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INTRODUCTION

As one looked over the broad floor of the Progressive National Convention in 1912 he could see here and there such varied delegates as the humanitarian Jane Addams and the financier George Perkins. These and many others met on this sultry August day in Chicago to formally launch a new political party on the always rough sea of politics.

It is a Christian Crusade, you might have heard someone say. But a skeptic might have asked: against whom and for whom were the Crusaders entering the fray? Against the poor and downtrodden? Certainly they were not going to receive further blows from such as Jane Addams. The evil rich? Then why did men like George Perkins support the party so generously with their time and fortunes. The great American Middle-Class? That would be the height of foolishness; weren't all these delegates of this great American Middle-Class?

Who were these Progressives and what was their movement all about? Many approaches have been used to explore this question: tracing the historical development of progressivism in the United States which finally led to the crusade of 1912, examination of the personal motives
of Theodore Roosevelt, and analysis of the party's platform and speeches by its leaders.

More recently, historians have undertaken studies of the Party's leadership which have shed considerable new light on its composition and its meaning.

Two studies of this nature are especially important. In the first, Professor George Mowry examined the personal histories of forty-seven California Progressives in order to form a collective portrait of the "typical" Progressive leader. Mowry says that this "typical" leader was from the middle-class, was Protestant, had a western background and/or a north European name, was quite often a Mason, and had generally been, at least until 1900, a conservative Republican willing to go along with men like Senator Hanna and President McKinley.¹

Alfred D. Chandler, Jr. in a study of 260 Progressive Party leaders reached similar conclusions. The typical Progressive, argues Chandler, was urban and middle-class, native American Protestant, was quite likely to be a professional man and a college graduate and had had little experience in politics and then as a rule only in

local politics. This lack of political experience, Chandler argues, combined with the lack of any institutional discipline and the individualistic middle-class attitudes of the group caused the decline of the Progressive Party.\(^2\) Chandler divides his 260 leaders into geographical sections and the conclusions reached differ in some respects according to section.

These studies by Mowry and Chandler have been especially important in forming the foundation of an increasingly accepted theory as to the roots of progressivism. Professor Mowry relies largely upon his collective biography to support the view that the Progressive movement was a middle-class revolt against the power of both big business and organized labor.

More recently Professor Richard Hofstadter in The Age of Reform has accepted these two studies and has built upon them an impressive body of theory about the Progressive movement. It was, he argues, a middle-class individualistic response to changing patterns in American society. The Progressive movement, Hofstadter says, was a

---

status revolution of the middle-class against:

the newly rich, the grandiously or corruptly rich, the masters of great corporations, who were bypassing the men of the Mugwump type—the old gentry, the merchants of long standing, the small manufacturers, the established professional men, the civic leaders of an earlier era.\(^3\)

Thus the Progressive party was, according to Hofstadter, a revolt of the old against the increasingly dominant new.

These theories of Mowry and Hofstadter go too far. For while they assume that the Progressives were uniquely middle-class, their collective biographies, the major evidence on which their conclusions are based, do not prove this to be true. Mowry and Chandler have shown what the backgrounds of two groups of Progressives were, but not what was unique about those backgrounds. The major question should be: was the typical Progressive leader different from the leaders of the other two Republican factions and if so in what way? Only after answering this question will we know what was distinctive about the Progressive Party, and only after we find what was distinctive can we begin to theorize safely as to the reasons for the rise of the party.

Our major problem then, despite the Mowry-Chandler studies, still remains: in what ways were the Progressives distinctive? Suppose that this study, for example, should find that the leaders of all three factions were of the middle-class. Then the idea of Mowry, Chandler, and Hofstadter that the Progressive movement was a middle-class revolt would lose much of its validity. Moreover, we would be able to argue that in its middle-class character the Progressive Party was like all American political parties at the time in that they drew their leadership from the middle-class. The mere fact that the Progressives were middle-class fails to establish the fact that they were uniquely of the middle-class. The Mowry-Chandler studies have assumed, and Professor Hofstadter has accepted and elaborated on their assumptions, that the Progressive party leaders were somehow different from leaders of the other two factions. But they have certainly offered no comparative proof that this is so. If it was found that the Progressive leaders were really unique in background from the other two groups studied herein, then we would have a true basis on which to form generalizations about their uniqueness. On the other hand, if it was found that the Progressive Party leaders were
not unique in background then we would certainly have to look elsewhere for our explanation of the Progressive Party.

Professors Mowry, Chandler, and Hofstadter, moreover, frequently imply that generalizations based upon certain groups of Progressive Party leaders correctly describe the Progressive movement. Here they fail to distinguish between the Bull Moose Party of 1912 and broader features of progressivism prior to and after the Bull Moose Party (1912-1917) which might have differed from the party itself.

In Iowa, with which this paper is primarily concerned, the progressive movement thrived from 1901 to 1912 almost exclusively under the leadership of Governor and Senator Albert Baird Cummins.4 Might not the Cummins movement have differed from the Bull Moose Party? In other words to know what was unique about Roosevelt Progressives we must discover how they were distinctive not only in the

4. Senator Cummins was elected Governor in 1901 and Senator in 1908 although Mowry says 1902 and Hofstadter says 1910 as the date for his first election as Governor. One of the major problems of the Progressive Party in 1912 was that many of these Cummins Progressives, including Senator Cummins himself and Senator Kenyon, did not break openly with the Republican Party in 1912; many of them did, however, support Roosevelt semi-privately.
total picture, but among Progressives themselves.  

The techniques of collective biography and statistical analysis as used by Mowry, Chandler, and other students in various fields will be used herein to determine the differences among the three factions of Iowa Republicans. Categories used to describe the political leaders are for the most part the same as those used by Mowry and Chandler, although a few others have been added.

Personal histories of one-hundred men of each of the three factions will be described, compared and contrasted in the main body of this thesis. By determining in what categories the three groups were similar and dissimilar it is hoped that some real insight will be gained into the composition of the Progressive Party. We must know what is distinctive about the Progressives before we can safely go further into analyzing the party and/or movement.

5. The three-way split in the Iowa Republican Party in 1912 suggests that there were differences between the Progressive factions. These three wings of 1912 were the Roosevelt Progressives, Standpats, and the Cummins Progressives.

6. Of additional importance here is the attempt to determine if the Cummins Progressives were different in background as, if this proves to be the case, it might help to explain why they did not unite with the Progressive Party in its crusade of 1912.)
THE SAMPLE

For this study our sample consists of 100 political leaders from each of three Iowa Republican factions. Such a sample seems sufficiently large to make valid comparisons and contrasts; at the same time it is convenient for purposes of calculating percentages.  

Members of the sample occupied a variety of positions in the party. Holders of state and national offices and candidates for such offices comprise by far the largest group; others were members of the state party organizations who held no public office, state and national convention delegates, officers of political clubs, and prominent campaigners. Tables 1, 2, and 3 present a complete breakdown

7. The majority of the sample for the Cummins Progressive and Standpat factions was taken from the files of the Des Moines Register and Leader for 1908. The split between these two Republican groups was quite apparent this year and the Register and Leader was in the habit of breaking down the groups of men discussed into the two factions; thus it provides a good source for obtaining names of men belonging to each of the factions which were so evident in 1908. The names of the Roosevelt Progressives were taken for the most part from the Iowa Official Register of 1913-1914 and 1915-1916. Certain sections of these books listed the candidates for offices for each party plus members of the state and national party organizations. As the Progressive Party wasn't in existence until 1912 it was impossible to obtain a breakdown of the membership before that date.
Table 1
POLITICAL POSTS HELD BY PROGRESSIVE PARTY LEADERS SELECTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Selected</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to Progressive National Convention, 1912</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Delegates to Progressive National Convention, 1912</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to State Progressive Convention with no other position, 1912</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of State Progressive Convention Committees, 1912</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive candidates for Elector, 1912</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive candidates for State Representative, 1912</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive candidates for State Senator, 1912</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive candidates for State Representative, 1914</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive candidates for State Senator, 1914</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive candidates for State offices, 1912</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive candidates for State offices, 1914</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive candidates for U.S. Congress, 1912</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive candidates for U.S. Congress, 1914</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers of State Progressive Convention, 1912</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers of State Progressive Convention, 1914</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional State Committeemen, 1912</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive State Committeemen, 1914</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive campaigners with no other position</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

