himself not a candidate.<sup>24</sup> On March 3 the Hawk-Eye reported that Roosevelt had asked Blythe to "take charge of all the western states" in the coming campaign, and in May reported that the "big men"--Senators Aldrich of Rhode Island, Spooner of Wisconsin, and Kean of New Jersey--favored Blythe as chairman.<sup>25</sup> George E. Cortelyou's acceptance of the post later in May put an end to the "Blythe Boom", however.<sup>26</sup>

By 1904 the factional split between the Blythe-Allison and Cummins wings of the party had grown deeper. It expressed itself at least partially that year in attempts by Cummins to be delegate-at-large to the national convention, Iowa's delegation to which he hoped to control. Blythe also expected to be one of the four delegates-at-large, and proposed that both he and Cummins go, with the delegation split evenly between the two factions.

The immediate issue was Cummins' support of a platform plank pledging the party to revise the tariff in



such a way as to "preserve for our producers and secure for our consumers adequate protection, no more no less."<sup>27</sup> Translated, this could only mean downward revision, especially on manufactured products used by Iowans, and was a logical extension of the so-called "Iowa Idea" proposed by the Cummins faction back in 1901, which had pledged the state party to "modifications of the tariff schedules that may be required to prevent their affording a shelter to monopoly."<sup>28</sup>

For his part, Blythe declared, "The railroads are not interested in the tariff."

"A factional fight is the last thing I want to see in Iowa, said Mr. Blythe. "We have made repeated attempts to compromise, but Governor Cummins has refused. We still hope, however, that the factional feeling will not interfere with the selection of a delegation of representative republicans of the state to send to Chicago."<sup>29</sup>

Thomas R. Ross, after examining some of Blythe's personal correspondence, writes, however, that far from being disinterested in the tariff, Blythe "wanted nothing about tariff revision in the national platform," and that he was "angry" because Senator Dolliver would not "speak out for high protection and against reciprocity."<sup>30</sup>

It may well be that Blythe's statement about railroad disinterest, per se, was true. However, it could just as well be true that the railroads were quite interested,

indirectly, in the tariff, as they tended to draw support from and give support to the very interests which stood to benefit most from retention of the tariff as it tariff as it then stood.

At any rate, had the railroads been interested, they need not have worried. After an "intimate" conference with Roosevelt, Blythe more than got his way, for the compromise that was proposed and accepted was that Senators Dolliver and Allison, along with Cummins and Blythe, should be the four delegates-at-large. The Hawk-Eye assured its readers that there would be "no question of his absolute control of the delegation," referring, of course, to Blythe.<sup>31</sup> Blythe was selected as the Iowa member of the resolutions committee, and was a member of the sub-committee on the platform which wrote a tariff plank declaring that the tariff schedules should be revised "only when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration."<sup>32</sup>

1904 may well have marked the apex of Blythe's power in Iowa politics, for Cummins was steadily gathering strength in the state. Blythe "was accustomed to getting what he wanted from. . . Senator Gear," but realized that with Dolliver (Gear's successor) his wishes no longer could "have undue weight."<sup>33</sup> More Important, in 1904

discontent was brewing back in Blythe's own stomping grounds, the Q Reservation, and by 1906 would present the first serious challenge to his control over his own bailiwick.

There can be little doubt, however, that Blythe remained a powerful figure until his death in 1909, and some even saw in him a more sinister figure after 1904 than had been seen previous to that date. According to Ross in his biography of Senator Dolliver, A. B. Funk, Cummins leader from Spirit Lake, had warned Dolliver "as early as 1904" that hope for lasting compromise between the two factions seemed futile.

"Men may cry peace, peace," Funk observed, "but in my judgment there will be no peace until J. W. Blythe is utterly routed and discredited or firmly entrenched as undisputed leader of Iowa Republicans." The fearless and able Funk clearly discerned that while Blythe's earlier relationship to politics "was the fruit of his desire to shield his corporation from legislative treatment, now his desire is strongly reinforced by the yearning of personal ambition."<sup>34</sup>

When, in 1906, Cummins sought a third term as governor on the grounds that not to do so would have been to surrender the state and his own supporters to Blythe,<sup>35</sup> the factional split developed into a yawning chasm surpassed only by that created when Cummins opposed Allison for the senatorial nomination in 1908. The fight in Iowa

was now receiving attention from national magazines, and Blythe received mention of his power in these.

The World Today, for instance, in an article about Cummins, mentioned Blythe as a "political boss, agent of the Burlington railroad, friend of corporations."<sup>36</sup> The Arena, described as "one of the more radical intellectual"<sup>37</sup> magazines of the day, spoke of Blythe in another article about Cummins, as "the director of political affairs for the corporations in Iowa," and as the man who had "engineered" the Molsberry bill through the state legislature.<sup>38</sup> The "sedate" Harper's Weekly, in an article on "Iowa's political war and its bearing upon the destiny of the Republican party," spoke of Blythe as "a leader in the great drama" being played out in Iowa. "He is," said Harper's Weekly, "a master mind in politics, the leader of those who would drive Albert B. Cummins back to private life."<sup>39</sup>

Whether or not Blythe actually ever had the political power at hand that is ascribed to him is difficult if not impossible to determine. Perhaps it is true, as Dolliver once said, that Blythe was "one of the most ominous creations of the progressive imagination;"<sup>40</sup> or, as the Hawk-Eye suggested, that the Cummins men were "using Mr. Blythe as a bogey man to scare the laggard Cummins republicans."<sup>41</sup> Certainly the Cummins press, and Cummins himself,

lost no opportunity to build Blythe up as a ruthless political boss with virtually unlimited power at his fingertips; and it seems just as certain that Cummins enjoyed posing as the "people's" David, standing fearlessly against this corporation Goliath.

One thing can't be denied, however. That is, that a great many of Blythe's contemporaries thought he had power and influence greatly beyond that possessed by most men in the state. And he probably did. Even upon his death (March 6, 1909) when the Register and Leader, a bitter foe during the dark days of 1906 and 1908, had seen Cummins safely to the Senate and could afford to be mellow in their appraisal of Blythe's career, they still paid homage to his political influence. In a sentence that could well have served as his epitaph, the Register and Leader wrote:

As a political organizer he had no peer in the state and as a political general no leader ever was more untiring or successful.<sup>42</sup>

#### William W. Copeland

The recognized leader of the Cummins Progressives in Burlington was William W. Copeland. Born in 1856 at Mifflin, Pennsylvania, Copeland was the son of a storekeeper for the Pennsylvania Railroad, and was educated in the public schools. After clerking briefly in a general

merchandise store in Pennsylvania, he came to Burlington in 1887, where he traveled for a short while with the Standard Oil Company.<sup>43</sup>

His first business venture in Burlington was the operation of a fish and oyster market. Next he became senior partner in Copeland & Martin, a fruit commission business, and in 1903 he bought Martin out to become sole proprietor. Operating "exclusively" as a wholesaler, Copeland handled his goods "in carloads, buying from and shipping to all parts of the United States."<sup>44</sup> In 1906 his shipments were reported to average "between 700 and 800 cars annually, closely approaching half a million dollars in value," and his trading area to include all of Iowa, eastern Illinois, and part of Missouri. Thanks to Copeland's fruit commission business, wrote the Evening Gazette, "close to \$40,000 a year is turned loose in expenses in this city."<sup>45</sup>

In 1898 he helped organized the Clinton-Copeland Candy Company with a capital of \$50,000. In 1905 a new plant was built which employed about 75 persons, and early in 1906 Copeland bought out the Clinton interest in the company.<sup>46</sup> Copeland was also president of the Modern Electric Company, a manufacturer of telephones, and a "heavy jobber" of a general line of telephone construction material and electrical supplies.<sup>47</sup>

In addition, Copeland was a director of the Merchants National Bank, the Northwest Iron & Steel Company, the city-owned Citizens Water Company, and the Burlington Hospital. In 1905 he was elected president of the Burlington Commercial Exchange. The Register and Leader described him in 1908 as "one of the wealthy manufacturers of Iowa with large interests in half a dozen different directions."<sup>48</sup>

Copeland was active in Burlington politics starting (at the latest) in 1901, when he was a delegate to the July county convention,<sup>49</sup> and was chairman of the Burlington central Republican committee from 1902 to 1908. In 1904 he declined the nomination for mayor and instead worked for the election of Dr. J. S. Caster.<sup>50</sup> When Caster won by the unheard of (for a Republican in a city which usually had a Democratic plurality of 500 to 800 in city elections)<sup>51</sup> margin of 1,989 votes,<sup>52</sup> the Hawk-Eye gave a great deal of the credit to "the alert tactician of the republican forces,"<sup>53</sup> and proudly quoted the Evening Gazette's statement that Copeland had "justly earned the title of the Mark Hanna of Burlington."<sup>54</sup>

According to a Register and Leader article in 1908, Copeland had spent "four or five years of quiet effort to arouse enough men to independent action to a

declaration of war against machine rule" before coming out himself in opposition to Blythe's control of Burlington and the county in 1904. "He met," wrote the Register and Leader, "with the usual pressure. A bank that had for years solicited his business, suddenly withdrew its credit."<sup>55</sup>

Considering the fact that Copeland had "for several years" been a director of the Merchants National Bank by 1905,<sup>56</sup> it hardly seems likely that he would experience any great difficulty in obtaining credit, though in 1906 at least, banking in Burlington appears to have been dominated by Standpats, and seasonal credit was no doubt crucial in the wholesale fruit business. If he stood in opposition to the Blythe machine in Burlington or the county in 1904 no hint of it reached the Hawk-Eye, a paper which did not take opposing factions and factionalists lightly. Whatever the case, by 1906 at the latest Copeland stood squarely opposed to Standpat rule in Burlington.

In early 1908 Copeland helped organize and was elected president of the Des Moines County Taft-Cummins Club, which in February claimed a membership of 300.<sup>57</sup> Two months later he was mentioned as a possible candidate for presidential elector-at-large by the Register and



Leader. The same newspaper reported an "Allison conference" held April 18 at which "members of the conference vigorously assailed Mr. Copeland and declared his nomination would surely lose the party votes at the general election."<sup>58</sup> The Des Moines paper then produced a list of signers for Copeland's character that contained the names of prominent businessmen of Burlington, among them several Standpats.<sup>59</sup>

On May 3, 1908 The Fruit and Produce Jobbers Association of Iowa endorsed Copeland's candidacy and pledged themselves "to use all our energy in securing his election at the coming primaries." The pledge was signed by members from Burlington, Ottumwa, Davenport, Dubuque, Cedar Rapids, Clinton, Waterloo, Fort Dodge, Marshalltown, Mason City and Des Moines.<sup>60</sup> Copeland did carry Burlington and Des Moines county in the June primaries, and by a handsome margin,<sup>61</sup> but lost the election by 2,797 votes.<sup>62</sup>

In 1910 Copeland was named postmaster of Burlington, succeeding J. L. Waite, Standpat editor of the Hawk-Eye, who had held the position for twelve years. The Evening Gazette announced that "the appointment of Mr. Copeland to this important position is a recognition of his activities in behalf of the republican party, being an active and effective leader of the progressive wing of the

party in southeastern Iowa." Copeland served as postmaster four years.<sup>63</sup>

Copeland was a member of the Masons. As to his religious affiliation, little more can be said than that he was a Protestant; two separate sources list him as a Lutheran and Congregationalist.<sup>64</sup>

Blythe and Copeland were unquestionably the top leaders of their respective factions. But, like most leaders, they were in some ways quite different from their followers.

Copeland was able to lead the Progressive of Burlington probably more because he was different from them than because he was like them. He was unquestionably wealthier by far than almost any individual in the Burlington faction; he was the only one of them to have an active business relationship with more than one firm; he was the only Progressive with any banking connections;\* and he was one of the very few Progressives with any practical experience in city and county politics prior to 1906. He made his experience, respectability, and probably his funds,

---

\* Alex and James Moir, Progressives in 1906 and Standpats in 1908, owned the controlling interest in the Merchants National Bank.

available to a group not too well-equipped in any of these things, and leadership was his.

Blythe, though much more similar to his following than Copeland, differed from them mainly in the scope of his power and influence and in the resources at his command. No man in either Burlington faction remotely touched Blythe's state-wide reputation and influence. It is probably safe to say that neither did anyone have behind him the resources such as were available to Blythe through the C. B. & Q.

### Secondary Leadership

The character and make-up of the secondary leadership of both factions partially illustrates the differences between those factions and, on the whole, more accurately reflects them.

Next to Copeland himself, Michael E. Flynn probably provided the most leadership to the Burlington Progressives in 1906 and 1908. The Hawk-Eye, writing shortly after Flynn had played his rather conspicuous part in the 1906 caucuses, described him as "the recognized leader" of the Cummins forces in Burlington, perhaps because Flynn was more easily assailable than the respectable and respected Copeland. In the same article the Hawk-Eye maintained that

that Flynn had been a Democrat in 1904,<sup>65</sup> a charge they had first made some weeks earlier.<sup>66</sup>

Biographical material on Flynn, as for most of the Progressive leadership, is almost non-existent. In 1904 the city directory lists his name, but no occupation, though in August of that year he was reported to have quit a job as a baseball umpire.<sup>67</sup> At one time he was a guard of a stone gang.<sup>68</sup> In 1905 he was on the police force, for the Hawk-Eye in that year reported an "unfortunate mistake" he had made in arresting a reputable citizen, who in turn claimed Flynn was drunk.<sup>69</sup> The incident apparently had no ill effect on his career, for in 1906 he was made police captain.<sup>70</sup>

In September of 1906 Flynn was appointed state inspector of food products by Governor Cummins. Tongue-in-check, and still smarting from Flynn's caucus tactics, the Hawk-Eye could only conclude that "he received this appointment not as a reward for service or to encourage other democrats to shift their allegiance, but on the theory that so able an exponent of purity in politics ought to be able to recognize pure foods when he sees them"<sup>71</sup> Apparently Flynn was able to recognize pure foods when he saw them for he served out seven consecutive two-year appointments as state food inspector, the last one

ending in 1920.<sup>72</sup> Flynn did yeoman service to the Progressive cause in 1906 and 1908, though his colorful tactics may well have frightened more timid souls away from actively joining the Progressive standard.

Another secondary leader of the Progressives was Charles Thaddeus Griggs. Born in Indiana in 1846 and educated in the public schools, Griggs came to Burlington in 1869, left four years later, and didn't return until "about" 1893. From 1896 until 1898 Griggs was ill from some unnamed malady, "and after recovering his health he became an active factor in political circles."

It is hard to escape the suspicion that Griggs' political activity was pointed towards the practical end of gaining government employment in an appointive position. The 1904 city directory lists him as a milk inspector. In that year he was also appointed deputy city marshall by Mayor Caster, his chief duty being to make sure the warning lamps were lit in areas where construction was in process. In 1907 Griggs was appointed state oil inspector by the Governor, his job being to test illuminating oil for the required minimum flash point. He held the position for one term only. Griggs attended the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was a Mason, Odd Fellow, and Modern Woodman.<sup>73</sup>

Also quite prominent in 1906 and 1908 Progressive politics was Charles O'Malley, cigar maker employed by the Dehner Cigar Company. In 1906 he was termed "a new figure in Burlington politics."<sup>74</sup> In that year he ran for county representative on the Republican ticket, though at his nomination the "volume of 'noes' was greater than the 'ayes' and more emphatic."<sup>75</sup> (The chairman of the county convention, called to choose the county and township ticket, was Dr. G. E. Rizer, a Progressive in both 1906 and 1908.) After the November elections the Hawk-Eye, in an article titled "Labor Unions and the Elections," was at loss to explain why O'Malley, "who is himself a union labor official and had the endorsement of the Federation of Labor," ran behind the rest of the ticket while his opponent, a Democrat, was put under the ban as 'unfair,' and the working men warned to vote against him."<sup>76</sup> Like most Progressives, O'Malley appeared on the 1906 Burlington political scene almost from out of nowhere.

The secondary leadership of the Standpats was internally rather similar and was heavily weighted with lawyers. At least one of these deserves mention here.

Thomas Hedge, born in 1844 in Burlington, started college at Yale, left to serve in the Civil War, and returned to Yale for the B. A. in 1867. Next came a

two-year course at Columbia Law School, followed by a law practice in Burlington. As already mentioned, Blythe and Hedge joined in a law partnership in 1875. With Blythe's help, Hedge was elected to Congress from the First District in 1897, where he remained until 1907. Hedge was also president of the Gilbert-Hedge Lumber Company and a director of the First National Bank. His connections with the bar, banking, lumber, and government service make him, more than any other Standpat leader, representative of that leadership as a whole.<sup>77</sup>

#### Collective Biographical Information

Biographical information of sorts was found for 27 Standpat and 17 Progressive leaders in Burlington. A rough idea concerning some aspects of the make-up of both factions can thus be obtained. It should be emphasized, however, that these 44 men represent less than one quarter of the 191 persons whose factional affiliations could be determined on the basis of their membership on contesting delegations to county conventions in 1906 and/or 1908.

By averaging the birthdates and dates of initial Burlington residency of the men in each faction it was found that the Standpats averaged seven more years in age, and had resided in Burlington nine years longer, on the average, than the Progressives. (See Table 5)

Although a nearly equal proportion of persons in both factions had been born in Burlington (See Table 7), Progressives were more likely to have been born in Iowa than were Standpats, and a larger proportion of Progressives was born in the Midwest than Standpats. About one-fourth of the Standpats had been born in the eastern states, while only a twentieth of the Progressives came from that section. About 12% of the Progressives and 4% of the Standpats were foreign-born.

The Progressives in this sample were predominantly Protestant and the Standpats were entirely so. (See Table 6) 14.3% of the Progressives were Catholics. Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational church affiliations predominated in both factions, but accounted for a larger proportion of Standpat affiliations (87.6%) than of Progressive (64.3%).

The Standpats had had more formal education than the Progressives. Almost three-fourths (74.1%) of the Standpats had continued their formal educations beyond the high school level, while 58.8% of the Progressives had done so. Also, more Standpats (44.4%) than Progressives (35.3%) had at least a B. A. degree or its equivalent.



TABLE 5  
AVERAGE AGE AND LENGTH OF BURLINGTON RESIDENCY

	Progressives	Standpats
Average age in 1906	41 years	48 years
Average length of Burlington residency by 1906	23 years	32 years

TABLE 6  
CHURCH AFFILIATION

	Progressives		Standpats	
	number persons	percent total	number persons	percent total
Methodist	5	35.7%	7	29.2%
Presbyterian	2	14.3	7	29.2
Congregational	2	14.3	7	29.2
Catholic	2	14.3	-	--
Spiritualist	-	--	2	8.3
Episcopal	1	7.1	1	4.1
Lutheran	1	7.1	-	--
German Baptist	1	7.1	-	--
TOTALS	14	100.0%	24	100.0%

TABLE 7

## NATIVITY OF BURLINGTON FACTIONAL LEADERS

Place of birth	Progressives		Standpat	
	Number	persons Percent	Number	Persons Percent
Iowa	9	52.9%	10	37.0%
Burlington	5	29.4	8	29.6
<b>MIDWEST:</b>	<u>14</u>	<u>82.4%</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>70.4%</u>
Iowa	9		10	
Ohio	2		4	
Illinois	1		2	
Indiana	1		0	
Kansas	1		1	
Kentucky	0		1	
Missouri	0		1	
<b>EAST:</b>	<u>1</u>	<u>5.8%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>25.9%</u>
Pennsylvania	1		3	
New York	0		2	
New Jersey	0		1	
Massachusetts	0		1	
<b>FOREIGN:</b>	<u>2</u>	<u>11.8%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3.7%</u>
Canada	1		1	
Switzerland	1		0	
<b>TOTALS:</b>	17	100.0%	27	100.0%

The membership records of Burlington Masonic lodges for the years 1900 through 1908 show that of the 101 known Standpat leaders in 1906 and/or 1908 sixteen (15.8%) were Masons. Nine (9.9%) of the known Progressive leaders in 1906 and/or 1908 were Masons.

On the basis of the data available, then, it appears that the Standpat was older, had lived a larger proportion of his life in Burlington, was more likely to have been born in an eastern state, had had more education, was more likely to have been a Methodist, Presbyterian, or Congregationalist, and was more likely to have been a Mason than the Progressive.

