

HISTORY OF  
POST-WAR REACTION  
AGAINST DEMOCRACY

by

Emery C. Wine  
A.B., McPherson College, 1922

Submitted to the Department of  
History and the Faculty of the  
Graduate School of the University  
of Kansas in partial fulfillment  
of the requirement for the degree  
of Master of Arts.

Approved by:

  
James C. Malin  
Instructor in Charge

  
F. H. Hodder  
Head or Chairman of Department

May 25, 1927.

## PREFACE

The chief purpose of this study is to set forth the extent and causes of the reaction in America since the World War against the instruments of direct government which were generally adopted in the early part of this century. Chapter one sketches the development of the modern, world-wide movement for democratic government, with particular emphasis on the twentieth century movement for popular government in America. Chapter two develops the post-war reaction in Europe against parliamentary government and the establishment of dictatorships. Chapter three traces the post-war reaction in America against the primaries, initiative, referendum, and recall, and suggests some considerations respecting the future of democratic government.

I wish to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. J. C. Malin of the University of Kansas,

who has very considerably directed this study. He has made many helpful suggestions regarding the organization of material and excluded a greater number of errors of style than are found in the paper.

HISTORY OF  
POST-WAR REACTION  
AGAINST DEMOCRACY

---

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I. The Growth of Democracy -----	(Page)
1. Meaning of Democracy -----	1
2. Development Before the Twentieth Century --	3
3. Twentieth Century Movement -----	5
a. Gains for Democracy in Europe and Asia -	5
b. Popular Government Movement in America -	6
(1) Adoption of the Primaries, Initiative, Referendum, and Recall -----	7
(2) Election of 1912 -----	21
Chapter II. Post-War Reaction in Europe	
1. Apparent Gains for Democracy -----	25
2. Crisis of Representative Government -----	29
Chapter III. Post-War Reaction in America	
1. Recall -----	41
2. Presidential Primary -----	45
3. Initiative and Referendum -----	50
4. Direct Primary -----	62
Conclusion -----	94
Footnotes -----	105
Bibliography -----	122

## CHAPTER I

### The Growth of Democracy

Democracy is a term of wide significance. It may refer to a society based on equality; a state in which the actual power of government rests with the masses; or a form of government in which the authority of the state is directly administered by the people or their representatives. The term is often used to describe all these ideas taken together, and more vaguely to characterize the tendency of progressive nations during the last 200 years toward the realization of such a social and political organization. The social idea has been most frequently advanced by the continental and especially the French writers, while the English and American political writers have tended to limit the use of the term to the actual exercise of political power by the people, -- in this sense it is almost identical with popular government.

A democratic society is one in which privilege of birth, wealth, and intelligence has been abolished, and equality of legal rights and opportunity established. The existence of distinctions whether they be hereditary, intellectual, or social are not to be found in such a society. The development of

centralization of wealth and the existence of extreme poverty hinder its progress. It can, therefore, under the present industrial system only be imperfectly realized. Its best illustrations are found in primitive and simple communities like some of the Swiss cantons, and early frontier settlements of western United States and Canada.

A government in which the administration of the affairs of state rests with the people, to be performed either by them directly or through their representatives, is a republic. The pure or direct form has never been completely realized and is not practical on a large scale. The town meeting plan of government cannot be extended to the masses in the modern state. Although a democratic state tends to act through republican forms, a representative republic is not necessarily democratic either in spirit or operation. A government republican in form may be like most of the Spanish American states, a military tyranny or a despotism. Strictly speaking these states are not democracies, but England may be so called even though it is monarchical in form, and also Canada which is a part of an empire. The term democracy is not properly used to describe an external form of government, but a political society in which the power of the state is controlled by the mass of the people.

Unlike the theory on which the ancient republics were based, the modern conception of democracy has grown out of the belief in the equality of all members of the state. It rests on the idea that the people, for whom the government is established, are better judges of what is best for their welfare than any individual or group of individuals. The theory is a fine one, but experience shows that it tends to the extreme position that in directing the affairs of state one man's opinion is as good as another.

It was in England that democratic principles first found political expression in a modern state. The revolutions of the seventeenth century, which resulted in the establishment of a commonwealth and the expulsion of the Stuarts, eliminated the rule of absolute monarchs and brought Parliament into a position of power. Though the Parliament was until the reforms of 1832 and 1867 an aristocratic body, it did respond to public opinion and resist the encroachments of the king. By the close of the nineteenth century constitutional government had been established in every European state of any size except Russia. But, nowhere except in England, France, Switzerland, Norway, and Sweden had the rule of the people attained any degree of success.

Democracy in America was the offspring of the democratic forces which established the English lib-

eral political institutions. It was the British liberal group that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries dominated the settlement of the colonies, and to some extent directed their political development. The simplicity of colonial life and the absence of any large number of English aristocratic classes contributed to the development of political forms which successfully withstood the strain of separation from the mother country. The conservative constitutions adopted by the states were gradually liberalized in the first half of the nineteenth century. The control of the federal government at the opening of the century shifted from the control of the aristocratic Federalists to the Jeffersonians, who believed in right of suffrage for the masses but the restriction of office holding to men of special training. But with the advent of Jackson all this was changed. The dangers of special preparation for office were strongly emphasized. An unlimited faith, placed in the ability of the masses, found expression in the spoils system and rotation in office. In the Civil War democracy triumphed over an aristocratic social and political society which threatened the existence of democratic institutions.

Early in the nineteenth century the Spanish American colonies revolted from the mother country and established republics with written constitutions modeled after the United States. In the latter half

of the century parliamentary government was achieved in Canada. The British Australian possessions, building on the precedent of the United States and Great Britain, developed social and political institutions far more democratic than those of the mother country of America. With their universal male and practically universal female suffrage, social reform measures, and efforts to solve the problem of economic democracy, these countries may be ranked as foremost in the development of democratic institutions.

In the early part of the twentieth century there was a striking revival of the democratic spirit in western Europe and America, and the beginnings of the spirit in Asiatic countries which had before been unresponsive to its influence. The unrest in India, the revolution in China resulting in the establishment of a republic, the young Turkish movement, the granting of constitutions in Russia and Persia, the European demand for woman's suffrage and granting of greater power to the lower house in the British Parliament, indicated that the movement was world-wide.

In Asia, the movement was only the beginning of a struggle to destroy absolutism; in Europe, with the exception of Russia, the demand was for better representation of the masses in the governmental machinery already in operation; but in America, the revival of the democratic spirit was promoted by a desire of the

masses to secure a more direct control of the government through the adoption of the primaries, the initiative, referendum, and recall, and the direct election of senators.

In the period following the Civil War, American representative government failed to satisfactorily solve the problems of the new society growing out of the settlement of the west, the building of railroads, the establishment of large industries and corporations, the increase in population, and the rise of large cities. With little consideration for the masses, the financial and industrial interests manipulated governmental machinery to promote their own interests.

Gradually the people realized they were being oppressed and sought relief through governmental intervention. This proposal was at first looked upon as revolutionary and socialistic. The idea was a complete change from the thinking of politicians in the pre-war period, when there was no suggestion that a democratic government would limit the rights of the individual for the good of the social group. The government was urged to relieve objectionable conditions by creating commissions to curb the railroads, by dissolving the combinations, and by placing a tax on incomes. The response was inadequate and tardily made.

To the reformers the possibility of securing relief through representative governmental machinery

seemed hopeless. The result was a movement for the adoption of instruments for direct government.

First the primary was established to remove control of party nominations from the hands of bosses and corrupt interests. When satisfactory results were not achieved by this system alone, the initiative and referendum were adopted. This gave the people the power to enact laws over the heads of the legislators and reject laws passed by them. Finally, when officers continued to show a lack of consideration for the interests of the people, the recall was proposed. The masses felt that representative government had failed, and direct government was necessary to meet the problems of the new society.

In point of time the first of these devices to be adopted by a state were the initiative and referendum. South Dakota made legal provision for them in 1898.<sup>1</sup>

For a few years the adoption by other states was slow. But in the latter part of the first decade of the century the movement grew rapidly, and by the close of 1915 seventeen states had provided for the initiative and nineteen for the referendum.<sup>2</sup>

The chief object of these instruments was to break up what was known as the "invisible government", by democratizing the political machinery. The people felt that the state governments were getting beyond

their control. They desired a means of direct action both in making and enforcing the laws. Demands were made upon the legislatures for reforms respecting the control of corporations, tax abuses, and other subjects of public interest, but there was no response. The legislatures were generally "boss ridden" and seemed more anxious to serve some special interest rather than the people. The reformers, tired of using persuasion to secure reforms, decided on direct methods of making their influence felt and their wishes respected. They were quite conscious of the difficulties encountered in securing the Australian ballot and other important reforms.

The lack of a faith in the integrity of the legislators, and an unusual willingness on their part to place upon the voters the responsibility for law-making popularized the movement.

By its friends the movement was proclaimed a phase of a world-wide democratic movement<sup>3</sup> -- "a part of that great political awakening which the nation is now experiencing and which will bring about a permanent change in our political methods"<sup>4</sup>. Prophecies were made that there would be no more class legislation against the welfare of the citizens because the individual, realizing the impossibility of securing special legislation for himself and against the welfare of the community, would soon discontinue his

efforts for special privilege and content himself with supporting measures for the general welfare only. "The individual cannot, under the initiative, enact legislation against general welfare or in favor of any selfish interest."<sup>5</sup>

An unusual faith in the ability of the people to determine questions of legislation was exhibited by the leaders of the movement. "The people can surely be trusted with the power to use these agencies of liberty. In matters which concern their safety, well being, and happiness, the people as a whole are wiser than any man."<sup>6</sup> Many were confident that when cases of "intricate policy" were presented the citizens would rely on the judgment of those who had made a special study of the problem for consideration.<sup>7</sup>

The leading advocates of the initiative and referendum movement were in Oregon. From time to time in the early part of the century, there came from that state striking evidences of the success of the new instruments of popular control. It was claimed that a major result of their introduction in Oregon was the "breathing of new life" into the state government. As soon as the people found they had a vital part in legislation, indifference to politics ceased and immediately they began to take an active interest in public affairs.

The Portland Oregonian, leading Republican

daily of that state, and one of the most influential dailies on the Pacific Coast, in its issue of June 10, 1906, made the following statement in the course of the discussion of a recent election entitled, "Most Important Political Events of the Year": "the different propositions were studied by the electorate without factional prejudice and decided, we may fairly suppose, solely without prejudice to the public good".<sup>8</sup>

Frederick C. Howe in an article entitled, "Oregon: Most Complete Democracy in the World", which appeared in Hamptons in 1911, commented on an election in Oregon in 1910 when 32 measures were submitted to the voters at one time (a thing which people generally thought demanded unusual powers of discrimination) as follows: "Lawyers, bar associations, and legal reformers, have urged for generations that the law be simplified, be opened to all alike, in fact as well as theory. It remained for Oregon, for the people of Oregon, to cut the Gordian knot and open up the administration of justice to rich and poor on something like equal terms".<sup>9</sup>

Perhaps no one thing proved such a stimulus to the movement as the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States respecting the initiative and referendum handed down in 1912 by Chief Justice White. A telephone company operating in Oregon protested against a tax levied under a law enacted by the initiative process. The Oregon state courts decided

against the company, and appeal was made to the Supreme Court of the United States. The argument was that the initiative and referendum amendments to the Oregon constitution were in violation of the Federal constitution which declares that the "United States shall guarantee in every state in this union a republican form of government". The contention was that the republican form must be the representative form, and that under the initiative and referendum it was no longer representative but pure democracy. The Supreme Court held that it had no right to decide whether or not a state government is republican. That is a political, not a judicial matter, and the power is vested in Congress. It is exercised when that body recognizes a senator or a representative from a state.

This decision was a great gain for the cause of popular government. It seemed to be a confirmation of the legality of the new system of legislation. The New York American declared on this occasion that the Supreme Court had agreed with Abraham Lincoln that "this country with all its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it".

Thus the majority of the American people were "swept away" with the idea of the initiative and referendum. What faith there was exhibited in the masses! Reformers were sure the solution to democracy's ills had been found.

Along with the initiative and referendum developed the primary, which originated in 1860 in Crawford County, Pennsylvania, when the Republican voters of that district established the direct primary by party rule. In 1899 Minnesota enacted a primary law for Hennepin County, but it was not until 1903 that it was adopted in Wisconsin for the entire state.

At first, progress of the movement was slow but between 1907 and 1915 it spread rapidly. At the end of that period all but three states had primaries in some form.<sup>13</sup> Thirty eight states had primaries by statute and five by the rules of the Democratic party. Utah had a law permitting parties to hold primaries, and in Delaware, delegates to the state conventions were chosen by direct primary.<sup>14</sup> There was a wide variance in the states as to the number and kind of officers brought under the direct primary system and the extent to which they eliminated conventions, but everywhere through-out the nation the primary was hailed as an effective means of popular control of the government.

The primary developed as a means of combating the evils of the convention system for selecting candidates to office. The evils of the old system were numerous and widespread through-out the country. Particularly in the East, where the foreign population was large and the control of politics in the hands of

well organized machines, the convention system had become corrupt. Conditions were somewhat different in the West, generally, but the same difficulties arose in the crowded districts of that section. Some of the evils of the system which the primary displaced are traced below.

Under the convention system it was rather unusual to find the best type of citizen sent as a delegate. Usually the majority was composed of the members of some political machine; especially was this true in the states and counties where large cities were located. The description given here of the delegates to a Cook County Convention held in Chicago in 1896, though not true of conventions generally, shows what the possibilities of poor representation were under the old system.

"Of the delegates, those who have been on trial for murder numbered, 17; sentenced to the penitentiary for murder or manslaughter and served sentence, 7; served terms in the penitentiary for burglary, 36; served terms in the penitentiary for picking pockets, 2; served term in the penitentiary for arson, 1; ex-Bridewell and jail birds identified by detectives, 64; keepers of gambling houses, 7; keepers of houses of ill-fame, 2; convicted of mayhem, 3; ex-prize fighters, 11; pool-room proprietors, 2; saloon keepers, 265; lawyers, 14; physicians, 3; grain dealers, 2; political employees,

148; hatter, 1; stationer, 1; contractors, 4; grocer, 1; sign painter, 1; plumbers, 4; butcher, 1; druggist, 1; furniture supplies, 1; commission merchants, 2; ex-policemen, 15; dentist, 1; speculators, 2; justices of the peace, 3; ex-constable, 1; farmers, 6; undertakers, 3; no occupations, 71. Total delegates, 723." <sup>15</sup>

A comparatively long period usually elapsed between the time of choosing delegates and the meeting of the convention. This was conducive to bribery and other means of controlling the votes of the delegates. It was not an uncommon thing for voting in the convention to be by "proxies". Delegates would be selected who had no intention of attending the convention and would transfer their credentials to a politician (perhaps for a monetary consideration) to act as their substitutes.

The conventions were often carried on with much disorder and sometimes violence. When there was a close contest, the chairman might not be able to see a member of the opposing faction rise to make a speech, and when the votes were taken disregard the volume of the sound produced and decide it according to his own desire. The large conventions were usually so complex in their organization that the majority of the members could exert very little influence. For the most part they were controlled by the bosses and machine politicians.