POLITICAL POSTS HELD BY CUMMINS PROGRESSIVE PARTY LEADERS SELECTED

| How Selected |
|---------------|----------|
| Number        |          |
| State Representative, 1908 | 40 |
| State Senator, 1908 | 17 |
| Cummins Progressives elected State Senator, 1908 | 1 |
| Cummins Progressives elected State Representative, 1908 | 3 |
| State officers listed as Cummins Progressives, 1908 | 6 |
| Candidates in 1908 Republican primaries for state office who were listed as Cummins Progressives, 1908 | 6 |
| Congressional candidates or Congressmen listed as Cummins Progressives, 1908 | 5 |
| Delegates to Republican State Convention, 1908 | 1 |
| Prominent Cummins campaigners as listed in Register and Leader, 1908 | 16 |
| Cummins's Club Presidents, Vice-Presidents or Secretaries, 1908 | 5 |
Table 3

POLITICAL POSTS HELD BY STANDPAT
REPUBLICAN PARTY LEADERS SELECTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Selected</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Representatives, 1908</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senators, 1908</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Candidates or Congressmen, 1908</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates for state office, 1908</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates for State Representative, 1908</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men mentioned as candidates against Cummins for Senator after death of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Allison, 1908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to Republican State Convention, 1908</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Standpat Conference which nominated Lacey for Senator, 1908</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigners for Allison and/or Lacey</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers of Allison Clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the party positions held by our group of leaders.

A number of leaders, prominent in Iowa Republican politics, do not appear in our sample. Some of these were excluded because it was practically impossible to classify them with either the Cummins Progressive or Standpat factions. At this period (1908) in Iowa history many men stood on the fence so to speak while others left one faction to move to the other. Perhaps the most notable example of this group is Senator Jonathan P. Dolliver, who, after the death of Senator Allison in 1908 was a man temporarily without a faction. Standpats considered Senator Dolliver to be a Progressive and conversely Progressives thought he was a Standpat.

There was no such difficulty with Progressive Party leaders of 1912; these men were either members of the Progressive Party or they were not. However, it was especially difficult to find material about many of the prominent Roosevelt Progressives; these therefore were excluded from the sample. A list of men of this faction for which no material save their county of residence could be found appears in Appendix II.
AGE

Compositely, the California Progressive leader was a young man, often less than forty years old. The Iowa Roosevelt Progressive leader was equally young, and younger than leaders of either of the other two factions. While the mean age of the Roosevelt Progressive as of 1910 was 47, that of the Cummins Progressive was 52 and of the Standpat, 56. Thus, there existed a spread of nine years in age between the Bull Mooser and the Standpat.

Table 4
MEAN AND MEDIAN AGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Progressive</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standpat</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummins Progressive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportions of each group in various age categories also differed greatly. Five per-cent of the

8. Mowry, op. cit., p. 86.
Roosevelt Progressives were under thirty; none of the Standpats or Cummins Progressives were this young. While 30% of the Roosevelt Progressives were under forty, only 14% of the Cummins Progressives and only 4% of the Standpats fell in the same bracket. The age group, under fifty, displays a similar difference; 54% of the Roosevelt Progressives, 40% of the Cummins Progressives and 19% of the Standpats fell in this category.

Table 5
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THREE REPUBLICAN GROUPS, AS OF 1910

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressive</th>
<th>Standpat</th>
<th>Cummins Progressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures for the upper-age categories reveal also the relative youth of the Roosevelt Progressives and age of the Standpats. While 42% of the Standpats were over sixty, only 26% of the Cummins Progressives and 24% of the Roosevelt Progressives were in the same category. On the other hand, 19% of the Standpats were over seventy, while only 7% of each of the other two factions were in this group. One Standpatter, Senator William B. Allison, would have been eighty-one in 1910 had he still lived.
NATIVITY

Professor Chandler remarks that his 260 Progressive Party leaders "were native born...;...only nine...were born outside the United States."\(^9\) Professor Mowry, though he presents no exact figures, states that the California Progressive "had probably been born in the Middle West... and...carried a north-European name."\(^{10}\) The Iowa Roosevelt Progressives were also predominantly native-American, but so were the other two Republican factions. In fact, the Standpats were more native born than were either the Bull Moosers or the Cummins Progressives. This is reflected in the nativity of both the leaders' fathers and the leaders themselves.

Of the fathers of Roosevelt Progressives 70% were born in the United States; on the other hand 71% of the fathers of Cummins Progressives and 79% of those of the Standpats were native born.\(^{11}\) Of the leaders themselves,

- \(^{10}\) Mowry, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
- \(^{11}\) Unfortunately there is a large unknown group here. Some of these fathers are known to have been born in the United States and where this is known it is so given both in Table 6A and in the Appendix. A large group of men also exists for which no information as to father's birthplace is known at all. The total number unknown was 20 for the Roosevelt Progressives and 23 for each of the other two groups.
87% of the Roosevelt Progressives, 89% of the Cummins Progressives and 90% of the Standpats were native born. Both of the Progressive factions, therefore, were less native-born and gave more representation to foreign nationality groups than did the Standpats.

This is especially true of the Scandinavian element. The fathers of five each of the Cummins and Roosevelt Progressives were Scandinavian born, while among the Standpats the father of only one was Scandinavian. On the other hand, four of the Roosevelt Progressives were themselves Scandinavian born, two of the Cummins Progressives, and none of the Standpats. These facts help to support the view that both Progressive groups received considerable Scandinavian support, a fact already suggested by the observation that the stronghold of both Progressive factions lay in north central and northwestern Iowa where most of the Iowa Scandinavian settlement took place.

Leaders from Canadian and British backgrounds also found important representation in the two Progressive groups. Among the Roosevelt Progressive leaders, the parents of nine were born in Great Britain, as compared to thirteen for the Cummins Progressives, and only five for the Standpats; at the same time two each of the Roosevelt
Progressives and Standpats and three of the Cummins Progressives were born in Great Britain. Not a single Standpat leader was born in Canada or had parents of Canadian nativity. Yet of the Roosevelt Progressives the parents of two were born in Canada, as was true of one Cummins Progressive; at the same time four Roosevelt Progressives themselves were born in Canada and so were four Cummins Progressives.

Equally striking is the disproportionate number of leaders of Irish descent among the Standpats. Of the leaders' fathers, ten of the Standpats were Irish, six of the Roosevelt Progressives and six of the Cummins Progressives. On the other hand, while five of the Standpat leaders themselves were born in Ireland, not one of either of the Progressive factions were natives of the Emerald Isle.

Distinctions with respect to other nationalities are not so striking as for the Scandinavians, the British, the Canadians, and the Irish. For example, the parents of nine Roosevelt Progressives were born in Germany, of Standpats four, and of Cummins Progressives three; at the same time three Roosevelt Progressives themselves were born in Germany, three Standpats, and no Cummins
Progressives. Only three other nationalities are represented in the entire group, one of Dutch parentage was a Cummins Progressive, one of Swiss parentage a Standpat, and one born in Rumania who was a Cummins Progressive. This last individual was the only leader among the 300 who did not have a northern European, Canadian, or American ancestry.

Of the 2,224,771 people living in Iowa as of 1910, 1,660,870 or 74.66% were born of native-born parents. We have seen that 70% of the Roosevelt Progressives fathers were born in the United States and that 71% of the Cummins Progressives and 79% of the Standpats were also native born. Both of the Progressive factions, therefore, gave more representation to foreign nationality groups than their proportion of the total population, while the Standpats gave disproportionate representation to the native-born.