N O T E S

1. Des Moines Register and Leader, May 3, 1908, sec. 3, p. 1.
2. Edgar R. Harlan, (ed.), A Narrative History of the People of Iowa, Vol. II, pp. 145-147.
3. Cochran and Miller, The Age of Enterprise, pp. 172-173, write that Attorney General Richard Olney "was so close to railroad men that he accepted the Attorney Generalship from Cleveland only after getting permission from President Perkins of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy."
4. Herman C. Nixon, "The Populist Movement in Iowa," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, Vol. 24, No. 1 (January 1926), pp. 11-12.
5. Des Moines Register and Leader, Loc. cit.
6. Biographical Review of Des Moines County, pp. 15-16; Des Moines Register and Leader, March 7, 1909, p. 1; Burlington Evening Gazette, March 24, 1906, p. 15.
7. Annals of Iowa, Vol IX, No. 1, p. 74; Harrington, "A Survey of the Political Ideas of Albert Baird Cummins," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, Vol. 39, No. 4 (October 1941), pp. 343-344.
8. Loc. cit. (both)
9. Burlington Evening Gazette, March 24, 1906, p. 15.
10. Council Bluffs Nonpareil, quoted in the Burlington Hawk-Eye, January 2, 1906, p. 8.
11. Burlington Evening Gazette, March 24, 1906, p. 15.
12. Loc. Cit.
13. Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 7, 1909, p. 2.
14. Harlan, op. cit., p. 103.

15. Thomas R. Ross, Jonathan Prentiss Dolliver: A Study in Political Integrity and Independence, p. 111; Harlan, Loc. cit.
16. Interview with H. W. Cartwright in Council Bluffs Nonpareil, quoted in Burlington Hawk-Eye, January 2, 1906, p. 8.
17. Leland L. Sage, William Boyd Allison, p. 276.
18. Ross, op. cit., p. 162; Benjamin F. Gue, History of Iowa From the Earliest Times to the Beginning of the Twentieth Century, Vol. IV, pp. 100-104; Dan E. Clark, History of Senatorial Elections in Iowa, p. 245.
19. Des Moines Register and Leader, January 19, 1900; also quoted in Sage, op. cit., p. 277.
20. Sage, op. cit., p. 277.
21. Des Moines Register and Leader, March 7, 1909, p. 1.
22. Des Moines Capitol, quoted in Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 10, 1909, p. 4.
23. Burlington Evening Gazette, August 8, 1901, p. 2.
24. Burlington Hawk-Eye, February 26, 1904, p. 1; February 25, 1904, pp. 1, 4.
25. Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 3, 1904, p. 1; May 10, p. 1; May 11, p. 1; May 13, p. 1; May 17, p. 4; May 28, p. 1.
26. Burlington Hawk-Eye, May 17, 1904, p. 1; and June 17, 1904, p. 1.
27. Ross, op. cit., p. 189.
28. Sage, op. cit., p. 282; Iowa Official Register, No. 17 (1902), p. 274.
29. Burlington Hawk-Eye, January 28, 1904, p. 1.
30. Ross, op. cit., p. 190.

31. Burlington Hawk-Eye, June 18, 1904, p. 1.
32. Ibid., June 21, 1904, p. 1; June 22, p. 1.
33. Ross, op. cit., p. 166.
34. Ibid., pp. 215-216.
35. Brooklyn, Iowa, Chronical, quoted in Burlington Hawk-Eye, February 1, 1906, p. 4; Ross, op. cit., p. 218; Sage, op. cit., p. 327.
36. H. G. Moorhead, "Albert B. Cummins: Governor of Iowa," The World Today, Vol. XI, No. 4 (October 1906), pp. 1089-1091.
37. Russel B. Nye, Midwestern Progressive Politics, p. 170.
38. Lewis W. Smith, "Governor Albert B. Cummins: A Statesman Who Places the Interests of the People Above the Demands of Privileged Classes," Arena, Vol. XXXVI (July 1906), pp. 38-41.
39. Edward Lissner, "Iowa's Political War and Its Bearing Upon the Destiny of the Republican Party," Harper's Weekly, Vol. 1, No. 2574 (April 21, 1906), pp. 549-550, 567.
40. Ross, op. cit., p. 230; Des Moines Register and Leader, April 29, 1908, p. 1.
41. Burlington Hawk-Eye, May 5, 1908, pl 4.
42. Des Moines Register and Leader, March 7, 1909, p. 1.
43. Augustine M. Antrobus, (ed.), History of Des Moines County, Iowa, and Its People, Vol. II, p. 100-104; Burlington Hawk-Eye, April 2, 1910, p. 7.
44. Loc. cit. (both).
45. Burlington Evening Gazette, March 24, 1906, sec. 3, p. 3.
46. Antrobus, Loc. cit.

47. Burlington Evening Gazette, Loc. cit.; Burlington Hawk-Eye, February 18, 1905, p. 6.
48. Des Moines Register and Leader, May 3, 1908, sec. 3, p. 1; Burlington Hawk-Eye, February 28, 1905, p. 7; Biographical Review of Des Moines County, pp. 56-60.
49. Burlington Evening Gazette, July 19, 1901, p. 5.
50. Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 5, 1904, p. 6.
51. Ibid., March 29, 1904, p. 4.
52. Ibid., March 29, 1904, p. 7.
53. Ibid., March 29, p. 4.
54. Ibid., March 30, p. 4.
55. Des Moines Register and Leader, Loc. cit.
56. Biographical Review of Des Moines County, pp. 56-60.
57. Burlington Hawk-Eye, February 14, 1908, p. 6.
58. Des Moines Register and Leader, April 12, 1908, p. 9; April 20, 1908, p. 1.
59. Ibid., April 20, 1908, p. 3.
60. Ibid., May 3, 1908, sec. 3, p. 3.
61. Iowa Official Register, No. 23 (1909-1910), p. 599.
62. Ibid., pp. 598-600.
63. Burlington Evening Gazette, quoted in Burlington Hawk-Eye, April 2, 1910, p. 7; for tenure see Antrobus, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 100-104.
64. Antrobus, op. cit., pp. 100-104, says Lutheran; Biographical Review of Des Moines County, pp. 56-60, says Congregational.
65. Burlington Hawk-Eye, November 11, 1906, p. 7.
66. Ibid., September 19, 1906, p. 14.

67. Ibid., August 3, 1904, p. 2.
68. Des Moines Register and Leader, quoted in Burlington Hawk-Eye, August 1, 1906, p. 2.
69. Burlington Hawk-Eye, November 11, 1905, p. 7.
70. 1906 Burlington City Directory.
71. Burlington Hawk-Eye, September 19, 1906, p. 14.
72. Iowa Official Register, No. 21 (1907-1908) through No. 27 (1919-1920).
73. 1904-1905 Burlington City Directory; Biographical Review of Des Moines County, pp. 421-423; Iowa Official Register, No. 22 (1909-1910), p. 240.
74. Burlington Evening Gazette, May 19, 1906, p. 5.
75. Burlington Hawk-Eye, September 23, 1906, p. 6.
76. Ibid., November 15, 1906, p. 4.
77. Biographical Review of Des Moines County, p. 976; Gue, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 124.



## CAUCUSES AND CONVENTIONS 1901 - 1912

Prior to and including the time the primary election law went into effect in Iowa in 1908 party nominations for elective officers and choices for the personnel of the party machinery were made under a caucus-convention system.

Starting with a caucus at the ward or precinct level delegates were chosen to attend city or county conventions. The city convention chose nominees for city offices, and usually selected at the same time the local party central committee.

The county convention served a variety of functions. It first of all nominated candidates for county offices, and chose the personnel of the county party machinery. It also chose delegates to a variety of conventions closer to the apex of the pyramid-like structure of the state political organization.

The manner of selecting delegates, nominees, and party officials varied. Usually a committee was named by the chairman of the meeting to select a list of delegates, etc., and the list was then voted upon viva voce. Or, if all were not harmonious among the party faithful, there would be a motion to nominate from the floor, from which

point affairs sometimes collapsed in a parliamentary jumble, with shouts for a division of the house from those unable to make their "aye" or "nay" heard by a seemingly deaf chairman.

It was a sometimes colorful system that held the added attraction, no doubt, of providing an excellent opportunity for gathering together with neighbors and friends from throughout the area bounded by the jurisdiction of the meeting.

More important, however, the caucus-convention system held the key to political power within the geographical area of the convention's authority. The struggles in these conventions that appeared at times so ludicrous were at bottom basic struggles for political power and all that it implied. No one in the political saddle, whether he was called "boss" or by some sweeter name, could have gotten there or long remained there without controlling the lowly ward caucus or county convention.

The Standpats, successful in the caucus battles, were skeptical of the primary election law before it was adopted and had not changed their opinion one whit by 1912 when the Standpat Hawk-Eye blasted the direct primary as "a perversion of the American principle of representative government."<sup>1</sup> In 1908, they argued that it favored the rich

man more than the poor, and as voter affiliation was not to be stated until the 1910 election they greatly feared that Democrats would vote the Cummins ticket in the seclusion of an election booth.<sup>2</sup> In 1910 the Hawk-Eye charged the primary election with being "another potent factor in the disintegration of parties," and hinted darkly that "its work is not yet done."<sup>3</sup> Whether the Hawk-Eye opposed the direct primary election law on principle or for more practical reasons (or both) is hard to determine. One thing is certain; the Standpats had more to lose from a primary election system than to gain.

In Burlington by, but not before, 1906 a struggle was in full swing between Standpat and Progressive factions for control of the caucus-convention system. The struggle was continued in 1908 with great vigor. But in 1910 it had died to a single protesting murmur, and by 1912 it was, to all appearances, resolved.

### The Quiet Years

The caucus and convention accounts prior to 1906 give almost no indication of impending fireworks.

The ward caucuses held in July of 1901 were uneventful. Cummins had announced his candidacy for the

governorship in February, and Blythe was searching for the means to block his success,<sup>4</sup> but the caucuses in Burlington were quiet and quickly got through the business of voting on prepared lists of delegate nominees.<sup>5</sup>

A brief flare-up occurred at the county convention two days later. D. H. McKee, a rural delegate from Mediapolis, read a "lengthy" resolution endorsing Governor Shaw's administration. The resolution went on to say that

the republican party declares itself unalterably opposed to the candidacy of any man for an office at its hands, who seeks to advance himself by discrediting it, and to substitute class hatred and populism for its historic principles.<sup>6</sup>

This rather transparent slap at Cummins brought immediate response from A. M. Antrobus,\* a Burlington lawyer, who offered a substitute resolution pledging the Des Moines county Republicans "to stand by the candidates nominated in the national, state, district and county conventions, and to use honorable means to secure their election." Antrobus explained that his resolution was prompted by the "report that certain traitorous republicans in Des Moines county had stated that they would not support the man who assisted in the election of Boies," Democratic governor of Iowa, 1889-1893.<sup>7</sup>

---

\* Antrobus later wrote the county history cited in the bibliography.

At this point Blythe remarked that "he did not think anything in the record of the republican party would warrant a pledge from loyal, true republicans to stand by the party," that it was "not necessary that it should be tied down when it [came] to voting for a candidate," and moved that both resolutions be tabled. "Slight applause" had greeted Antrobus' speech; Blythe's motion was carried "by a chorus of ayes that could be heard in Mediapolis," a neighboring village.<sup>8</sup>

Perhaps the sub-heading over the Evening Gazette's account of the convention best sums it up: "Proceedings cut and dried and everything over in fifteen minutes."<sup>9</sup>

Thomas Ross, in his biography of Senator Dolliver, writes that "the Iowa Standpatters did not oppose Cummins' renomination in 1903. Everybody wanted 'harmony.'"<sup>10</sup> This was apparently the case at the Des Moines county convention, where Standpat chairman William Pilger, elected unanimously, selected a committee of three to choose a list of delegates to the state convention. Among the three were W. W. Copeland and the same D. H. McKee of Mediapolis who had offered the resolution opposing Cummins' candidacy in 1901.<sup>11</sup>

The issues in 1904 centered around the "Iowa Idea"--lowered tariffs and reciprocity--and on the battle

between Blythe and Cummins over control of the delegation from Iowa to the national nominating convention to be held in June. Again the caucuses were quiet. There may have been some premonition of trouble at the county convention, however, for upon taking the chair unanimously elected Nils C. Hanson of Union Township expressed his "hope that all would work in unity and the proceedings be harmonious."<sup>12</sup>

They were. J. W. Waite, editor of the Hawk-Eye, read a resolution expressing the county's "pleasure" that other county conventions had instructed their delegates to vote for J. W. Blythe, "our honored fellow citizen," for delegate-at-large to the national convention. Read Waite:

Mr. Blythe's broad and generous policy of conciliation with a view to the united support of President Roosevelt by Iowa republicans, and complete party harmony in the state and congressional and local elections, is wise and commendable. To that end we favor the selection of Senators Allison and Dolliver, Governor Cummins and J. W. Blythe for delegates at large....<sup>13</sup>

Hitting at the "Iowa Idea," the resolution went on to declare that "reciprocity should be the complement, and not the burden of the tariff, an 'associated policy' and not an antagonism, of any protected interest."<sup>14</sup>

The resolution was adopted unanimously, giving Waite the opportunity to editorialize in the Hawk-Eye:

The delegations to the state and congressional conventions are composed of men who "stand pat" for principles, but who are disposed to be broad and liberal in dealing with men. They were willing to favor the election of Governor Cummins as one of the delegates-at-large to the national convention, but utterly repudiated his vagaries touching the tariff and reciprocity.<sup>15</sup>

W. W. Copeland and Standpat C. L. Poor were on the three-man committee that reported a list of delegates and alternates to the state convention.<sup>16</sup>

The July 1904 convention, according to the Evening Gazette, lasted twenty minutes, was "positively featureless," and ended with all "apparently satisfied."<sup>17</sup> The Hawk-Eye headlined their article on the convention "Republicans Quiet."<sup>18</sup>

### An End to Harmony

And so they were--until Cummins declared for re-election to an unprecedented third term in 1906 on the grounds that otherwise the Blythe forces would control the state unopposed.

There must have been more than a suspicion that trouble was brewing, for the morning of the caucus elections county chairman Fred S. Holsteen, a Standpat, had published a list of precinct committeemen "in order that there may be no confusion as to who is committeeman, or

authorized to act as such in case of vacancy."<sup>19</sup> But no one could have been quite prepared for just what followed that evening. In the words of the Evening Gazette, there was "a hot time in the old town" on the night of May 17.<sup>20</sup> When the dust had settled it was found to consist mainly of extremely minute fragments of fragile "harmony."

In the First and Fourth wards there appears to have been little disturbance, and these wards elected delegates pledged to Standpat candidate for governor, George Perkins. In the Seventh the Standpats named a Perkins delegation, though it was "understood" that the "Cummins faction" claimed several of the delegates.<sup>21</sup>

In the Sixth, Eugene Buttles, a grocer described as a "co-partner in the cummins compact" with Copeland, tried a head-on assault against Blythe himself. Buttles was candidate for state railroad commissioner against Standpat Colonel David Palmer of Washington, and did his best to carry the ward for Cummins and himself. He was, reported the Hawk-Eye, "overwhelmingly defeated," and the Evening Gazette agreed that "Mr. Blythe won out with ease."<sup>22</sup> It was probably in reference to activities in the Sixth that the Register and Leader later wrote that

forcing men to march through a door and vote openly as they passed, in a city where the Q has its headquarters and where Q employment is



indispensable to thousands of workers is itself a form of coercion that is un-American....<sup>23</sup>

However, if Blythe found it easy to meet the challenge in his own ward, Standpats in the Third, Fifth and Second wards found the going much more difficult.

In the Second, a ward that went to Allison in the 1908 June primaries by 15 votes, it was "known in advance that there would be a hot contest." The Second was described by the Evening Gazette as "the home of staid, conservative, blue blood republicanism." Here both factions nominated a candidate for chairman, a vote was had, and the Standpat candidate was declared elected 152 to 148. Though the count was not challenged, Alex Moir, \* "leader of the Cummins forces," led a bolt from the caucus and set up a rump convention in the hose station.<sup>24</sup>

In the Third affairs got completely out of hand. The undoubtedly biased Evening Gazette likened the damage to the city council chamber where the caucus met to the effects of a cattle stampede, reporting "benches and chairs were broken, window panes were smashed."<sup>25</sup> Even the Hawk-Eye termed the meeting "tumultous (sic) and ungovernable."

---

\* Though Moir could be called a "leader of the Cummins forces" in 1906, he stuck with the Standpats in a contested delegation from the Second Ward in the 1908 caucuses.

Here something new was added by Cummins leader Mike Flynn: The "Des Moines style of 'rushing' the meeting with a noisy gang of shouters," over whose "shouting and riotous action. . .no one could be heard and no business intelligently transacted."<sup>26</sup>

Standpat Horace Rand, Blythe's brother-in-law, was declared chairman on a viva voce vote. Flynn then led a vote for Progressive George Turner, who "hustled to the platform" and stood by the side of Rand where, "being personally friendly they shook hands." The two friends agreed to a division of the house, which was accomplished "with great difficulty." Unfortunately, the tellers could not agree on the count, the Cummins teller claiming Turner elected 114 to 111, and the Perkins teller just as certain Rand had won by a vote of 115 to 114.<sup>27</sup>

Meanwhile, "several tricky Cummins fellows" had been "seen climbing over the rail and were counted twice--to which the Perkins adherents naturally objected." This comic opera situation concluded with simultaneous conventions being held side by side, each with its own chairman, secretary and list of delegates. The Evening Gazette reported that "only a few" of the Third ward Cummins delegates could be identified, and that the Republican central committee failed to "find many of their names on the list when the last republican poll was taken."<sup>28</sup>

In Copeland's ward, the Fifth, some 700 showed up, only a "small fraction" of which were able to enter the meeting place. The result was one of "the most remarkable and unruly gathering [s] ever held in the city," and one which made "a run on a Yiddish bank look like a prayer meeting" in comparison, was the gleeful observation of the irrepressible Evening Gazette. Copeland seemed able to do no more than sit quietly during the reigning pandemonium. Standpat M. W. Hays tried to read a prepared list of delegates, "but the paper was pulled out of his hand by a man by the name of O'Malley and it looked like real trouble was imminent.(sic)." Although the Evening Gazette claimed that only Copeland men had been able to enter the building, the Hawk-Eye stoutly maintained that the Cummins men were outnumbered two to one at the meeting. That the Cummins men carried the day speaks well for the former interpretation. Whatever the case, the Perkins men filed out to hold a rump caucus when the shouting died down.<sup>29</sup>

Two days later the scene shifted to the county convention where a decision on the contested delegations would have to be made. The credentials committee divided the contestants almost evenly. The Perkins delegation in the Second ward and the Cummins delegation from the Fifth

were seated; both delegations from the Third were seated, each delegate with a half vote.<sup>30</sup>

Before the committee report could be adopted, however, Copeland rose to insist the Cummins faction be given a proportionate share of delegates to the state convention and that the delegation go uninstructed.<sup>31</sup>

Apparently the chair ignored the request, even when put in the form of a motion by Mike Flynn, and instead entertained a motion to have the chair appoint a committee to select a list of delegates to the state convention. Progressive George Turner immediately moved to amend the second motion so that the delegates be selected from the floor. His motion failed. As the committee filed out Charles O'Malley "bravely announced," to the tune of "derisive laughter," that unless the Progressives got their fair share of delegates they would bolt the convention.<sup>32</sup>

Now J. W. Blythe rose and read resolutions instructing for Palmer as railroad commissioner. O'Malley protested the instructions and asked that they be stricken. The resolution was adopted and read. The Progressives' hand was forced. Flynn, Copeland and O'Malley led their delegates from the Third and Fifth wards, as well as three delegates from the First, from the meeting. A sympathetic Register and Leader report of the bolt stated

that "in several cases" the Progressives had not been recognized by Standpat chairman Holsteen, and that they had bolted the convention "only as a last resort when it was plain they could not gain."<sup>33</sup>

The resolutions adopted by the resulting Progressive rump convention are perhaps worth including here, as they present the first and practically only declaration of faith by the Burlington Progressives:

We, the delegates in convention assembled, representing the progressive republicans of Des Moines county, wish to declare our faith in the republican doctrines as proclaimed in the national platform of 1904 and as exemplified by president Theodore Roosevelt and Governor A. B. Cummins.

We further endorse railroad rate legislation as advocated by our president and governor.

We believe in a "square deal," freedom from bossism and the primary election laws.

We believe in election of the United States senators by direct vote of the people and heartily endorse the steps taken to secure this needed reform by our present governor.

Recognizing the ability of our fellow townsman, Mr. Eugene Buttles, we heartily endorse him for the position of railroad commissioner and pledge him our support.<sup>34</sup>

The Progressives' attempt to control the caucus-convention system in Des Moines county in 1906 failed. They carried the fight to the district convention, but were turned out lock, stock, and barrel. Now the split in the Republican ranks was wide enough for all to see clearly, but as yet nothing concrete had been gained.

### Conflict Renewed

1908 saw the battle renewed with undiminished heat. When Cummins declared his candidacy for the Senate seat of the incumbent and aged Allison in 1907, the coming struggle in Burlington promised to be a bitter one. For now the factional strife was centered more than ever on personalities. On the state level it was the shining knight of Progressivism against the "beloved Nestor of the Senate." On the local level it was Blythe versus Copeland.