In his message to the New York legislature at the opening of his second term (1909) as Governor, Charles Evans Hughes, twice elected Governor against the will of the party bosses, pointed out four evils of the convention system. First, it has a disastrous effect upon party leadership. Second, it tends to discourage party voters from participation in affairs of the party. Third, it causes candidates to consider themselves responsible to party leaders rather than the people. The fourth is the effect upon the people:

"To the extent that party machinery can be dominated by the few, the opportunity for special interests which desire to control the administration of government; to shape the laws, to prevent the passage of laws, or to break the laws with impunity, is increased. These interests are ever at work, stealthily and persistently, endeavoring to pervert the government to the service of their own ends. All that is worst in our public life finds its readiest means of access to power through the control of the nominating machinery of parties."

It was against these evils that the American people "cried out". As a remedy they established the direct primary system of nomination. The ardent reformers made great claims for the new plan. They believed it was a panacea for the ills of politics, and that it would draw even the indifferent voters to the polls and an "era of political purity"

17

would be ushered in. Its less ardent advocates supported it because they felt (1) it was more democratic than the convention, (2) it would bring more people to the polls, (3) it would destroy machine control, (4) it would produce better candidates, (5) it would diminish corruption.

The masses seized upon these ideas. They felt that if they were wise enough to select officers on election day, surely they could choose the nominees also. Report of the accomplishments of the primary were broadcast through-out the country by the reformers and enthusiastically received by the people.

The story of California's fight for the primary is typical of that in other states. Before the adoption of the primary there, the state government was dominated by the Southern Pacific railroad. Anyone who wanted to secure an office had to go to San Francisco and ask permission of the men who controlled the road. It was Hiram Johnson who, with others, broke the control of that railroad in California politics making an appeal to the people through out the entire state for their support of a primary law. In 1910 Johnson was nominated governor, a thing which could not have been possible without a primary.

18

In 1911 there was passed in New Jersey under the leadership of Gov. Woodrow Wilson, the Geran Bill,

which placed the whold machinery of elections under public control. This was the occassion for the editor of the Outlook to make this very significant statement:"The event is indicative of the new idea that the party is a part of the machinery of government and should be kept under the control of the people ..... It is a very wholesome sign that people are not contented with merely the name of self-government, but are determined to use means to secure to themselves its substance".<sup>19</sup>

The following quotation expresses the general attitude toward the primary in the period preceding the war: "Popular primary elections as a method of giving citizens a direct choice of men to be nominated by their political parties have become a fixture in our political system. Not only will the primary laws be improved, but will be extended. States in which the direct primary is now unknown will have the complete system within a few years and states which have direct primaries for local officers will extend them to the selection of all officers and the election of delegates to the presidential conventions".<sup>20</sup>

The recall was one of the later developments of the movement for popular government. It was not adopted over as large an area as the initiative, referendum, and direct primary, although advocated for

the same general reasons.

Los Angeles first introduced the recall in her city charter of 1903. In 1906 it was incorporated in the charter of Seattle, Washington, and in 1907 Iowa embodied it in her commission government laws. About the same time this was done in South Dakota and Texas. The recall is best suited for small areas and has been accepted chiefly in connection with the commission plan of city government.<sup>21</sup>

Oregon in 1908 was the first state to make the recall applicable to elective state officers. The next state to adopt it was California, three years later. Between 1912 and 1914 seven other states made provisions for it by statute.<sup>22</sup> When the world war opened, nine states, all of them except Michigan west of the Mississippi, had provisions for the recall in some form.

The recall received its greatest popularity in 1911 and 1912 in connection with the admission of Arizona into the union. The constitution which the territory presented provided for the recall without the exclusion of judges. Congress passed an enabling act, stipulating that an amendment be submitted to the people of the state at the next election, by which judicial officers should be exempted. In spite of this provision President Taft vetoed the enabling act, arguing against the recall of judges. Congress

then amended the enabling act by inserting the words "except members of the judiciary", as applied to the proposed recall provisions in the constitution.

Arizona entered under the changed constitution, but the following year restored the judicial recall to its constitution.<sup>23</sup>

The reformers believed the recall would serve as a continual reminder to the officer of pre-election promises, and as a means of keeping all officials responsible and responsive to public opinion.<sup>24</sup> "Too often when a man has been elected to public office he suffers some kind of an intracerebral accident. He cannot any longer interpret the vox populi. His pledges are forgotten. The recall is to aid the office holder in retaining a candidate's state of mind."<sup>25</sup> In Oregon the recall was "hailed" as the "crowning act to complete the temple of popular government."<sup>26</sup>

The last important instrument of popular control to be examined is the presidential preference primary. Although Wisconsin, as early as 1905, passed a law providing for the direct election of all delegates to national conventions, and in 1906 Pennsylvania provided for the direct election of district delegates to national conventions, it was not until 1910 that any state passed a law providing for the di-

rect election of all presidential convention delegates and made provision for a preference vote for president and vice-president. Following this action of Oregon, other states in rapid succession passed similar laws. At the close of 1915 twenty-one states had passed presidential primary laws.<sup>27</sup> In every case they were passed through the efforts of the progressive Republicans or Democrats or a combination of the two.<sup>28</sup>

The demand for presidential primaries came as a result of a desire on the part of the voters to have a more direct voice in naming presidential candidates. The very rapid growth of the movement was due to the fact that the Republican National Convention in 1912 showed a tendency to disregard the will of the majority of Republican voters in making the nomination that year. Some writers predicted that the National Convention system would be substituted by a nation-wide primary.<sup>29</sup>

As in the case of the direct primaries, the people felt that the parties should not be composed only of party leaders, bosses, and workers, but all the party voters. It was argued that it would be a good thing because it would "remove from the president the inducement to use patronage improperly, or make bargains with bosses. It would enable

him to devote his time to the work of his office instead of giving a great part of it to politics." <sup>30</sup>

Although there were some objections raised to this movement, its progress was very little hindered before the war. Of all the instruments of popular government advocated in the early part of the century the presidential primary "gained ground" most rapidly. It was generally felt that there was little room for argument on the question of whether or not the people were competent to nominate a candidate for president; this was simply the next step in the great democratic movement which was sweeping the country.

Enthusiasm for the popular government movement reached its height in the campaign of 1912. Before the campaign formally opened a group of Republicans as early as January 21, 1911, formed a National Progressive Republican League at the residence of Senator LaFollette in Washington. They set forth a program endorsing the movement for direct government in all its phases. Another meeting was held in Chicago in October when LaFollette was declared the Republican candidate for President of the United States. <sup>31</sup>

August 3, 1910, ex-President Roosevelt, recently returned from Africa, gave utterance at Osawatimie, Kansas, to his principles of "New National-

ism". He advocated, among other things, the direct primary and the recall of elective officers. Though he was not in the campaign, Mr. Roosevelt continued to discuss current issues of popular government, and on February 12, 1912, in an address at Columbus, Ohio, came out for a complete program of direct government, including the initiative, referendum, recall, and primaries. In spite of his discussion of current issues he pushed aside all suggestion that he would be a presidential candidate.<sup>32</sup> But when the governors of several states issued a statement that good government demanded his candidature,<sup>33</sup> he threw himself into the field.

The fundamental issue of the campaign Mr. Roosevelt pointed out in an address in Carnegie Hall, New York City, March 20, 1912. He asked, "Are the American people fit to govern themselves, to rule themselves, to control themselves?" He answered his own question by stating, "I believe that the majority of the plain people of the United States will, day in and day out, make fewer mistakes in governing themselves than any smaller class or body of men, no matter what their training, will make in trying to govern them. I believe the American people are, as a whole, capable of self control and of learning by their mistakes."<sup>34</sup>

In order that the proper delegates to the national convention would be selected, it was necessary for Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft to go directly before the voters and discuss the issues of the day. When the Republicans met at Chicago in June, it was quite evident that Roosevelt had secured the delegates in the states where the people had a chance to select them. Out of the 1078 seats 252 were contested. The national committee decided the contest in a way that Taft was assured a majority. The Roosevelt followers refused to take any part in the convention, withdrew, and organized a third party. At their convention held in Chicago, August the fifth, they nominated Roosevelt for president and adopted a platform advocating the rule of the people.

Woodrow Wilson was nominated by the progressive wing of the Democratic party, and in a large measure adopted the principles of the progressive movement. The rule of the people was the leading issue of the campaign, but the result of the election a foregone conclusion. The fact that the ranks of the Republican party were divided made a Democratic victory certain. Even though Mr. Roosevelt was defeated, the popular government movement did not wane -- it seemed only to be quickened.

As president, Wilson set out to do what he

could to carry out the movement of the progressives. In his first annual message he reviewed the rapid development of popular government and expressed a firm faith in the ability of the American people to rule themselves. He urged Congress to "enact legislation which will provide for primary elections through-out the country at which the voters of the several parties may choose their nominees for president without the intervention of nominating conventions".<sup>36</sup>

The papers of the country hailed this part of the message as "one of the most important political undertakings of the generation". "The greatest single step in the direction of popular control of government taken in this country in years."<sup>37</sup>

Several bills were introduced in Congress in 1914 providing for a national presidential primary, but no action on them was taken. The war came and the attention of the national government was directed into channels other than political reform. Likewise, in the states, the movement for popular government which seemed to be nearing acceptance through-out the nation was arrested because of interest in more important affairs.

## CHAPTER II

### Post War Reaction in Europe

The natural development of the democratic movement which swept the world in the early part of the twentieth century was arrested by the conflict of 1914-1918. For the period of the war domestic differences gave way to the discussion of the greater problems occasioned by the conflict. Social and political reforms were put aside, but, democracy as the great ideal of the world not only held its former position in the minds of men, but became the battle cry of all the nations.

World leaders were certain the war would not only effect great changes in the domestic policies of the countries involved, but that nationality and imperialism would be adjusted in a manner more in accord with the principles of self determination and democracy. As the great conflict wore on it assumed more and more the nature of a final struggle between arrogant nationalism and medieval autocracy, on the one hand, and modern democracy and the rule of international law on the other. A change in the political and social order comparable to that of 1789 to 1815 was predicted as the outcome.

In the last months of the war, and for a few years thereafter, there were great gains for democracy. The sacrifices of the peoples of the world in order to destroy absolutism and establish the rule of the masses did not seem to have been in vain. Crowned heads were rapidly put to flight and republics established to replace monarchies. Democracy seemingly was triumphing.

As early as March 15, 1917, the Czar of Russia was forced to abdicate and a provisional government set up under Prince Lvov, who was replaced by Kerensky in July 1917. Kerensky in turn was overthrown by the Bolsheviki on November 7, 1917, under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky.

In October of 1918 the Austro-Hungarian monarchy collapsed, and November 12 of the same year the Republic of Austria was proclaimed. Their new constitution went into effect October 1, 1920, and the new president was elected October 9, 1920.

There met in Prague, November 18, 1918, the first body representative of the Czecho-Slovak people -- the national assembly. It decided unaniamously in favor of a republic and unanimously elected Masaryk as president.

November 9, 1918, the German people put

to flight their kings and princes and proclaimed a republic. Twenty-two thrones were vacated.

January 19, 1919, a national assembly was elected by the most democratic suffrage that had perhaps ever been called for such a purpose -- every man or woman over twenty had the right to vote.

February 6, 1919, this group met at Weimar and four days later a provisional constitution was accepted.

July 31, 1919, they adopted a permanent constitution which was put into force August 11, 1919.<sup>4</sup>

Poland was recognized by Prince Lvov of Russia in 1917 as an "independent state including all regions with an indisputable ethnic majority".<sup>5</sup> Polish representatives were at the Peace Conference in 1919, and in January of the same year a constituent assembly was elected under universal suffrage. A constitution was finally adopted March 17, 1921.<sup>6</sup>

America, under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, played a leading role in effecting the establishment of self government for the oppressed peoples of Europe. In his famous war message to Congress, April 2, 1917, he outlined the chief reasons for our entrance into the world war. "We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them, to fight thus for the

ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no domain. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them."<sup>7</sup>

In his speech of January 8, 1918, Wilson set forth "Fourteen Points" as the program of the world's peace. February 11, 1918, he laid down "Four Principles", July 4 "Four Ends", and September 27 "Five Particulars".<sup>8</sup> Mr. Wilson attended the Peace Conference in person because he wanted to secure a league of nations and see that the peace in general was in accordance with his principles.

Mr. Howe states that "When Woodrow Wilson landed in France, he was hailed as a Messiah. People thought his presence would bring the millennium. His photographs, cut from newspapers, had a

place beside the highly colored representations of the Virgin Mary in peasant's cottages of France, Italy, and Spain. People knelt by the side of the railway when his train passed. At Paris, President Wilson stood on a pinnacle. He had lifted the world to his own idealism and the world seemed ready for a Messianic dispensation".

The peace was made and a league of nations formed. As a result nine new states arose in Europe -- Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia, and Finland; the monarchies of Germany and Russia were destroyed. In western Asia the republics of Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbain were established. Everyone was convinced the war had not been in vain, that the world had been made safe for the great political ideal, -democracy.

But the period of "showing" gains for democracy has been followed by unmistakable defeats; not only have large territories been lost for democracy, but it has lost ground in the confidence of men. "No one who surveys the political situation of the world today (1926) but must admit that democracy seems to be facing the greatest trial of its brief career."

It is a fine ideal that people should

choose their own rulers and have a choice and voice in determining the policies of the government. It is quite the natural thing to think that if people are given the right of self government they will eagerly make use of it, that they will select the best men for office, and see that they remain there. But it has not worked out that way. At least for the moment, democracy seems to have failed.

Heritz Bonn recently stated: "The crusade which the Western Powers undertook to make the world safe for democracy has in many respects shared the fate of previous crusades. Inspired prophets came forward preaching the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre. But when the battle cries died away, Jerusalem was found to be still in the hands of unbelievers. The crusaders had contented themselves with pocketing land and power. The last crusade has also failed to bring the millenium in which its sincere preachers believed. It has not even brought the modest measure of internal contentment, which might have been counted upon soberly as a result of the war. Political discontent reigns over the whole world".

Since 1923 there have been dictators in Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Russia,

12

Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Belgium. von Hindenburg is ruling in Germany and France has sought a man strong enough to solve her financial problems. Perhaps there have never been as many dictators in Europe at one time since modern democracy appeared.

To a great extent this resort to dictatorships is an answer to Bolshevism. Somehow, people are more willing to sacrifice their individual rights to a dictator, in order to secure law and order, rather than endure the extremes of radicals. Years ago there was too much liberty and men were glad for autocratic rulers. When there came, then, too much order and not sufficient liberty, there resulted a revolutionary period which brought in democracy. Perhaps there is a swinging back now. It is strange how very similar the situation is today in Europe with that of centuries ago when people welcomed autoeracy as a cure for feudal anarchy. Now dictatorships are welcomed as a cure for democratic anarchy.

Other reasons for the prevalence of dictatorships are fear of class government -- rule of the proletariat -- inability of democracy to meet the problems of post war society, the indiffer-

ence to and incapacity for self government, economic suffering, and the fact that the war was directed and the "abominable" peace made by democratic governments.