Iowans of German parentage formed 11.74% of the population of Iowa in 1910; yet only 5%, or less than one-half of the proportion in the total population, of the 300 leaders were of German born parentage. Roosevelt Progressives came closest to the total population ratio with 8% or their leaders having at least one parent German-born; however, among the Cummins Progressives only 4% and
the Standpats only 3% of their leaders came from this group.

Irishmen and descendents of men and women born in Great Britain were overrepresented among the 300 leaders in comparison with their proportion of the total population. Irishmen\textsuperscript{12} formed only 3.33% of the total population of Iowa in 1910 yet 7.33% of the 300 were Irish. The Standpats especially gave the Irish a disproportionate representation of 10% of their leaders.

The picture for Great Britain varies somewhat here as the two Progressive groups grant a disproportionate amount of representation to people with parents born there. Direct descendants of the British formed 2.98% of the Iowa population in 1910; yet 9% of the 300 leaders were of such parents. The picture becomes even more unbalanced when we see that of 100 Cummins Progressives thirteen had at least one parent born in Great Britain; the Roosevelt Progressives also had a high percentage here with nine although the Standpats only had 5% in this category.

Elsewhere there seems to be little or no distortion between percentage of nationality groups in the

\textsuperscript{12} Here the term is used to represent those leaders having one or both parents who were born in Ireland.
total population of Iowa and percentage of these groups among the 300 Iowa leaders.

The Middle-Atlantic region was the birthplace of most of the fathers of all the 300 leaders and ranked third for the members of the three factions themselves. Twenty-three percent of the Roosevelt Progressive fathers were born in this area, as were 20% of the fathers of each of the other groups of 100. Again the Roosevelt Progressives led in the number of leaders born there with 15% while 13% of each of the other two factions were born in one of the Middle-Atlantic states.

More leaders of all three groups were born in the Old Northwest than in any other area outside of Iowa. A high 34% of the Cummins Progressives as compared with the much lower 22% for the Roosevelt Progressives and Standpats were originally from this area. On the other hand, 15% of the Standpats fathers were born in this region while only 11% of the Cummins Progressives and 13% of the Roosevelt Progressives first saw light in the Old Northwest.

Standpats once again led in the number of fathers born in the South with 10% while the number dropped rather

13. The Old Northwest includes the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin.
sharply to 6% for the Cummins Progressives and a still lower 5% for the Roosevelt Progressives' fathers. A similar situation presents itself when we see that 3% of the Standpats themselves were born in this region although no Cummins Progressives and only one Roosevelt Progressive could call a part of Dixie his original home.

The numbers of New Englanders who came to Iowa was large, but many first stopped in some state of the old Northwest so the numbers represented in this study are not too large although there is still a sizeable representation for the Puritans. Of the Cummins Progressives' fathers 9% were born in New England; the percentage gradually drops to 8% for the Standpats and 7% for the Roosevelt Progressives' fathers. The Standpats themselves led in the number born in one of the New England states as is the case with the Southern born leaders. The percentage of Standpats so born is the same as the percentage for the Standpat fathers who were born in New England—8. The Progressive groups dropped off abruptly as the Cummins Progressives had 5% and the Roosevelt Progressives 4% of their leaders who were born in the extreme Northeastern states of the United States.

No fathers were born in regions other than those
previously discussed and Iowa; however, a few of the leaders themselves were born in other areas. The 100 Roosevelt Progressives included three men who were born in states other than Iowa of the Western Midwest; only one of each of the other two factions was born in one of those newer Midwestern states. One Roosevelt Progressive was born in Texas to complete the picture.

Of the Standpats' fathers 3% were born in Iowa; however, this is not much different from the situation for the fathers of the other two factions as 2% of each of these were also born in Iowa. As one might expect a much larger percentage of the 300 leaders themselves were born in the Corn State. The Standpats led with 42% of their leaders having been born in Iowa. For the Roosevelt Progressives 41% were born in Iowa so that hardly indicates any major difference; however, only 37% of the Cummins Progressives were born in Iowa. Although the Cummins Progressives were at the bottom of the list as regards number born in Iowa, it may be remembered that they led in the percentage of leaders born in the neighboring states of the Old Northwest.

14. Western Midwestern states represented here are Minnesota and Kansas.
It has been indirectly noted that 63% of the Cummins Progressives were born outside of Iowa; 41% of these, however, came to Iowa before their twentieth birthday. Twenty-three per-cent of the Roosevelt Progressives (total--59 born outside of the state) and 31 of the Standpats (total--58 born outside of the state) also arrived in Iowa before reaching the age of twenty. This difference is shown even more sharply when it is realized that 15% of the Cummins Progressives arrived in Iowa before reaching ten while for the Standpats the percentage was only nine and for the Roosevelt Progressives eleven. Only twelve Roosevelt Progressives arrived in the state between the ages of ten and twenty; 22% of the Standpats and 26% of the Cummins Progressives arrived in Iowa while of that age.

The remainder of those born outside of Iowa, except for those for which no material was found, came to Iowa after the age of twenty. A high 31% of the Roosevelt Progressives, 27% of the Standpats and 21% of the Cummins Progressives were old enough to vote or nearly so by the time they reached the Hawkeye state.
## Table 6A

**PATERNAL NATIVITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(state unknown)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Northwest</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Atlantic</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New England</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Britain</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norway, Sweden, and Denmark</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holland</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switzerland</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Northern Europe (Canada through Switzerland)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6B

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF IOWA POPULATION WITH ONE OR BOTH PARENTS FOREIGN BORN; AND NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL SAMPLE (300) WITH ONE OR BOTH PARENTS FOREIGN BORN.*

Total Iowa Population (1910)--2,224,771

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Iowa Population Foreign Born</th>
<th>Percentage of Iowa Population Foreign Born</th>
<th>Number of Sample Foreign Born</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample Foreign Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>28,852</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>74,259</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>66,483</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>108,190</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>261,247</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>17,411</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>7,459</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>563,901</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on U. S. Census of 1910.
Table 7

BIRTHPLACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Northwest</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Midwest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

AGE OF ARRIVAL IN IOWA OF THOSE MEMBERS OF THE THREE FACTIONS WHO WERE BORN OUTSIDE OF THE STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number born out of state</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NUMBER OF RURAL DWELLERS IN THE THREE FACTIONS AND URBAN POPULATION DISTRIBUTION OF THOSE MEMBERS OF THE THREE GROUPS WHO LIVED IN AREAS WITH OVER 500 POPULATION

"The leaders of the Progressive Party were city men..."\textsuperscript{15} This also was a distinctive characteristic of the Iowa Roosevelt Progressive. While 23\% each of the Standpats and Cummins Progressives came from rural areas (farms, and towns under 500), only 13\% of the Roosevelt Progressives lived in the same areas. The Roosevelt Progressives were not drawn disproportionately simply from towns over 500, but more precisely from cities over 10,000. Leaders of all three groups came in almost the same proportion from towns between 500 and 10,000 population (56\% Roosevelt Progressives, 56\% Standpats, and 57\% Cummins Progressives); but while 36\% of the Roosevelt Progressives came from cities over 1,000 population, only 27\% of the Standpats and 23\% of the Cummins Progressives came from areas of similar size.

Standpats and Cummins Progressives contained the same percentage of rural dwellers; however, there were a few differences respecting the geographical

\textsuperscript{15} Chandler, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 1462.
distribution of these rural men. The Cummins Progressive rural leaders were concentrated in northwestern and northcentral Iowa while the Standpat rural leaders tended to be located in southern or eastern Iowa. This agrees with other studies made of the subject of geographical distribution of the Cummins Progressives and Standpats. However, in the small and medium size towns (500-10,000) no such uneven geographical distribution appears. This is certainly one place where a much larger sample would be necessary before any definite conclusions could be reached.