First reports from the March 1908 caucuses were heartening, and the Register and Leader was quick to exult that "the victory for the progressives is decisive. It is the first time in history that Burlington, the seat of the reservation and the home of J. W. Blythe, has slipped from his control." The Progressives were thought to have won the First, Second, Third, Fifth and Seventh wards.<sup>35</sup>

The Standpats, however, contested two of these, the Second and the Third, and on the fate of these two wards hung the Progressives' control of the coming county convention.

Using the experience gained in 1906 the Progressives had run the meetings in the Second and Third wards with a desperate dispatch that hinted strongly of a great deal of preparation and forethought. In both wards

Progressives called the caucuses to order and conducted elections of caucus chairmen. In both the voting was viva voce, on the basis of which Progressives were declared victors, despite Standpat calls for a division. There was little for the Standpats in the Second to do but remain after adjournment and hold a rump caucus.<sup>36</sup>

The Register and Leader was especially pleased over first reports of the outcome in the Third ward, where Horace S. Rand, Blythe's brother-in-law and "direct representative," went down in seeming defeat.<sup>37</sup> There, despite protests and calls for a division of the house from Rand and Thomas Hedge, Progressive committeeman Dr. George Rizer declared Mike Flynn chairman. Tensions boiled to the surface after the meeting was over, when the Standpats attempted to hold their rump caucus in the same room. Chairman Flynn is reported to have shouted, "There ain't going to be no rump convention. I hired this hall, it is my contract and the lights will be put out as soon as we adjourn." After adjournment, according to J. L. Waite's Hawk-Eye,

Mr. Flynn immediately began turning out the lights, five out of six being quickly extinguished without giving those present an opportunity to find their wraps in the darkness. One republican struck a match and lit a lamp. Flynn grabbed him by the wrists, turned out the light, and declared in violent

langue (sic), "...get out!" Mr. Flynn seized him by both wrists, and a rounder came to Flynn's assistance and they began to push the republicans out of the hall.<sup>38</sup>

Later, at the state convention, Flynn was asked by the Central Committee if there had been any violence at the caucus, to which he replied, "No violence, . . . except that J. L. Waite hit me over the head with an umbrella."<sup>39</sup>

On March 8 a tumultuous county convention met in Burlington. The Progressives obviously were taking no chances this time of losing a victory that seemed definitely theirs. LaMonte Cowles, Standpat delegate from the contested Second ward and District Committee Chairman, tried to call the meeting to order. This proved the signal for the start of general pandemonium.

According to the Hawk-Eye State Oil Inspector Charles T. Griggs jumped onto the platform and named Charles O'Malley chairman, at which point O'Malley "succeeded in wrenching" the gavel from Cowles' hand. After twelve minutes of chaos the Progressives left the hall in a body, and later published the minutes of the meeting, along with Taft, Cummins and Garst resolutions. Both sides claimed nothing could be heard in this brief span except "a steady roar of human voices." Each accused the



other of deliberately planning the ruckus.\* When the Progressives left, the Standpats adopted Allison resolutions and decided the contested wards in favor of the Standpat delegations.<sup>40</sup>

Dr. Paul H. Schaefer, secretary of the Progressive portion of the meeting and delegate-elect from the Seventh ward, probably best summed up the Progressives' attitude about the meeting when he said later, "I think it was the only way we could win. We knew we could get no satisfaction from Mr. Cowles. . . ." <sup>41</sup>

Copeland fought to have the Progressive delegations seated at the district and state conventions, but was unsuccessful.<sup>42</sup> 1908 saw the second, last, and best organized Progressive bid for control of the caucus-convention system in Burlington and Des Moines county. The Standpats were roughed up but still in the saddle when it came to riding the system to victory.

---

\* At the state convention Copeland confronted Blythe before the Central Committee with the charge that he had seen Blythe give signals to the Standpats to keep up the disturbance. An argument developed which the Committee had to adopt a "fierce tone" to stop. (Register and Leader, March 12, 1908, p. 1.)

### The Mending Years

The delegates to the July, 1910 county convention had been elected in the June primaries. Eleven Progressives and ten Standpats, plus seventeen persons of unknown affiliation, made up the delegation from Burlington.

Standpat Thomas Hedge was unanimously elected chairman. At one point it seemed as though things were going to erupt into a first-class battle. Standpat Charles Willner moved that a committee be appointed to select a list of delegates to the state convention. Progressive Charles T. Griggs "was on his feet at once" with a motion that delegates be appointed from the floor. Griggs failed to get a second to his motion! The convention pushed implacably on to adopt a resolution which read, in part, ". . .we heartily endorse the administration of President Taft and commend its successful efforts in the face of great obstacles to accomplish the purposes declared in the last national platform of the party."<sup>43</sup> This could only have been a thinly-veiled reference to the terrific battle waged by the insurgents in Congress against the Payne-Aldrich Tariff bill in 1909--a battle in which Senator Cummins had played a prominent part.

Even more mystifying than the silence of the Progressives at the convention was an announcement which

appeared in the Register and Leader declaring the Des Moines county convention had selected a delegation to the state convention that included only four Progressives, the four elected under "the harmonious agreement" that they would vote as a bloc with the rest of the delegates.<sup>44</sup>

Thus, some sort of agreement seems to have been reached between the two factions by 1910. Events in 1912 seem not only to bear this out, but to hint strongly at the return of the long-lost and somewhat battered "harmony."

The ward caucuses held in March 1912 to choose delegates to the county convention were the scenes of numerous acts of political brotherhood. In the Third, for example, where some of the most bitter battles had gone on in 1906 and 1908 there was nothing if not harmony. Standpat Dr. Carl Stutsman was nominated by Progressive George Turner, and Standpat Horace Rand to select a list of delegates to the county convention. They picked a group that included two Progressives and seven Standpats.<sup>45</sup> The Hawk-Eye reported the next morning that "Political veterans, who have grown grey in many hard-fought campaigns, scanned the returns from the republican primaries. . .and declared it (sic) unanimous for Taft."<sup>46</sup>

At the county convention "there was not a break in the harmony that prevailed. All the delegates were

cordially favorable to the renomination of Taft, and the various motions and resolutions went through without a dissenting voice." The committee on resolutions consisted of former combatants Flynn, Thomas Hedge, and C. C. Clark.<sup>47</sup>

At the June county convention, whose delegates had been elected in the direct primaries, the Hawk-Eye reported there was "nothing like a bolt," the convention requiring "under an hour" for the transaction of its business.<sup>48</sup>

#### The Bull Moose County Convention

Toward the end of July the Roosevelt Progressives put out a call for a county convention over the signatures of some 60 persons. The convention met July 20. The guiding light of the movement, and the man who circulated the petition for the convention, seems to have been Carl Lohmann, editor of the German-language Volksfreund-Tribune. A former Democrat, Lohmann declared at the convention that he would not have been there had Champ Clark won the Democratic nomination instead of Wilson.<sup>49</sup>

In addition to Lohmann, Dr. J. S. Baughman, 1906 Cummins Progressive, seems to have been a leader in the county Bull Moose organization, and was named First district delegate to the national convention.<sup>50</sup>

The Hawk-Eye thought the Roosevelt convention presented an unique scene:

Editor Carl Lohmann, of the Volksfreund-Tribune, and George Boeck, German liberals doing team work with Dr. J. S. Baughman, and Ben Jones, radical prohibitionists and members of the late civic federation.<sup>51</sup>

Observers at the convention were struck, said the Hawk-Eye, by the advanced age of the delegates.

It was a matter of comment that the grey heads and the bald constituted the larger element of the gathering. Two or more men were in the 80's, and quite a large proportion were over 60....<sup>52</sup>

It would appear that neither Cummins Progressives nor old-line Standpats were willing to support the new party in large numbers in 1912. Besides Dr. Baughman only three other Cummins Progressive leaders attended the convention: Forrest Houston, George Wahl, and Eric Moberg. One former Standpat, Charles Liddeen, was present. Even though the convention adopted a resolution which read, in part, "we sever our connection with our former party," there was great reluctance to do so. The convention was in a quandary over the question of what name to take and, wishing to avoid a name for the county organization which would in any way imply that a new party had been formed, decided to wait until after the national convention before adopting a title. A. E. Jones of Burlington, for instance,

objected to calling the organization a "party," declaring that he was and would continue to be a Republican. His views were echoed by Mediapolis delegate Dr. J. A. Matson, who told the convention:

"In Des Moines we adopted a platform to stand by the state and county tickets. Lots of us don't want to leave our party. I was born a republican and want to stay one."<sup>53</sup>

A slightly larger dose of this distaste for cutting old party ties may have accounted the lack of participation in the Roosevelt organization on the part of former Cummins Progressives. Besides the fear that a new party would bring disaster to the regular Republicans when faced with a united Democratic vote there seems to have been the feeling--or hope--that the regular Republican party was flexible enough to include Progressive measures in its program, given enough time. When it became rumored, for instance, that A. M. Antrobus, Burlington lawyer and delegate to the regular Republican state convention, would support the new party he felt compelled to issue a rather wistful denial:

"I am a republican from principle and believe in its general doctrines and policies, although, like many others, dissenting from some of its more recent platform declarations and the policies of the present administration. I am a so-called 'progressive republican' and am in sympathy with the progressive ideas of senators Cummins and Kenyon and their colleagues, both

in and out of the state. But, like them, I believe the place for the advocacy of these principles is within the republican party, and not outside it; and therefore, I cannot follow Colonel Roosevelt in the organization of a new party...."54

The fact that Roosevelt won over Taft in Burlington in the November elections seems to indicate that many former Cummins Progressives solved their dilemma by voting for Roosevelt even though they refused to actively participate in the local Roosevelt organization.

#### Standpat and Progressive Participation in Politics

We have seen that the years of by far the strongest insurgency in Burlington Republican politics were 1906 and 1908. This rather naturally leads to questions concerning the political activity of the Cummins Progressive prior to and following this period. Was, for instance, the Progressive a brand new factor in the personnel of Burlington politics, suddenly appearing in 1906 only to fade quietly away after 1908? Or had he been active in local and county politics all along, waiting until 1906 to show his disaffection for "regular" Republicanism? Did he continue active in politics after 1908, and if so, did he tend to become a Roosevelt Progressive in 1912?

Participation in ward caucuses and county conventions, along with candidacy in primary elections, provide

an excellent picture of the personnel of local political activity for the period 1901 to 1912. Moreover, the pyrotechnics of 1906 and 1908 clearly illuminated the factional affiliations of many caucus and convention participants. By charting the participation of those who could clearly be labeled Progressive or Standpat in 1907 and/or 1908 throughout the period 1901 to 1912 a picture of the Progressive's political activity can be drawn and contrasted with that of his Standpat counterpart.\*

These points stand out concerning Progressive political activity:

First, the Progressive was not quite as active in terms of actual participation in caucuses and primaries as was the Standpat. This held true, over the total 1901 to 1912 period, for each group of Progressives considered, and the discrepancy between average participations of both factions was greatest among the repeater groups, from which came the nucleus of leadership in both factions. Though the repeater groups in both factions averaged greater participation than 1906 and 1908 groups the Standpat repeater group averaged one and one-half more participations

---

\* Not all those clearly affiliated with a particular faction in 1906 or 1908 were clearly affiliated in both years. Labeling was determined through membership in



per person than did the Progressive repeater group. (See Table 8)

Second, the Progressive was more likely to have been a newcomer to politics in 1906 than was the Standpat. Only 18.9% of the Progressives were active in local and county politics prior to 1906, while almost double this percentage of Standpats (37.5%) were active in the same period. Moreover, more than half the Standpat repeater group (54.5%) was active during this period, compared to about a third (31.8%) of the Progressive repeater group.

Third, participation after 1908 was nearly equal for both factions, with the Progressives averaging one-tenth more participations per person than the Standpats. Between 32 and 33 percent of both factions participated during this period, but again about a third (36.4%) of the Progressive repeaters participated as compared to about half (54.5%) of the Standpat repeaters.

---

contesting delegations for the most part. (A few persons were found labeled in newspaper articles.) Thus, some are clearly identifiable in 1906 but not in 1908, while the reverse is equally true. Two separate groups can therefore be identified in both factions, the "1906 group" and the "1908 group." A third group is composed of those who were clearly identifiable in both 1906 and 1908, the "repeaters." A very small group, four 1906 Progressives and one 1906 Standpat, shifted allegiance in 1908. On the grounds that 1908 provided a "moment of truth" for testing factional affiliation, especially for the Progressives, these five persons have been included in the faction to which they adhered in 1908.

TABLE 8

PARTICIPATION IN PRIMARY ELECTIONS BY BURLINGTON PROGRESSIVES AND STANDPATS  
1901 - 1912

	Number of persons participating		Percent of total persons in each group		Total participations per group		Average participations per person	
	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S
<u>PARTICIPATION BY:</u>								
All persons.....	90	104	100.0%	100.0%	199	266	2.2	2.6
1906 group.....	33	45	100.0	100.0	60	86	1.7	1.9
1908 group.....	35	37	100.0	100.0	67	75	1.9	2.0
Repeaters (1906 & 1908)...	22	22	100.0	100.0	72	105	3.3	4.8
<u>PARTICIPATION PRIOR TO 1906 BY:</u>								
All persons.....	17	39	18.9%	37.5%	29	83	1.7	2.1
1906 group.....	6	16	18.2	35.6	9	30	1.5	1.9
1908 group.....	4	11	11.4	29.7	5	17	1.3	1.5
Repeaters (1906 & 1908)...	7	12	31.8	54.5	15	36	2.1	3.0
<u>PARTICIPATION AFTER 1908 BY:</u>								
All persons.....	29	34	32.2%	32.7%	43	48	1.5	1.4
1906 group.....	9	9	27.3	20.0	12	12	1.3	1.3
1908 group.....	12	13	34.3	35.1	18	17	1.5	1.3
Repeaters (1906 & 1908)...	8	12	36.4	54.5	13	19	1.6	1.6

P = Progressive

S = Standpat

Fourth, while Roosevelt in 1912 did poll more votes in Burlington than did Taft, participation by Cummins Progressives in the local and county Roosevelt Political Machinery was almost non-existent. Of the 61 Roosevelt Progressives in the county who either signed the call for the county convention or attended it only four former Cummins Progressives are to be found. One 1908 Standpat attended the Roosevelt county convention.\*

In summary, then, the Cummins Progressives tended to steer clear of involvement with the Bull Moose organization. They tended to be johnny-come-latelies to organized political activity, though after 1908 they participated on a par with the Standpats. An exception to this occurs in the crucial leadership group of the repeaters where, though the Progressive repeaters' average participation was on a par with the Standpats', a smaller percent of the group participated.

The beginning of all-out factional warfare in Burlington coincides with the entrance into organized politics on the part of the Cummins Progressive. Exactly why 1906 should have been the initial date for the outbreak of

---

\* For a full list of names and individual participations see Appendix 1.

factionalism is not entirely known, but Cummins' decision to run for a third term as governor seems to have had a catalytic effect on Burlington Republicans.

Continued participation on a par with the Standpats after 1908 and the avoidance of involvement with the Roosevelt organization would seem to indicate that some mutually satisfactory compromise had been achieved between the two factions, certainly by 1912, and quite likely as early as 1910. This latter conclusion is more than born out by reports of the 1910 and 1912 county conventions. The nature and cause of the compromise, if indeed it existed, are unknown factors also. Reasons for non-involvement with the Roosevelt organization have been suggested above. The fact that Cummins, in 1908, at last achieved his main ambition of becoming United States Senator from Iowa probably played some part in the following rapprochement. Blythe's death in 1909 removed the most powerful Standpat leader from the scene. The apogee of Progressive legislation in Iowa seems to have been reached in 1908, as indicated in a study of the subject by William L. Bowers.<sup>55</sup> Though hardly adequate for a full explanation of subsiding factionalism after 1908, these factors probably played a role in its demise.

NOTES

1. Burlington Hawk-Eye, June 29, 1912, p. 4.
2. Ibid., April 25, 1908, p. 4, for argument that direct primary favors the rich. For fear of democratic support of Cummins see May 8, p. 1; May 9, p. 4; May 15, p. 4; May 22, p. 4; May 23, p. 1; May 24, p. 6; May 26, p. 4; May 27, p. 1.
3. Ibid., November 19, 1910, p. 4.
4. Thomas R. Ross, Jonathan Prentiss Dolliver, p. 167.
5. Burlington Evening Gazette, July 19, 1901, p. 5.
6. Ibid., July 20, 1901, p. 1.
7. Loc. cit.
8. Loc. cit.
9. Loc. cit.
10. Ross, op. cit., p. 184.
11. Burlington Hawk-Eye, June 19, 1903, p. 6, for caucus accounts; Ibid., June 21, 1903, p. 7, for convention accounts.
12. Ibid., April 10, 1904, p. 7.
13. Loc. cit.
14. Loc. cit.
15. Ibid., p. 4.
16. Ibid., p. 7.
17. Burlington Evening Gazette, July 16, 1904, p. 5.
18. Burlington Hawk-Eye, July 17, 1904, p. 6.
19. Ibid., May 17, 1906, p. 6.

20. Burlington Evening Gazette, May 18, 1906, p. 4.
21. Loc. cit.
22. Burlington Hawk-Eye, May 18, 1906, p. 8; Burlington Evening Gazette, May 18, 1906, p. 4.
23. Des Moines Register and Leader, May 21, 1906, p. 4.
24. Burlington Hawk-Eye, May 18, 1906, p. 8.
25. Burlington Evening Gazette, May 18, 1906, p. 4.
26. Loc. cit.; Burlington Hawk-Eye, Loc. cit.
27. Loc. cit. (both)
28. Loc. cit. (both)
29. Loc. cit. (both)
30. Burlington Hawk-Eye, May 20, 1906, p. 1; Burlington Evening Gazette, May 19, 1906, p. 5.
31. Loc. cit. (both)
32. Loc. cit. (both)
33. Burlington Evening Gazette, Loc. cit.; Burlington Hawk-Eye, Ibid., p. 8.
34. Burlington Evening Gazette, Loc. cit.
35. Des Moines Register and Leader, March 6, 1908, p. 1.
36. Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 6, 1908, p. 7.
37. Des Moines Register and Leader, Loc. cit.
38. Burlington Hawk-Eye, Loc. cit.
39. Des Moines Register and Leader, March 19, 1908, p. 2.
40. Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 8, 1908, p. 5.
41. Loc. cit.

42. Des Moines Register and Leader, March 13, 1908, and Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 12, 1908, p. 1, for accounts of district convention. Register and Leader, March 19, 1908, p. 2, for account of state convention.
43. Burlington Hawk-Eye, July 3, 1910, p. 7.
44. Des Moines Register and Leader, July 3, 1910, p. 2.
45. Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 15, 1912, p. 7.
46. Loc. cit.
47. Ibid., March 17, 1912, p. 2.
48. Ibid., June 30, 1912, p. 7.
49. Ibid., July 21, 1912, p. 8.
50. Ibid., July 25, 1912, p. 1.
51. Ibid., July 21, 1912, p. 8.
53. Loc. cit.
54. Ibid., July 18, 1912, p. 7.
55. William L. Bowers, "The Fruits of Iowa Progressivism," Iowa Journal of History, Vol. 57, No. 1 (January 1959), pp. 34-60. Bowers examines Progressive legislation in Iowa for the period 1900 to 1915, and writes that "the year 1907 seems to have produced a bumper crop of Progressive reform legislation." (P. 46) Examination of the article reveals that by far the majority of Progressive reform legislation was on the books before 1909.

## OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS: PART ONE

Having discussed the most outstanding leaders of the Republican factions in Burlington during the first decade of the twentieth century the question arises as to the nature of the total leadership of these factions. What, if anything, was unique about the local leadership group in the Progressive faction that set it apart from its counterpart, the Standpat faction?

Only a partial answer to this question has been found. But by examining the occupations and the business connections of the lower echelons of leadership in the two factions some idea of their character and make-up, as well as some clues to their motivations for membership in a particular faction, can be found.

The sample

As in the study of the political participation of the members of the two factions the sample used here consists of those who, by their presence on contesting ward delegations, were clearly aligned with a particular faction in 1906 and/or 1908. Those few whose factional affiliations were not determined in this manner were found already labeled in newspaper articles.



Most of these men were leaders only in a limited sense of the term. Few exercised leadership beyond the boundaries of their own precincts. However, inasmuch as their political activity went beyond that of those who did no more than cast their ballots at election time, they have been termed here the lower echelon of factional leadership. They form the lowest segment of leadership that exists in our political structure.

In an effort to gain a clearer picture of the Progressive movement and the Progressive party three notable studies have been made of the collective biographies of state and national leaders in both party and movement.

In 1951 George Mowry published the results of a study of 47 California Progressive leaders who attended the state-wide Progressive conferences in 1907 and 1909.<sup>1</sup> In 1954 Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., published the results of a study of 260 state and national Progressive party leaders.<sup>2</sup>

The most recent of these studies is that of Eli Daniel Potts in a Master's thesis submitted at the State University of Iowa in 1956.<sup>3</sup> Potts examined the collective biographies of 300 Roosevelt Progressive, Cummins Progressive and Standpat leaders in Iowa for the period 1904 to 1914. Potts' is the only one of the three studies which, through comparative analysis of factional membership,

attempted to find the truly unique factors in the make-up of the Progressive leadership.