In England during the past year there was a determined effort to replace parliamentary government with some form of class rule. Criticism of democracy is strong there. Dean William Ralph Inge of St Paul's, London, recently stated that democracy is a form of government through which western civilization must pass; that England only retained it because nothing better had yet been worked out to replace it.<sup>13</sup> In his book, "Outspoken Essays", Dr. Inge gives these criticisms of democracy as representative of British thought:- democracy does not bring the best men to the top at ordinary times, it is a "ready victim to shibboleths and catch words", it "lands not only of rash iconoclasm but of obstinate conservatism and abstrusiveness", and it breeds corruption and anarchy.<sup>14</sup>

The adverse criticism of democracy in England is to a large degree due to the rise of Socialism, which has gained ground because of the extreme poverty and unemployment. The middle class and the capitalists have become frightened,

and democracy has come to be associated with revolution and not order as in the pre-war period. A Fascisti organization has arisen, promoted by those who fear that Bolshevism will "carry away" the country.<sup>15</sup>

The two outstanding losses to democracy in Europe are Russia and Italy. In the former country the autocracy of the czarist regime, destroyed by a popular revolution in 1917, has been replaced by class rule. The gains for democracy there at the close of the war brought the applause of the world, but today the rule of the Bolsheviki is declared more autocratic than that of Nicholas II. Italy, caught in the grip of communism after the war, was rapidly disintegrating. Mussolini, backed by the Fascisti, seized the government in 1922 and made himself dictator. Political and personal liberties have been curbed in the furtherance of his program and his power made absolute. The semblance of democratic institutions which Italy had before the war has now disappeared. These two political experiments, though fundamentally quite different, are worth our consideration, for they are bound to affect world democracy during this very critical period.

The best presentation of the political

theory of Fascism is found in a speech recently made by Alfredo Rocco, Minister of Justice in the Italian Government. <sup>16</sup> Nicholas Murry Butler

has written the following prefatory statement to the publication of this address:- "Fascism is not a mere party upheaval such as often takes place in any country where parliamentary institutions exist. It is, rather, a silent and bloodless revolution which rests upon a body of political principles and seeks to achieve a set of political ideals, which, taken together, constitute a new aspect of political philosophy". <sup>17</sup>

Rocco attacks the democratic theory of government because it is based on the idea that society is merely a "sum total of individuals". <sup>18</sup> The result, he says, is that the ends of a society are the ends of the individual. This, he declares, is anti-historical because it reduces social life to the existence of one generation. "It rejects the ideas and sentiments which each generation receives from those preceding and hands down to the following generation." <sup>19</sup>

The liberals (supporters of democracy) maintain that the best way to secure the welfare of the individual is to interfere as little as possible with his activities. The state exists as

a guarantee of his liberties. Under this system the state cannot have too much power and the citizens must have a part in the law making. This leads to democracy where the action of the state is positively in favor of the individual, and finally to Socialism where the workingmen claim that if the state is for the welfare of the individual the population should not be divided into capitalists and laborers. Socialism creates Bolshevism which demands the rule of the proletariat to make sure that the laboring classes will not be exploited by capital. Thus Liberalism and Socialism are based on the same principle -- the welfare of the individual. In this way Rocco has pictured democracy and its resulting forms.

On the other hand, the Fascist maintains that mankind is not the several individuals who are living at any one time, but the series of groups-- past, present, and future. The goal of mankind, they declare, is not that of the individuals that are living at any one time. In fact, they may be in opposition, for this reason the individual must sometimes be sacrificed for the preservation and development of the whole.

In brief, under Fascism, instead of so-

ciety for the individual, we have the individual for society. In democracy the individual is the end, in Fascism society. Liberals contend for the rights of the individual and inflict the penalties of the law on those who infringe on those rights. The Fascist contends for the rights of society and declares what the individual's duty is to the state.

Liberalism places sovereignty with the people, Fascism with the state. In the former, government is turned over to the individuals to use for their interests, in the latter, the government is entrusted to men "capable of rising above their private interests and of realizing the aspirations of the social group collectively, considered in its unity and in its relation to the past and the future. Only a few rare winds have this ability of ignoring individual interests and working for the higher interests of society".<sup>20</sup>

Under Fascism the individual is not given a bill of rights to make him superior to the state and thus give him power to act in opposition to society. Citizens are given liberty only so long as they exercise it in the interests of society. Fascism has no particular method for achieving its ends -- it depends on the situation. The present program calls for control of the government over

freedom of speech and press, concentration of power in the premier, state supervision of industry, etc. It is quite evident that this theory of government is the very antithesis of democracy.

In Russia, instead of the rule of a lone dictator, we have the dictatorship of a class -- the proletariat -- under the direction of the communistic party. The system in operation shows no consideration for the bourgeoisie and land-owners, and is just as aristocratic as the rule of the Romanoffs. The communists declare there must be an absolute workman's government until their opponents have been so completely defeated that they will never have any hope of rising to power.

The principles of this proletariat autocracy indicate how far removed Russian government today is from modern democracy. The chief principles are:-(1)the use of force against those who wish to restore capitalism,(2)the placement of former capitalists to manual labor and on rations,(3)the restriction of freedom of press or speech,(4)the drilling of children in communism so as to make them immune from capitalistic influence,(5) the disenfranchisement of persons having hired labor for profit,those living on unearned income,private merchants,clergy,and ex-police agents,(6)the eventual abolition of all classes.

The governmental system is one of a hierarchy of bodies which comprise a pyramid of representative soviets. The masses at the bottom of the system choose representatives to the local or rural soviets.<sup>23</sup> The provincial and city soviets elect representatives to the All Russian Congress. This meets annually to select a committee of three hundred, called the Central Executive Committee. This group selects the Praesidium - a kind of cabinet, known as the Council of People's Commissaries with seventeen members. The last group is the controlling, directing, and managing body of the government -- a legislature, executive, and judiciary all in one.<sup>24</sup>

One cannot refrain from wondering why this general reaction against democracy. Writers through-out America, England, and the continent are declaring that democracy is "done for".<sup>25</sup> This is very strange because it follows so quickly after the crusade for making the world safe for democracy. Mussolini was recently quoted as having said that this century's experience shows that a different type of government is needed from that of the nineteenth century. "Facts," he says, "outweigh books; experience is worth more than theory."<sup>26</sup>

Perhaps the fall of Woodrow Wilson at

Paris signified that the existing ideals and principles of the human race are not practical. <sup>27</sup> Mr.

Harvey, American Ambassador to the Court of St. James, in a speech to the Pilgrims at their dinner on May 19, 1921, said, "We shall get nowhere until we abruptly put aside academic discussion of theoretic proposals, and manfully face without wincing and mincing, the actual realities". <sup>28</sup>

Have we entered upon a pragmatic era of politics?  
Is democracy soon to be replaced by a new theory  
of government fundamentally different?

### CHAPTER III

#### Post - War Reaction in America

On the eve of the great war the movement for direct control of the American government was rapidly gaining ground. Its advocates were sure it was only a matter of time until the primaries, initiative, referendum and recall would be a generally accepted part of the political machinery of every state. But, in the midst of greater issues, the agitation for political reforms was temporarily abandoned. The entire nation put aside internal differences and under the leadership of President Wilson played a leading role in the last phases of the struggle which was to bring an end to war and make the world safe for democracy.

But, today, America like Europe is caught in a wave of reaction. She seems to be exhausted after all the talk of idealism by Roosevelt and Wilson, and desires a rest. She has had her fill of idealism, prophecy, and public action and is settling down to enjoy her economic prosperity. The popular government movement has not

gone forward as was anticipated by the reformers, who, with most American citizens, felt that the war would "be followed by the most tremendous forward strides toward political and economic democracy that the world had ever known".<sup>2</sup> Instead there have been frequent attacks upon the devices for popular control and in many cases laws repealed which in the earlier period were proclaimed as the solution for democracy's ills.

#### The Recall

The recall has received comparatively little consideration since the war. With the exception of North Dakota, where it was adopted in 1920 through the efforts of the Non-Partisan-League, it has maintained its status of 1914. Though demanded infrequently, for both local and state officers, it is used most often for the first. In neither case, however, has it been free from undesirable influences.

In 1921 Lynn J. Frazier, elected governor of North Dakota in 1920 by a vote of 117, 188 to 112, 488, was defeated in a recall election by a vote of 114, 432 to 107, 333.<sup>3</sup>

According to Frazier's own statement, the recall was fraudulent and resulted from his refusal to "sell out" to opposition leaders who demanded that he support legislation designed to weaken the State Bank of North Dakota and other innovations of the Non-Partisan League. Contemporary press notes stated that the recall movement was occasioned by the results of an investigation by the state legislature into the conduct of the industrial commission, (composed of the governor, attorney general, and commissioner of agriculture) which operated the Bank of North Dakota, the Elevator Association, and the North Dakota Home-builders Association.<sup>4</sup> Frazier's majority, when elected in 1920, was less than that of his opponent in the recall, but in the latter election the total vote was smaller by eight thousand.<sup>5</sup> Frazier charges that the voters were kept from the polls by intimidation. Granting that the eight thousand voters, who absented themselves from the recall election, did so because of threats from employers or bankers opposed to the program of the Non-Partisan League, one must conclude that the result of the election

was not an expression of the will of the majority. Little bitterness against Frazier seemed to survive for he was elected to the United States Senate in 1922.<sup>6</sup>

In Long Beach, California, in 1923, "The inability or unwillingness of the people to pass upon the qualifications of an administrative expert was demonstrated", when G.E. Hewes was removed by a recall election. He had been city manager in Alhambra and Alameda before going to Long Beach, and was known as an honest, capable official. Certain political groups decided to put him out by the use of the recall and they succeeded.<sup>3</sup>

In Denver Mayor Stapleton was recalled August 12, 1924, in spite of the fact that 400 fraudulent names were on the petition and that four of the "circulators" were convicted of perjury. In addition to the disgrace of the recall was added the cost of the election, \$15,500, besides the \$8,000 needed for two registration days. Stapleton's recall began the day he was elected. The friends of the defeated candidate declared then that no matter who was elected they would recall him within six months.<sup>9</sup>

Caution and a note of distrust mark the recent statements of political scientists regarding this device for popular control. In his latest edition of American Government Beard states:

"In our present state of knowledge it is impossible to render a sound judgment on the merits of the recall in practice. In a country which has frequent elections, and gives the voters abundant opportunity to pass upon the merits of these rulers, it is impossible to share the enthusiasm of the advocates who offered the recall as a device to save us from the tyranny of officials." <sup>10</sup>

and Dodd believes:

"The recall involves political dangers in that to a large extent it reopens a political contest that has once been decided. It has probably accomplished little in the way of political reform.... The chief result of the recall is to increase the number of elections. The cure for too great a burden on the voter is not to burden him further." <sup>11</sup>

while Brooks suspends final judgment:

"Careful observers find it difficult to appraise the effectiveness of the recall. Experience is not sufficiently extensive even in those cities and states which have had it longest for final judgment."<sup>12</sup>

The Presidential Primary.

The Alabama law, which went into effect September 13, 1923, was passed by a democratic legislature to give Senator Underwood the privilege of selecting, personally, the delegates to the Democratic National Convention who would vote for him.<sup>13</sup>

The Alabama Attorney General declared this law unconstitutional in 1924 because it was not in accord with section 190 of the Alabama Constitution of 1901 which provides: "The legislature, shall also make provision by law, not inconsistent with this article, for the regulation of primary elections... but shall not make primary elections compulsory."<sup>14</sup>

His opinion has not been contested.

After one trial Minnesota and Iowa re-

pealed their laws in 1917. In the former state the progressives aided the conservatives in the attack upon the presidential primary chiefly because they were disgusted with the way it worked in 1916 when, in spite of the fact that only a few of them favored him, they were forced to vote for Senator Cummins as their choice for President. In Iowa there was no contest in either party in 1916. Consequently, the public felt that the cost of a presidential primary was too great for the results achieved. They considered \$200,000 too much to spend to get 90,000 people to vote for one man in each of the two parties.<sup>15</sup> In 1923 a bill was introduced by State Senator J.L. Brookhart providing for the restoration of the presidential preference primary in Iowa. In spite of the fact that its passage was urged by United States Senator S.W. Brookhart in a speech at a joint session of the legislature, it<sup>16</sup> was defeated on March 9, 1923.

The Vermont law was repealed in 1921, after it had been in force during 1916 and 1920. The fact that there had never been a great contest for presidential preference in Vermont resulted in a small vote at these elections. The reac-

tionaries, desiring to return to the convention system, used this fact as a means of convincing the people that the machinery was unnecessary and expensive.<sup>17</sup>

In 1920 a measure for repeal in Montana passed the legislature, but was rejected by a referendum vote of the people. Again in 1924 the legislature passed a law for repeal which was approved by the people in a vote of 77,343 to 57,640.<sup>18</sup>

The legislature of Nebraska passed a law in 1920 repealing the presidential primary, but the people rejected it. Again in 1922 a similar bill was rejected by a vote of two to one.<sup>19</sup>

In 1921 New York modified its law by giving state conventions the choice of all delegates at large. In other states, particularly Indiana and New Jersey, there have been continuous attempts the last few years to weaken and repeal the presidential primary laws, but these efforts have failed.<sup>20</sup>

The war "cut short" the movement begun in 1914 to secure a national presidential primary law. The interest shown then in the movement was much greater than it has ever been since that time.

The present lack of interest in the movement is due in part to the general aftermath of the war, and also to the disappointing results of the primary in the pre-convention campaign of 1916 and 1920.

Circumstances in 1916 made the presidential primary almost useless. In the Democratic party Wilson's renomination was a foregone conclusion. On the Republican side "due consideration of the properties" prevented the submission of Justice Hughes's name in a primary contest, and Roosevelt forbade that his name be used in any primary. The presidential primary voting in 1916 was only an expression of compliments to favorite sons. "It gave no aid and pointed to no conclusion in the nomination of candidates that year."<sup>21</sup> The situation was much the same in 1920 and 1924.

In spite of the fact that the presidential primary had proved of little or no value in the election of 1916 and 1920, there was a movement in the early part of this decade, promoted chiefly by Senator Hiram Johnson, and approved by Major-General Leonard Wood,<sup>22</sup> to secure a national presidential primary law. Johnson aspired to the Republican presidential nomina-

tion in 1920 and 1924, but realized that his only hope of securing the nomination was through the presidential preference primary. He advocated such a law in speeches delivered in the several states and in 1923 introduced a bill in the Senate providing for a national presidential preference primary.<sup>23</sup> The matter received no consideration and Johnson's agitation was soon forgotten.

A great obstacle to a national primary law has been the belief that such a law would be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. According to the constitution, presidential electors in each state are appointed "in such manner as the legislatures thereof may direct". The only power given Congress is that of determining the time when electors are to be chosen and the day on which they are to cast their votes.<sup>24</sup> This fact, and the realization that the state laws have been unsatisfactory, has made adoption of a national law impossible.