In cities over 30,000 geographical differences in distribution appear, but these are mainly due again to the lack of a larger sample. Most of the larger cities in Iowa were located in the Standpat centers of southern Iowa and on the Mississippi and Missouri borders. This partially accounts for the fact that 15% of the Standpat leaders were residents of cities from 30,000 to 50,000 population; while 12% of the Roosevelt Progressives and only 2% of the Cummins Progressives resided in these border cities.

Central Iowa and Des Moines were noted as being Progressive during most of this period (Des Moines was
Table 9

POPULATION OF TOWN OR CITY IN WHICH LEADERS OF THE THREE FACTIONS HAD THEIR MAJOR RESIDENCES AT THE TIME THEY WERE LEADERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Range</th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Roosevelt Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural 0-500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-5,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-20,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-30,000*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-50,000*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-50,000**</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sioux City, Davenport, Dubuque, Cedar Rapids

** Des Moines
Senator Cummins's home) and therefore this might explain why only 5% of the Standpats were residents of Des Moines, while 11% of the Roosevelt Progressives and 10% of the Cummins Progressives lived in Iowa's capital city.
OCCUPATION AND ECONOMIC CLASS DIVISION

Occupations

The occupations of these Progressive leaders make impressively clear their urban middle-class backgrounds. At a time when the professional classes were much smaller than today...over sixty per-cent...were professional men....The remaining ninety-five leaders were businessmen, but only a very few were owners and operators of really small businesses. Among the 260 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...16

Thus does Professor Chandler sum up his remarks on the occupations of his 260 Progressive Party leaders. Professor Mowry sums up in almost the same fashion by remarking that "This was a group of highly literate, independent free enterprisers, and professional men."17

All three groups in this study were found to have a majority of middle-class professionals and businessmen.18 There are, however, some differences here. Of the

17. Mowry, op. cit., p. 83.
18. Professionals as used in this study include: medical doctors, educators, veterinarians, horticulturists, architects, college presidents, and druggists. Chandler includes in addition: lawyers, authors, social workers,
Roosevelt Progressives 17% were professionals (other than lawyers) while only 8% of the Standpats and 7% of the Cummins Progressives held professional occupations. Twenty of the thirty-two professionals were medical doctors; 11% of the Roosevelt Progressives, 5% of the Standpats and only 4% of the Cummins Progressives were M.D.'s. Among the remaining ten professionals there was little difference between the three groups of 100. Each faction had two educators; the remaining four professionals were distributed among two factions and three occupations. Strangely enough no ministers appeared in the list of Roosevelt Progressives; one Roosevelt Progressive was a minister, but at this time he was acting in his capacity as a college president. Fathers of some members of the three groups were ministers; 5% of the fathers of both Progressive factions and 6% of the fathers of the Standpats performed ministerial duties.¹⁹ Fathers of six of the Cummins engineers, and experts in agriculture or municipal government. Lawyers here are treated in a separate category; this study included none of the other professionals listed by Chandler which do not appear in my list of professional occupations.

¹⁹. The occupation of the fathers of the leaders of the three factions at the birth of these leaders (or as close to the date of birth as can be determined) is what is given here and in Appendix I as the father's occupation.
Progressives were medical doctors as compared with 3% for the Roosevelt Progressives and 2% for the Standpats.

Lawyers were not well represented as fathers. Fathers of 4% of the Roosevelt Progressives were lawyers; a still lower 3% and 2% of the fathers of the other two groups were lawyers. Lawyers, however, were far more prominent among the leaders themselves. A high 36% of the Cummins Progressives were lawyers while the Roosevelt Progressives had 31% and the Standpats 27%, including three corporation attorneys.

Bankers were most prominent in the Standpat faction. Of the Standpats 9% were bankers while 8% of the Cummins Progressives and only 5% of the Roosevelt Progressives were of this occupation. None of the 300 leaders' fathers were bankers.

Each progressive faction had one father who was an editor; none of the Standpat fathers were of this category. Standpats, however, led in the number of editors among the leaders themselves. Editors comprised

---

20. The occupations of fathers are unknown for many of the Roosevelt Progressives; the 19% unknown for the Roosevelt Progressive contrasts with 13% unknown for the Standpats and the much lower percentage of 8 for the Cummins Progressives.
11% of the Standpats and 7% of each of the Progressive factions.

The number of businessmen in the Roosevelt Progressive faction was a high 26%; the figure for the Cummins Progressive and the Standpats is the same and is lower--17%. Manufacturers were represented by four Standpats and by two Roosevelt and Cummins Progressives. There was not much disparity among the three groups in the number of fathers who were businessmen. Of the Cummins Progressives' fathers 10% had owned and/or operated a business; the percentage here for the other two groups is a somewhat higher 12.

Among the fathers' occupations a fairly sharp difference will be noted if the three categories of laborers, mechanics, and engineers are combined. Here we see that 10% of the fathers of the Roosevelt Progressives and only 1% of the fathers of the leaders of the other two factions were in this joint category.

The other occupations, with the exception of farmers, are not well enough represented to reveal any significant differences. Fathers of three of the Standpats were teachers; the other two groups were not represented here. Roosevelt Progressives and Standpats each had one
father who was a stone-mason; the Cummins Progressives were again not represented. One leader from each faction was in law school at the time he was a leader. Semi-professional classes had one leader on the Standpat and Cummins Progressive factions, but none of the Roosevelt Progressives held a semi-professional occupation.

A large percentage of the fathers in all three groups were farmers; yet the background of the Roosevelt Progressives was far less rural than that of the other two groups. While the fathers of only 45% of the Roosevelt Progressives were farmers, fully 59% of the Standpats and 67% of the Cummins Progressives' fathers were of this occupation. A still sharper percentage difference is shown by the number of farmers which each faction had as leaders. The Standpats and Cummins Progressives with twenty-two and twenty-one farmers had twice as many as the Roosevelt Progressives with eleven. This seems to correlate fairly well with the number of rural vs. number of city dwellers in each faction and with the occupational background of the leaders' fathers. These facts as to number of farmers further underscores the relatively low rural quality of the Bull Moose movement.
A further attempt was made to divide the three factions into three classes representing employed people; self-employed people including farmers, editors, professionals, and most business men; and large farmers, businessmen, corporation attorneys, and manufacturers. This division was primarily made in order to determine if there was a larger number of what might be called big businessmen in one group than in the other two. 21

As can be easily seen in Table 12 a huge majority of all three factions were in the middle division of self-employed people. The Cummins Progressives led with 91% of their leaders in this division, and the other two factions each had a high 85% of their leaders here.

It was found that there actually was a larger number of Standpats in the highest category--III. Standpats had 14% of their leaders in this category while 10% of the Roosevelt Progressives and only 6% of the Cummins Progressives fitted in here.

At the opposite end of the scale the Roosevelt Progressives led in the number of employed people with 5%;

21. No really huge businesses were located in Iowa at this time, but there were a few that were of fairly good size.
Economic Class Division

A further attempt was made to divide the three factions into three classes representing employed people; self-employed people including farmers, editors, professionals, and most business men; and large farmers, businessmen, corporation attorneys, and manufacturers. This division was primarily made in order to determine if there was a larger number of what might be called big businessmen in one group than in the other two. 21

As can be easily seen in Table 12 a huge majority of all three factions were in the middle division of self-employed people. The Cummins Progressives led with 91% of their leaders in this division, and the other two factions each had a high 85% of their leaders here.

It was found that there actually was a larger number of our big businessmen in the highest category—III. Standpats had 14% of their leaders in this category while 10% of the Roosevelt Progressives and only 6% of the Cummins Progressives fitted in here.