Complete biographical materials were simply not available for the great majority of the individuals in the sample used in this study. County histories and biographical collections mention only 44 of the 191 men in this sample.

Major reliance was placed upon city directories, supplemented by occasional bits of information from newspapers. The city directories did list occupations and places of employment, and it is from this source that most of the "biographical" information was obtained. This study, then, forms only one section of a true collective biography, and can more correctly be called an occupational analysis.

Given the data supplied in the city directories occupations were arbitrarily separated into two broad groups and one sub-group, according to the nature of employment. These groups were then labeled "X", "Y" and "Z", purely for reasons of convenience. A further category, "R", was used to denote overlapping affiliation times. Before going further a brief explanation of the content of these groupings is in order.

The "X" group consists of persons who, in 1906 and/or 1908, were corporation officials, hired business

managers, professionals (including medical doctors, osteopaths, dentists, lawyers, educators, editors and publishers), government officials, and independent entrepreneurs (including self-employed artisans and business proprietors or partners).

As some members of the "X" group had occupations involving two or more separate business concerns or two or more of the above occupational sub-categories, a need arose for a special sub-grouping under group "X". This sub-group was labeled "Z". It includes, for instance, persons who were corporation officials and at the same time lawyers, lawyers who were at the same time government officials, and business proprietors who were at the same time corporation officials.

The "Y" group consists of those whose occupations were of a nature which placed them in immediate dependence upon others for their livelihood, exclusive of the occupations listed under group "X" above. These were the employed, the wage earners and lower reaches of the salaried classes.

The "R" group consists of those who were repeaters, i.e., those who were clearly identifiable as factional adherents in both 1906 and 1908. As mentioned previously, five persons in this group shifted allegiance between 1906

and 1908. In each case data concerning the repeater group or the entire sample includes these men in the faction to which they adhered in 1908.

Given these groupings, one can cross-classify them in terms of occupations and affiliation times. Thus, for instance, one can speak of the "X-R" group, which is composed of those persons in group "X" who were clearly identifiable as Standpats or Progressives in both 1906 and 1908.

There are 90 Progressive and 101 Standpat representatives in the sample. In Table 9 the total membership of both factions is broken down into the groupings discussed above. From this an over-all view and comparison of the two factions can be gained before viewing the "X" and "Y" groups in greater detail.

The first and most striking distinction between the two factions is found in the relative memberships of the "X" and "Y" groups. While over a third (37.6%) of the Standpats fall into group "Y", over half (55.6%) of the Progressives fall into the same group. Thus it can be seen that the Progressive was far more likely to be a wage-earner or among the lower level of salaried employees than was the Standpat. Conversely, about two-thirds of the Standpats could be called business leaders, government

officials, professionals, or self-employed artisans, while the same could be said of less than half the Progressives.

Second, over one-tenth (12.9%) of the Standpat individuals represented two or more firms or occupations, while the same could be said of only about one-fiftieth (2.2%) of the Progressives.

Thus, while the Progressives were split nearly evenly between the "X" and "Y" groups, the Standpats were heavily weighted toward the "X" group, and had the further distinction of far out-weighting the Progressives in terms of multiple business and occupational connections.

Membership in the "R" group can be taken as some indication of political persistence. The Progressives, in these terms, were slightly more persistent on the whole than the Standpats; i.e., proportionately more Progressives (24.4%) than Standpats (21.8%) were politically active in both 1906 and 1908.

A clearer picture of where the strongest elements of political persistence occur can be obtained by breaking down the "R" group into its "X", "Y" and "Z" components.

In the "X" and "Z" groups a larger proportion of Progressives than Standpats were repeaters (30.0%-28.6%; 100%-61.5%, respectively). However, a larger proportion of the total Standpat faction was composed of repeaters

from these two groups than was true of the Progressives.

In the "Y" group two of every ten Progressives (20.0%) and one of every ten Standpats (10.5%) were repeaters. Thus it seems clear that the "Y" group within the Progressive faction played a more persistent as well as a proportionately larger role than was true of the same group within the Standpat faction.

### The "Y" Group

A more detailed view of the "Y" group can be seen in Table 10. Here the group has been broken down into four broad occupational categories. A glance at the Table shows significant differences in the relative composition of this group within the two factions.

Almost two-thirds (62.9%) of the Standpat "Y" group is composed of white collar workers, i.e., administrative, clerical, and sales personnel, while slightly less than one-third (31.9%) of the Progressive "Y"s fall within this category. (See Table 11 for specific content.) Moreover, a greater proportion of the Standpat "Y"s (17.1%) than of Progressive "Y"s (8.5%) had occupations of a supervisory or "blue collar" nature. (See Table 12 for specific content.)

TABLE 9  
GROSS BREAKDOWN OF PROGRESSIVE AND STANDPAT LEADERSHIP

	Standpat	Progressive
Total persons	101	90
Total "Y" persons	38	50
Total "X" persons	63	40
Total "Z" persons	13	2
Total "R" persons	22	22
Total "Y-R" persons	4	10
Total "X-R" persons	18	12
Total "Z-R" persons	8	2
<u>Percent of total persons represented by:</u>		
"Y" persons	37.6%	55.6%
"X" persons	62.4	44.4
"Z" persons	12.9	2.2
"R" persons	21.8	24.4
"Y-R" persons	4.0	11.1
"X-R" persons	17.8	13.3
"Z-R" persons	7.0	2.2

Taken together the skilled and unskilled categories--clearly the wage-earner segment of the "Y" group--account for over half (59.6%) of the Progressive "Y"s, and close to one-third (31.1%) of the total Progressive sample. These two categories make up only 20% of the Standpat "Y" group and 6.9% of the total Standpat sample.

Quite clearly, the wage-earner and lower-salaried classes comprised an important and unique segment of the lower echelons of Progressive leadership in Burlington in 1906 and 1908. Moreover, and more uniquely, the skilled and unskilled wage-earner dominated this segment.

Just as clearly, though the wage-earner and lower-salaried classes comprised a lesser segment of the lower echelons of the Standpat leadership, this segment was dominated on the Standpat side by the white collar and blue collar workers.

There seems to be no clear-cut answer as to why this should be so.

Mowry, describing the California Progressive's attitude toward organized labor, writes that "so long as organized labor was reasonably ineffective as an economic bargaining agent, the California progressives were inclined to view the movement more or less tolerantly."<sup>4</sup>



TABLE 10  
COMPOSITION OF THE "Y" GROUP BY CATEGORIES

	<u>Standpat</u>		<u>Progressive</u>	
	persons	percent total "Y"	persons	percent total "Y"
WHITE COLLAR	22	62.9%	15	31.9%
BLUE COLLAR	6	17.1%	4	8.5%
SKILLED	4	11.4%	20	42.6%
UNSKILLED	3	8.6%	8	17.0%
TOTALS:	35	100.0%	47	100.0%

TABLE 11  
COMPOSITION OF THE  
"WHITE COLLAR" CATEGORY IN THE "Y" GROUP

	<u>Standpat</u>	<u>Progressive</u>
Commercial traveler or sales agent.....	3	5
Clerk.....	9	7
Store manager or department manager.....	1	1
Bookkeeper.....	2	1
Secretary.....	3	1
Assistant bank cashier.....	2	
Cashier (C. B. & Q. freighthouse).....	1	
Bill collector.....	1	
Totals:	22	15
Percent of total "Y" group:	62.9%	31.9%

TABLE 12  
COMPOSITION OF THE  
"BLUE COLLAR" CATEGORY IN THE "Y" GROUP

	Standpat	Progressive
Foreman.....	3	4
Construction boss.....	1	
Stable boss.....	1	
Train dispatcher.....	1	
Totals:	6	4
Percent of total "Y" group:	17.1%	8.5%

TABLE 13  
COMPOSITION OF THE  
UNSKILLED CATEGORY IN THE "Y" GROUP

	Standpat	Progressive
Laborer.....	1	3
Teamster.....	2	2
Driver.....		3
Totals:	3	8
Percent of total "Y" group:	8.6%	17.0%

TABLE 14  
 COMPOSITION OF THE  
 SKILLED WORKER CATEGORY IN THE "Y" GROUP

	Standpat	Progressive
Cooper.....	1	
Bartender.....	1	
Machinest.....	2	1
Tailor.....		1
Jeweler.....		1
Photographer.....		1
Piano tuner.....		1
Gardener.....		1
Blacksmith.....		1
Boilermaker.....		1
Finisher.....		1
Harnessmaker.....		2
Packer.....		2
Cigar maker.....		3
Tinner.....		4
Totals:	4	20
Percent of total "Y" group:	11.4%	42.6%

The Burlington city directory of 1906 lists some 32 labor organizations which met regularly, ranging from organizations of barbers and broommakers to railway trainmen and woodworkers. It seems more than likely that many if not all of those listed in the skilled worker category in the sample were members of these labor organizations. There could hardly be a question of the Progressives' tolerance of the organized laborer, at any rate, especially as it is quite possible that some 20% of the local Progressive leaders were members of labor organizations.

However, there is also little reason to believe that these organizations operated as effective economic bargaining agents. Only one local strike was reported in the newspapers between 1904 and 1908, a strike by members of the Woodworkers Union Number 200 against the Leopold Desk Company starting on April 15, 1905.<sup>5</sup> The strikers were mainly skilled workers in the machinery department of the plant, which employed 138, many of whom were unskilled boys. Of the total strike force of about 80 men only 48 were union men, though a "large number" of the remainder were reported to have joined the union once the strike started.<sup>6</sup>

Apparently there were no demonstrations or violence, and a company official was happy to report that

the strikers were "conducting themselves in a most commendable manner." This was five days after the strike started, and on the same day "several" of the strikers applied for work, though not enough to start work in the machinery department again. Also on the same day five men in the shipping department were fired for "taking advantage of the situation to make extraordinary demands."<sup>7</sup>

On April 22 a company official published a statement to the effect that outside help would have to be obtained to run the machinery department, as there were not enough skilled machine operators in Burlington to fill the jobs. Nothing more concerning the strike was printed in the Hawk-Eye. Apparently the jobs were filled and the strike fizzled.<sup>8</sup>

Richard Hofstadter, in The Age of Reform, has pointed out the rapid rise in the cost of living between 1897 and 1913, and has suggested that rising prices "added to the strength of Progressive discontents." He goes on to say that the rise in living costs

...took on added significance because it was associated in the public mind with two other unwelcome tendencies: the sudden development of a vigorous, if small, labor movement, and an extraordinary acceleration in the trustification of American industry.<sup>9</sup>

It must be remembered that Hofstadter is taking the middle class as a point of departure in his analysis

of the Progressive movement. Using the same ideas and facts expressed above, but taking instead of the middle class the organized wage-earner as a point of departure, these could be used to explain the presence of a significant group of organized wage-earners in the Progressive leadership in Burlington.

There is some evidence that this group was concerned about the rise in prices they had experienced. The unionized workers in the Leopold strike, for instance, had asked for a flat 10% increase in wages, basing their demand on the higher cost of living, and specifically on the higher cost of rent, fuel and clothing.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, they too could have been concerned over the "trustification of American industry;" certainly Governor Cummins spoke often enough of and himself showed enough concern over the growth of trusts to have made them cognizant of the situation. Their position outside the middle class did not preclude them from any of the above middle class grounds for joining the Progressive movement other than their lack of fear of the consequences of a "vigorous, if small, labor movement."

Though little evidence exists upon which to base a truly defensible conclusion, the political circumstances existing in Burlington in 1906 do provide some basis for a

further tentative explanation regarding the existence of a predominant group of skilled wage-earners within the Progressive "Y" group.

Prior to 1906 the Standpats controlled the local political organization. This group--the Standpat leadership--was composed primarily of businessmen and professionals, and secondarily of what may be assumed to have been management-oriented white collar workers. None of these have been noted for their sympathy for the aims of organized labor.

With the seats of local political power occupied by these groups, there would be little room for representatives of the relatively new and growing force of skilled and organized wage-earners. In 1906 an almost entirely new political group in terms of personnel--the Progressive faction--arose and sought to change local politics from its sedentary character, with the politically established Standpats comfortably seated, to a rousing game of musical chairs. The prospect of a wild scramble for seats might well have been inviting to a group whose feet were beginning to ache. In short, it seems possible that the Progressive movement may have offered the organized wage-earner his first real opportunity for political participation as opposed to mere political expression through voting. Nor need

the pursuit of this opportunity have implied a calculated drive towards a specific legislative goal. It must be remembered that this was an era when "the people" were being urged to exercise their political rights against "the interests" and "the trusts." It may well be that the organized wage-earner felt mainly an urge to join through political participation this select group, "the people."

In none of the three studies of Progressive leadership mentioned previously were representatives of the occupational class that has here been labeled "Y" to be found.

Chandler found that among the group he studied ...there were no farmers, no laboring men, and only one labor-union leader. Nor were there any representatives of the non-professional or white collar workers.<sup>11</sup>

Mowry's study revealed "a group of highly literate, independent free enterprisers and professional men," who were the "well fixed" and "fortunate sons of the upper middle class."<sup>12</sup> Potts did find that ten percent of the fathers of Roosevelt Progressives and one percent of the fathers of the leaders of the other two factions were laborers, mechanics, or engineers.<sup>13</sup> But none found leaders who were themselves of the wage-earner or lower-salaried classes.



This is not surprising, of course. These are studies of leadership groups on the state and national level, and it would have been especially strange in 1908 or 1912 to have found a tinner or harnessmaker in the bosom of the party elite.

Yet, when once descends from the state to the local and precinct level one finds that about one-half the Cummins Progressive leaders of Burlington were tanners, harnessmakers, laborers, clerks and the like. Mike Flynn, for instance, was guard of a stone gang, baseball umpire, policeman and, it appears, of no definite occupation shortly before becoming quite active in Burlington Progressive politics in 1906. Charles O'Malley, cigar maker and union official, played a prominent role in Progressive politics in 1906 and 1908. These two, in fact, were probably next to Copeland in leadership of the Burlington Progressives.

This is not to suggest that studies of the personnel of the higher levels of leadership are not in themselves valuable. What it does suggest is that studies of leadership on these levels, taken alone, may totally obscure what may be important elements in the make-up of a political movement as a whole. It suggests further that generalizations based upon studies of high-level leadership

alone may be dangerous indeed, if used to explain and rationalize an entire political movement.

Professor Hofstadter, in The Age of Reform, has developed a theory about the mainsprings of the Progressive movement based largely upon the studies of Mowry and Chandler of state and national leadership of the movement and party. The crux of this theory is that the old and individualistic middle classes--"the old gentry, the merchants of long standing, the small manufacturers, the established professional men, the civic leaders of an earlier era"--responded to the increasing influence in civic and economic affairs on the part of "the newly rich, the grandiosely or corruptly rich, the masters of great corporations."<sup>14</sup> Participation in the Progressive movement was part of this response to changing patterns of power and prestige, argues Hofstadter, and he has called this response a status revolution. There is no room in this scheme for the lower-than-middle classes.

Mowry found the California Progressive prejudiced against organized labor, and that his "bias against labor was always greater than against the large corporation."<sup>15</sup> Hofstadter appears to have accepted and generalized upon this finding, for there is no room either, in the status revolution theory, for the organized wage-earner.

In short, the wage-earner and lower-salaried classes lay outside the middle class of which Hofstadter writes. Neither does the organized wage-earner represent an old and established class declining in power and prestige; he belongs instead to a new class seeking to become established, and seeking socially accepted power which had never been his, had yet to be his, and thus could not decline.

Surely active support of a political movement on the part of an identifiable and somewhat unique segment of the population at the lowest, grass-roots level of leadership is of some importance in the determination of the overall character of that movement. The status revolution theory neither takes into account the presence of such a segment of non-middle class population in the Progressive movement nor explains how or why it could be there at all.

It may be, of course, that Burlington was an unique case and its leadership abberational in make-up. But this only suggests that further study in the area of grass-roots leadership might be profitable for the student of the Progressive movement. High-level leadership can at best present an obscuring distillation of a multitude of possibly important factors that go into the formation of a mass political movement. This is true also, though to a

lesser degree, of the lowest levels of leadership. Beyond the precinct level of leadership, however, the paths of historical research are dark indeed.

NOTES

1. George Mowry, The California Progressives, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951.
2. Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., "The Origins of Progressive Leadership," The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt, Vol. VIII, Appendix III, Edited by Elting E. Morison, John M. Blum, Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., and Sylvia Rice, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.
3. Eli Daniel Potts, A Comparative Study of the Leadership of Republican Factions in Iowa, 1904-1914, Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of History: State University of Iowa, 1954.
4. Mowry, op. cit., p. 93.
5. Burlington Hawk-Eye, April 16, 1905, p. 5.
6. Ibid., April 18, 1905, p. 7.
7. Ibid., April 20, 1905, p. 6.
8. Ibid., April 22, 1905, p. 6.
9. Hofstadter, The Age of Reform, p. 168.
10. Burlington Hawk-Eye, April 16, 1905, p. 5.
11. Chandler, op. cit., pp. 1462-1463.
12. Mowry, op. cit., p. 88.
13. Potts, op. cit., p. 35.
14. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 137.
15. Mowry, op. cit., pp. 92-93.

## OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS: PART TWO

The main emphasis of the last chapter was placed upon the "Y" group. The "X" group is the focal point of this chapter.

Analytical Perspectives

The "X" group can be viewed from at least two perspectives with the data available in this study. The first of these is the one taken by Chandler, Mowry and Potts. It tends to view a given sample mainly in terms of occupation. The focus of this approach is on the question: "What is done?" A second perspective is permitted by data which includes not only the nature of employment but the nature of the employer. The focus can then shift to the question: "What is done for whom?"

In the first of these perspectives the economic characteristics of a particular occupation have been viewed mainly as determinants of the socio-economic status of the occupation, and have been considered important primarily because they permit that occupation be assigned a position on a socio-economic scale. Chandler, Mowry and Hofstadter have been mainly impressed, for instance, by the middle class status represented by the occupations of the Progressives, and Potts has been interested in the occupations

of his sample mainly in order to determine whether or not the middle class status of the Progressives was unique to them.

There are at least two limitations to this perspective. One is that the contents of socio-economic classes are determined by somewhat nebulous criteria and are not clearly circumscribed. The problem in most cases seems not to be one of what to include in a particular class but rather one of what to exclude from a particular class. Another limitation is that this approach allows only a macroscopic view of specific economic interests which may be represented by those in a given occupational grouping.

The second of these perspectives overcomes the drawbacks of the first to some extent. Less emphasis is placed upon the socio-economic status of the individual and more is placed on the relationship between the individual and specific economic enterprise, or groups of similar economic enterprises.\*

---

\* It is interesting that Mowry, in The California Progressives, tends to shift perspectives when writing of the Conservative opposition to the Progressives. An attorney for the Southern Pacific, for instance, gains significance not because his occupation affords a particular social status, but because his occupation affords a peculiar relationship to a particular economic institution with unique interests.

Inasmuch as persons in the "X" group are either self-employed or share major responsibility in the direction of business concerns it is assumed that they have some economic stake in the success or failure of the businesses with which they are connected. While this is not an argument that economic considerations are the only or even the prime determinants of political behavior, it does assume that economic factors may enter into political behavior.

In the next section the "X" group will be dealt with from the first of the above perspectives in what might be called the "occupations approach." In the following section the "X" group will be dealt with from the second perspective, in what might be called the "business affiliations" approach.

### Occupations

In Table 15 the "X" group is broken down into five occupational categories, and the "X", "Z", and "R" representations for each category are given. What is most readily apparent here is that the Standpats have a numerical superiority in all categories save one. This is not surprising, as the Standpats have half again as many persons in group "X" as do the Progressives.



Because of the Standpat numerical superiority in group "X" a comparison of raw numerical data would prove little and only serve to highlight their plurality. What is required is an "equalizing" factor which will artificially make the Progressive total of persons equal to the Standpat without destroying the original proportions of Progressive representations for each category. Then a basis for comparison will have been laid.

This has been done in the following manner: first the proportion by which the Standpat total of persons was greater than the Progressive total of persons was found by dividing 40 into 63. The resulting quotient of 1.575--the "equalizing" factor--was then multiplied by the numerical categorical representations of the Progressives to yield an adjusted numerical representation which preserved the original proportions of the categorical representations. The adjusted Progressive totals for each category listed on Table 15, in order are 11, 14, 36, and 4.