No one is advocating the presidential primary now in any form. In the face of the many difficulties confronting the plan, it is unlikely that it will be given serious consideration as long as our present party system remains. Some

of the leading obstacles to the movement are:-

(1) national conventions are beyond the reach of state law, (2) dates of state primaries vary greatly, (3) pledged delegates are difficult to control, (4) delegates chosen by the states may not honestly desire the nomination of the state's preference, (5) local politics influence choice of delegates, (6) favorite sons game remains, (7) many voters fail to take part in the election, (8) large number of candidates is produced, (9) convention and primary cannot be combined. The presidential primary has proved the most unsatisfactory of all the pro-war plans for more direct control of the government by the people.

#### The Initiative and Referendum

During the last nine years the initiative and referendum have not only failed to be adopted in additional states, with the exception of Massachusetts, but have shown in many cases that they are not a practical means for reforming the legislative system. In 1916 nineteen states had laws providing for the referendum and seventeen for the initiative. Utah in 1917 passed an act

providing for the necessary machinery to put her acts of 1900 into operation.<sup>25</sup> Massachusetts adopted an amendment in 1918 providing for a closely restricted initiative and referendum.<sup>26</sup> This law could scarcely be called a gain for popular government as indicated by the following comment made by an Oregon paper:- "How reckless! After straining several months, the Massachusetts convention has succeeded in swallowing a gnat. The initiative and referendum amendment finally adopted looks small and pitifully weak beside the Oregon system.... And Massachusetts thinks she has played the chickens. The conservative old state reminds us of a Sunday-School teacher on a nut sundae jag."<sup>27</sup>

In several states, recently, repeated attempts have been made to repeal or amend the existing laws to render them less effective, but when submitted to the people such measures have been defeated. An effort made in 1918 in Arkansas to secure the adoption of a new constitution which contained a provision for a more conservative initiative and referendum law failed when put to the people for a vote.<sup>28</sup> Another effort was made in 1920 to decrease the effectiveness of these laws

by increasing the number of petitioners. This was  
accepted by the people.<sup>29</sup> In South Dakota a sim-  
ilar amendment was submitted to the people in 1922,  
but was rejected.<sup>30</sup>

The people of Illinois in 1919 express-  
ed themselves, through the state advisory refer-  
endum process, to the Constitutional Convention  
in favor of incorporating in the new constitution,  
then in process of formation, provisions for the  
initiative and referendum.<sup>31</sup> The Convention del-  
egates were absolutely opposed to the I. and R. in  
any form and no provision was made for them in  
the new constitution.<sup>32</sup>

California adopted the I. and R. in  
1911 with the manifestation of comparatively lit-  
tle opposition. But since the war there has  
been a concerted effort made by the Anti-Single  
Tax League to reduce the effectiveness of these  
measures. In 1920 this organization placed on  
the ballot a constitutional amendment requiring  
initiative petitions relating to the assessment  
of collection of taxes to be signed by 25 per  
cent of the voters instead of eight per cent.  
The people rejected it, but the attack was contin-  
ued in the legislature in 1921. There appeared

on the ballot in 1922 a measure similar to the one of 1920, except that the percent was reduced to 15. Though it had been approved by the legislature the people rejected it.<sup>33</sup>

Since 1912 the Idaho State Constitution has contained provisions for the I. and R., but the legislature has never set up the necessary election machinery to make possible the use of these devices. Repeated attempts to secure such legislation have been made, but they have all resulted in failure to obtain the passage of laws needed.<sup>34</sup>

Mississippi adopted the I. and R. in 1914. The Supreme Court of the state in 1922 held the amendment invalid because that section of the constitution providing for the submission of amendments had not been complied with, and the I. and R. amendment had not received a majority of those voting, as required by the constitution.<sup>35</sup>

A striking illustration of an abuse of the I. and R. occurred in 1922 in Missouri. In 1920, for the first time since 1872, the Republicans gained control of both the executive and legislative branches of the Missouri government. During the campaign both parties had promised

the voters to support a program for the reorganization and abolition of useless state offices. True to their campaign promises the Republicans, under the leadership of Governor Hyde, carried through a program of consolidation of state administration. The Democrats, however, opposed practically every measure and the bills passed by a strict party vote.

Party lines were also sharply drawn on a bill for redistricting the circuit courts of the state and on a number of measures consolidating the offices of justices of the peace and constables of Jackson County, but all were passed.

The opposition to these measures, which continued after the close of the legislature, was promoted by those who were losing their jobs because of the change occasioned by the enactment of the new bills. A referendum on the measures was proposed and officially sanctioned by the Democratic state committee. Under the direction of this party, petitions were circulated and the following measures suspended and referred to the voters in November 1922:- budget bill, department of labor bill, and two bills abolishing

the office of beverage inspector and state inspector of oils.

The Democratic state committee also approved the referendum on a bill redistricting the circuit courts of the state and four bills relating to the offices of justices of the peace and constables of Jackson County. All these measures were "hold up" by the referendum process.

In the case of the four bills relating to the offices of justices of the peace and constables in Jackson County, the legislature had declared the measures "necessary for the immediate preservation of public peace, health, and safety". Under these circumstances the Secretary of State declined to accept the referendum petitions on these measures, following the ruling laid down, by the Supreme court of Oregon.<sup>36</sup> Mandamus proceedings were instituted to compel acceptance by the Secretary of State of the referendum petitions. The Supreme Court ruled that the judiciary must pass upon the question of whether or not the measures were necessary for the immediate preservation of the "public peace, health, and safety". They later held that

the bills were not of that nature and ordered the Secretary of State to accept the referendum petitions on the four bills with emergency clauses.<sup>37</sup>

The bills submitted to the people were all defeated as a result of the efforts of the Democratic party.<sup>38</sup> The immediate reaction in Missouri was an effort to secure a change in the I. and R. provisions in order that one party could not use these devices to defeat the legislative program of the other for partisan reasons. During the 1923 session of the Missouri Constitutional Convention proposals for these safeguards met with strong opposition from the politicians. An amendment, though containing features to make it more difficult for organized minorities to use the I. and R. for partisanship purposes, was placed before the people in 1923 and defeated.<sup>39</sup>

Late in 1920, after the election of President Harding, there was agitation for the enactment of federal legislation providing for a national war referendum to precede a declaration of war by Congress. Senator Owen originated the idea, and at the time of the discussion of the League of Nations Covenant he introduced in the United States Senate an amendment embodying this plan,

and suggested that it be attached to the cov-  
<sup>90</sup>  
 enant.

W.J.Bryan and Colonel Harvey suggested such a plan to President-elect Harding late in 1920, and though Harding did not discuss the matter, newspaper dispatches reported that he looked  
<sup>41</sup>  
 with favor on the idea.

Senator Borah, an opponent of the League of Nations, declared to Bryan that he opposed the  
<sup>42</sup>  
 plan. Likewise, Senator Reed of Missouri and President Butler of Columbia University expressed their opposition to President-elect Harding. Reed attacked the plan as impracticable, and stated that while the United States was taking a referendum on a war with Japan, that nation could seize the Philippines and Hawaiian Islands. Butler opposed it because he felt the masses were  
<sup>43</sup>  
 incompetent to judge on a matter of that nature.

In 1923 and 1926 resolutions were introduced in Congress providing that "no act of war by the executive branch of the government of the United States shall be taken except to suppress insurrection or repel invasion, as provided for by the constitution of the United States, until the question at issue shall be submitted

to a referendum of the voters of the United States". In every case these resolutions were referred to the judiciary committees from which they did not re-  
 44  
 appear for discussion.

In many cases arising from the initiative and referendum intelligent voting demands knowledge of the law beyond the face of the ballot. It seems practically impossible to get this information to the people in such a way that they will vote wisely. In Oregon recently two propositions, of directly opposite character respecting the salmon fishing rights in the Columbia river, were submitted by referendum. In spite of an attempt  
 45  
 to explain the facts both propositions carried.

In Ohio fifty-seven counties had by 1914 voted dry under a local-option law. In that year other counties voted on the question under the same law. At the same election an amendment to the constitution was submitted on the referendum for a state-wide vote. Its opponents had made at least eight different speeches in each of eighty-eight counties explaining clearly the effect of the amendment. At the election twenty additional counties voted dry under the local option law, making seventy-seven in all, with only

eleven counties wet. But the state as a whole adopted the wet amendment, and the saloon was admitted even to the seventy-seven counties that had voted dry.<sup>46</sup>

There is frequent reference in the papers and magazines to the idea that the I. and R. are unconstitutional because they are not republican reforms of government. It is declared that should a case be brought to its attention the United States Supreme Court might declare the present laws null and void. These writers are, of course, unaware that the Supreme Court in 1912 held that it had no right to decide whether or not a state government was republican, that it was a matter for Congress to determine. Unless the Court should change its opinion the I. and R. will not be destroyed by the federal judiciary.

Regardless of the decision of the Supreme Court there is a wide-spread feeling that the I. and R. are contrary to representative government and make of the legislator a "delegate" rather than a "representative". In the one case, the office-holder is supposed to use his judgment respecting matters of government after he has acquainted himself with the facts, which it seems

impossible for the people as a whole to do. In the other, where the I. and R. are in operation, he is more a tool of the public tossed by every change in opinion. No doubt in some cases this does cause men to abstain from office holding.

In government Americans have felt that one man was as competent as another to judge in political affairs, while in the conduct of their business they feel that progress is best made by expert knowledge and strong leadership. Commerce, industry, etc., have abandoned the theory of equality, but in government the "fundamentalists" ideas have prevailed. The bankers do not take a vote of their clerks to find out how best to place their loans, but a thousand drivers of garbage carts in New York City may be permitted to vote on the question of whether the United States should enter the League of Nations.

Professor Merriam says, "The future of these institutions [I. and R] is in doubt."<sup>47</sup>

Professor Dodd remarks, "Although the I. and R. have not replaced representative bodies, they seem to have had little, if any, influence in making these bodies better or worse. Repre-

representative legislatures are capable of material improvement. It is doubtful if the I. and R. will bring such improvement. It is also doubtful whether they have done, or are apt to do, a great deal toward reducing or destroying such responsibility as representative legislatures now possess.... Clearly they have proved neither a panacea for all political ills nor a substitute for representative government." <sup>48</sup>

Professor Hall summarizes his treatment of the I. and R. by quoting the following statement of Emmett O'Neal:- "Members of the legislatures of the different states are the agents and direct representatives of the people, and if it be true that as a whole they are incompetent, unworthy, and corrupt it would follow necessarily that the masses from whom they spring and from whom they are selected were also either corrupt or criminally indifferent to their interests or liberties. They possess the same characteristics as the people from whom they have come, and if after repeated trials and selections, the community cannot secure an intelligent and honest man to represent it, I would not like to live under laws initiated or adopted by the sovereignty of that

people."<sup>49</sup>

### The Direct Primary

In the pre-war period the direct primary was more widely adopted than any device instituted for direct control of the government by the people. In some form it was in operation in 1915 in forty-five states, the presidential preference had been adopted by only twenty-one states, the referendum by nineteen, the initiative by seventeen, and the recall by nine. Since the war the reaction against popular government has centered on that instrument which was most popular in the earlier period and declared by the reformers to be the greatest means for popular control. On the other hand these attacks are an attempt of the politicians to restore their power of the ante-primary period, while others are critical of the system in order to secure the elimination of its defects.

The most sweeping reaction has come in Idaho, where the primary was adopted in 1909. In 1919 the law providing for the nomination of state and congressional officers by the direct

primary system was repealed. The primary only applies now to county candidates and delegates to state conventions.<sup>50</sup> Several attempts have been made to restore the old law but none have proved successful. The most significant struggle occurred in 1922 when Senator Borah attempted to "re-convert the state to the primary in the face of opposition from the Republican organization. As a result of his agitation the legislature in 1923 passed a bill restoring the primary, but Governor Moore vetoed it because of the expense involved in primaries and the fact that such elections were determined largely by personalities and not principles.<sup>51</sup> No attempt was made to pass it over his vote.<sup>52</sup>

A protracted struggle for repeal in New York state drew the attention of the country in 1919, 1920, and 1921. Governor Hughes strongly advocated the primary and secured its adoption in 1913. Though the law remained in force until 1921, when the Republicans repealed it, during the entire period the parties held their regular conferences, drew up slates, and had them placed on the ballot by petition. In no case did the candidate having the support of the party organization fail to be elected from 1913 to 1921.

This fact, coupled with the expense of two elections and the decreasing public interest in the primary, was the leading factor in bringing about the repeal.

When the primary was first agitated in New York, Tammany joined with the conservative Republicans at Albany to fight it. But when the law had been adopted, they learned it was an aid to their purposes in New York City so fought for its continuation when the Republicans began the movement for repeal in 1919.

In the pre-war period the progressive elements of both major parties united to promote the movement for popular government and the conservatives combined to oppose it. But in the recent struggle for repeal in New York, party lines were strictly drawn, except for a very few individuals and the women's organizations. The Republicans as a united party urged repeal and the Democrats were on the opposition. The women's organizations of both parties opposed repeal because of their poor representation in the conventions and equal representation in the primaries. Their position prevented the complete repeal of the law.

In 1919 a bill to revive the convention for the nomination of the state judiciary officers failed to pass the Republican legislature.<sup>55</sup> Though some Republicans favored it, the party leaders were decidedly opposed to any such action at that time. Smith, a Democrat, was governor. The Republicans, a bit uncertain about the position of the public mind on the question of the primaries, were afraid that a move of this kind would be playing into the hands of the governor. If the people responded favorably to the bill, Smith would sign it; if not, he would veto it and consequently "make medicine" at the expense of the Republicans.

February 4, 1920, Charles H. Betts, Republican, introduced a bill to restore the convention for nominating the state and judiciary officers.<sup>56</sup> His bill was replaced by the Walton-Fearon bill, also a Republican measure, providing for the restoration of the convention for the nomination of judicial officials only. The substitute measure passed the legislature, but was vetoed by Governor Smith because he thought "it is better for a candidate to receive his nomination from a majority of the voters of his party

than through the favor of the few".<sup>57</sup>

Another bill, "intended to confer upon the unofficial party conventions the power to suggest candidates for state office and for the offices of the Supreme Court," passed during the same session, but was likewise vetoed by Smith.<sup>58</sup>

The main issue in the state election of 1920 was the direct primary. The Republicans nominated Nathan L. Miller as their candidate for governor and adopted a platform declaring the primary not applicable to state-wide offices, not an expression of the will of the majority of the people, and its machinery too "cumbersome and expensive". In its stead they advocated a convention of delegates, chosen by direct primaries, to select candidates for the whole state and justices of the Supreme Court.<sup>59</sup>

The platform of the Democrats contained this paragraph regarding the primaries:- "We believe in direct nominations. We are opposed to any legislation that will, in whole or in part, deprive enrolled voters of the direct choice of their candidates. We approve the action of Governor Smith in vetoing the direct primary law.