At the opposite end of the scale the Roosevelt Progressives led in the number of employed people with 5%;

21. No really huge businesses were located in Iowa at this time, but there were a few that were of fairly good size.
the Cummins Progressives had 3% and the Standpats only 1% of their leaders in this group.
Table 10

FATHER'S PRIMARY OCCUPATION AT BIRTH
OF REPUBLICAN LEADERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Roosevelt</th>
<th>Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins</th>
<th>Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone-Masons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11

**OCCUPATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Attorneys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Professionals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Doctors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulturist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druggist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12

**ECONOMIC CLASS DIVISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I (employed)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II (self-employed)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDUCATION

Seventy-five per-cent of the California Progressives studied by Professor Mowry had received a college education.22 Professor Chandler remarks that: “At a time when college graduates were much fewer, over sixty per-cent...were professional men, a large number of whom attended graduate schools.”23

Each faction studied here contained a large group of college and university men; 52% of the Roosevelt Progressives had received some college training as had 45% of the Cummins Progressives and 43% of the Standpats. Generally speaking the Roosevelt Progressives had a larger number of men who had received some graduate work.

As might be expected, most of the college or university trained people attended school in Iowa, particularly the State University of Iowa. This is especially true in the case of the lawyers. Twenty-two per-cent of the Cummins Progressives, 18% of the Standpats, and 17% of the Roosevelt Progressives attended the State University.

22. Mowry, op. cit., p. 87.
Other Iowa colleges and universities were attended by 13%, 15%, and 16% of the leaders of each faction in the same order as before. A high 19% of the Roosevelt Progressives received their highest education outside of Iowa; this contrasts with 10% for each of the other two factions.

There appears to be little difference among the other educational categories except in the case of those members of each of the factions who had received their highest education at a business college. Seven per-cent each of the Roosevelt Progressives and Standpats and only 1% of the Cummins Progressives were business college men.²⁴

²⁴. For 4% of each faction no material was available on the subject of education. One Standpat had stated that he had received no formal education.
Table 13
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Medical School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Trades School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RELIGION

Professor Chandler states that his Roosevelt Progressives were Protestant.\(^2^5\) Professor Mowry goes a little more into detail:

The long religious hand of New England rested heavily upon California progressivism, as it has on so many American movements. Of the twenty-two progressives whose biographies indicate a religious affiliation, seven were Congregationalists, two were Unitarians, and four were Christian Scientists.\(^2^6\)

The great majority of the leaders of all three Republican factions in Iowa were Protestant.\(^2^7\) Of the 100 Roosevelt Progressives studied, 85% were known Protestants; 87% of the Standpats and 84% of the Cummins Progressives were also known to be Protestants.

On the other hand the Roosevelt Progressive faction practically had a monopoly on Catholic leaders. While only 4% of the Roosevelt Progressives were Catholics; only 1% of the Cummins Progressives and none of the Standpats were of this faith.

\(^{25}\) Chandler, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 1462.
\(^{26}\) Mowry, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 88.

\(^{27}\) A person, for these purposes, is considered to be a Protestant if no denomination was stated in any source, but if it was stated that he was a member of a Protestant fraternal organization, or if a close relative was found to be a Protestant.
Table 14

RELIGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant (denomination unknown)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of God</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Brethren</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main Protestant denomination in Iowa in the period studied were the Methodists. Methodists comprised 19% of the Roosevelt Progressives, 26% of the Standpats, and only 18% of the Cummins Progressives. Presbyterians rank second in number of members among the 300 with 11%, 13% and 16% in the same order. Congregationalists rank third among the Protestant sects with 10% of the Cummins Progressives being of this faith while 9% of the Roosevelt Progressives and 5% of the Standpats were also members of the Congregational church.

The only important differences among the Protestants are found in the number of Unitarians and Christian Scientists the Roosevelt Progressive group contained and the somewhat larger number of members of the various evangelical sects among the other two factions. 28 Five per-cent of the Roosevelt Progressives were known to have been Unitarians or Christian Scientists while no Unitarians were found among the leaders of the other two factions although one Standpat was a Christian Scientist. Otherwise there seems to be little or no differences in religion.

28. Evangelical sects as used in this paper refer to all Protestant sects with the exception of Unitarians and Christian Scientists which are discussed separately in this paper.
between the three factions except for the number of Catholics as previously discussed.
MEMBERSHIP IN FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS

"He [the California Progressive] was more often a Mason." What Mowry has said concerning the fraternal affiliation of the California Progressive holds true for the Iowa Roosevelt Progressive; it is also true for the other two factions. Masons were represented by 46% of the Cummins Progressives. Many members of the three groups were also members of other organizations of a similar nature.

All in all there appears to be little difference among the three factions respecting the other fraternal organizations to which many of them belonged. A smaller percentage of the Roosevelt Progressives were not (or unknown) members of any fraternal organizations. This 32% for the Roosevelt Progressives contrasts with the higher 41% for the Standpats and 44% for the Cummins Progressives. A typical Cummins Progressive tended more to belong to fewer organizations than did a typical member of one of the other two factions. Twenty per-cent of the Roosevelt Progressives and 18% of the Standpats were members of three or more such organizations, while only 12% of the

Table 15
MEMBERSHIP IN FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights of Pythias</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd Fellows</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Woodmen</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Workmen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Workmen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons of American Revolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Star</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodmen of the World</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Brotherhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Beta Kappa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Foresters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Order of Foresters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeomen of America</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystic Toilers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights of Columbus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Sons of America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons of Veterans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Arcamum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known to be member of none</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, nothing said about fraternal organizations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16  
NUMBER OF FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS BELONGED TO  
BY EACH MAN WHO WAS A MEMBER OF AT LEAST ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cummins Progressives belonged to more than three fraternal societies. Twenty-four per-cent of the Roosevelt Progressives, 20% of the Standpats, and only 11% of the Cummins Progressives were members of two of these fraternal organizations.
VETERANS

Civil War veterans were represented among the 300 by 24% of the Standpats, 10% of the Roosevelt Progressives, and 8% of the Cummins Progressives; all presumably were members of the Grand Army of the Republic.

On the other hand, the Roosevelt Progressives led in the number of Spanish-American War veterans with 8%; Cummins Progressives had 5% and the Standpats 2% of their leaders represented in this war. This may or may not be due partly to the admiration which some people had for the hero of San Juan hill which might have led them to support Roosevelt while they might not otherwise have done so. However, the number of veterans is probably due (both Spanish-American and Civil War) more to the age factor than to anything else.

One Roosevelt Progressive claimed to be a veteran of the Indian Wars, having served in the regular army from 1879 to 1884.
PREVIOUS POLITICAL ALIGNMENT

As is generally assumed, and as Chandler and Mowry both state, the great majority of the Roosevelt Progressives were former Republicans. This is why the author has taken the liberty to call them merely a faction of the Republican party although as will be shown this is far from being a completely correct assumption.

Information was found on all but 13% of the Roosevelt Progressives in regard to their previous political alignment. It is probably that these thirteen were Independents up until 1912.

Seventy-four per-cent of the Roosevelt Progressives were listed as being Republicans up to 1912. Six per-cent had been Democrats until 1912 and 4% had been Democrats who had broken with the party after the nomination of Bryan in 1896. One Roosevelt Progressive definitely listed himself as an Independent up until 1912. Two per-cent had stated that they had never belonged to either major party so they too might be classified as Independents. One Roosevelt Progressive reportedly had belonged to the Prohibitionist Party prior to 1912.
Two Standpats had been Democrats until 1896; afterwards they had listed themselves as Republicans. One Standpat had listed himself as a Liberal Republican Party member in 1872.