In Table 16 these adjusted figures have been used to determine which occupational categories are dominated by which faction. This has been done by finding the numerical difference between the Standpat representations in each category and the adjusted Progressive representations

TABLE 15  
 OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES  
 REPRESENTED BY PERSONS IN GROUP "X"

	<u>Standpat</u>			<u>Progressive</u>		
	X	Z	R	X	Z	R
Professionals*	22	6	12	7	1	1
Corporation executives	17	7	7	9	1	7
Business proprietors and/or partners**	23	5	3	23	1	2
Government officials	5	4	4	3	1	3
Hired business managers	5	-	1	-	-	-
TOTAL REPRESENTATIONS	72	22		42	4	
TOTAL PERSONS	63	13	18	40	2	12

\* Category includes all lawyers, doctors, dentists, educators, editors and publishers.

\*\* Category does not include law partnerships.

in each category. Thus, for instance, the Standpats have 22 representations in the Professionals category and the Progressives 11 adjusted representations. This leaves the Standpats with a numerical difference, or plurality, of 11 representations in this category.

From this it can be seen that the Progressives are represented most strongly in the Business Proprietors and/or Partners category. Most of those in the Progressive "X" group were small businessmen.

Turning to Table 17 one can see that over half (57.5%) of the Progressives in group "X" were proprietors or partners, while over one third (36.5%) of the Standpats were of this occupation. However, there is little difference between the two factions in terms of the proportion of proprietors and/or partners in the total sample; 24.4% of the total Progressive and 22.8% of the total Standpat sample were of this category.

The Standpats are represented most strongly in the Professionals category. Over a third (34.9%) of the Standpats in group "X" were professionals, and over one fifth (21.8%) of the total Standpat sample was composed of professionals. The Progressive proportions were about half this; 17.5% of their group "X", and only 7.8% of their total group were professionals.

TABLE 16

OCCUPATIONAL REPRESENTATIONS BY PERSONS IN GROUP "X"  
 CATEGORICALLY RANKED BY NUMERICAL DIFFERENCE FROM  
 GREATEST STANDPAT TO GREATEST PROGRESSIVE REPRESENTATION\*

Standpat	Numerical difference	Progressive
Professionals.....	11	
Hired business managers..	5	
Corporation executives...	3	
Government officials.....	1	
	13	....Business proprietors and/or partners

\* See pages 115-117 for explanation.

This is a different pattern than found by Chandler, Mowry or Potts. Chandler found that over sixty percent (63.5%) of his 260\* Progressive Party leaders were professional men.<sup>1</sup> Thirty-four (72.3%) of the forty-seven California Progressives in Mowry's sample were professional men.<sup>2</sup> By combining Potts' figures for professional men and lawyers (he separates the two) one finds that 43% of the Cummins leaders and 35% of the Standpat leaders in Iowa were professional men.<sup>3</sup>

The disparity between the proportion of professional men found in the leadership on the local level and that found on the state and national level suggests strongly that professional men--especially lawyers--survive the selective process that promotes men beyond the level of local leadership more readily than do others, and thus lend distortion to the total picture of group make-up.

Chandler has written:

Traditionally American political leaders have been lawyers and editors. Since the men of the law and the press in the West lived in the largest cities...they had little sympathy with the Democratic heirs to Populism. Many in fact, had long been active in local Republican politics. Yet,

---

\* Chandler's figures actually add up to 261 Progressive party leaders in the sample.

TABLE 17

REPRESENTATIONS IN GROUP "X" OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES EXPRESSED  
AS PERCENTS OF TOTAL PERSONS IN GROUP "X" AND TOTAL PERSONS IN  
EACH FACTION

	<u>Standpat</u>		<u>Progressive</u>	
	<u>n</u> 63	<u>n</u> 101	<u>n</u> 40	<u>n</u> 90
Professionals (22-7)*	34.9%	21.8%	17.5%	7.8%
Corporation executives (17-9)	27.0	16.8	22.5	10.0
Business Proprietors and/or Partners (23-23)	36.5	22.8	57.5	24.4
Government officials (5-3)	7.9	5.0	7.5	3.3
Hired business managers (5-0)	7.9	5.0	---	---
TOTAL "X" PERSONS		63		40
TOTAL PERSONS		101		90

\* Numbers in parentheses denote total Standpat and Progressive persons, respectively, in each category.

like the earlier agrarians, these Republicans from the cities of the West found an enemy in the railroads and industrial corporations whose managers, usually living in the distant East, held such economic power over the business life of the West.<sup>4</sup>

Burlington is not located in the West, of course, but the above serves to point out what might at first glance appear unique about Burlington politics. Here the very core of opposition to the Progressives was to be found; here, among the lawyers and the press, was the closest friendship to a railroad that must have held considerable power over the business life of the community.

One factor which probably influenced the alliance between the professionals of Burlington and the railroad was that the management of the C. B. & Q. did not seem distant. Indeed, the seat of the C. B. & Q.'s empire seemed located in Burlington. The president of the line made his home there for many years. The line's most powerful hired hand, J. W. Blythe, lived in Burlington even though it meant a lot of traveling between there and his Chicago office, and he seems, moreover, to have been an immensely likeable and approachable person. All in all, it is this

situation which is unique of Burlington. Given this situation, the professionals' affiliation with the railroad in politics is not so unique.

It is difficult if not impossible to see even the faintest stirrings in Burlington of the status revolution described by Hofstadter in The Age of Reform. The "old-family, college-educated class that had deep ancestral roots. . .and often owned family businesses, that had traditions of political leadership. . .,"<sup>5</sup> was probably more familiar to the East than to the Middle West. Nothing quite like it existed in Burlington in the first decade of the twentieth century. The closest thing in Burlington to such a class, however, was the middle class Standpat. And he stood not for the status revolution but for the status quo.

#### Business Affiliations

It has been established that persons in group "X" are at least in part responsible for the direction of the affairs of the businesses with which they are connected. With this much given, and with a knowledge of particular businesses represented by persons in this group, the following questions can be asked: What types of businesses are represented, and what is the distribution of representations?



Which types of businesses, if any, are unique in that they are predominantly represented in one faction and not the other? What possible reasons might there be for a particular type of business to be predominantly represented in only one faction?

The answer to the first of these questions can best be found in Table 18. There the businesses have been classed by types.\* Individual businesses fell rather naturally into fourteen categories. "X", "Z", and "R" representations are given for each faction.

The following points are most immediately apparent from Table 18: There are no Progressive representations for lumber companies and transportation and communications companies; there is only one Progressive representative in banking; and there are no Standpat representatives in wholesaling. Moreover, there is definite Standpat domination of the professions, as has already been noted. The Professions category is not broken down into its components; if it were it could be seen that eleven Standpats are lawyers. Only one Progressive is a lawyer.

---

\* A full list of specific businesses represented under each category is presented in Appendix III.

TABLE 18  
 BUSINESS CATEGORIES  
 REPRESENTED BY PERSONS IN GROUP "X"

	<u>Standpat</u>			<u>Progressive</u>		
	X	Z	R	X	Z	R
Lumber companies (4-0)@.....	5	4	3	-	-	-
Transportation & communications (4-0).....	4	-	2	-	-	-
Banks (8-1).....	9*	7*	5*	1	1	1
Professions (20-7).....	21	7	11	7+	1+	1+
Government officials (5-3).	6	5	5	3+	1+	3+
Insurance, loans, real estate, abstracts, brokerage (4-4).....	6*	3*	2*	4	-	1
Producers for industrial consumption (4-2).....	4*	3*	3*	3	2	2
Producers for non-industrial consumption (3-6).....	3	-	-	6	1	4
Retailers (12-14).....	12*	-	2*	14	-	1
Wholesalers (0-3).....	-	-	-	3	1	2
Self-employed artisans (8-4).....	8	2	-	4	-	-
Other (1-0).....	1	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL REPRESENTATIONS	80	31		46	7	
TOTAL PERSONS	63	13	18	40	2	12

@ The numbers in parenthesis denote the actual number of individuals representing each business category for Standpat and Progressive factions respectively.

\* Denotes representations that include those of persons who shifted allegiance from the Progressives in 1906 to the Standpats in 1908.

+ Denotes representations that include those of persons who shifted allegiance from the Standpats in 1906 to the Progressives in 1908.

The above points become even more apparent when the various categories are ranked by numerical difference from greatest Standpat to greatest Progressive representation. Here, as in the comparison of occupational representations, an "equalizing" factor has been used. The results are shown in Table 19. Standpat strength in the professions, banking, lumber, and transportation and communications stands out. Likewise, Progressive strength in retailing, producers of consumer goods, and wholesaling stands out.

Turning to Table 20 one can see that banking, lumber and transportation and communications account for 22.8% of all Standpat business representations. These same categories account for only 2.2% of all Progressive representations.

There were eleven Standpat and one Progressive lawyers. If these are added to the above representations, then banking, lumber, transportation and communications, and the law account for 36.0% of the Standpat business representations. These account for only 4.3% of Progressive business representations.

Clearly, then, the above three business categories plus law stand out as being uniquely Standpat.

TABLE 19

BUSINESS REPRESENTATIONS BY PERSONS IN GROUP "X"  
 CATEGORICALLY RANKED BY NUMERICAL DIFFERENCE  
 FROM GREATEST STANDPAT TO GREATEST PROGRESSIVE  
 REPRESENTATION\*

Standpat	Numerical difference	Progressive
Professions.....	10	
Banks.....	8	
Lumber.....	5	
Transportation and communications....	4	
Self-employed artisans...	2	
Government officials.....	2	
	4	.....Wholesalers
	6	..Producers of consumers goods
	11	.....Retailers

There is numerical equality in two categories: pro-  
 ducers of industrial goods; and insurance, real  
 estate, etc.

\* See pages 115-117 for explanation.

TABLE 20

BUSINESS REPRESENTATIONS OF THE "X" GROUP EXPRESSED  
AS PERCENTS OF TOTAL "X" PERSONS AND AS PERCENTS OF  
TOTAL BUSINESS REPRESENTATIONS

	Number (N) representations	<u>N</u> 63	<u>N</u> 80
<u>STANDPATS:</u>			
Professions	21	33.3%	26.3%
Retailers	12	19.0	15.0
Banks	9	14.3	11.5
Self-employed artisans	8	12.7	10.0
Insurance, real estate, etc.	6	9.5	7.5
Government officials	6	9.5	7.5
Lumber	5	7.9	6.3
Transportation & communications	4	6.3	5.0
Producers of industrial goods	4	6.3	5.0
Producers of consumer goods	3	4.8	3.8
<u>TOTAL REPRESENTATIONS</u>	<u>80</u>		
<u>TOTAL PERSONS</u>	<u>63</u>		
		<u>N</u> 40	<u>N</u> 46
<u>PROGRESSIVES:</u>			
Retailers	14	35.0%	30.4%
Professions	7	17.5	15.2
Producers of consumer goods	6	15.0	13.0
Self-employed artisans	4	10.0	8.7
Insurance, real estate, etc.	4	10.0	8.7
Wholesalers	3	7.5	6.5
Government officials	3	7.5	6.5
Producers of industrial goods	3	7.5	6.5
Banks	1	2.5	2.2
<u>TOTAL REPRESENTATIONS</u>	<u>46</u>		
<u>TOTAL PERSONS</u>	<u>40</u>		

Just as clearly, wholesaling stands out as being uniquely Progressive, while wholesaling, retailing, and production of consumer goods are categories represented predominantly by Progressives. Together, these three categories account for 49.9% of the Progressive representations. They account for only 18.15% of the Standpat representations.

The Standpat Hegemony in Banking, Lumber, Law, and Transportation and Communications

Standpat predominance in banking, lumber, law and transportation and communications is the most striking fact about the "X" group. Using the railroad as a point of departure, as its domination of and adherence to the Standpat faction in Burlington seems well established, this unique predominance can be explained partly in terms of a web of personal and business relationships.

Two attorneys, William D. Eaton and J. W. Blythe, represent the C. B. & Q. in the "X" group. Blythe seems to have had some interest in lumbering arising from his railroad employment, for on a trip to Washington in 1905 he took time out to meet with "many leading railway men" who were attending the American Forestry congress.<sup>6</sup>

Horace Rand, Blythe's brother-in-law, was president and treasurer of both the Rand and the Burlington lumber companies, and was also an officer of the Iowa State Savings Bank and a director of the First National Bank. Thomas Hedge, Blythe's law partner, was president of the Gilbert-Hedge Lumber Company and a director of the First National Bank. Samuel P. Gilbert was second vice-president of the German-American Savings Bank and secretary and treasurer of the Gilbert-Hedge Lumber Company. William Carson, though not known to be a Standpat, was president of the First National Bank and a vice-president of the Burlington Lumber Company, showing, at least, a further link between banking and the lumber business. George H. Higbee was president of the Burlington Savings Bank and president of the Murray Iron Works Company, which sold most of its iron castings to the C. B. & Q., and which had been "found in a badly crippled condition" until Murray "arranged for capital and credit and secured the patronage of the C. B. & Q." back in the 1870's.<sup>7</sup> (Higbee's son, George H., was also an active Standpat, and superintendent of the Murray Iron Works Company.) Moreover, former C. B. & Q. president Charles Perkins had been a director of the Iowa State Savings and the First National banks until his death in 1907.<sup>8</sup>

Two Standpat lawyers are known to have had direct or indirect ties with railroads in their careers. LaMonte Cowles had been four years a civil engineer for the Union Pacific and the Burlington & Missouri railroads, "locating and constructing their lines in Colorado, Idaho, Kansas and other western states" before taking up law.<sup>9</sup> Cornelius L. Poor, a staunch Standpat, is credited with having been four times the campaign manager of Senator John Gear, a former railroad man and a great friend of the railroads while in office.<sup>10</sup>

There appears to be some link, too, between communications and lumber. Samuel T. Huebner, Burlington manager of the Iowa Telephone Company, one of the largest in the state, was among the members of a conference held by two lumbermen's associations of the upper Mississippi Valley in 1905.<sup>11</sup> A practical interest in lumber dealers' affairs would not be out of place for the manager of a company requiring large quantities of telephone poles, and in 1905 the Iowa Telephone Company had 6,366 miles of line in the state.<sup>12</sup>

These business categories appear to have been bound together by a rather extensive web of personal and business ties, and include the most powerful and influential businesses and men in Burlington.



### The Lumber-Railroad Axis

For lumbermen especially there seem to have been practical business reasons for a sound relationship with the railroads. Lumbering was big business in many Mississippi River towns prior to the decline of the forests of Wisconsin and Minnesota. Tremendous rafts of logs were floated downriver, manufactured into lumber, and sold to points west from these river distribution centers. By 1910 the Southeastern Iowa Lumbermen's Association was bemoaning the "woeful falling off in the rafting trade," and noted that "there are today only five saw mills south of St. Paul and of these Burlington boasts one."<sup>13</sup> In 1906 the Evening Gazette could boast that "Burlington manufactures and sells more lumber than any point on the Mississippi River between La Crosse and St. Louis."<sup>14</sup>

There were three large lumber companies in Burlington in 1906. The Gilbert-Hedge Lumber Company, organized in the early 1850's, employed 100 men and sold 18,000,000 board feet of lumber in 1905.<sup>15</sup> The Rand Lumber Company, one of the oldest in Iowa, had a history going back to 1842. In 1906 it was beginning to turn away from the dwindling supply of northern timber, and was gradually turning to western timber and "large amounts of yellow pine and cypress from the South."<sup>16</sup>

The Burlington Lumber Company was largest of all. In 1906 it employed 300 "during the busy season," had an annual pay-roll of \$125,000 and a twenty-acre plant with a capacity of 150,000 feet a day. Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma and Illinois were included in its market area. The company made a specialty of railroad bridge timber.<sup>17</sup>

With increasing reliance on timber supplies in the West and South, and with market areas inaccessible by water routes, railroads and railroad rates were crucial factors in the success of Burlington lumber companies. The importance of these factors was brought clearly to the fore in 1905, when the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce began hearings on what was to become the Hepburn Act of 1906.

On May 12, 1905, Horace Rand appeared before the Committee to testify against any legislation to give a government commission power to regulate railroad rates. He made clear that he was interested in the lumber industry in the states of Washington, Idaho, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa, and that he had "some mills in Idaho and other places."<sup>18</sup>

Rand's statement brought to light the fact that the lumber companies of the upper Mississippi Valley area

had a mutually profitable agreement with the railroads on shipping rates for lumber. His greatest fear was that a commission empowered to tamper with rates would establish distance tariffs to replace the delicate balance of the established rate-making system. He warned:

There can be but one ultimate outcome of a rate-making commission. That is a distance tariff, and any other method would swamp the commission with complaints at once, and I venture to assert that it would take ten men ten years to settle the lumber tariffs alone.<sup>19</sup>

The basis of the profitability of upper Mississippi Valley lumbering, said Rand, was an agreement between railroads and lumbermen known as the "Bogue differentials," an intricate schedule of freight rates for lumber from differing points of production to common markets. In his statement before the Committee Rand described the conditions that had led to the establishment of the Bogue differentials in 1884:

Before May, 1884, there was extreme competition between the railroads running from Chicago, which represented the Michigan and lake producing lumber points; Minneapolis, with what was then known as the Wisconsin and Minnesota lumber mills, and points like Winona, Dubuque, Clinton, Rock Island, Muscatine, Burlington, ... known as the Mississippi River mills, to get control of the Missouri River market, extending from Sioux City and Kansas City and west thereof. The manufacturers accepted rebates, underbilled cars, and resorted to every device known to move their lumber to Missouri River territory at the lowest minimum cost--I am one of them--and

chaos would be a mild word to express the condition of the Missouri River lumber market at that time. The railroads and producers, both realizing they were doing business for less than cost, held a meeting and, after due consideration, agreed on what was known as the "Bogue differentials."....<sup>20</sup>

The Bogue differentials, according to William Z. Ripley, in Railway Problems, were designed by George Bogue, arbiter for the Southwestern Railway Association and the Central Iowa and Northwestern Traffic Association, and former member of the Illinois railroad commission.<sup>21</sup> Their purpose was to divide the business up between the railroads and to remove competitive advantages enjoyed by a few lumber producers so that all could benefit. Writes Ripley:

What he evidently intended was that lumber should cost the producer approximately the same when delivered at destination, whether manufactured at one place or another. Increased charges for transportation were to offset advantages of location or other natural facilities for cheap production. In this way the tonnage was to be fairly divided between the roads, and the prosperity of all these towns secured by enabling them to compete on an even footing in the common markets.<sup>22</sup>

"These rates have stood the test of time," said Rand, and the principle behind them had been applied to the rates made on western and southern timber shipped to the Middle West as well. Regarding the South, Rand said:

Transportation companies covering this section encouraged lumber producers to locate timber and build the necessary plants....They gave all the implied, if not actual, promise that rates of transportation should be the same to common markets, or nearly so, regardless of distance, and on this basis a very large and prosperous business has been built.<sup>23</sup>

Rand did his best to show that the Bogue differentials were crucial to the prosperity of the lumber business in the country, and that they should not be tampered with:

Timber has been bought, mills built, and plants equipped and started throughout the entire country, both East, West, North, and South, on the basis that railroads and transportation companies would make rates based on the cost of the product as delivered to them, and the value of such product when delivered to the consuming community. In other words, they make the rates what the traffic will bear; and that is what we all do.<sup>24</sup>

In August of 1905 the Mississippi Valley Manufacturing Association declared itself "in favor of leaving the rate making power where it now rests, with the railroads themselves." The Hawk-Eye added an editorial postscript to this. "The gret (sid) laumber (sic) interests of the upper Mississippi Valley have been built up under a system of freight rate discrimination," it said, and warned: "That leeway of individual initiative must be left undisturbed or the lumber interests will suffer and the industry decline. . . ." <sup>25</sup>

It seems quite apparent that railroad rates mutually advantageous to both railroad and lumber interests play an important role in the alliance between the two businesses. Further, it seems more than likely that this business alliance was an important factor in the political alliance between these two groups in Burlington.

#### Railroad Rates as a Factor in Factionalism

Other manufacturers in Burlington appear to have enjoyed favorable freight rates too.

In a letter to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce dated May 17, 1905, Horace Rand set out to prove this point. In his letter Rand included a rate table comparing rates made to Burlington manufacturers of machinery, furniture, and implements and wagons with those made to manufacturers of like goods in other cities shipping to the same markets. "On these rates," wrote Rand,

...the Murray Iron Works Co. are enabled to sell the best and cheapest Corliss engine in America, and you will find their engines running in every state of the Union.

The Leopold Desk Co. can make desks from mahogany grown in Africa and ship them not only to all the states, but to Europe, Asia and Africa.

The Chittenden-Eastman Co. are enabled to be the largest jobbers and manufacturers of furniture in the United States.

The Mississippi Valley Pearl Button Co. sell their buttons in competition with any factory in the world....<sup>26</sup>

Whether or not because of favorable railroad rates, the companies specifically mentioned above (and they were the only companies specifically mentioned in Rand's letter) all had representatives in the Standpat "X" group. There were no "X" group representations for these firms by the Progressives.

Affiliation with the Standpats may have been more a negative than a positive response on the part of those shippers who enjoyed favorable freight rates. If favorable rates were of importance to their businesses they would hardly have appreciated any tampering with these rates, especially by those asking for a general revision of rates with the intention of "equalizing" them. Little could be gained by such a review and much might be lost. The Progressives in Burlington definitely favored tampering with Iowa freight rates and making them more equitable, and had favored regulation of interstate rates as well.