Party obligations which cannot be maintained without depriving the party voters of the final say ought not exist."<sup>60</sup>

In spite of the fact that the Republican platform declared against the primary, Miller avoided a personal statement on the issue in the early part of the campaign. He was repeatedly urged by Smith to state his position, and late in October was questioned by "hecklers" in the small-town meetings. At Lockport, a few days before the election, he stated that many issues in the campaign were more important than the primary, but that the "statewide primary was a delusion and a fraud", and that if he were elected governor he would get rid of it for state and judicial offices.<sup>61</sup>

The Republicans carried the state in the November elections, and in accordance with their campaign promise, introduced a bill in the legislature providing for the nomination by convention of Governor, United States Senators, and elective state officers. The bill passed the Senate April 15, 1921, by a vote of 32-10,<sup>62</sup> and the House two days later by a vote of 91-56.<sup>63</sup> The Demo-

crats and a few Republicans opposed the bill, but<sup>64</sup> the governor signed it on May 3, 1921. The governor and Republican leaders had stood for complete repeal, but felt that it was unwise to go that far at one time on account of opposition in the progressive element of the party, including the women's organizations.

The partial repeal reacted in two distinctly different ways in the 1922 session of the legislature. On the one hand the conservative Republicans attempted to restore the convention for all officers except in the towns, villages, and school districts, while the Democrats tried to secure the repeal of the bill passed in 1921 by the Republicans. Nothing was accomplished by either group.

The primary was a major issue in the state election of 1922. Alfred Smith, the Democratic candidate for governor, stood "unequivocally for the restoration of the direct primary for all public offices".<sup>65</sup> The Republicans defended their convention legislation. Although they lost the governorship and the majority in the State Senate, they retained their majority in the assembly.<sup>66</sup>

Governor Alfred Smith, in his message to the legislature in 1923, recommended return to the primaries.<sup>67</sup> A measure with such provisions was introduced and passed the Senate by a vote of 29-21,<sup>68</sup> but lost in the Republican assembly by 66-74.<sup>69</sup>

Frequent attempts have been made in New York since 1923 to restore the primary and also to repeal the entire system, but none have been successful.

The Supreme Court of Illinois in June of 1920 declared void the primary election act of 1917, because the provisions regarding freedom and equality of elections were unconstitutional; but it held that the primary election act of 1910, with later amendments made prior to 1917, should remain in force. The decision proved very significant for Cook County. The Republican Committee for that county, which had been controlled by Mayor Thompson, was now replaced, and his political opponents put in control.<sup>70</sup> In August 1926 the law of 1910 was invalidated by the state circuit court. Appeal will be made to the supreme court of the state and should the decision of the lower court be upheld the entire system of making party nominations would be wiped out in Illinois.<sup>71</sup>

In Nebraska, Montana, and South Dakota repeal measures adopted from time to time by the state legislatures have been rejected by state referenda.<sup>72</sup> In Vermont and Colorado in 1926 the primary had narrow escapes. In the former state it was saved by the deciding vote of the lieutenant governor in the Senate, and in Colorado by the governor's veto.<sup>73</sup> In other states the platforms of both parties have contained planks advocating a return to the convention system. State governors in their messages have requested repeal or reform of the existing laws, and numerous bills introduced to carry out these suggestions. The repeal movement, seemingly, has only gotten started.

In the national government the primary has attracted comparatively little attention during the post-war period, though in connection with the agitation for a national law providing for the presidential preference primary, several resolutions for an amendment to place the direct primaries under federal control were introduced in Congress in 1921. They were all referred to the Committees on Elections and not returned to the Houses for discussion.<sup>74</sup>

The Harding administration made several

gentures advocating repeal of the primary, but met with such strong opposition from the progressives that the idea was soon abandoned. In 1922 on February 11, when President Harding addressed the League of Republican State Clubs at a Lincoln Day dinner in Washington, he said, "I crave the return of intelligent conventions in the republic. I would rather have men appeal for popular support on the pronouncement of party convictions than to have the appeal of the individual for his particular locality... I believe in that collective vision of the convention; I believe in the dictum of the party,"<sup>75</sup>

The same idea was set forth by Secretary Weeks of the War Department in an address given to the graduating class of Western Reserve University June 15, 1922. He declared the direct primary agitation was an evidence of the fact that the government was heading away from its "ancient safeguards" and tending toward complete social democracy. And that "the direct primary had so palpably lessened the quality of men willing to serve in public affairs that prompt action should be taken to greatly modify or entirely repeal it."<sup>76</sup>

The speech was not an official adminis-

tration pronouncement, but the progressives in Congress accepted it as a challenge. Several speeches denouncing the stand of Secretary Weeks and championing the cause of the primary were made in both houses of Congress by Republicans and Democrats.

Representative Stevenson of South Carolina, Democrat, in the course of his comment quoted as follows from the Washington Herald:-

"There is an apparently concerted effort on among high administration officials, first to effect a modification or repeal of the direct primary law, and second, to better the personnel of Congress....

In connection with this movement there has developed a chorus of warnings from highly placed officials against the so called "Red Menace" in this country, against the placing of too much power in the hands of the people themselves, and expressions of concern lest propaganda and the cry of "demagogues" translate that power into a social democracy for the United States."<sup>77</sup> Distrust of the American people by the administration officials, Stevenson remarked, was due to the fact that Weeks was defeated for the Senate in a Republican state, Hughes defeated for president, Denby beaten for

Congress, and Hoover never able to carry a primary for a Republican office. "No wonder the Republican administration has lost faith in the people."<sup>78</sup>

Senator Norris referred to the speech of Weeks in a long address on the merits of the primary. As in his other pronouncements on this subject his arguments all centered about the popular contention that "no man can successfully deny the right of the people to nominate candidates, unless at the same time he is consistent and denies the right of the people to vote at general elections."<sup>79</sup> Senator France remarked, "I feel that there is a general lack of faith in the capacity of the people of the United States for self-government."<sup>80</sup>

The result of the agitation provoked by the administration was a two day conference of the thirty-three progressives and radicals of the Senate and House. It was held, under the leadership of La Follette, in Washington, December first and second 1922 to promote progressive legislation in order to drive special privilege out of control of the government. The work of the conference was summed up in a series of resolutions adopted on the second day. One of them

referring to the primaries read as follows:

"Everywhere this reform has met with the determined opposition of political bosses, who represent the special interests of the country. Their purpose is to defeat the laws if possible, and when compelled by public opinion to pass a primary law, they endeavor by skillfully contrived jokers to nullify its main purpose. Powerful interests had planned a concerted and widespread attack for the coming winter legislative sessions upon the various primary laws which have been passed in some of the States in the Union. The plan has been made more difficult, and we hope rendered impossible by the splendid results of the recent elections which indicate a widespread and powerful progressive sentiment among the people".<sup>81</sup> A special committee was provided for, to draw up a uniform primary law to be used as a guide for the progressives in those states which had not yet adopted the primary. It was thought that this would avoid the "jokers" which enemies of the direct primary had used in so many cases to defeat its purpose.<sup>82</sup>

It is difficult to estimate the importance of this conference, but the fact that the administration immediately dropped its anti-progressive

program indicates that they realized the strength of the La Follette group. The newspapers spread rumors in the spring of 1923 to the effect that Harding would oppose the extension of the primaries in a series of speeches through-out the country, <sup>83</sup> but this was not done.

It is commonly held that those opposing the primary are only the machine politicians who desire a return to the convention system in order to restore their old power in the party. The facts in the case do not uphold this position. A survey made in 1923, <sup>84</sup> though quite limited in its scope, indicates the division of opinion on the subject among men in different fields and is suggestive of the fact that a combination of the convention and primary systems is more favorably considered than either system alone. Two questions were sent to state governors, party officials, newspaper editors, and college professors. The first question read, "Is the direct primary, in regard to the state-wide offices, a success or failure, in your state?" The answers were as follows:

state governors - 10 affirmative (Six Republicans  
and four Democrats)  
4 negative (All Republicans)

party officials - 2 affirmative (Both Republicans)  
3 negative (Three Republicans  
and five Democrats)

newspaper editors- 4 affirmative (One Independent;  
one Independent-Republican;  
two Democrats)  
4 negative (One Independent; one  
Independent-Republican; two  
Republicans)

college professors-7 affirmative  
5 negative

The other question was, "Is the party  
nominating convention, with delegates thereto chosen  
at a primary, preferable to the direct primary?"

state governors - 8 preferred the primary  
2 preferred the combination

party officials - 2 preferred the primary  
7 preferred the combination

newspaper editors-4 preferred the primary  
4 preferred the combination

college professors 5 preferred the primary  
6 preferred the combination

Among business men there is a general  
criticism of the primary and agitation for its de-

struction. The National Industrial Council is seeking to enlist hundreds of national, state, and local industrial associations in an effort to have the direct primary system repealed. At a meeting in 1926 of this council, which is made up of state industrial association managers, a resolution was adopted declaring the direct primary "a dangerous and unsatisfactory departure from the principles of representative republican government".<sup>85</sup>

J.E. Edgerton, chairman of the council, has stated that, "the feeling is general among business leaders of the country...that the general standards of national and state law-makers and legislation have been seriously lowered since the adoption of the direct primary system.... As soon as the state organizations affiliated with the National Industrial Council have severally acted on the resolution an intensive campaign of education by speakers and dissemination of literature will be carried on".<sup>86</sup>

But there are organizations which have learned to use the primary to their own advantage and oppose its repeal. The women of the country have a representation of but five or ten per cent

in the conventions, while in the primaries it is about forty. Realizing that it will be some time before they will be fully represented in the conventions, they oppose the repeal of the primary through their political organizations. The Non-Partisan League has in many states been able to control the machinery of the dominant party through the use of the primaries and stands firm in the support of that system. The American Federation of Labor, because they feel that the convention system takes the nominating power out of the hands of the masses and places it with the few who control the government in the interests of big business, is not favorable to the return of that system.

In a study of this kind it would be of great interest to set forth the statements made by the political reformers of the pre-war period and their post-war opinions of popular government. This is not possible because those who were quoted most freely during the earlier period are now off the scene of action. One bit of information, however, is available concerning the change in the attitude of Theodore Roosevelt toward the reform movement. In the fall of 1917

Mr. O.K. Davis, who had always insisted in conversation with the Colonel that his popular government movement was unsound, wrote Roosevelt about the primary election in New York for a new mayor which was a complete victory for the machine. In the letter he attacked the primary most severely, showing its inability to solve political problems. In reply Roosevelt wrote Davis under date of November 10:

"Dear O.K.:-

You are quite right and what you say applies not only to the direct primary, but to the initiative, referendum, and recall. They should all of them be exceptional remedies. It should be possible to invoke them in exceptional cases to control the boss and the machines, but they simply do damage if habitually invoked."<sup>87</sup>

Were Woodrow Wilson living today perhaps he, too, would deny the effectiveness of the devices for popular control. When president of Princeton, he said, "A government must have organs; it cannot act inorganically by masses. It must have a law making body; it can no more make law through the voters than it can make law through the newspapers."<sup>88</sup> It may be that Wilson, Roosevelt

and other political leaders advocated popular government in order to secure temporary power with the people, and not because they really believed the movement a means of improving the government.

Since the war no one thing has discredited the primary more than the fact that enormous sums have been spent by candidates in many of the primary campaigns. A major argument against the convention system was that it encouraged corruption. The reformers contended that while it was possible to buy a nomination from the convention one could not buy it from the entire electorate. The facts in the case lead one to think that only men of means can secure the nomination under the primary system, because of the great expense involved in canvassing for two elections. A great many cases might be cited to prove this contention. The most recent and spectacular was the campaign in Pennsylvania last summer (1926), when \$3,000,000 was spent.<sup>39</sup> In the same year F.L. Smith, who defeated W.B. McKinley in the Illinois primaries, spent \$300,000 and his opponent

<sup>90</sup>  
 \$361,000. These "scandals" were the occasion for the following remarks by Senator David Reed of Philadelphia:- "We have got to get back to the convention system now we have given this fancy reform a fair show. We have tried it for twenty years and have seen the time arrive when no man of moderate means has a Chinaman's chance of getting nominated for office".<sup>91</sup>

The only alternative, should a man not be a millionaire, in order to secure a nomination to state office is to accept the contributions of friends and interested business concerns. This is undesirable because it means that a man must "mortgage" his future official conduct. On the other hand, it may be argued that great sums were spent for bribes in the old convention. This may be granted, but the fact remains that the primary has not corrected the evil against which it was directed.

The expense of the primary election is borne by the tax payers. This calls for an additional tax burden which has been effectively used as an argument against the system. The state must pay for an extra registration in ad-

vance of the primary, for the printing of ballots, the rent of polling places, and the salaries of election officials. The primary election in New York City September 2, 1919, cost the city \$400,000 - an election in which, with the two exceptions only, the candidates selected by the bosses were chosen by the voters. In six election districts there were no votes cast and out of a possible 937,000 electors only 216,910<sup>92</sup> voted. Is the primary worth the cost?

Opponents of the primary insist that the system has lowered the character of public officials. This argument has less appeal to the masses than the matter of expense, but it is generally held that more men of mediocre ability get into office through the primary than by the convention system. The primary creates a situation which makes it difficult to get strong men to enter the race for office, while demagogues, perhaps the real representatives of the people, are successful. The primary is pure democracy, but is the direct expression of the will of the people desirable for governmental efficiency? Americans may not want efficiency in government, but only that the people have their way about it -- good or bad.

"The architect's plans were pretty but the structure itself offends the sight, hearing, and smell of all of us."<sup>93</sup>

A few years ago in New Jersey a man of small intelligence decided to run in the party primaries for nomination to the state legislature. The party leaders paid no attention to him and took him as a kind of joke. Below is given a verbatim copy of the election "manifesto" which this candidate issued and sent through his district.

To The Voters Of \_\_\_\_\_ County.  
 I, \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_, New Jersey, the Democratic Candidate for Assembly of \_\_\_\_\_ County.  
 As you know the Campaign that I am waging, is one for Personal liberty, and the Preservation of our Constitution rights. The Daylight Candidate what I am in favor of Just an Equal rights for all, a Privilege Sunday, -- go to Parks, Church, Moving-Pictures, Ball Games, trolley or automobile riding. do as you please in a respectable way. Meeting or enjoyment I am also in favor of Hotels and respectfull saloons, that liquor, wines, beer, tobacco may be sold, and giving the public in a business

way home comforts of both boards and beds and free comforts to the public, and helping to reduce the tax rate by its revenues paid in to the city tax offices. I am also in favor of trade unions, opposed to lock outs or strikes, all grievances or disputes should be arbitrated in a cool and fair way, with the war over the U.S. has become the greatest nation of the whole world in a business way as the export trade of this country is becoming gigantic, hence capital and labor in a very short time will become consolidated in a business way to make our business houses, and the great manufacturing plants of America much greater in the future than in the past. I am also in favor of an eight hour day, as it will build a nation of making it stronger and much healthier, furthermore it will give the great number of toilers in America time for recreation and education, and then toilers of the great factory plants will become more vorst, and skilled and a greater production will be turned out then, than in the present way of business....

In what I have stated to the public if you heartily concern with me in the above statements then I ask your heartly cooperation by supporting me

in the coming primary elections for denomination for  
 Assembly of \_\_\_\_\_ County by going to the pooles  
 and supporting me on the primary day without fail.

Yours very respectfully,

---

\_\_\_\_\_ N.J., residence  
 88 \_\_\_\_\_ Avenue

This man won the nomination over the  
 regular organization nominees and was defeated  
 in the election by only three thousand votes,  
 in a large and populous county.<sup>94</sup> A system which  
 lends itself to such an occurrence is little bet-  
 ter than the old convention plan.