Only 2% of the Cummins Progressives are known to have ever given their allegiance to a party other than the Grand Old Party. One had been a member of the Greenback Party when that movement was flourishing in Iowa; another had been a Whig before the days of the Republicans. Undoubtedly, many of the other older men in all three factions had also been Whigs in their younger days, but nowhere, except in this one instance, is this so stated.
PREVIOUS POLITICAL EXPERIENCE

The Iowa Roosevelt Progressive leader was politically inexperienced. None of them had held state executive or national offices and only ten had, previously to 1912, held office as a State Representative or Senator. Forty-four percent of the Roosevelt Progressive leaders, as far as is known, had held no offices either elective or in local Republican or Democratic organizations prior to 1912; only 8% of the Cummins Progressives and a still lower 4% of the Standpats were inexperienced. This jibes well with Professor Chandler's statement that: "The Progressive leaders had had little experience outside of local politics." 30

Thirteen categories of offices were computed and are presented in table 17. This chart vividly shows that the Roosevelt Progressive was politically inexperienced when compared to the average Cummins Progressive or Standpat. The Standpats had held a total of 218 multiple offices (see footnote under table 17); the Cummins Progressives had held 196 and the Roosevelt Progressives

only 95 of the offices listed. Between the Cummins Progressives and the Standpats there does not seem to have been any significant differences in political experience although the Standpat did, on the average, have slightly more political experience than did the Cummins Progressive leader.
Table 17
PREVIOUS POLITICAL EXPERIENCE BEFORE 1908, 1912, or 1914

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Roosevelt Progressives</th>
<th>Standpats</th>
<th>Cummins Progressives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had served on School Board</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had held City offices</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had held Township offices</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had held County offices</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had been an officer in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County or Congressional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District organization of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican or Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had been Delegates to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican or Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conventions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had held State Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had held National offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or had been Congressmen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had served as Regent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had served as State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator or State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had been an officer of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State party convention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or a member of a party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had been elected Elector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had held Judicial District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. A multiple listing is made in this table. That is, if a man had held offices in more than one of the thirteen categories he is counted more than once. Because of this, 218 is listed as the total number of categories of offices held by the Standpats and 196 is listed for the Cummins Progressive for the same reason.
CONCLUSION

What was the background of the Progressive Party leader of Iowa? Was it uniquely different from the background of leaders of the other two factions? In some ways the Progressive Party leaders were truly unique, yet in other characteristics the differences were slight, if they existed at all. Taken as a whole, we probably could generalize, for Iowa at least, that the Progressive Party leader was unique in background.

The two characteristics which show an unique difference to the greatest extent are those of political experience and age. The Roosevelt Progressive truly had a lack of political experience when compared with his brother in one of the other two factions. In the field of comparative number of men who had held political offices other than minor local posts this lack of experience is especially evident. The age of the Roosevelt Progressive certainly indicates that he was, on the whole, younger than a member in one of the other two groups.

Together with the age and political experience factors, the Roosevelt Progressive is different, yet not to as great a degree, in some other characteristics. It
has been shown, for example, that the Roosevelt Progressive did have more of an urban background than did the average Cummins Progressive or Standpat. Also the Roosevelt Progressive had slightly more education than an average member of one of the other factions. Occupational field is a third way in which the Roosevelt Progressive is somewhat different. All three groups were composed primarily of middle-class professionals and businessmen, but a few differences emerge within these groupings. The Roosevelt Progressive was not nearly as likely to be a farmer as a member of another faction would be. At the same time he was more apt to be a businessman (one-third more than either of the other two), or a professional other than a lawyer (seventeen vs. eight for each of the other two factions). In the field of economic class division the Standpats did have a few more members of the upper class and the Roosevelt Progressives a few more of the lower middle-class.

In still other characteristics there were no, or very slight and certainly not unique, differences among the three factions. Nativity is one of these categories. All fathers of members of the three factions were from northern Europe or were born in the United States with
northern European names; only one of the three hundred men surveyed was born in southern Europe. There were a few differences among the factions concerning the nationality distribution of the fathers from northern Europe and of the leaders themselves from both northern Europe and the United states. For example, it has been shown that the two Progressive factions both tended to give more representation to foreign nationality groups than did the Standpats and that this was especially evident in the case of those fathers of leaders born in Scandinavia or Britian. There was very little that might really be termed unique in the field of religious affiliation. All three factions were composed overwhelmingly of Protestants. The Progressive Party leaders did, however, have a small group of Catholics and members of the more liberal Protestant sects (i.e., Unitarians), while the Standpat and Cummins Progressive was more likely to be a member of one of the evangelical sects. The same situation, as in religious affiliation, applies in the case of comparative membership in fraternal societies. The Roosevelt Progressive was usually a Mason and quite often belonged to other fraternal societies as well; the same applies to both the Standpat and Cummins Progressive groups. The Roosevelt Progressive as a rule was more of a joiner than was the typical member of one of the other factions.
A second question remains to be answered. Was the Cummins Progressive closer in background to the Standpat or to the Roosevelt Progressive? As is the case with the Roosevelt Progressive we find that in some ways he was similar to both groups and in other ways closer to either the Roosevelt Progressive or Standpat faction in background.

The Cummins Progressive had about the same amount of political experience as the average Standpat. The slight difference (196—Cummins Progressive, 218—Standpat) may probably be explained by the slight age difference. The Cummins Progressive was also similar to the Standpat in respect to the number of rural and number of urban residents in each faction. Lawyers formed a great percentage of the Cummins Progressive group than of any of the other two. On the other hand, the Cummins Progressive and Standpat groups had a basically similar number of farmers, businessmen, and professionals other than lawyers.

In some features, however, the Cummins Progressive was more like the Roosevelt Progressive. The Cummins Progressive was younger than the Standpat, although not quite as young as the Roosevelt Progressive. The two Progressive factions were also basically similar, or at least
closer to each other than to the Standpats, in the field of nativity.

As has been shown, there were few or no differences among all three groups in such fields as education, religion, and fraternal affiliation.

In light of the Mowry-Chandler studies what does this study imply concerning the composition of the Progressive Party leadership? As mentioned in the introduction, Mowry and Chandler give us a picture of two selected groups of Progressive Party leaders, but make no comparisons of these leaders with leaders of the other political factions of the day.

It has been noted that the Iowa Progressive Party leader was very much like the leader surveyed by Professors Mowry and Chandler. To repeat, he was: middle-class, protestant, native American or northern European, often a professional, well educated, and was lacking in practical political experience. But it has also been noted herein that the Progressive Party leader was not uniquely of the middle-class, and was not unique in many other features mentioned by Mr. Mowry and Mr. Chandler.
The fact that Mowry and Chandler noted that the Progressive leader was of the middle-class has been seized upon by Professor Hofstadter and others to partially explain the Progressive movement and party as a status revolt of the middle-class. But we have seen that all three Republican factions were predominantly middle-class. So, if the Progressive movement and party of 1912 was a middle-class revolt as Professor Hofstadter and others have said, the failure of the other two large groups of middle-class Republicans to revolt certainly needs more explanation than it has ever been given in any known study of the period. It seems a faulty assumption even to say it was a middle-class revolt when such strong evidence is available, showing that only one segment of the middle-class was in revolt.

What then does this study show that might be used to explain partially the Progressive Party and movement? The two major characteristics in which the Roosevelt Progressives are different are in the fields of age and political experience. These two naturally are closely related as men gain political experience generally as they grow older. Now we would have to determine whether these Roosevelt Progressives on their own free will kept out
of politics before 1912, or were they kept out by the older and more established politicians of the other factions. No doubt a few of the Progressive Party leaders of 1912 had not entered politics before because they honestly had no desire to soil their hands. For the great mass of the leaders, however, it seems much more plausible to say that they were isolated and kept from participating in politics unless they worked their way up through the Cummins Progressive or Standpat machines; newcomers were generally not welcomed into the higher councils of either of these factions unless they had the proper connections.

It is suggested, therefore, that the Progressive movement of 1912 was not a middle-class revolt and scarcely had any connection with such a thing; but was instead a revolt of young politicians against the old who had heretofore excluded them from active participation in politics. When these younger men were refused entrance into the higher councils of either of the two older machines they simply attempted to form one of their own when the opportunity glaringly presented itself in that glorious summer of 1912.
THESIS BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Other Sources

Des Moines Register and Leader. 1908 and 1912.