The only concrete, non-ideological expression of Progressive dissatisfaction which appeared on the Burlington scene centered on the issue of railroad rates. This dissatisfaction first came into the open in 1906, when the

Progressives fought to nominate one of their number, Eugene Buttles, for a position on the state railroad commission.

The battle over Buttles' nomination perhaps sheds some light, too, on the fact that wholesaling was a business category (and the only one) represented solely by Progressives. Nothing is known as to the extent of the businesses of two of the firms represented in this category, but Copeland's firm was reported doing a half-million dollar business in 1906, shipping and receiving 700 to 800 carloads of fruit annually. The Progressives in wholesaling had one thing in common: they all dealt in perishable foodstuffs. And while Horace Rand was at some pains to point out that Burlington manufacturers received favorable shipping rates, he mentioned nothing about shippers of perishables.

The Progressives who bolted the county convention in 1906 had adopted a resolution endorsing the railroad rate legislation "advocated by our president and governor." Shortly afterwards Copeland, acting as chairman of the Progressive Republican Committee for Des Moines county, sent a letter to the Register and Leader asking for revision of Iowa freight rates as well. In the letter Copeland first attacked the Standpat nominee for railroad commissioner,



the incumbent Colonel David J. Palmer of Washington, Iowa:

"Colonel Palmer has always been the close political friend and associate of J. W. Blythe. He owes his elevation to office directly to the power of Mr. Blythe in Iowa politics, and is today the most loyal lieutenant of Mr. Blythe in the First District."<sup>27</sup>

Having established that Palmer was firmly under the thumb of the railroads, Copeland got down to what seems to have been the crux of the matter, writing:

"...We find the railroad commission established a classification and schedule of freight rates for Iowa seventeen years ago. The schedule remains the same to this day, and the classification is but slightly changed. During nine years of that time Palmer has been on the commission. At the time these rates were made they were then low and Iowa led the procession in the demand for equitable rates. Today they are above average for this group of states and higher than the average in the United States. Everybody has made progress but Iowa. Here is an issue that demands serious consideration. Upon it we plant the candidacy of Eugene Buttles.

"We promise that he will give the people of the state a 'square deal.' We also promise he will give the railroad corporations a 'square deal,' with their approval, we hope, but if not he will give it to them anyhow...."<sup>28</sup>

While this letter was doubtless intended to appeal to Cummins Progressives the state over, its message--especially that contained in the last paragraph quoted above--could hardly have appealed to many of the Standpats, particularly those connected with the railroad and those who were doing quite nicely under the current rate structures.

It seems apparent that railroad rates were an especially sore point with the Progressives. Most Progressives in the "X" group were small businessmen, and the concentration on railroad rates seems to indicate that those Progressives whose prosperity depended partially upon railroad rates felt that they were not obtaining the same advantages obviously enjoyed by many Standpats. The Progressive proclivities of at least some, and among them the most important, members of the faction appear to have been grounded on considerations more concrete than a struggle to regain lost status.

#### Summary

In summary, this study of local factional leadership gives rise to three broad and general conclusions:

First: A comparison of the make-up of state and national leadership with that on the local level indicates that serious and significant differences exist between the two, and that generalizations based only upon the higher levels of leadership may be quite misleading if used to characterize a mass political movement as a whole.

Second: The presence of a relatively large and uniquely Progressive wage-earner and lower salaried group

within the Progressive sample; the presence of a far larger proportion of middle class (group "X") persons in the Standpat than in the Progressive sample; and the fact that the Standpat middle class person more nearly typifies the middle class model presented by Hofstadter all give rise to serious doubts as to the existence of a status revolution in process among the Progressives of Burlington in the first decade of the twentieth century.

Last: An examination of the business affiliations of persons in both factions indicates that in many cases, especially in those of the top leadership in both factions, factional affiliations were based on circumstances which went far beyond mere membership in a particular socio-economic class, and these circumstances provided a basis for a clearer understanding of factional make-up than did socio-economic class membership.

N O T E S

1. Chandler, op. cit., p. 1462.
2. Mowry, op. cit., pp. 87-88.
3. Potts, op. cit., pp. 33, 34.
4. Chandler, op. cit., p. 1464.
5. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 137.
6. Burlington Hawk-Eye, January 5, 1905, p. 1.
7. Antrobus, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 10-17; Biographical Review of Des Moines County, pp. 310-317.
8. Harlan, op. cit., Vol II, pp. 145-147.
9. Antrobus, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 25-28; Biographical Review of Des Moines County, pp. 34-36.
10. Burlington Evening Gazette, March 24, 1906, p. 16.
11. Burlington Hawk-Eye, February 17, 1905, p. 8.
12. Iowa Official Register, No. 20 (1905), p. 216.
13. Burlington Hawk-Eye, February 9, 1910, p. 9.
14. Burlington Evening Gazette, March 24, 1906, p. 1.
15. Ibid., p. 11.
16. Burlington Hawk-Eye, September 30, 1906, p. 6.
17. Burlington Evening Gazette, Loc. cit.
18. Statement of Mr. H. S. Rand, Hearings Before the Committee On Interstate Commerce, U. S. Senate, In Special Session, Pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 288, Fifty-Eighth Congress, Third Session, Vol. III, pp. 2188, 2193.
19. Ibid., p. 2188.

20. Ibid., pp. 2188-2189.
21. George Wesley Sieber, Sawmilling on the Mississippi: The W. J. Young Company, 1858-1900, pp. 453-454.
22. William Z. Ripley, Railway Problems, p. 247.
23. Statement of Mr. H. S. Rand, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 2189, 2190.
24. Ibid., p. 2189.
25. Burlington Hawk-Eye, August 27, 1905, p. 12.
26. Statement of Mr. H. S. Rand, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 3368-3371.
27. Des Moines Register and Leader, July 18, 1906, p. 2.
28. Loc. cit.

APPENDIX 1  
(Political Participation)

Introduction

Appendix 1 shows participation in city primary elections by each person in the sample used in this study.

The sample is arranged so that for each faction there are three groups, each group listed in alphabetic order. The first of these groups is composed of those whose factional affiliations were definitely known in 1906 only. The second is composed of those whose factional affiliations were definitely known in 1908 only. The third is composed of those whose factional affiliations were definitely known in both 1906 and 1908. Names, affiliations, and participations were gathered from newspaper accounts of caucuses and county conventions.

The first column on the left, "Participations," lists the total number of primaries (of those listed) each person was known to have attended. Participation in specific primary elections is indicated by an "x" in the appropriate column to the right of the list of names.

In the second column from the left each person is classified according to membership in the "X", "Y", and "Z" occupational categories explained on pages 82 and 83.

PARTICIPATION IN REPUBLICAN PRIMARY ELECTIONS 1901 - 1912  
BY THOSE KNOWN TO BE PROGRESSIVES IN 1906

Participations	Classification	Name	1901 Primaries	1903 Primaries	1904 Primaries	1906 Primaries	1908 Primaries (March)	1908 Primaries (June)	1910 Primaries	1912 Primaries (March)	1912 Primaries (June)	1912 Roosevelt Progressive County Convention
2	X	Baughman				X						X
1	Y	Bawmann				X						
3	Y	Brown			X	X			X			
3	X	Brutus	X	X		X						
2	X	Burnham		X		X						
3	X	Buttles		X	X	X						
2	X	Canny, E.				X				X		
4	X	Canny, F.				X	X	X			X	
1	X	Cave				X						
1	Y	Clayborn				X						
1	Y	Cutler				X						
1	Y	Flynn, J.				X						
1	Y	Fulton				X						
1	Y	Gleudy				X						
1	Y	Griffith				X						
1	Y	Gross				X						
1	X	Hagerty				X						
1	Y	Hayes				X						
1	Y	Hollingsworth				X						
3	X	Houston				X			X			X
1	Y	Jones				X						
1	X	Kaiser				X						
2	Y	Kinsloe				X				X		
1	Y	Keegan				X						
1	Y	Larson				X						
1	Y	McMahon				X						
1	X	Naumann				X						
2	Y	Peterson, G.				X			X			
1	X	Romkey				X						
1	Y	Schenck				X						
2	X	Smither	X			X						

(CONTINUED)

Participations		Name	Classification									
			1901	1903	1904	1906	1908	1908	1910	1912	1912	1912
5	X	Turner	x	x		x		x	x			
1	Y	Wheeler				x						
2	X	Youngquist				x			x			



PARTICIPATION IN REPUBLICAN PRIMARY ELECTIONS 1901 - 1912  
BY THOSE KNOWN TO BE PROGRESSIVES IN 1908

Participations	Classification	Name	1901 Primaries	1903 Primaries	1904 Primaries	1906 Primaries	1908 Primaries (March)	1908 Primaries (June)	1910 Primaries	1912 Primaries (March)	1912 Primaries (June)	1912 Roosevelt Progressive County Convention
1	Y	Antick					X					
1	Y	Baker					X					
1	Y	Buser					X					
1	Y	Craig					X					
1	X	Carr					X					
1	Y	Duke					X					
2	Y	Foehlinger					X	X				
2	X	Greiner		X			X					
4	Y	Jordan					X	X		X	X	
2	Y	Koett					X		X			
2	Y	Krekel					X			X		
1	X	Lahee					X					
1	Y	Langenburg, A.					X					
2	Y	Langenburg, O.					X	X				
4	X	Litzrodt					X	X		X	X	
4	Y	Lyon	X	X			X		X			
1	X	McConnell					X					
4	Y	Miller	X				X		X	X		
2	Y	Moberg					X			X		X
2	X	Moore					X	X				
1	X	Nelson					X					
1	Y	Obermann					X					
1	Y	Rasche					X					
6	X	Schaefer, P.		X	X		X	X		X	X	
2	Y	Schaefer, W.					X		X			
1	Y	Siegle					X					
3	X	Stadtlander					X		X	X		
1	Y	Suesens					X					
3	X	Sutter					X			X	X	
1	Y	Trevitt					X					
2	Y	Trump					X			X		

(CONTINUED)

Participations	Classification	Name			
		1901 Primaries			
		1903 Primaries			
		1904 Primaries			
		1906 Primaries			
		1908 Primaries (March)			
		1908 Primaries (June)			
		1910 Primaries			
		1912 Primaries (March)			
		1912 Primaries (June)			
		1912 Roosevelt Progressive County Convention			
2	Y	Weber		X	X
1	X	Weiss		X	
1	X	Wiesley		X	
1	Y	Zeller		X	

PARTICIPATION IN REPUBLICAN PRIMARY ELECTIONS 1901 - 1912  
BY THOSE KNOWN TO BE PROGRESSIVES IN BOTH 1906 & 1908

Participations	Classification	Name	1901 Primaries	1903 Primaries	1904 Primaries	1906 Primaries	1908 Primaries (March)	1908 Primaries (June)	1910 Primaries	1912 Primaries (March)	1912 Primaries (June)	1912 Roosevelt Progressive County Convention
3	X	Burg	x			x	x					
2	X	Burt				x	x					
4	Y	Chamberlain				x	x		x	x		
7	XZ	Copeland	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	
3	Y	Copp				x	x			x		
2	X	Donahue				x	x					
2	Y	Enger				x	x					
3	X	Flynn, M.				x	x			x		
6	X	Gillies	x			x	x		x	x	x	
5	X	Griggs	x			x	x		x	x		
5	X	Hawkins	x	x	x	x	x					
2	Y	Langenberg				x	x					
2	Y	Mollison				x	x					
2	Y	O'Malley				x	x					
2	X	Neighbors				x	x					
3	X	Rizer				x	x	x				
4	X	Snyder	x		x	x	x					
2	Y	Stiefel, E.				x	x					
2	Y	Stiefel, G.				x	x					
6	XZ	Thompson	x	x	x	x	x			x		
2	Y	Tuttle				x	x					
4	Y	Wahl				x	x				x	x

PARTICIPATION IN REPUBLICAN PRIMARY ELECTIONS 1901 - 1912  
BY THOSE KNOWN TO BE STANDPATS IN 1906

Participations	Classification	Name	1901 Primaries	1903 Primaries	1904 Primaries	1906 Primaries	1908 Primaries (March)	1908 Primaries (June)	1910 Primaries	1912 Primaries (March)	1912 Primaries (June)	1912 Roosevelt Progressive County Convention
2	X	Anderson		X		X						
2	X	Archibald				X				X		
1	X	Baird				X						
1	X	Boatman				X						
1	Y	Bouquet				X						
1	X	Cameron				X						
1	X	Carr				X						
2	Y	Cartwright, C.		X		X						
1	Y	Cartwright, H.				X						
4	Y	Casperson	X	X		X				X		
1	Y	Chittenden				X						
6	X	Clark	X	X	X	X				X	X	
3	Y	Clements		X	X	X						
1	X	Cook				X						
1	X	Cooper				X						
4	X	Droegemeyer	X	X	X	X						
4	X	Eaton, W. B.	X	X	X	X						
2	XZ	Gilbert	X			X						
1	X	Gross				X						
2	X	Grotewohl				X			X			
3	X	Hays		X	X	X						
1	X	Hemphill				X						
1	Y	Lane				X						
1	X	Low				X						
3	Y	Lundgren			X	X					X	
1	XZ	Lutz				X						
3	Y	Marsteller	X	X		X						
3	X	Martin		X	X	X						
1	X	McMullin				X						
1	X	Millard				X						
1	Y	Mosena				X						
1	X	Murphey				X						
1	Y	Ohle				X						

## (CONTINUED)

Participations	Classification	Name	1901 Primaries	1903 Primaries	1904 Primaries	1906 Primaries	1908 Primaries (March)	1908 Primaries (June)	1910 Primaries	1912 Primaries (March)	1912 Primaries (June)	1912 Roosevelt Progressive County Convention
2	XZ	Palmer				X				X		
1	X	Phillips				X						
1	Y	Raichle				X						
1	Y	Rigsby				X						
1	Y	Rundorff				X						
1	Y	Schramm				X						
5	X	Stutsman	X		X	X				X		X
1	X	Troxel				X						
2	Y	Wallbridge	X			X						
5	X	Willner		X	X	X		X		X		
3	X	Wilson	X		X	X						
2	Y	Wilkin				X				X		

PARTICIPATION IN REPUBLICAN PRIMARY ELECTIONS 1901 - 1912  
BY THOSE KNOWN TO BE STANDPATS IN 1908

Participations	Classification	Name	1901 Primaries	1903 Primaries	1904 Primaries	1906 Primaries	1908 Primaries (March)	1908 Primaries (June)	1910 Primaries	1912 Primaries (March)	1912 Primaries (June)	1912 Roosevelt Progressive County Convention
1	X	Adams					X					
1	Y	Cowles, R.					X					
2	Y	Daries		X			X					
3	Y	Denward					X			X	X	
4	Y	Dryden	X		X		X			X		
1	Y	Eggert					X					
1	Y	Felt					X					
2	X	Foster					X			X		
4	X	Fowler	X	X	X		X					
2	X	Gilbert					X			X		
3	Y	Gregson					X	X		X		
1	X	Hackman					X					
1	XZ	Higbee, G. H.					X					
5	Y	Hilleary	X			X	X			X	X	
1	Y	Holmquist					X					
1	Y	Horstmann					X					
3	Y	Huebner					X			X	X	
1	X	Hungerford					X					
1	X	Kinnear					X					
1	X	Kinney					X					
1	X	Larson					X					
2	Y	Lideen					X					X
3	Y	Lilly	X				X	X				
2	Y	Mackey			X		X					
1	Y	McFarland					X					
2	Y	McKee					X			X		
1	Y	Millard					X					
1	X	Otto					X					
2	Y	Peterson					X		X			
5	Y	Phillips	X	X	X		X			X	X	
1	X	Power					X					
4	Y	Roberts	X				X	X		X		

(CONTINUED)

Participations	Classification	Name	1901 Primaries	1903 Primaries	1904 Primaries	1906 Primaries	1908 Primaries (March)	1908 Primaries (June)	1910 Primaries	1912 Primaries (March)	1912 Primaries (June)	1912 Roosevelt Progressive County Convention
1	X	Schramm					X					
3	X	Sharts	X	X			X					
3	X	Sterling			X		X	X				
1	Y	Tyler					X					
3	X	Waite, C.		X			X		X			

PARTICIPATION IN REPUBLICAN PRIMARY ELECTIONS 1901 - 1912  
BY THOSE KNOWN TO BE STANDPATS IN BOTH 1906 & 1908

Participations	Classification	Name	1901 Primaries	1903 Primaries	1904 Primaries	1906 Primaries	1908 Primaries (March)	1908 Primaries (June)	1910 Primaries	1912 Primaries (March)	1912 Primaries (June)	1912 Roosevelt Progressive County Convention
3	X	Bird			X	X	X					
3	X	Blythe	X	X	X	X	X					
7	X	Caster	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		
4	Y	Courtwright	X	X		X	X					
7	XZ	Cowles, L.	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	
6	X	Eaton, W. D.	X	X	X	X	X			X		
2	X	Elliott				X	X					
2	Y	Gantz				X	X					
8	XZ	Hedge	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
3	X	Higbee, G. G.		X		X	X					
3	X	Holsteen			X	X	X					
2	Y	Hosford				X	X					
3	Y	Lattner				X	X	X				
6	XZ	Moir, A.			X	X	X	X	X	X		
3	XZ	Moir, J.				X	X			X		
5	XZ	Poor	X		X	X	X		X			
4	X	Power			X	X	X			X		
5	XZ	Rand	X			X	X		X	X		
5	X	Schlichter	X	X	X	X	X					
6	XZ	Stutsman	X	X	X	X	X			X		
5	XZ	Waite	X		X	X	X		X			



## APPENDIX II

## CONTENT AND COMPOSITION OF THE "Y" CATEGORY

	Progressive Standpat	
Tailor.....	1	
Jeweler.....	1	
Photographer.....	1	
Piano tuner.....	1	
Gardener.....	1	
Blacksmith.....	1	
Boilermaker.....	1	
Finisher.....	1	
Harnessmaker.....	2	
Packer.....	2	
Cigar maker.....	3	
Driver.....	3	
Tinner.....	4	
Laborer.....	3	1
Commercial traveler or sales agent..	5	3
Foreman.....	4	3
Store manager or department manager.	1	1
Teamster.....	2	2
"Works" or "with".....	3	3
Machinest.....	1	2
Bookkeeper.....	1	2
Secretary or private secretary.....	1	3
Clerk.....	7	9
Assistant bank cashier.....		2
Cashier (C. B. & Q. freighthouse).....		1
Construction boss.....		1
Bill collector.....		1
Train dispatcher.....		1
Cooper.....		1
Bartender.....		1
Stable boss.....		1
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>38</b>

APPENDIX III  
(Business Representations)

Introduction

Appendix III lists all known business, professional, and government post representations by those members of the sample in the "X" group.

The individual firms, professions, or government posts are listed under the categories they represent.

Categories appear in capital letters and are underlined. The numbers in parentheses immediately following the categories denote the actual number of Standpat and Progressive persons, respectively, in each category.

The underlined numbers in the "X" columns denote the total number of "X" representations for each faction in each respective category.\*

The underlined numbers in the "Z" columns denote the total number of "Z" representations for each faction in each respective category.

The underlined numbers in the "R" columns denote the total number of "R" persons for each faction in each

---

\* For an explanation of "X", "Y" and "R" groupings see pages 92-94.

respective category.

Numbers are not underlined within the "X", "Z" and "R" columns indicate the number of representations for each individual firm, profession or government post listed.

Numbers in the Standpat column marked with an asterisk (\*) indicate that representations by persons who were Progressives in 1906, but who switched to the Standpat faction in 1908, have been included.

Numbers in the Progressive column marked with a plus (+) indicate that representations by persons who were Standpats in 1906, but who switched to the Progressive faction in 1908, have been included.