The primary tends to weaken and dis-  
 organize the party and promote differences among  
 its leaders. Under the convention system the  
 leaders got together occasionally and ironed out  
 their differences. If democracy cannot exist  
 without some form of government "because of the  
 inherent limitation on mass movements and public  
 opinions,"<sup>95</sup> then the value of the system which  
 means for the disintegration of the party is to  
 be questioned. Effective party government, it  
 is said, "requires a constant process of compromise

between different elements of the party. This the direct primary makes comparatively impossible in the selection of a ticket and extremely difficult in the formation of a party platform.... Unless there is such a spirit of accommodation and adjustment the party will be driven on the rocks of factional disaster".<sup>96</sup>

Without a doubt the direct primary is responsible to some degree for the bloc system of legislation which has developed since the war. Under the primary a man desiring election in order to represent a class is able to enter the election and seek a place on the regular party ticket. If elected he is nominally a party man, but feels no party responsibility or loyalty. He joins a bloc, supports measures to disorganize the party, and fights its policies. Legislation under these circumstances is difficult. The individual responsibility of the official and the citizen is increased but inefficient government results -- there is government by individuals rather than principles. "It has in it the seed out of which autocracy is born, though up to the present moment it happily has only gone so far as to create a 'heyday' for

demagogues."<sup>97</sup>

The primary has not driven out the political boss or the machine. It does not remove conditions which have produced the system of machines and bosses, but really aids them in making politics more confused, irresponsible and expensive. Penrose of Pennsylvania used it to his advantage as have the bosses in New York as indicated above. The party machine in control in any state secures the election regardless of the system used. "Candidates are slated, voters are assisted, votes are estimated, the count is simplified, and the primary is no more representative of the people at large than is the convention."<sup>98</sup>

There are exceptional cases, as in Pennsylvania when Pinchet was elected governor against the will of the machine, and Brookhart in Iowa, but this is not the rule.

The primary tends to produce a large number of candidates. It assumes that all public offices should be open to all citizens. The result is that so many run for office that the voter does not know who is qualified. Sometimes the machine politicians bring out a large number of re-

spectable candidates in order to divide the anti-machine vote, while the candidate favored by the machine can easily get a larger number of votes than any of his opponents.

The reformers realize there is a strong campaign against the primary and that its existence in the present form is threatened with destruction. They are wise to recognize its weaknesses and concede some changes, as the abolition of nomination by plurality. But they do not think it should be given up entirely because it is weak any more than the constitution should be abolished because it is not perfect. The defects in the operation of primary laws in many states, they contend, are due to the fact that the laws have purposely been framed with defects by the politicians in order that their repeal might be secured.

Another defense of the reformers is that in states where the repeal of the primary has been placed before the people it has been defeated. In Montana by a vote of 77,000 to 60,000 and in Nebraska by 133,000 to 49,000. In New York the Republican party which was responsible for the partial repeal of the primary in 1921, was defeated in the

election of 1922. These facts indicate that the people as a mass are not ready to give up the primary, but it does not necessarily follow that the primary is a success.

Perhaps the strongest argument of the reformers is that set forth so frequently the past few years by Senators Norris, Beveridge, and Capper. They believe if the people are qualified to vote in the election they are qualified to vote in the primary. "Four times out of five the primary is more important than the regular election."<sup>101</sup>

These men maintain that the expenditure of large sums is unnecessary. Beveridge asks "if the primary favors the man of wealth, why does not the man of wealth favor the primary?" His answer is that the primary costs the rich man so much more than the convention that he favors the latter. "What they get now through the primary at great expense, they get at serious risk of exposure. The convention was cheaper and easier to handle."<sup>102</sup> If we want to save money we had better go back to the "viva voce" system of voting to save the expense of printing ballots.<sup>103</sup>

Friends of the primary do not believe

the weakening of the party is necessarily serious. Perhaps the party has served its purpose and men and women will now exert their influence upon governmental action through labor unions, farmer's organizations, associations of commerce, vocational and professional groups of all kinds, instead of parties. <sup>104</sup> This has not been worked out but may be a partial solution to the present political-industrial problems.

In many states the voters know little interest in the primary elections because they do not consider themselves partisan, and only in recent years have they been sufficiently well educated to cast a semi-intelligent ballot. When popular education has become better established through-out America, there may be a greater interest in political <sup>105</sup> affairs in general.

The one great defect of the primary system is the fact that it does not consider the necessity for leadership. It is humanly impossible to conceive of a democracy so perfect that leadership is not of great value. The primary has not provided for open and official leadership. The result is that a more or less secret and irrespon-

sible leadership has grown up in the system. There cannot be effective government without some form of party organization.

To correct this weakness several plans have been suggested. In a number of the states pre-primary conventions have been developed,-- in some cases they are official and more often unofficial. The purpose is to agree upon candidates so that the votes will not be fatally scattered and to draw up a platform. But Mr. Wallace, who has made a close study of this plan, believes it is inevitably deadening to the primary.

A plan to combine the convention and primary systems was advocated in Kansas in 1927. A bill introduced in the legislature during the 1927 session of the legislature provided for primary elections to be held in April, not August, to select delegates to a state convention empowered to make nominations. William Allen White and other state leaders endorsed the plan but the insertion of a "joker" discredited the measure, and its defeat followed. On a small scale this plan has been in successful operation in Delaware. In that state the primary is optional, but the parties

have adopted the primary-convention plan as a means of securing nominees for office.

As early as 1909 Governor Hughes of New York proposed a plan which attracted considerable attention then, and again in 1920 when he presented it in an address before the Annual Meeting of the National Municipal League at Indianapolis.<sup>109</sup> His proposal was to have a series of party committees selected directly by the voters. These committees to meet "under suitable provisions of statute to designate the persons recommended for nomination for the offices to be filled," and to draw up a platform. The voters at the primary would accept or reject the committee nominations and have an opportunity to make substitutions. The theory underlying the plan was that the representative body would not care to be challenged by the voters and would try to meet the wishes of the people. Hughes thought it would minimize expense, avoid unnecessary contests, and yet provide a check and give an opportunity for a primary if there was any real reason for one. Under this system he thought natural leaders would not subject themselves to the annoyances of the

primary.

April 12, 1924, the staff of the Independent magazine set forth an adaptation of Mr. Hughes's plan which was endorsed by Mark Sullivan, W.B. Munro, George H. Moses, J.W. Wadsworth, Jr., and other men interested in reforming the primary system. This plan provides for nominating conventions in April preceding the November elections. After the convention the party voters are to be given sixty days to register their dissent from the convention action and file petition for the nomination of other individuals. If these petitions carry a considerable per cent of the voters then the primary is to be held, otherwise not.<sup>110</sup> This puts the primary in the same category as the initiative and referendum -- instruments to be used in case of emergencies, when the regular party leaders fail to express the will of the voters.

These plans have not been adopted by any of the states but are suggestive of the most recent trend to solve the present problems of the primary system which originated "in the outburst of historic statesmanship which sought universal panaceas in the devices of direct democracy, and support in

the insidious flattery of the public. Its chief appeal was the capitalization of popular prejudice against the bosses and its main defense relied upon vain sophistries regarding popular majorities and their assumed omnipotence.... The direct primary was not the product of a careful and scientific analysis of the problem of party nominations, nor a constructive effort to so organize our political machinery that the public opinion of the party would function with maximum efficiency and beneficence. It was an attempt to make party nominations subject to popular control, without taking the pains to analyze the conditions inherent in the latter. In other words the movement was histrionic rather than scientific."

### Conclusion

Since the beginning of civilization there have been frequent popular revolutions against established political institutions. But according to the late James Bryce, insurrections of the masses until modern times were occasioned by a desire for good government rather than self-government. Kings, tyrants, and other political leaders were occasionally deposed by the people before the sixteenth century, but no one thought of changing the existing form of government. In the modern age, however, popular uprisings have occurred because the people wanted a form of government based on popular will and expressed through universal suffrage.

This new movement, known as democracy, received its first great impulse in England during the seventeenth century. Its progress was slow until the latter part of the eighteenth and during the nineteenth centuries. In America democratic institutions were accepted with reservations, and as late as 75 years ago the educated classes in Europe looked with fear upon a govern-

ment that permitted the expression of the people's will. By 1914, however, democracy was almost universally accepted as an irresistible force. Even in those countries where its enemies were in power, it was rapidly gaining ground. It was generally believed that it was only a matter of time until all the peoples of the world would adopt democracy as their permanent form of government.

At the close of the nineteenth century representative government was well established in America, and, in the early part of the twentieth century as a part of the world-wide revival of the democratic spirit, a movement for popular control of the government developed as a means of purifying the evils of the representative system. In the course of seventeen years (1898-1915) nine states adopted the recall, seventeen the initiative, nineteen the referendum, 21 the presidential preference primary, and 45 the direct primary. America took the lead among the great nations of the world in the movement which was generally considered the next phase in the development of democratic institutions.

The world war arrested the natural devel-

opment of the early twentieth century democratic spirit, but as the struggle "wore on" it took the form of a conflict to destroy absolutism and establish the principle of self-determination throughout the world. Those people enjoying the blessings of democratic government were urged to rise in defense of government by the people and destroy absolutism forever.

The war was a victory for the armies of the Allies, and the world considered it a victory for democracy. Before the struggle was formally closed, and immediately thereafter, absolutism suffered great losses; nine new states arose in Europe, the monarchies of Germany and Russia were overthrown, and the republics of Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan established in Asia. But the period of "showy gains" for the principle of self-determination was followed by a period of reaction unlike anything known before in the history of modern democracy. Since 1923 dictatorships have been established in Portugal, Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Russia, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and Belgium. France has sought a man strong enough to control her finances and von Hindenberg rules in Germany. New

theories of government diametrically opposed to democracy have found expression in Russia and Italy, and everywhere democracy is denounced as "done for".

In America the reaction has taken a different form from that of Europe. Pure democracy primarily, and representative democracy only incidentally, have been attacked. In contrast with the great demand for popular control of the government made in the early part of the century, there has been, since the war, a concerted effort to destroy the devices of direct government. With the exception of North Dakota, the recall, never widely adopted or frequently used, has retained its status of 1914. In four states the presidential preference primary laws have been repealed and in several others legislative action for their repeal defeated by referenda. The initiative and referendum have nominally held their pre-war position, though the laws in many states have been rendered ineffective or fallen into disuse. The direct primary laws of Idaho and New York have been partially repealed and the Illinois law declared unconstitutional by a circuit court. In several other states measures for repeal passed by the legislatures have been defeated by the people or by the

executive veto, and in more than half the states bills to restore the convention, totally or in part, have commanded the serious attention of the legislators.

The European reaction against democracy has been chiefly due to its failure to meet the conditions growing out of the war. A fear of extreme radicalism has created in the people of the continent a willingness to sacrifice their individual rights to a dictator in order to secure law and order. Other reasons for the breakdown of this ideal are the indifference to and incapacity of the masses for self-government, economic suffering, and the fact that the war was directed and the "discredited" peace made by democratic governments.

America, like Europe, has been caught in a general wave of reaction which is the natural aftermath of every war. This spirit of the post-war period has hastened the modification and in some cases the complete destruction of the instruments of popular control, which have proved themselves to be impractical. The breakdown of these devices has been seized upon by the politicians as an opportunity to restore the representative system of govern-

ment. However, the "so called" reactionary movement has not been confined to this group of men, but is supported by business men, newspaper editors, college professors, and men of various other walks of life. It is generally realized that the means advocated in the early part of the century to purify representative government were adopted without sufficient consideration of their adaptability to the American political system. They have failed of their purpose, they are not practical and the post-war spirit of reaction has only hastened their destruction.

On the surface it would seem that the reaction against parliamentary government in Europe is only temporary; that when normal conditions of society are restored democracy will move forward as predicted in the pre-war period. Likewise in America, one might suppose that although the impractical devices for popular control are destroyed, representative government will remain. This is not likely.

In the face of recent scientific discoveries most of the reasons set forth for the failure of democracy appear rather as excuses or contribu-

ting factors. There is a very fundamental reason for the present, general reaction against democracy, which, though not entirely conclusive, is highly significant. In Europe and America the reaction has assumed different forms according to the conditions peculiar to each country, but on both sides of the Atlantic the same fundamental forces are at work. Democracy is found wanting.

Since the close of the war expression has frequently been given to the idea that the masses are unable to rule themselves. The contention is not a new one. It was set forth in the pre-war period by opponents of the movement for popular government, but was overridden by the rising tide of liberalism. During the last ten years, however, there has been an unusually large production of books, and magazine articles denouncing the ability of the people to rule, and platform lecturers have frequently made this contention the subject of their discussion.

The general consideration of this matter in the post-war period is primarily due to the results obtained by intelligence tests given American soldiers in the late war, and the fact that these find-

ings seem to be well substantiated by more recent studies and experimentation in the fields of psychology, biology, and kindred subjects.

Nearly 2,000,000 drafted men above the average in intelligence (the feeble-minded were excluded) were given intelligence tests by the American War Department in 1917 and 1918. Granting that these men were a fair sample of the entire population of approximately 100,000,000 the results obtained indicated that the intelligence of 45,000,000 people in America is that of a twelve  
 112  
 year old child. To consider the results of these tests in another way using 105,000,000 as the basis for the population of America, - 45,000,000 are of subnormal intelligence, 15,000,000 feeble-minded, 5,000,000 first class ability, 15,000,000 second class ability, and 25,000,000 third class ab-  
 113  
 ility. This means that the brain power to run

the government must come from the upper two groups.

Although one admits that the results of these tests are inconclusive, they are, nevertheless, indicative of facts which on a smaller scale have been substantiated by subsequent scientific experimentation. If further investigation supports the present contention of the scientists then the very

heart of the theory of modern democracy is destroyed. Under such circumstances if democracy is to go forward it must be redefined, - otherwise, a new political theory will replace it through-out the world, as has taken place already in Russia and Italy. How long will the "fundamentalists" be able to maintain their power?

There is a group of leaders in America who accept the results of the recent tests regarding the classification of the masses, but believe that in the future by proper education mankind will be able to establish an efficient popularly controlled government. This is a beautiful idea, but if the following principles are substantiated by future experimentation this hope will not be realized:-(1)acquired characteristics are not inherited, (2)"assortive mating operates unremittingly to depress one end of the moral and intellectual scale and to elevate the other", (3)the individual, not the mass, is the source of human advancement.

114

From the point of view of science, democracy is beyond human achievement - present or future. Accordingly, if progress is to be made, the masses must be willing to allow those of higher intelligence

to represent them in government. What the world  
is calling reaction today may be progress? Perhaps  
democracy is a delusion?

-----

The End

## FOOTNOTES

## Chapter I -- The Growth of Democracy

1. Illinois Constitutional Convention Bulletin.  
Springfield, Schnepf and Barnes, 1919. 60-81.
2. Ibid, 81. South Dakota (1898), Oregon (1902),  
Montana (1906), Oklahoma (1907), Maine (1908),  
Missouri (1908), Arkansas (1910), Colorado  
(1910), Arizona (1911), New Mexico (1910),  
California (1911), Nebraska (1912), Nevada  
(1912), Washington (1912), Ohio (1912), Mich-  
igan (1913), North Dakota (1914), Mississippi  
(1914), Maryland (1915). Maryland and New  
Mexico have the referendum only. The date  
given for Nevada is the time that her law  
of 1904 was put into force. Idaho is not  
included because machinery for putting her  
law into operation was never passed. Utah  
is also omitted from this list because her  
law of 1900 was not made operative until 1917  
Many of the books, including the American  
Year Books, are confused on these details.
3. Eggleston, W.G. "The People's Power in Oregon".  
Worlds Work, XXII, 1435-1439.