---

32. Another bibliography is given at the end of the Appendix and this lists all sources used to gather material on the 300 men studied. The sources listed in the thesis bibliography are those used directly, in the writing of the main body of the thesis.
APPENDIX I

Three Hundred Biographical Sketches
INTRODUCTION

The following sketches are intended to be for the use of any future student of Iowa politics of this period or for any interested person. Most of the material gathered by the author about each man is presented. For this reason, among others, a list of source(s) has been provided at the end of each sketch. Additional material may be found about each man included in this appendix by consulting one or more of these sources. A system of simple code numbers has been devised to eliminate the necessity of full notes on sources. The first number under "See" in all cases refers to the number of the book or other source as listed by number in the appendix bibliography. The second number in the code, if there are three numbers, (i.e., 19-II-215), refers to the volume number of the work cited. If the volume number is under five, as is the case with all county histories, this number is then given in Roman numerals. If a work or series has over five volumes, the volume number is then given in Arabic numerals. In the case of one volume works the second number cited (i.e., 39-468) refers to the page number. In the multi-volume works the third number listed is the page number. If more
than one source is listed, each source is divided by a semi-colon (;).

The address given in these sketches is the address of the Cummins Progressives and Standpats as of 1908 and the address of the Roosevelt Progressives as of 1912-1914. City and county names should provide no trouble, though it should be remembered that many Iowa cities are not located in counties of the same name. The city of Des Moines, for example, is not in Des Moines County.

The term Roosevelt Progressive, Cummins Progressive, and Standpat are used in the loose sense. Of course, there were some men in the Cummins camp, for instance, who did not consider themselves closely attached to Senator Cummins. Nevertheless, all the men listed under each group may generally be considered of that general group. See the unit on "The Sample" for more information on this subject.

The office held, or contested, by each man is given next. In a few cases a man held or ran for no office; in these cases a short statement is made concerning the position of each of these men within the group.

Age as given in these sketches is based on the
age of each man concerned in 1910. In two cases age could not be found, but other dates were which made it possible to closely estimate their ages. No difficulty was occasioned concerning place of birth.

The father's birthplace was found in most cases. In a few cases, however, no material was discovered concerning paternal nativity. In this case as in all others (except political experience) where information about the leaders could not be found, there is simply a blank in the sketch. The father's occupation is the occupation at the birth of the leader, or as nearly afterwards as could be determined.

The early occupation of the subject is their occupation(s) before they entered the occupation(s) they were believed to hold in 1908, 1912, or 1914. A man could be a farmer up to 1907, for instance, and a merchant thereafter. Farmer would be listed as the early occupation and merchant as the occupation in 1908 if he was a Cummins Progressive or Standpat. If a man went directly from school to the occupation he held in 1908, 1912, or 1914 the early occupation is listed as student.

Education as given in these sketches refers to the highest formal education known to have been achieved
by the man in question. It may be safely assumed that all men who went to college had had previous education of a high school level. Some material about the individual's education was found in almost every instance; however, it was often only stated that a man had attended "public schools." This could conceivably include everything from kindergarten through high school. No interpretation is attempted here. The statement "public schools" is in many cases, a direct quote from sources used. All the lawyers listed who did not attend a law school or college presumably read law. In some cases this is to stated in biographies, and is given in these sketches.

Political experience is not usually a subject which is left out of county history biographies or other biographical works. Elective offices are usually the only ones considered here. There are, however, in several cases statements as to appointive offices held. If available, dates or years an office was held are included; but no special effort was made to compile all the dates of many minor offices. The fact that a man held a certain office is the important thing. These biographies do not, in most cases, extend beyond 1908, 1912, or 1914. If, however, certain facts are known about a man after one of the above
dates these facts are included if they are deemed of im-
portance.

For the Roosevelt Progressives the previous politi-
cal alignment, if known, is given. In a few cases in
the other two factions there are men included who had
shifted parties. The proper statement is then made to that
effect.

Veterans of the Civil War and Spanish-American
War are noted as is one veteran of the Indian Wars. Church
affiliation, if known, is given. If a man, as an example,
attended the Methodist church, but was not a member, he
is still considered to be a Methodist for our purposes.
If a man was known to be a Protestant, but the denomination
was unknown, the word "Protestant" is all that is given.
Masons and members of other Protestant semi-secret societies
are considered to be Protestants for purposes of church
membership.

Membership in fraternal organizations is next
given. College fraternities, with the exception of Phi
Beta Kappa, are not included. Membership in commercial,
social, or political clubs as a rule is not given.

If the above information fails to answer any
questions the reader might have after looking over a particular sketch, it is suggested that he consult the sources listed where he will find all the material used for the preparation of the sketch. With a very few exceptions, all sources used may be found in the library of the State Historical Society of Iowa.


BEALER, Elmer J. C. Cedar Rapids, Linn. Standpat. Candidate for Alternate Delegate at Large in Republican primaries, 1908. Age 65, born in Switzerland. Father born in Switzerland, a stonemason. Education, public


power in Iowa politics up to his death. Episcopalian Church. Died at Burlington, March 6, 1909. Class III.


BROOKS, John T. Sigourney, Keokuk. Standpat.


Hed served as Mayor of Cedar Rapids and as a Regent on the State Board of Education, Democrat until 1896. Veteran of Civil War where he won the Medal of Honor and was breveted Lieutenant-Colonel. Protestant. Masons. Died at Cedar Rapids, December 22, 1913. Class II. See: 140-III-960; 142-II-177.


CLARKE, Edgar E. Cedar Rapids, Linn. Standpat. Mentioned as a candidate for Senator against Cummins in Standpat Convention, 1908. Interstate Commerce Commissioner,


CLEAVES, R. L. Cherokee, Cherokee. Roosevelt Progressive. Delegate to Progressive National Convention,


Canada. Father born in Canada, a farmer. Education, rural public schools. Occupation farmer for entire life. Had served as Township Assessor, School Board member, City Councilman, County Supervisor. Class II. See: 146-22-611.


Member Masons, Odd Fellows. Died October 13, 1924.
Class III. See: 11-II-430; 146-22-613; 157-15-158.


DUNHAM, George W. Manchester, Delaware.


DYE, Charles C. Rural, Decatur. Standpat.
State Representative, 1908. Age 50, born in Iowa. Father American born, a farmer. Education, high school graduate.
Early occupation, teacher. Occupation in 1908, farmer (500 acres). Had served as Road Overseer, 20 years.
Class II. See: 146-22-614.


Former Republican. Episcopal Church. Member Elks, and
Modern Woodmen. Class II. See: 8-448(father); 107-II-297.

GREENWOOD, Charles G. Silver City, Mills.
Standpat. State Representative, 1908. Age 74, born in
Maine. Education, University of Wisconsin. Early occupa-
tion, teacher. Occupations in 1908: lumber businessman,
bank president. County Supervisor, 10 years. Justice of
the Peace, 12 years. Protestant. Masons. Class II.

GRIER, George E. Deep River, Poweshiek. Cummins
Progressive. State Representative, 1908. Age 34, born
in Iowa. Father born in Pennsylvania, a farmer. Educa-
tion, Iowa College, B.A. Early occupation, teacher.
Occupation in 1908, bank cashier. Member Republican
County Central Committee, 4 years. Presbyterian Church.
Masons. Class I. See: 111-II-630; 146-22-618.

GRIFFITH, Harry L. Elkader, Clayton. Roosevelt
Progressive. Member of Progressive State Committee on
Nominations, 1912. Age 38, born in Iowa. Father born
in Indiana, a newspaperman. Education, University of
Wisconsin, 2 years. Early occupation, electrical engineer.
Occupation in 1912, Editor and Publisher of the Elkader
Argus. No previous known political experience. Former


HENRY, Samuel D. Coon Rapids, Carroll. Standpat. Member of Standpat Conference which nominated Lacey for Senator, 1908. Age 56, born in Indiana. Father born in Kentucky, a farmer. Early occupation, flour miller. Occupations in 1908: Editor and Publisher of Coon Rapids


Governor of Iowa in 1920. Class II. See: 146-22-623.


in 1912, fire insurance and realty agent. Township Clerk, 10 years. Township Trustee, 8 years. School Board member. Former Republican. Methodist Church. Member Masons, Odd Fellows. Class II. See: 6-II-811.