## BUSINESSES REPRESENTED BY THOSE PERSONS IN CATEGORY "X"

	<u>Standpat</u>			<u>Progressive</u>		
	X	Z	R	X	Z	R
<u>LUMBER COMPANIES (4-0)</u> .....	5	4	3			
Burlington Lumber Co.	2	1	1			
Gilbert-Hedge Lumber Co.	2	2	1			
Rand Lumber Co.	1	1	1			
<u>TRANSPORTATION &amp; COMMUNICATIONS (4-0)</u> .....	4		2			
C. B. & Q.	2		2			
Iowa Telephone Co.	1					
River Transportation:	1					
Diamond Jo Line Steamers						
Carnival City Packet Co.						
Northwestern Transportation Co.						
<u>BANKS (8-1)</u> .....	9*	7*	5*	1	1	1
Merchants National	3*	2*	2*	1	1	1
Burlington Savings	1	1				
First National	3	2	2			
German-American	1	1				
Iowa State Savings	1	1	1			
<u>PROFESSIONS (20-7)</u> .....	21	7	11	7+	1+	2+
Lawyers (non-railroad)	11	4	5	1+	1+	1+
Doctors	4	1	2	1		
"Magnetic healers" (Caster)	1		1			
Osteopaths				1		
Dentists	1			3		1
Educators	1		1	1		
Editors and publishers:						
Hawk-Eye Publishing Co.	2	2	2			
Saturday Evening Post	1					
<u>GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (5-2)</u> .....	6	5	5	3+	1+	3+
U. S. Congressman (1906)	1	1	1			
U. S. Referee in						
Bankruptcy (1906)	1	1	1			
U. S. Pension Examination						
Board Member (1906)	1	1	1			
Postmaster	1	1	1			
County Attorney (1906)				1+	1+	1+
Deputy County Auditor	1					
City Attorney	1	1	1			
Police Captain (1906);						
State Oil Inspector (1908)				1		1
Deputy City Marshall (1906);						
State Food Inspector (1908)				1		1

	<u>Standpat</u>			<u>Progressive</u>		
	X	Z	R	X	Z	R
<u>INSURANCE, LOANS, REAL ESTATE,</u>						
<u>ABSTRACTS, BROKERAGE (4-4).....</u>	<u>6*</u>	<u>3*</u>	<u>2*</u>	<u>4</u>		<u>1</u>
Moir Bros. & Safford (loans)	2*	2*	2*			
Charles C. Fowler (abstracts)	1					
John Sterling (real estate)	1					
Luke Palmer (real estate)	1	1				
Equitable Life Assurance						
Society of New York	1					
J. C. Greiner (insurance)				1		
Merchants Life Association				1		1
John S. Lahee (insurance,						
real estate, loans)				1		
J. W. Smither (broker)				1		
<u>PRODUCERS FOR INDUSTRIAL</u>						
<u>CONSUMPTION (4-2).....</u>	<u>4*</u>	<u>3*</u>	<u>3*</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Murray Iron Works Co.	2	1	1			
Mississippi Pearl						
Button Co.	2*	2*	2*			
Modern Electric Co.				1	1	1
Nairn-Gillies & Co.						
(planing mill)				1		1
Northwestern Iron & Steel Co.				1	1	1
<u>PRODUCERS FOR NON-INDUSTRIAL</u>						
<u>CONSUMPTION (3-6).....</u>	<u>3</u>			<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Chittenden & Eastman Co.						
(furniture)	1					
Phillips Lime & Coal Co.						
(cement block)	1					
V. P. Boeck & CO.						
(meat packers)	1					
Burg Wagon Co.				1		1
Clinton-Copeland Candy Co.				1	1	1
Leopold Desk Co.				1	1	1
Robert Donahue Iron &						
Hardware Co.				1		1
S.R. & I.C. McConnell Co.						
(leather goods, saddlery)				1		
Swedish Sleigh Bell Co.				1		
<u>WHOLESALERS (0-3).....</u>	<u>3</u>			<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
W. W. Copeland (fruits, oysters)				1	1	1
Burt-Zaiser Co. (groceries)				1		1
George W. Turner & Son						
(fruits, vegetables)				1		

	Standpat			Progressive		
	X	Z	R	X	Z	R
<u>RETAILERS (12-14).....</u>	<u>12*</u>		<u>2*</u>	<u>14</u>		<u>1</u>
Guest Piano Co.	1*		1*			
J. S. Schramm (dry goods)	1					
West Hill Drug Store	1					
Drake Hardware	1					
George W. Bird (groceries)	1*		1*			
David S. Cooper (books)	1					
Henry Droegemeyer (shoes)	1					
John H. Troxel (furniture)	1					
H. S. Gross & Sons (clothing)	1					
Stewart & Hayden (plumbing)	1					
Fate Martin (saloon)	1					
German Village (saloon)	1					
Stadtlander Hardware Co.				1		
Sutter & Gamble (sporting goods, automobiles)				1		
Star Ice Co.				1		1
Haines & Burnham (ice)				1		
T. R. Rankin & Co. (ice)				1		
Ed P. Litzrodt (pharmacy)				1		
W. O. Kaiser (pharmacy)				1		
Ockert & Nelson (groceries)				1		
Canny Brothers (groceries)				2		
Eugene Buttles (groceries)				1		
Charles F. Weiss (meats)				1		
Cave Coal Co.				1		
John H. Romkey (hardware)				1		
<u>SELF-EMPLOYED ARTISANS (8-4).....</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>		<u>4</u>		
McMullin-Woehlhaf Co. (printer)	1					
Conrad Lutz & Sons (printer)	1	1				
Lutz Calendar Co.	1	1				
Carpenters:	4					
Herman Anderson						
William F. Gilbert						
John E. Hackman						
Austin Hemphill						
George Carr (painter)	1					
Lincoln Cook (barber)	1					
Edward Moore (tailor)					1	
Alfred Wiesely (painter, paperhanger)					1	
A. J. Youngquist (mason)					1	
John E. Hagerty (blacksmith)					1	

	<u>Standpat</u>			<u>Progressive</u>		
	X	Z	R	X	Z	R
<u>OTHER (1-0).....</u>						
Hawk-Eye Publishing Co.						
TOTAL REPRESENTATIONS	80	31		46	7	
TOTAL INDIVIDUALS	63	13	18	40	2	12

APPENDIX IV  
(Biographical)

Introduction

Appendix IV lists the names of all those included in the sample used in this study. Most of the names were obtained from newspaper accounts of ward caucuses and county conventions. The following information is included, where possible, for each person in the sample:

1) Factional affiliation and year of known affiliation, designated by a letter and number combination. For instance: "P-6" designates known Progressive affiliation in 1906, "S-6; P-8" designates known Standpat affiliation in 1906 and known Progressive affiliation in 1908, and "S-8; RP-12" designates known Standpat affiliation in 1908, and known Roosevelt Progressive affiliation in 1912. Affiliations were determined by newspaper accounts of ward caucuses and county conventions which listed names of those on contesting delegations. A few persons were identified as to factional affiliation in other newspaper articles.

2) Occupation and place of business or employment. Where no occupation is listed and the firm name is the same as the person's name it is assumed that the person is a proprietor or partner in the firm. Where the



name of the firm gives no indication of the type of business conducted this information is included in parentheses following the firm's name. City directories were the main source of occupational information and type of business conducted, although some information was gained from newspapers and biographical sources.

3) Date and place of birth; e.g., "B. 1850, Iowa." This information was obtained from biographical sources and was not available for all persons in the sample.

4) Date of initial Burlington residency; e.g., "Burlington 1887." This information was obtained from biographical sources and was not available for all persons in the sample.

5) Education beyond high school; e.g., "Ed. State University of Iowa." This information was obtained from biographical sources and was not available for all persons in the sample.

6) Official position and date position held in political and business organizations and professional societies; e.g., "1906 president, Retail Grocers Assn. of Burlington." This information was obtained from newspapers, city directories and biographical sources, and was not available for all persons to which it might have applied.

7) Church affiliation. This information was obtained mainly from biographical sources. Newspaper accounts and city directories listed the officers of Catholic societies and various administrators of local churches, some of whom were persons in the sample.

8) Membership in social clubs and societies. Information regarding membership in Masonic societies was obtained from the files of the Masonic Library in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Membership in other clubs and societies was obtained mainly from biographical sources and, in a few cases, from lists of officers given in the city directories and in newspaper accounts.

Where information about a person has been obtained from published biographical sources the source(s) and page number(s) are enclosed in parentheses; e.g., (II: 143-146). The Roman numeral inside the parentheses corresponds to the Roman numeral preceding each source listed in the Bibliography to Appendix IV (page 1). The numeral(s) designates the pages upon which the biographical information used appears. Information found in newspapers is footnoted. Information not footnoted was found in city directories.

APPENDIX IV  
(Biographical)Progressives

- ANTICK, MEYER: P-8. Packer. Dehner Cigar Co.
- BAKER, FRED E.: P-8. Clerk. W. W. Copeland (wholesale fruits).
- BAUGHMAN, JACOB SCHROCK: P-6; RP-12. Osteopath. B. 1858, Davis county, Iowa. Burlington 1887. Ed. Lombard College; State Normal, Kirksville, Missouri; Kirksville School of Osteopathy. 1903 President, Iowa Osteopathy Assn. 1905 President, Eastern' Iowa Osteopathy Assn. Also inventor. Methodist. Mason. (II: 520-524)
- BAWMANN, SAMUEL D.: P-6. Commercial traveler. Northwestern Cabinet Co.
- BROWN, CHAUNCEY F.: P-6. Photographer. I. F. Everett.
- BRUTUS, LEO F.: P-6. President. Swedish Sleigh Bell Co.
- BURG, CHARLES E.: P-6, P-8. Vice-president and secretary. Burg Wagon Co.
- BURNHAM, LOREN B.: P-6. Haines and Burnham (ice). B. 1866, Kansas. Burlington 1874. Ed. Elliott's Business College; Baptist University. 1904 Secretary and 1905 vice-president, Republican Club of Burlington. Odd Fellows. Woodmen of the World. Modern Woodmen of America. (II: 143-146)
- BURT, WALTER M.: P-6 & 8. President. Burt-Zaiser Co. (wholesale groceries).
- BUSER, ALBERT J.: P-8. Foreman. Conner Mercantile Co.
- BUTTLES, EUGENE: P-6. Proprietor. Grocery store. 1903 Director, Retail Grocers Assn. of Burlington. 1906 candidate for nomination as state railroad commissioner.

- CANNY, FRANK: P-6. Partner. Canny Brothers Grocery.  
1903 Director, Retail Grocers Assn. of Burlington.  
Catholic. Ancient Order of Hibernians.
- CANNY, EDWARD J.: P-6. Partner. Canny Brothers Grocery.  
Catholic. Ancient Order of Hibernians. Knights  
of Columbus. Woodmen of the World.
- CARR, WILLIAM E.: P-8. Teacher. Burlington Public Schools.
- CAVE, WILLIAM FREDERICK: P-6. Cave Coal Co. B. 1855,  
Ontario, Canada. Burlington 1891. Presbyterian.  
Mason. Independent Order of Foresters. (II:  
122-124)
- CHAMBERLAIN, HENRY E.: P-6 & 8. Tinner. Nichols &  
Rankin Co.
- CLAYBORN, JOHN C.: P-6. (colored) Blacksmith. Head &  
Schroeder.
- COPELAND, WILLIAM W.: P-6 & 8. W. W. Copeland (wholesale  
fruits); President, Clinton-Copeland Candy Com-  
pany; President, Modern Electric Company (tele-  
phones and telephone construction materials);  
Director, Merchants National Bank; Director,  
Northwest Iron & Steel Company. B. 1856, Pennsyl-  
vania. Burlington 1887. 1906 Chairman, Pro-  
gressive Republican Committee of Burlington.  
1908 President, Des Moines County Taft-Cummins  
Club. Candidate for nomination as presidential  
elector-at-large, 1908. 1910-1914, Postmaster.  
Mason. (I: 100-104; II: 56-60)
- COPP, ALBERT J.: P-6 & 8. Manager. The Popular Hard-  
ware Store.
- CRAIG, GEORGE W.: P-8. Works. Leopold Desk Co.
- CUTLER, AMON: P-6. Teamster.
- DONAHUE, FRANK T: P-6 & 8. President and treasurer. Ro-  
bert Donahue Iron & Hardware Co. (Blacksmith  
supplies).
- DUKE, SAMUEL: P-8. Teamster. Granite Brick Co.

- ENGER, CHARLES: P-6 & 8. Cigar maker. Dehner Cigar Co.
- FLYNN, MICHAEL E.: P-6 & 8. 1906 Police captain; 1907-1920 State food inspector.
- FOEHLINGER, CHARLES HENRY: P-8. Clerk. G. H. Alfs (art goods). B. 1874, Iowa. Ed. Elliott's Business College; correspondence course, La Salle School, New York, N. Y. First Methodist. Workmen of the World. (VI: 376)
- FULTON, FRED A.: P-6. Works. Sickles New Method Laundry.
- GILLIES, DAVID: P-6 & 8. Treasurer. Nairn-Gillies & Co. (plaining mill, sashes and doors). 1907 city alderman. 1908 vice-president, Des Moines County Taft-Cummins Club. Father was born in Scotland.<sup>3</sup> Congregational.
- GLEUDY, VICTOR E.: P-6. Jeweler. G. H. Alfs.
- GREINER, JOHN C.: P-8. J. C. Greiner Co. (insurance). Mason.
- GRIFFITH, CLARENCE: P-6. Works. T. L. Parsons Trust Co.
- GRIGGS, CHARLES THADDEUS: P-6 & 8. State oil inspector. B. 1846, Indiana. Burlington 1869. Grace Methodist Episcopal. Mason. Odd Fellow. Modern Woodmen of America. Foresters of America. (II: 421-423)
- HAGERTY, JOHN E.: P-6. Blacksmith. J. Hagerty & Sons.
- HAWKINS, ALBERT B.: P-6 & 8. Secretary. Merchants Life Assn. (life insurance). B. 1851, Ohio. Episcopal. (II: 555-557)
- HAYES, JOHN D.: P-6. Driver. Fitch's Laundry.
- HOLLINGSWORTH, LOUIS H.: P-6. Driver. Sickles New Method Laundry..
- HOUSTON, FOREST F.: P-6; RP-12. Partner. T. R. Rankin & Co. (ice). B. 1878, Burlington. Congregational. Odd Fellow. Moose. Knights of the Maccabees. (I: 487-488)

- JONES, HARVEY: P-6. (colored) Laborer.
- JORDAN, HENRY F.: P-8. Tinner. T. A. Nichols.
- KAISER, W. O.: P-6. Proprietor. Drug store. B. 1863, Illinois. Burlington 1897. Ed. college. Mason. Elk. (I: 23-29)
- KEEGAN, CHRISTOPHER H.: P-6. Boilermaker.
- KINSLOE, EDWARD C.: P-6. Commercial traveler. Mason.
- KOETT, ANDREW A.: P-8. Cigar maker. Dehner Cigar Co.
- KREKEL, KURT W.: P-8. Laborer.
- LAHEE, JOHN S.: P-8. Insurance, real estate, loans. B. 1864, Burlington. Ed. State University of Iowa. Presbyterian. Knights of Pythias. Elks. American Economic Assn. American Academy of Politics and Social Science. Royal Economic Society of Great Britain. Board of Trade. Commercial Club. State Charity Assn. (I: 494-498)
- LANGENBERG, JULIUS C.: P-6 & 8. Price clerk. SR & IC McConnell Co. (wholesale leather and saddlery).
- LANGENBURG, ARTHUR C.: P-8. Clerk. E. C. Gnahn (office supplies).
- LANGENBURG, OTTO H.: P-8. Harnessmaker. SR & IC McConnell Co.
- LARSON, OSCAR: P-6. Packer. Murray Iron Works Co.
- LITZRODT, EDWARD P.: P-8. Proprietor. Drug store. B. 1874, Des Moines county, Iowa. Father born in Saxony, Germany. Ed. St. Louis College of Pharmacy. Methodist. Mason. (I: 98-100)
- LYON, JAMES M.: P-8. Driver. G. H. Alfs.
- McCONNELL, SAMUEL R.: P-8. President and treasurer. SR & IC McConnell Co. (wholesale leather and saddlery).

- McMAHON, FRANCIS J.: P-6. Machinest.
- MILLER, GEORGE, JR.: P-8. Foreman. Burlington Basket Co.
- MOBERG, ERICK: P-8; RP-12. Laborer.
- MOLLISON, ALLEN E.: P-6 & 8. 1906 Foreman, 1908 Superintendent. Churchill Drug Co. Mason.
- MOORE, EDWARD: P-8. Tailor.
- MORGAN, ABRAHAM: P-8. Retired.
- NAUMANN, LORENZ A.: P-6. Dentist.
- NEIGHBORS, WILLIAM F.: P-6 & 8. Secretary. Leopold Desk Co.
- NELSON, LUDWIG F.: P-8. Ockert & Nelson (grocers).
- OBERMANN, A. WILLIAM: P-8. Tinner. J. M. Scott & Co.
- O'MALLEY, CHARLES: P-6 & 8. Cigar maker. Dehner Cigar Co. Labor union official.<sup>4</sup>
- PETERSON, GEORGE J.: P-6. Gardener.
- RASCHE, THEODORE W.: P-8. Clerk. A. J. Benner (grocery store).
- RIZER, GUSTAVUS E.: P-6 & 8. Dentist. 1910 president, Lutheran Brotherhood of Iowa.<sup>5</sup> Lutheran. Mason.
- ROMKEY, JOHN H.: P-6. Proprietor. Hardware store.
- SCHAEFER, PAUL H.: P-8. Physician and surgeon. B. 1879, Burlington. Father born in Germany. Ed. State University of Iowa; College of Physicians and Surgeons, Chicago. 1905 county physician. Lutheran. Mason. Woodmen of the World. Ancient Order of United Workmen. Modern National Reserve. Des Moines County Medical Society. (II: 565-566)
- SCHAEFER, WILLIAM L.: P-8. Piano tuner. Guest Piano Co.

- SCHENCK, WALTER: P-6. 1906 secretary; 1907 second vice-president. Drake Hardware Co. B. 1848, Ohio. Burlington 1871. Methodist Episcopal. United Commercial Travelers. Travelers' Protective Assn. (I: 190-194)
- SIEGLE, EMIL: P-8. Commercial traveler. W. W. Copeland.
- SMITHER, JOHN W.: P-6. Merchandise broker. 1907 city alderman.
- SNYDER, WILBER J.: P-6 & 8. Partner. Star Ice Co.
- STADTLANDER, HENRY W.: P-8. Stadtlander Hardware Co. B. 1872, Burlington. Ed. Elliott's Business College. 1905-1907 city alderman. Modern Woodmen of America. Royal Neighbors. (II: 824-825)
- STIEFEL, ERNEST: P-6 & 8. Tailor. J. P. Mailandt (men's clothing).
- STIEFEL, GOTTLIEB, JR.: P-6 & 8. Bookkeeper. Iowa Grain & Produce Co.
- SUESENS, FRED J.: P-8. Tinner. Stadtlander Hardware Co.
- SUTTER, JOSEPH B.: P-8. Sutter & Gamble (sporting goods and automobiles). B. 1876, Burlington. Ed. Lombard College, Galesburg, Illinois. Elks. Moose. (I: 378-379)
- THOMPSON, FRANK E.: S-6; P-8. Lawyer. County attorney 1899-1902; 1904-1907. B. 1873, Iowa. Burlington 1896. Ed. State University of Iowa. 1901 candidate for state representative. 1902 chairman of county central committee. 1914 state senator. Elk. Eagle. Modern Woodmen of America. (I: 322-325, 338; II: 338)
- TREVITT, IRWIN F.: P-8. Clerk. Merchants Life Assn.
- TRUMP, RALPH: P-8. Foreman. Robert Donahue Iron & Hardware Co.



- TURNER, GEORGE A.: P-6. G. W. Turner and Son (fruits, vegetables, and garden seeds). 1906 city alderman. Independent Order of Foresters. Royal Arcanum.
- TUTTLE, CHARLES E.: P-6 & 8. Clerk. Robert Donahue Iron & Hardware Co. 1908 Secretary and treasurer, Des Moines county Taft-Cummins Club. Mason. Elks.
- WAHL, GEORGE E.: P-6 & 8; RP-12. 1906 harnessmaker, 1908 foreman. SR & IC McConnell Co.
- WEBER, JOHN F.: P-8. Commercial traveler. Iowa Novelty Co.
- WHEELER, GEORGE E.: P-6. Traveling agent.
- WIESLEY, ALFRED: P-8. Painter and paperhanger. B. 1880, Switzerland. America 1884. Burlington 1907. German Baptist. Moose. (I: 304-305)
- WEISS, CHARLES F.: P-8. Proprietor. Meat market.
- YOUNGQUIST, ANDREW J.: P-6. Stonemason.
- ZELLER, EDWARD: P-8. Finisher. Leopold Desk Co.

Standpats

- ADAMS, EDWIN D.: S-8. Vice-president. Drake Hardware Co. B. New York. Burlington 1888. Presbyterian. (I: 79-80)
- ANDERSON, HERMAN: S-6. Carpenter. Mason.
- ARCHIBALD, THOMAS S.: S-6. Sales manager. Burlington Lumber Co.
- BAIRD, W. H.: S-6. Dentist.
- BIRD, GEORGE W.: P-6; S-8. Proprietor. Grocery store. B. 1872, Burlington. Ed. Elliott's Business College. 1902-1903 vice-president, 1904 president, Retail Grocers' Assn. of Burlington. 1905 city alderman. Elks. (II: 667-668)
- BLYTHE, JOSEPH WILLIAM: S-6 & 8. General counsel. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad. B. 1854, New Jersey. Burlington 1874. Ed. Princeton; Bethany College, Kansas; Hanover College, Indiana. Elk. (II: 15-16; IV: 74-75; VII: 110)
- BOATMAN, OLIVER W.: S-6. Physician and surgeon. B. 1879, Kentucky. Burlington 1903. Methodist. Mason. Elk. (I: 187-188)
- CAMERON, HENRY D.: S-6. Real estate. Agent. Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York.
- CARR, GEORGE: S-6. Painter.
- CARTWRIGHT, CHARLES H.: S-6. Railway mail service clerk.
- CARTWRIGHT, HORATIO W.: S-6. Retired. Resident Des Moines county since 1839.<sup>6</sup>
- CASPERSON, EDGAR W.: S-6. Clerk. John Boesch Co. (department store).