## Footnotes - Chapter I.

4. Reinsch, Paul S. "The Initiative and Referendum." *Annals of American Academy of Political Science*, III, 203.
5. Bourne, Jonathan, Jr. "A Defense of Direct Legislation." in *The Initiative, Referendum, and Recall* by W.B. Munro, New York, Appleton, 1915. 195-216.
6. Guthrie, G.W. "The Initiative, Referendum, and Recall." *Annals of American Academy*, XXXXIII, 30.
7. *The Initiative and Referendum. Debaters Handbook Series.* Minneapolis, H.W. Wilson, 1911. 35-39.
8. *Ibid.*, 35.
9. *Ibid.*, 83.
10. "The Initiative and Referendum Upheld." *Literary Digest*, XLIV, 411-412.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Binkerd, R.S. "The Doom of the Old Machine Convention." *Review of Reviews*, XLI, 597-599.
13. *American Year Book.* 1919, 229.
14. Brooks, Robert. *Political Parties and Electoral Problems.* New York, Harper, 1923.  
Footnote 242-243. States having statutory pri-

## Footnotes - Chapter I.

mary: Wisconsin (1903), Oregon (1904), Iowa (1907), Missouri (1907), Nebraska (1907), North Dakota (1907), South Dakota (1907), Washington (1907), Kansas (1908), Ohio (1908), Oklahoma (1908), California (1909), Idaho (1909), Michigan (1909), New Hampshire (1909), Nevada (1909), Tennessee (1909), Colorado (1910), Illinois (1910), Maryland (1910), Maine (1911), Massachusetts (1911), New Jersey (1911), Wyoming (1911), Arizona (1912), Louisiana (1912), Kentucky (1912), Minnesota (1912), Mississippi (1912), Montana (1912), Virginia (1912), Florida (1913), New York (1913), Pennsylvania (1913), Indiana (1915), North Carolina (1915), Vermont (1915), and West Virginia (1915).

The states in which the rules of the Democratic party provide for the primary are: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, South Carolina, and Texas. The three states which have no form of the primary are Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Mexico.

15. Easley, Ralph M. "Sine Qua Non of Caucus Reform." Review of Reviews, XVI, 222-223.

## Footnotes - Chapter I.

16. Outlook, XCI, 91-92.
17. Ray, P.O. An Introduction to Political Parties and Practical Politics. New York, Schribners, 1924. 89.
18. "What the Direct Primary Did For California." McClure, XXXVIII, 479-480.
19. Outlook, IIIC, 945.
20. Dunn, A.W. "The Direct Primary: Promise and Performance." Review of Reviews, IVL, 439-45.
21. Gilberton, H.S. "The Recall - Its Provisions Significance." Annals of American Academy, XXXIV, 216.
22. Ray. Introduction to Political Parties. 401. Oregon (1908), California (1911), Arizona (1912), Nevada (1912), Colorado (1912), Washington (1912), Michigan (1913), Kansas (1914), Louisiana (1914). Arizona is given not as 1911 but 1912 when her act was put into operation. Idaho is not included because provision has never been made for machinery to operate her law of 1912. Many of the books are confused on this point.
23. Brooks. Political Parties and Problems. 503.

## Footnotes - Chapter I.

24. Munro. Initiative, Referendum, and Recall. 46.
25. Ibid., 229.
26. Barnett, J.O. The Operation of the Initiative, Referendum, and Recall in Oregon. New York, Macmillan, 1915. 191.
27. American Year Book. 1919. 229.  
Oregon (1910), California (1911), New Jersey (1911), Wisconsin (1911), North Dakota (1911), Nebraska (1911), Massachusetts (1912), Illinois (1912), Michigan (1912), South Dakota (1912), Maryland (1912), Montana (1912), Ohio (1913), New Hampshire (1913), New York (1913), Minnesota (1913), Pennsylvania (1913), Iowa (1913), Vermont (1915), Indiana (1915), North Carolina (1915).
28. Overacker, Louise. The Presidential Primary. New York, Macmillan, 1916. 15
29. "Presidential Primary." Nation, VIII, 568.
30. Review of Reviews, VI, 520.
31. Beard, C.A. Contemporary American History. New York, Macmillan, 1914. 344-346.
32. Penman, J.S. The Irresistible Movement of Democracy. New York, Macmillan, 1923. 167-68.

## Footnotes - Chapter I.

33. Beard, C.A. Contemporary American History.  
352.
34. "The Right of the People to Rule." Outlook, C,  
618-626.
35. Penman, J.S. Irresistible Movement of Democ-  
racy. 171-174.
36. "Direct Nomination of Candidates for Pres-  
ident." Independent, LXXVII, 254-256.
37. "Must the National Convention Be Remanded  
to the Scrap Heap?"  
Current Opinion, LVI, 2-3.  
"Presidential Primaries". Outlook, CV,  
783-785.

Chapter II-- Post War Reaction in Europe

1. Hazen, C.D. Europe Since 1815. 2 Volumes.  
New York, Henry Holt, 1924. II, 701-702.
2. Ibid., 807-901.
3. Ibid., 812.
4. Ibid., 769-779.
5. Ibid., 842.
6. Ibid., 832-852.
7. President Wilson's Great Speeches and Other  
History Making Documents. Stanton and Van  
Vliet Company Publishers, Chicago, 1917.
8. Hazen: II, 737.
9. Howe, Frederic C. Confessions of a Reformer.  
New York, Scribner's Sons, 1925. 397.
10. Abbot, Wilbur C. "Democracy or Dictatorship."  
Yale Review, XVI, 1.
11. Bonn, Morita. Quoted by Stuart Hodgson, "Cri-  
sis of Democracy." Nineteenth Century Mag-  
azine, IIC, 839.
12. Abbot, Wilbur C. "Democracy or Dictatorship."  
1-16.
13. "Democracy and Its Alternatives." Review of  
Reviews, LXXIII, 80.

## Footnotes - Chapter II.

14. Inge, W.R. Outspoken Essays. 2 Volumes.  
New York, Longmans, Green, 1923. I, 7-11.
15. Gibbs, Sir Philip. "Italy Under Mussolini."  
World's Work, L, 148-154.
16. International Conciliation, October 1926,  
Number 223, 393-415.
17. Ibid., Preface, 5.
18. Ibid., 395.
19. Ibid., 395.
20. Ibid., 405. Here, it seems to me, is the  
greatest weakness of the theory.
21. Merriam, C.E. and Barnes, H.E. (Editors). A  
History of Political Theories: Recent Times.  
New York, Macmillan, 1924. Chapter VI.
22. Ibid., 256-257.
23. The system of representation favors the work-  
ingmen. C.C. Moxey. The Problems of Govern-  
ment. New York, Knopf, 1925. 117.
24. Merriam and Barnes. Chapter VI.
25. Elliot, W.Y. "Mussolini, Prophet of the Pragmat-  
ic Era." Political Science Quarterly, XXXI,  
161-192.
26. Ibid., 163.
27. Ibid., 166.
28. Ibid., 167.

## Chapter III -- Post-War Reaction in America

1. Lippman, Walter. "The Causes of Political Indifference Today." *Atlantic Monthly*, CXXXV, 261-268.
2. King, Judson. *The State-Wide Initiative and Referendum*. Senate Document No. 756, 2 session, 64 Congress.
3. Brooks, Robert C. *Political Parties and Electoral Problems*. 499.
4. *Kansas City Star*, September 18, 1921.  
Ibid., October 25, 1921.
5. Brooks, Robert. *Political Parties*. 436
6. Ibid.
7. Reed, Thomas H. "Notes On Municipal Affairs."  
*American Political Science Review*, XVII, 426.
8. Ibid.
9. Sowers, Don C. "Recall Election of Denver Mayor." *National Municipal Review*, XIII, 602-611.
10. Beard, C.A. *American Government and Politics*. New York, Macmillan, 1924, 517.
11. Dodd, W.F. *State Government*. New York, Century, 1922, 543.

## Footnotes - Chapter III.

12. Brooks, R.C. Political Parties. 500.
13. Crawford, F.C. "The Alabama Presidential Primary Law." American Political Science Review, XVIII, 325.
14. Overacker, Louise. The Presidential Primary. New York, Macmillan, 1926, 14.
15. Ibid., 20.
16. New York Times. March 10, 1923. 9:5.
17. Overacker, Louise. Presidential Primary. 21.
18. "Record of Political Events." Political Science Quarterly Supplement, XL, 35.
19. Ibid.
20. Overacker, Louise. Presidential Primary. 21
21. Ray, P.Orman. Political Parties. 156-158.
22. Wood failed to receive the nomination at the Republican Convention in 1920.
23. New York Times. August 15, 1920. 4:4.
24. "Presidential Primary Movement." Congressional Digest, V, 257-258.
25. Illinois Constitutional Convention Bulletin. 80.
26. Ibid., 81.
27. Haynes, George H. "Initiative and Referendum in Massachusetts." Political Science Quarterly, XXXIV, 454-475.

## Footnotes - Chapter III.

22. Record of Political Events, Political Science Quarterly, Supplement. XXXIV, 92.
29. Ibid., XXXVI, 40.
30. Ibid., XXXVIII, 48.
31. Ibid., XXXV, 73.
32. Brooks, Robert. Political Parties. 461.
33. Haynes, John Randolph. "California Sticks to the I. and R." National Municipal Review, XII, 116-118.
34. Record of Political Events. Political Science Quarterly, XXXVIII, 51.
35. "Initiative and Referendum Set Aside in Mississippi." American Bar Association Journal, VIII, 790.
36. The provision in the Missouri referendum section regarding this matter had been adopted from Oregon and was practically identical.
37. Barclay, Thomas S. "Proposed Changes in the Initiative and Referendum in Missouri." National Municipal Review, XIII, 194-197.
38. Loeb Isador. National Municipal Review, XII, 575.
39. Barclay, Thomas. National Municipal Review, XIII, 197.

## Footnotes - Chapter III.

40. New York Times. December 14, 1920. 1:1.
41. Ibid., and December 18, 1920. 1:3.
42. Ibid., December 23, 1920. 1:7.
43. Ibid., December 19, 1920. 5:1.
44. Congressional Record, 68 Congress, 1 session,  
22, 354.  
Ibid., 69 Congress, 1 session, 3413.
45. Davis, O.K. "Can You Trust The Primaries?"  
Collier's, LXXIII, 8-9.
46. Ibid.
47. Merriam, G.E. American Party System. New  
York, Macmillan, 1922. 418.
48. Dodd, W.F. State Government. 536-539.
49. Hall, A.B. Popular Government. 145.
50. New York Times. February 14, 1919. 6:5.
51. Political Science Quarterly. Supplement,  
XXXIII, 51.
52. New York Times. February 23, 1923. 7:5.
53. Overacker, Louise. "Operation of the State-  
Wide Direct Primary in New York State."  
Annals of the American Academy of Political  
and Social Science, CVI, 142-147.
54. New York Times. January 16, 1921. 12:1.

## Footnotes - Chapter III.

55. Ibid., April 20, 1919. 1:2.
56. Ibid., February 5, 1920. 2:7.
57. Ibid., May 18, 1920. 17:4.
58. Ibid., May 23, 1920. 19:2.
59. Ibid., July 29, 1920. 2:6.
60. Ibid., August 5, 1920. 2:6.
61. Ibid., October 23, 1920. 4:3.
62. Ibid., April 16, 1921. 1:1.
63. Ibid., April 18, 1921. 1:1.
64. Ibid., May 4, 1921. 14:2.
65. Ibid., October 19, 1922. 3:1.
66. Ibid.
67. Ibid., January 4, 1923. 10:4.
68. Ibid., March 14, 1923. 4:3.
69. Ibid., March 29, 1923. 2:3.
70. National Municipal Review, IX, 519.
71. Boeckel, Richard. Editorial Research Reports.  
Washington, 1926. 728-748.
72. Congressional Digest, V, 260.
73. Ibid.
74. Congressional Record. 66 Congress, 3 session,  
357.  
Ibid., 67 Congress, 1 session, 1165, 1283.  
New York Times. May 10, 1921. 3:5.

75. Ibid., February 12, 1922. 1:6.
76. Ibid., June 16, 1922. 20:2.
77. Congressional Record, 67 Congress, 2 session,  
8871.
78. Ibid.
79. Congressional Record. 67 Congress, 2 session,  
8805-8806.
80. Ibid., 8807.
81. New York Times. December 3, 1922. 2:1.
82. Ibid.
83. Ibid., March 24, 1923. 15:1.
84. Hannan, W.E. "Opinions of Public Men On the  
Value of the Direct Primary." Annals of  
American Academy, CVI, 55-62.
85. Boeckel, Richard. Editorial Research Re-  
port. 731.
86. Ibid.
87. Davis, O.K. Released For Publication. Hough-  
ton Mifflin, New York, 1925. 423.
88. Betts-Roosevelt Letters. Lyons, New York, 1912.  
23-24.
89. "Direct Primary Under Fire." Literary Digest,  
XC, 10-11.
90. "The Scandal In Illinois." New Republic,  
IIIL, 354-355.

91. Boeckel, Richard. Research Studies. 729.
92. New York Times. September 21, 1919. 17:1.
93. Child, Richard W. Congressional Digest, V, 269.
94. Myers, W.S. American Democracy Today. Princeton, University Press, 1924. 140-142.
95. Hall, A.B. "Direct Primary and Party Responsibility in Wisconsin." Annals of American Academy. CVI, 40-54.
96. Hall, A.B. "Direct Primary in Wisconsin." Annals of American Academy, CVI, 40-54.
97. Congressional Digest, V, 275.
98. Oakley, Imogen B. "Direct Primary." Atlantic Monthly, CXXXV, 742-748.
99. New York Times. December 3, 1922. 2:1.  
Kansas City Times. February 9, 1927. 4:4.
100. Payne, G.H. "The Tory and the Primary." Forum, LXX, 1845-1850.
101. Capper, Arthur. "Is the Direct Primary System Sound?" Congressional Digest, V, 265-267.
102. Beveridge, A.J. "Of, By and For the People - Yes or No." Saturday Evening Post, December 11, 1926, 9.
103. Ibid.
104. Congressional Digest, V, 274.

105. Merriam, C.E. "Nominating Systems." Annals of American Academy, CVI, 1-11.
106. Wallace, S.C. "Pre-Primary Convention." Annals of the American Academy, CVI, 97-104.
107. Kansas City Star. January 31, 1927. 1:1.
108. Kansas City Times. February 9, 1927. 4:4.
109. National Municipal Review, X, 23-31.
110. "Abuse of the Direct Primary." Independent, CXIII, 18.
111. Hall, A.B. Popular Government. 66.