LATTA, Karle C. Paton, Greene. Standpat. Member of Standpat Conference which nominated Lacey for Senator, 1908. Age 45, born in Iowa. Father born in Ohio, a farmer. Education, academy, 1 year. Early occupation, clerk. Occupation in 1908, drug store owner and
operator. City Council, 7 years. City Clerk, 5 years.


political experience. Former Republican. Protestant.
Member Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks. Class III. See:
136-568; 140-III-1012.

State Representative, 1908. Age 70, born in Ireland.
Father born in Ireland, a farmer. Education, public
schools. Early occupation, teacher. Occupation in 1908,
retired stock farmer. Had held all the local township
offices. Veteran of Civil War. Evangelical Church. Died
at Cedar Rapids, April 17, 1928. Class II. See: 85-855;
146-22-625; 157-16-559.

McELRATH, W. W. Rural, Woodbury. Standpat.
State Representative, 1908. Age 62, born in Ireland.
Father a farmer. Education, took a business college course.
Farmer entire life. Owned bank stock. County Board of
Supervisors, 1887-1890. Methodist Church. Masons. Class
II. See: 146-22-626.

McKENNEY, Jacob S. Fairfield, Jefferson.
Member of Standpat Conference which nominated Lacey for
Senator, 1908. Age 56, born in Iowa. Father born in
Pennsylvania, a general store operator. Education, Iowa
College. Early occupation, student. Occupation in 1908,
lawyer. Owned bank stock. No previous political experience.
Congregational Church. Class II. See: 71-II-43 and 68 (father).


Died at Des Moines, November 15, 1932. Class II. See: 143-IV-415; 157-16-630.


1908, real estate, loan, and brokerage business. Interested in banking. No previous known political experience. Class II. See: 143-IV-264; 146-22-632.


Had served as City Solicitor (Creston) and County Attorney (Union). Catholic. Class II. See: 140-III-960; 146-22-634.


Class II. See: 55-468.


at Iowa Falls, June 8, 1917. Class II. See: 146-22-636; 157-14-234.


War. Protestant. Member Masons, Shrine. Class III.
See: 34-136; 36-II-886.


Medical College, graduate. Early occupation, student. Occupation in 1908, medical doctor. Owned real estate. State Representative, 4 years. Had served as Mayor, City Councilman, President of Board of Education. Congregational Church. Knights of Pythias. Class II. See: 19-552; 20-II-70; 146-22-605.

APPENDIX II

Other Roosevelt Progressive Leaders
OTHER ROOSEVELT PROGRESSIVE LEADERS,
1912 and 1914.

Adams, A. B. Pottawattamie
Aitken, Charles T. Fremont
Allerson, E. G. Cass
Ashbrook, C. O. Marshall
Austin, H. C. Mitchell
Ayers, R. B. Johnson

Barr, James Black Hawk
Bates, H. B. Adair
Beatty, D. R. Jefferson
Belt, R. J. Black Hawk
Bemis, W. S. Clay
Benbow, William Lee
Berry, Henry S. Monroe
Bowker, E. Jasper
Boyce, George E. Black Hawk
Bradley, Charles W. Lyon
Brinkershoff, L. M. Ringgold
Brock, William Jasper
Brose, Gustave Dubuque

Carrier, M. A. Jasper
Cessna, T. C. Plymouth
Chacey, U. S. Poweshiek
Clark, C. O. Page
Clements, W. B. Fayette
Cooper, J. W. Scott
Cooper, U. S. Lucas or Wayne
Cowan, James A. Lee
Crail, Joe S. Jefferson

Dahlberg, R. M. Van Buren
Day, F. F. Adams

Fleming, H. S. Fayette
Franke, Carl Butler
Frum, J. E. Shelby
Frudden, F. A. Floyd

Gardner, Samuel Audubon, Dallas or Guthrie
Geiseki, O. A. Henry
Gibson, R. M. Linn
Goodfellow, John Poweshiek
Gormley, Luther Washington
Green, Merritt Marshall
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hadley, L. P.</td>
<td>Cass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, R. M.</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hempton, C. E.</td>
<td>Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey, C. E.</td>
<td>Decatur, Ringgold, or Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawley, A. W.</td>
<td>Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heller, D. B.</td>
<td>Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, D. B.</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess, E. B.</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess, Harvey</td>
<td>Black Hawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Harry W.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ickis, F. D.</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Frank</td>
<td>Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, W. J.</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judson, A. B.</td>
<td>Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingland, Thomas A.</td>
<td>Winnebago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kugler, A. J.</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, W. M.</td>
<td>Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang, A. U.</td>
<td>Clarke, or Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing, L. W.</td>
<td>Hardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson, Clarence W.</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughlin, L. W.</td>
<td>Ringgold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leik, William C.</td>
<td>Dubuque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden, Robert</td>
<td>Grundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linder, A. H.</td>
<td>Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loban, William W.</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland, T. O.</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCoid, George</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee, J. H.</td>
<td>Cerro Gordo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory, E. A.</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malone, Emmet T.</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Joseph</td>
<td>Linn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason, Alfred</td>
<td>Dubuque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters, Ross</td>
<td>Tama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell, Carl</td>
<td>Dubuque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meier, C. F.</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill, Horatio</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalf, Joseph</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzger, A. E.</td>
<td>Guthrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Henry</td>
<td>Dubuque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moberg, Henry</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molsberg, C. A.</td>
<td>Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Wilson H.</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morey, H. A.</td>
<td>Bremer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, B. C.</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musselman, S. M.</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nelson, N. F.  
Nervig, Omen  
Niles, Fred A.  

Lucas  
Humboldt  
Benton, Cedar, Grundy,  
Jones, Linn, Marshall,  
or Tama

Olson, Oscar  
Ontjes, O. A.  
Osborn, L. M.  

Buena Vista, Humboldt,  
or Pocahontas  
Grundy  
Marshall

Page, George W.  
Parsons, Alfred  
Paulger, L. O.  
Perrin, C. M.  
Philpot, S. B.  

Boone  
Scott  
Black Hawk  
Monona  
Webster, Carroll  
or Kossuth  
Hardin

Pitzer, J. W.  
Quade, C. R.  

Story

Randall, Frank  
Rankin, Wiley S.  
Rapp, Aaron  
Rath, Henry H.  
Read, Henry  
Reed, C.  
Reed, Henry  
Reed, J. W.  
Ralph, W. R.  
Riggs, George D.  
Rinker, Purley  
Robb, Sid D.  
Roberts, W. B.  
Robinson, Charles H.  

Linn  
Cerro Gordo  
Wapello  
Cedar  
Page  
Hamilton  
Mills  
Ida  
Lucas  
Polk  
Appanoose  
Clinton  
Lee  
Ringgold

Sanders, J. F.  
Sargisson, Payne  
Smith, Jerome  
Spaulding, G. A.  
Spencer, F. P.  
Starr, W.  
Stason, E. J.  
Steigerman, L.  
Stevens, John H.  
Stevens, O. W.  
Stinehart, James E.  

Lee  
Woodbury  
Adams  
Shelby  
Fremont  
Pottawattamie  
Woodbury  
Madison  
Cerro Gordo  
Fayette  
Cerro Gordo, Franklin,  
or Hancock
Strikling, J. H.          Lee
Swan, G. W.               Union
Sweasey, A. J.            Winneshiek
Sword, James M.           Linn

Tade, H. D.               Henry
Terwilliger, C. S.        Hancock
Thompson, Robert          Monroe
Tonet, E. W.              Clarke
Tuttle, W. A.             Marshall

Wakeman, A. B.            Taylor
Wellman, J.               Delaware
Wertz, J. B.              Clay
Weslenhauer, F. A.        Johnson
Westcott, S. X.           Lee
Wheeler, D. A.            Sioux
Whiley, W. E.             Woodbury
Whitaker, Jno. A.         Linn
Wilcox, Lucian T.         Webster
Williams, William         Benton
Wirth, Guido              Ringgold
Worth, G.                 

Young, Daniel H.          Buchanan or Delaware
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