- CASTER, JACOB S.: S-6 & 8. "Doctor." Caster's Magnetic Infirmary. B. 1860, Iowa. Ed. Ottumwa, Iowa Commercial College. 1897 city alderman. 1904-1906 Mayor. 1905 President, Iowa League of Municipalities. First Methodist Episcopal. Mason. Odd Fellows. Knights of the Macabees of the World. (II: 230-234)
- CHITTENDEN, ABRAM B.: S-6. Clerk. Chittenden and Eastman Co. (furniture manufacturer).
- CLARK, CHARLES C.: S-6. Lawyer. Seerley & Clark. B. 1859, Ohio. Ed. State University of Iowa. 1899-1902 county attorney. Congregational. Mason. (I: 338; VI: 372)
- CLEMENTS, CHARLES H.: S-6. Cooper. A. Moehn Co. (brewers).
- COOK, LINCOLN: S-6. (colored) Barber.'
- COOPER, DAVID S.: S-6. Bookseller.
- COURTWRIGHT, CHARLES SIGEL: S-6 & 8. Dispatcher. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad.
- COWLES, LaMONTE: S-6 & 8. Lawyer. B. 1859, Iowa. Ed. Iowa Wesleyan University. 1904-1906 city attorney. 1906 United States referee in bankruptcy. One-time chairman, city, county central committees. Ten years chairman, congressional committee, First District. Four years member, state central committee. Member, 33rd and 34th General Assembly, senator. 1910 United States Senator. Methodist. Mason. United Workmen of the World. Woodmen of the World. Elks. (I; 25-28; II: 34-36; V: 143-144; VI: 373)
- COWLES, ROLLIN J.: S-8. Department manager. Chittenden and Eastman Co.
- DARIES, JOHN C.: S-8. Private secretary. J. W. Blythe. Elks.
- DAVIS, FRANK T.: S-6. Laborer.
- DENWARD, CHARLES J.: S-8. Salesman. J. S. Schramm Co. (dry goods).

- DROEGEMEYER, HENRY: S-6. Proprietor. Boots and shoes store.
- DRYDEN, CARLTON: S-8. Foreman. Burlington Lumber Co. B. 1842, Ohio. Burlington 1869. Presbyterian. G. A. R. (I: 37-40)
- EATON, WALTER B.: S-6. Secretary. Chittenden and Eastman Co. B. 1863, Missouri. Presbyterian. Elk. (I: 457-458)
- EATON, WILLIAM D.: S-6 & 8. Lawyer. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad. Ed. University of Michigan. Brother of Walter B. Presbyterian. (I: 492-494)
- EGGERT, RALPH W.: S-8. Clerk. Gilbert-Hedge Lumber Co.
- ELLIOTT, GEORGE W.: S-6 & 8. President. Elliott's Business College. B. 1843, New York. Burlington 1879. (I: 467-470)
- FELT, EDWARD O.: S-8. Machinest. Murray Iron Works Co.
- FOSTER, WILLIAM P.: S-8. Vice-president, cashier. First National Bank. B. 1850, Ontario, Canada. Burlington 1867. Presbyterian. (II: 1096-1097)
- FOWLER, CHARLES C.: S-8. Abstracts.
- GANTZ, WILLIAM L.: S-6 & 8. Stable boss. Rand Lumber Co.
- GILBERT, SAMUEL P.: S-6. Secretary and treasurer. Gilbert-Hedge Lumber Co. Second vice-president. German-American Savings Bank. B. 1863, Burlington. Congregational. (I: 19-20)
- GILBERT, WILLIAM F.: S-8. Carpenter.
- GREGSON, THOMAS: S-8. Machinest. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad. Mason.
- GROSS, GEORGE: S-6. H. S. Gross & Sons (clothing store).
- GROTEWOHL, ARTHUR L.: S-6. Manager. Stewart & Hayden Co. (plumbing and heating).

- HACKMAN, JOHN E.: S-8. Carpenter.
- HAYS, McCLEOD W.: S-6. Vice-president. V. P. Boeck & Co. (packers and meat market). 1905 city alderman.
- HEDGE, THOMAS: S-6 & 8. Lawyer. Hedge and J. W. Blythe. President. Gilbert-Hedge Lumber Co. Director. First National Bank. 1897-1907 member of Congress. B. 1844, Burlington. Ed. Yale; Columbia Law School. Congregational. (II: 976; III: 124)
- HEMPHILL, AUSTIN: S-6. Carpenter.
- HIGBEE, GEORGE GREENLEAF: S-6 & 8. 1906 Assistant treasurer; 1908 superintendent. Murray Iron Works Co. Son of George H. B. 1878, Burlington. Ed. Harvard. Spiritualist. Mason. Elks. (I: 340-341; VI: 377)
- HIGBEE, GEORGE H.: S-8. President. Murray Iron Works Co. President. Burlington Savings Bank. B. 1836, Ohio. Burlington 1870. Ed. Princeton. Spiritualist. Mason. (I: 10-17)
- HOLMQUIST, CONRAD J.: S-8. Works. Burlington Cigar Box Co.
- HOLSTEEN, FRED SOPHUS: S-6 & 8. Lawyer. B. 1873, Burlington. Parents German-born. Ed. Burlington Institute College; State University of Iowa; Yale Law School. 1905 chairman, county central committee. Christian Science. Mason. Modern Woodmen of America. (II: 465-468; VI: 377)
- HORSTMANN, HENRY F.: S-8. Foreman. Burlington Lumber Co.
- HOSFORD, RALPH BENJAMIN: S-6 & 8. Clerk. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad.
- HUEBNER, SAMUEL T.: S-8. Manager. Iowa Telephone Co. 1905 city alderman. Woodmen of the World. Mason.
- HUNGERFORD, HERMAN J.: S-8. Cashier. Merchants National Bank.

- KINNEAR, WILLIAM W.: S-8. Agent and manager. Burlington Depot; Diamond Jo Line Steamers, Carnival City Packet Co., Northwestern Transportation Co. B. 1836, Pennsylvania. Iowa 1845. Congregational. Mason. (I: 328-300).
- KINNEY, GEORGE J.: S-8. Physician.
- LANE, FRANK: S-6. Foreman. Citizens Water Co.
- LARSON, CHARLES O.: S-8. Proprietor. West Hill Drug Store.
- LATTNER, ED: S-6 & 8. Clerk. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad. Modern Woodmen of America.
- LIDEEN, CHARLES: S-8; RP-12. Clerk. Straus Brothers (clothing).
- LILLY, WILLIAM W.: S-8. Collector. Wadleigh Fuel Co. Mason.
- LOW, CHARLES G.: S-6. Proprietor. German Village (saloon).
- LUTZ, ROBERT: S-6. Conrad Lutz & Sons (printers, publishers, and stationary); Lutz Calendar Co.
- MACKEY, JAMES: S-8. Clerk. Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad.
- MARSTELLER, FRANK L.: S-6. Private secretary. Dr. J. S. Caster. Knights of the Macabees of the World. Modern Woodmen of America.
- MARTIN, FATE: S-6. (colored) Proprietor. Saloon.
- McFARLAND, WILLIAM F.: S-8. Private secretary. Charles E. Perkins, Jr. (Former secretary to President Charles Perkins of the C. B. & Q.). B. 1861, Massachusetts. Burlington 1880. Episcopal. Mason. Elk. (I: 169-170)
- McKEE, J. W.: S-8. Superintendent. Burlington Construction Co.
- McMULLIN, N. L.: S-6. Proprietor. The McMullen-Woellhaf Co. (printers, publishers and stationers).

- MILLARD, FRANK A.: S-6. Vice-president and treasurer.  
Murray Iron Works Co.
- MILLARD, GEORGE, JR.: S-8. With. Murray Iron Works Co.
- MOIR, ALEX: P-6; S-8. Vice-president. Merchants National  
Bank. Secretary. Mississippi Pearl Button Co.  
Moir Brothers & Safford (loans).
- MOIR, JAMES: P-6; S-8. Vice-President. Merchants National  
Bank. Secretary. Mississippi Pearl Button Co.  
Moir Brothers & Safford (loans).
- MOSENA, MELVIN: S-6. Stable boss. Gilbert-Hedge Lumber  
Co.
- MURPHEY, JOHN W.: S-6. Publisher. Saturday Evening Post  
(weekly).
- OHLE, FRED B.: S-6. Cashier. Chicago, Burlington and  
Quincy freight house.
- OTTO, CHARLES E.: S-8. President. Drake Hardware Co.
- PALMER, LUKE: S-6. Lawyer, real estate. B. 1851, Bur-  
lington. Ed. Knox College, Illinois; Boston  
Law School. Congregational. (I: 326-328)
- PETERSON, FRANK: S-8. Bartender.
- PHILLIPS, ALBERT L.: S-8. Agent. Empire Line (steamship).
- PHILLIPS, PAUL H.: S-6. Secretary and treasurer. Phillips  
Lime and Coal Co. B. 1872, Burlington. Ed.  
Elliott's Business College. Elks. (I: 372-374)
- POOR, CORNELIUS L.: S-6 & 8. Lawyer. C. L. & B. P.  
Poor. President. The Burlington Hawk-Eye Co.  
B. 1845, Pennsylvania. Burlington 1875. Ed.  
State Normal School, Pennsylvania. First Metho-  
dist Episcopal. (I: 111-116)
- POWER, JOHN C.: S-6 & 8. Lawyer. Power & Power.

- RAND, HORACE S.: S-6 & 8. President and treasurer. Burlington Lumber Co.; and Lumber Co. Vice-President. Iowa State Savings Bank. Director. First National Bank.
- RAICHLE, JOHN GEORGE: S-6. Bookkeeper. Rand Lumber Co.
- RIGSBY, ARCHIBALD: S-6. Laborer.
- ROBERTS, HERBERT: S-8. Bookkeeper. Burlington Lumber Co.
- RUNDORFF, HENRY O.: S-6. Shipping clerk. Murray Iron Works Co.
- SCHLICHTER, CHARLES ALBERT: P-6; S-8. Vice-president. Guest Piano Co. B. 1865, Kansas. Ed. Elliott's Business College. 1905 city alderman. Methodist. Mason. (VI: 383)
- SCHRAMM, CHARLES E.: S-8. Proprietor. J. S. Schramm Co. (dry goods). Mason.
- SCHRAMM, WALTER S.: S-6. Assistant cashier. First National Bank.
- SHARTS, MELBER P.: S-8. 1905 county clerk. 1906 county auditor. 1908 deputy county auditor. Odd Fellows.
- STERLING, JOHN: S-8. Real estate. 1900-1904 city alderman.
- STUTSMAN, CARL, A.: S-6. Lawyer. 1900-1901 city alderman. Mason.
- STUTSMAN, CARL: S-6 & 8. Physician and surgeon. 1905 member, U. S. Pension Examining Board.
- TROXEL, JOHN H.: S-6. Troxel Brothers (furniture and carpets). B. 1835, Pennsylvania. Burlington 1864. Congregational. (I: 410-420)
- TYLER, GEORGE: S-8. Teamster. Burlington Lumber Co.



- WAITE, CLAY MILTON: S-8. Business manager. Burlington Hawk-Eye. B. 1866, Burlington. Son of John L. Methodist. (I: 17-18)
- WAITE, JOHN L.: S-6 & 8. Editor. Burlington Hawk-Eye. 1882-1885, 1898-1910 Postmaster. B. 1840, Ohio. Ed. Private academy; "a commercial school in Chicago." 1907-1908 president, National Association of Postmasters of First Class Offices. Methodist Episcopal. (I: 20-25; II: 263-265; VII: 1287)
- WALLBRIDGE, LEWIS C.: S-6. Assistant cashier. First National Bank.
- WILKIN, NEAL: S-6. Traveling agent. Burlington Rubber Shoe Co.
- WILLNER, CHARLES: S-6. Lawyer. Mason.
- WILSON, HAROLD J.: S-6. Lawyer. Blake and Wilson. B. 1879, Illinois. Ed. Monmouth College. Presbyterian. (I: 58-60)
- YOUNG, HENRY B.: S-6 & 8. Physician and surgeon. B. 1851, Illinois. Burlington 1879. Ed. Northwestern University; post-graduate work "in Europe." 1899 president, State Medical Society. 1905 president, Des Moines County Medical Society. Congregational. Mason. Elk. (I: 189-190)

Occupation Unknown

- |                         |                         |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ANDERSON, CARL: S-6.    | ILLICK, J. THERON: S-6. |
| ANDERSON, L. E.: P-6.   | LAUMAN, L. A.: P-6.     |
| BOUQUET, NIC: S-6.      | LUNDGREN, P. JOHN: S-6. |
| BOYLE, J. J.: P-6.      | PETERSON, CHARLES: S-6. |
| FLYNN, JOHN J.: P-6.    | PETERSON, LEO: P-6.     |
| GROSS, ALBERT: P-6.     | PILGER, WILLIAM: S-6.   |
| HILLEARY, SHERMAN: S-8. | YOUNG, GEORGE: P-6.     |

NOTES

1. Burlington Hawk-Eye, March 13, 1903, p. 7.
2. Ibid., April 14, 1912, p. 12.
3. Ibid., January 3, 1905, p. 6.
4. Ibid., November 15, 1906, p. 4.
5. Ibid., October 25, 1910, p. 8.
6. Ibid., January 2, 1906, p. 8.

## APPENDIX IV BIBLIOGRAPHY

- I. Antrobus, Augustine M. (ed.). History of Des Moines County, Iowa and Its People. Vol. II. Chicago: Clarke Publishing Company. 1915.
- II. Biographical Review of Des Moines County, Iowa. Chicago: Hobart Publishing Company. 1905.
- III. Gue, Benjamin F. History of Iowa From the Earliest Times to the Beginning of the Twentieth Century.
- IV. Harlan, Edgar R. (ed.). The Annals of Iowa. Vol. 9. Third Series. Des Moines: Historical Department of Iowa. 1909-1910.
- V. Harlan, Edgar R. (ed.). A Narrative History of the People of Iowa. Vol. II. Chicago and New York: The American Historical Society, Inc. 1931.
- VI. Iowa Press Association's Who's Who in Iowa, The. Des Moines: Iowa Press Association. 1940.
- VII. Who Was Who in America. Vol. I. (1897-1942). Chicago: The A. N. Marquis Company. 1942.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Historical Journals

- Bray, Thomas James. The Rebirth of Freedom. Indianola, Iowa: Record & Tribune Press. 1957.
- Bowers, William L. "The Fruits of Iowa Progressivism." Iowa Journal of History. Vol. 57. No. 1. (January 1959).
- Chandler, Alfred D., Jr. "The Origins of Progressive Leadership." The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt. Vol. VIII. Edited by Elting E. Morison, John M. Blum, Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., and Sylvia Rice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1954.
- Clark, Dan Elbert. History of Senatorial Elections in Iowa. Iowa City: The State Historical Society of Iowa. 1912.
- Cochran, Thomas C., and Miller, William. The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America. New York: The MacMillan Company. 1942.
- Cole, Cyrenus. I Remember I Remember. Iowa City: The State Historical Society of Iowa. 1936.
- Harrington. "A Survey of the Political Ideas of Albert Baird Cummins." Iowa Journal of History and Politics. Vol. 39. No. 4. (October 1941).
- Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1956.
- Horack, Frank Edward. "The Operation of the Primary Election Law in Iowa." Iowa Journal of History and Politics. Vol. 19. No. 1. (January 1921).
- Mowry, George. The California Progressives. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1951.

- Mowry, George. Theodore Roosevelt and the Progressive Movement. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. 1947.
- Nixon, Herman Clarence. "The Populist Movement in Iowa." Iowa Journal of History and Politics. Vol. 24. No. 1. (January 1926).
- Nye, Russel B. Midwestern Progressive Politics. Michigan State University Press. 1959.
- Potts, Eli Daniel. A Comparative Study of the Leadership of Republican Factions in Iowa, 1904-1914. Unpublished Master's thesis. Department of History: State University of Iowa. 1954.
- Ripley, William Z. Railroads Rates and Regulation. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1912.
- Ripley, William Z. (ed.). Railway Problems. Boston, New York, Chicago, London, Atlanta, Dallas, Columbus, San Francisco: Ginn and Company. 1913. (Revised).
- Ross, Thomas Richard. Jonathan Prentiss Dolliver: A Study in Political Integrity and Independence. Iowa City: The State Historical Society of Iowa. 1958.
- Sage, Leland L. William Boyd Allison. Iowa City: The State Historical Society of Iowa. 1958.
- Sias, Richard Timm. Groups and Movements Aligned with the Progressive Party in Iowa, 1912. Unpublished Master's thesis. Department of History: State University of Iowa. 1959.
- Sieber, George Wesley. Sawmilling on the Mississippi: The W. J. Young Company, 1858-1900. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. Department of History: State University of Iowa. 1960.
- Visser, John E. William Lloyd Harding and the Republican Party in Iowa. Unpublished Master's thesis. Department of History: State University of Iowa. 1957.

Newspapers and Magazine Articles

- Burlington Evening Gazette. Scattered references: 1901-1906.
- Burlington Hawk-Eye. 1901, 1903-1910, 1912.
- Des Moines Register and Leader. 1906-1908. Scattered references: 1901, 1903-1905, 1909-1910, 1912.
- Lissner, Edward. "Iowa's Political War and Its Bearing Upon the Destiny of the Republican Party." Harper's Weekly. Vol. 1. No. 2574. (April 21, 1906).
- Moorhead, H. G. "Albert B. Cummins: Governor of Iowa." The World Today. Vol. XI. No. 4. (October 1906).
- Smith, Lewis Worthington. "Governor Albert B. Cummins: A Statesman Who Places the Interests of the People Above the Demands of Privileged Classes." Arena. Vol. XXXVI. (July 1906).

Biographical Sources

- Antrobus, Augustine M. (ed.). History of Des Moines County, Iowa and its People. Vol. II. Chicago: Clarke Publishing Company. 1915.
- Biographical Review of Des Moines County, Iowa. Chicago: Hobart Publishing Company. 1905.
- Gue, Benjamin F. History of Iowa From the Earliest Times to the Beginning of the Twentieth Century. Vol. IV. New York: The Century History Company. 1903.
- Harlan, Edgar R. (ed.). The Annals of Iowa. Vol. 9. Third Series. Des Moines: Historical Department of Iowa. 1909-1910.

Harlan, Edgar R. (ed.). A Narrative History of the People of Iowa. Vol. II. Chicago and New York: The American Historical Society, Inc. 1931.

Iowa Press Association's Who's Who in Iowa, The. Des Moines: Iowa Press Association. 1940.

Who Was Who in America. Vol. I. (1897-1942). Chicago: The A. N. Marquis Company. 1942.

### Miscellaneous

Returns to the Grand Lodge of Iowa, Des Moines Lodge, No. 1, for the Year Ending December 31st, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908.

Returns to the Grand Lodge of Iowa, Malta Lodge, No. 318, for the Year Ending December 31st, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908.

Statement of Mr. H. S. Rand. Hearings Before the Committee on Interstate Commerce, U. S. Senate, In Special Session, Pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 288, Fifty-Eighth Congress, Third Session. Vols. II-III. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1906.

Secretary of the State of Iowa. The Iowa Official Register. No. 10 (1893), No. 14 (1897), No. 16 (1901), No. 17 (1902), No. 18 (1903), No. 19 (1904), No. 20 (1905), No. 21 (1906), No. 22 (1907-1908), No. 23 (1909-1910), No. 24 (1911-1912), No. 25 (1913-1914), No. 26 (1915-1916), No. 27 (1917-1918), No. 28 (1919-1920), No. 29 (1921-1922).

Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910. Vol. II. Population, Alabama-Montana. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1913.

Executive Council. Census of Iowa for the Year 1905. Des Moines: Bernard Murphy, State Printer. 1905.

City Directories

Gould's City and Classified Business Directory of the City of Burlington. Burlington, Iowa: Ora J. Gould.  
(Three volumes: 1900-1901, 1902-1903; 1904-1905.)

McCoy's Burlington, West Burlington and Des Moines County Directory. Rockford, Illinois: McCoy Directory Co. (Five volumes: 1906, 1907-1908, 1908-1909, 1910-1911, 1912.)

Zorn's Burlington Directory Including Also West Burlington 1909-1910. Chicago: Zorn Directory Co.