### Conclusion

112. Conklin, E.G. The Direction of Human Evolution. New York, Scribners, 1921.  
100-110.
113. Myers, W.S. American Democracy Today. Princeton, University Press, 1914. 4
114. Ireland, Alleyne. Democracy and the Human Equation. Dutton, New York, 1920. 125.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Public Documents

1. Congressional Records, 1918-1926.
2. King, Judson. "The State-Wide Initiative and Referendum." Senate Document 736, 64 Congress, 2 session:

-----

## Books

3. Adams, Henry. History of the United States.  
3 Volumes. New York, Scribners, 1890.
4. American Year Book.-- 1918, 1919, 1916,  
1925, 1926.
5. Babbitt, Irving. Democracy and Leadership.  
Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1924.
6. Barnes, Harry Elmer. (Editor) History and Pros-  
pectus of the Social Sciences. New York,  
Knopf, 1925.
7. Barnes, H.E. History and Social Intelligence.  
New York, Knopf, 1926.
8. Barnett, J.D. The Operation of the Initiative,  
Referendum, and Recall in Oregon. New York,  
Macmillan, 1919.

9. Beard, C.A. American Government and Politics.  
New York, Macmillan, 1924.
10. Beard, C.A. Contemporary American History.  
New York, Macmillan, 1914.
11. Beard, C.A. and Shultz, B.E. Documents On The  
Initiative, Referendum, and Recall. New York,  
Macmillan, 1912.
12. Betts-Roosevelt Letters. Lyons, New York, Betts,  
1912.
13. Boeckel, Richard. Editorial Research Reports.  
Washington, 1926.
14. Brooks, Robert. Political Parties and Electoral  
Problems. New York, Harper, 1923.
15. Brown, I.J.C. The Meaning of Democracy.  
Chicago, McClure, 1920.
16. Bryce, James. Modern Democracies. 2 Volumes.  
New York, Macmillan, 1921.
17. Bryce, James. American Commonwealth. New York,  
Macmillan, 1910.
18. Carpenter, W.S. Democracy and Representation.  
Princeton, University Press, 1925.
19. Conklin, E.G. The Direction of Human Evolution.  
New York, Scribners, 1921.

20. Croly, Herbert. Progressive Democracy. New York, Macmillan, 1914.
21. Davis, O.K. Released For Publication. New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1925.
22. Debaters Handbook Series. The Initiative and Referendum. Minneapolis, Wilson, 1911.
23. DeWitt, B.P. The Progressive Movement. New York, Macmillan, 1915.
24. Dodd, W.F. State Government. New York, Century, 1922.
25. Exline, Frank. Politics. New York, Dutton, 1922.
26. Hayes, C.J.H. A Political and Social History of Modern Europe. 2 Volumes. New York, Macmillan, 1926.
27. Hall, A.B. Popular Government. New York, Macmillan, 1921.
28. Hazen, C.D. Europe Since 1815. 2 Volumes. New York, Henry Holt, 1924.
29. Howe, Frederic C. Confessions of a Reformer. New York, Scribners, 1925.
30. Illinois Constitutional Convention Bulletin. Springfield, Schnepf and Barnes, 1919.
31. Inge, W.R. Outspoken Essays. 2 Volumes. New

- York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1923.
32. Ireland, Alleyne. Democracy and the Human Equation. New York, Dutton and Company, 1920.
  33. Jones, H.W. Safe and Unsafe Democracy. New York, Crowell, 1918.
  34. Kales, A.M. Unpopular Government. Chicago, University Press, 1914.
  35. Maxey, C.C. The Problems of Government. New York, Knopf, 1925.
  36. McLaughlin, A.C. Steps in the Development of American Democracy. New York, Abingdon Press, 1920.
  37. Malin, J.C. An Interpretation of Recent American History. New York, Century, 1926.
  38. Mencken, H.L. Notes on Democracy. New York, Knopf, 1926.
  39. Merriam, C.E. American Party System. New York, Macmillan, 1922.
  40. Merriam, C.E. and Barnes, H.E. (Editors). A History of Political Theories : Recent Times. New York, Macmillan, 1924.
  41. Munro, W.B. (Editor). The Initiative, Referendum,

- and Recall. New York, Appleton, 1915.
42. Myers, W.S. American Democracy Today. Princeton, University Press, 1924.
  43. Oberholtzer, E.P. The Referendum in America. New York, Scribners, 1911.
  44. Ogg (Frederic A.) and Beard (Charles A). National Governments and the World War. New York, Macmillan, 1919.
  45. Overacker, Louise. The Presidential Primary. New York, Macmillan, 1926.
  46. Penman, J.S. The Irrestible Movement of Democracy. New York, Macmillan, 1923.
  47. Ray, P.O. An Introduction to Political Parties and Practical Politics. New York, Scribners, 1924.
  48. Roberts, Richard. The Unfinished Program of Democracy. New York, Huebsch, 1920.
  49. Sedgwick, A.G. The Democratic Mistake. New York, Scribners, 1912.
  50. Sloane, W.M. The Powers and Aims of Western Democracy. New York, Scribners, 1919.
  51. Snow, Edith M. Digest of Provisions of the In-

- itiative, Referendum and Recall. New York,  
State Library, 1924.
52. Stearns, H.E. (Editor). Civilization in the  
United States. New York, Harcourt, 1922.
53. Wilcox, D.F. Government By All the People.  
New York, Macmillan, 1913.
54. Wilson's Great Speeches and Other History  
Making Documents. Chicago, Stanton and Van  
Vliet Company Publishers, 1917.
55. Wood, J.N. Democracy and the Will To Power.  
New York, Knopf, 1926.
56. Works of Charles Sumner. 15 Volumes. Boston,  
Lee and Shepard, 1885.

-----

Newspapers, Pamphlets, and Periodicals.

57. Abbott, L.F. "Spoofing or Ignorance."  
Outlook, CIIIVL, 791-792.
58. Abbot, William C. "Democracy or Dictatorship."  
Yale Review, XVI, 1-16.
59. Allen, W.L. "The Trend Toward a Pure Democracy."  
Outlook, LXXXIV, 120-125.
60. American Bar Association Journal. "Initiative

and Referendum Set Aside in Mississippi."

VIII, 739.

61. Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science. Digest of Primary Election Laws. CVI, 182-273. (Hereafter cited as Annals of American Academy.)
62. Barclay, Thomas S. "Proposed Changes in the Initiative and Referendum in Missouri." National Municipal Review, XIII, 194-197.
63. Barnett, J.D. "Legislative Notes and Reviews," American Political Science Review XV, 259.
64. Boals, Carleton. "Italian Fascism Developing a New Phase." Current History, XXII, 226-232.
65. Beveridge, A.J. "Of, By and For the People - Yes or No." Saturday Evening Post, December 11, 1926.
66. Binkerd, R.S. "The Doom of the Old Machine Convention." Review of Reviews, XLI, 597-599.
67. Bonyng, R.W. "Public Innovations." Forum, VII, 645.
68. Boots, R.S. "Career of Direct Primary in Nebraska." National Municipal Review, XI, 373-379.

69. Boots,R.S. "Direct Primary Weathers the Storm."  
National Municipal Review, X, 322-324.
70. Boots,Ralph S. "Legislative Notes and Reviews."  
American Political Science Review, XVIII,  
250-251.
71. Boots,Ralph S. "The Presidential Primary."  
National Municipal Review, IX, 507-617.
72. Boots,Ralph. "The Presidential Primary."  
National Municipal Review, IX, Supplement,  
606-616.
73. Boots,R.S. "Trend of Direct Primaries." Am-  
erican Political Science Review, XVI, 412-451.
74. Brockett,E.T. "The Direct Primary Versus the  
Conventions." Annals of American Academy,  
VIII, 172-189.
75. Briggs,J.E. "Direct Primary in Two States."  
National Municipal Review, XI, 282-290.
76. Buell,R.L. "Democracy In California."  
Outlook, CXXVIV, 176-179.
77. Butler,N.Murry, "The Direct Primary."  
Forum, LXV, 90-97.
78. Catlett,F.W. "The Working of the Recall in

- Seattle." Annals of American Academy,  
XLIII, 227-256.
79. Congressional Digest, V, # 10.
80. Crawford, F.C. "The Alabama Presidential Primary  
Law." American Political Science Review,  
XVIII, 325-325.
81. Crowell, Chester T. "Democracy's Flat Tire."  
Century, CXII, 203-212.
82. Current Opinion. "Must the National Conven-  
tion Be Remanded to the Scrap Heap?"  
LVI, 2-3.
83. Current Opinion, LVI, 2-3.
84. Current History. "Fascism As an Alternative  
to Anarchy." XXIII, 522-524.
85. Dallinger, F.W. "Reforming the Direct Primary."  
Independent, CXIII, 248.
86. Davis, O.K. "Can You Trust the Primaries?"  
Collier's, LXXIII. 0-9.
87. Dell, Robert. "Italy Inverted Bolshevism."  
Current History, XXIII, 518-522.
88. Durant, Will. "Is Democracy a Failure?" Harpers,  
CLIII, 555-565.

89. Dodds, H.W. "Views and Reviews." National Municipal Review, IX, 405-406.
90. Dodd, W.F. "Legislative Notes and Reviews." The American Political Science Review, XV, 256.
91. Dodds, H.W. "Removable Obstacles To The Success of the Direct Primary." American Academy Annals, CVI, 18-21.
92. Dunn, A.W. "The Direct Primary : Promise and Performance." Review of Reviews, IVL, 439-445.
93. Easley, R.M. "The Sine-qua-non of Caucus Reform." Review of Reviews, XVI, 322-324.
94. Elliot, W.Y. "Mussolini, Prophet of the Pragmatic Era." Political Science Quarterly, XXXI, 161-192.
95. Eggleston, W.G. "The People's Power in Oregon." World's Work, XXII, 1425-1439.
96. Forum. "Direct Primaries." LXV, 206-216.
97. Frank, Glenn. "Democracy at the Cross-roads." Century, CIII, 957-966.
98. Frank, Glenn. "On Discontent With Democracy." Century, CIV, 157-160.

99. Franklin, Fabian. "Direct Elections and the Presidency." *Independent*, CXI, 376-377.
100. Gardiner, J.B.W. "Direct Primaries." *Forum*, LXV, 206-216.
101. Geiser, K.F. "Defects of American Primary." *Annals of American Academy*, CVI, 31-39.
102. Gibbs, Sir Philip. "Italy Under Mussolini." *World's Work*, L, 140-154.
103. Gilbertson, H.S. "The Recall - Its Provisions and Significance." *Outlook*, XLIII, 216-226.
104. Guthrie, G.W. "The Initiative, Referendum, and Recall." *Annals of American Academy*, XLIII, 17-31.
105. Hall, A.B. "Direct Primary and Party Responsibility in Wisconsin." *Annals of American Academy*, CVI, 40-54.
106. Hankins, F.H. "Individual Differences and Democratic Theory." *Political Science Quarterly*, LIX, 388-412.
107. Hannan, W.F. "Opinions of Public Men On the Value of the Direct Primary." *Annals of American Academy*, CVI, 55-62.

108. Harack, Frank. "The Workings of the Direct Primary." *Annals of American Academy*, CVL, 148-157.
109. Harinell, O.C. "Direct Primary Law in Maine and How It Has Worked." *Annals of American Academy*, CVI, 128-1241.
110. Hart, C.B. "The Direct Primaries Versus the Convention." *American Academy of Political Science*, III, 210-219.
111. Hasbrouch, G.D.B. "The Direct Primary." *Forum*, LXV, 90-97.
112. Haynes, George H. "Initiative and Referendum in Massachusetts." *Political Science Quarterly*, XXXIV, 454-475.
113. Haynes, John Randolph. "California Sticks To the I.R. and R." *National Municipal Reviews*, XII, 116-118.
114. Hedges, J.E. "Statement On Direct Primary." *Annals of American Academy*, III, 220-234.
115. Hodgson, Stuart. "Crisis of Democracy." *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, IIC, 839-846.
116. Holmes, S.J. "Eugenics Vital to the Human Race." *Current History*, XXV, 346-350.

117. Hughes, G.E. "The Fate of the Direct Primary."  
National Municipal Review, X, 23-31.
118. Independent. "Abuse of the Primary."  
CXIII, 18.
119. Independent. "Direct Nomination of Candidates  
for President." LXXVII, 254-256.
120. Independent. "Direct Primaries." CXII, 189.
121. Independent. "Direct Nominations of Candidates  
For President." LXXVII, 254-255.
122. Independent. "Misdirected Primary." CXVII, 257.
123. Independent. "Progress in Direct Legislation."  
LXXIII, 511-513.
124. International Conciliation. October, 1926,  
No. 223.
125. Kettleborough, Charles. "The Direct Primary."  
Annals of American Academy, CVI, 11-17.
126. Lansing, Robert. "Decay of the American Parties."  
Independent, CXII, 193-195.
127. Laprade, W.L. "The Nominating Primary." North  
American Review, CC, 235-243.
128. Lippmann, Walter. "The Causes of Political In-  
difference Today." Atlantic Monthly, CIXL,  
261-268.

129. Literary Digest. "Direct Primary Under Fire."  
XC, 10-11.
130. Literary Digest. "Primary As Rich Man's Game."  
LXXIII, 10.
131. Literary Digest. "The Initiative and Referen-  
dum Upheld." XLIV, 411-412.
132. Loeb, Isador. National Municipal Review, XII,  
575.
133. Lowden, Frank O. "Too Much Government,"  
World's Work, XXXVII, 191-196.
134. McClure. "What the Direct Primary Did For  
California." XXXVIII, 479-480.
135. Merriam, C.E. "Nominating Systems." Annals of  
American Academy, CVI, 1-11.
136. Merriam, C.E. "Recent Tendencies in Primary  
Systems." National Municipal Review, X,  
87-94.
137. Munro, W.B. "Worst Fundamentalism." Atlantic  
Monthly, CXXXVIII, 451-459.
138. Murphy, James. "Italian Tyranny: An Anti-Fascisti  
View." Atlantic Monthly, CXXXVI, 818-827.
139. Nation. "High Cost of Primaries." CX, 390.
140. Nation. "Our Faltering Faith in Democracy."  
CXXII, 438.

141. Nation. "Presidential Primaries." VIIIC, 568-569.
142. Nation. "The Direct Primary." VIIIC, 114-115.
143. National Municipal Review, IX, 519.
144. National Municipal Review, X, 23-31.
145. National Municipal Review. "A New Type of Direct Primary." VIII, 472-480.
146. New Republic. "Light From the Lawyers." XL, 190.
147. New Republic. "Progressivism." IXL, 312-314.
148. New Republic. "The Scandal in Illinois." IIIL, 354-355.
149. New York Times. 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923 (Sept.)
150. Norris, G.W. "Why I Believe in Direct Primary." Annals of American Academy, CVI, 22-30.
151. Outlook, XCI, 91-92.
152. Outlook, IIIC, 945.
153. Outlook. "Direct Nominations." VC, 468-469.
154. Outlook. "Presidential Primary." C, 387-388.
155. Outlook. "Presidential Primaries." CI, 56-58.
156. Outlook. "Presidential Primaries." CV, 783-785.
157. Outlook. "Public Control of Elections." IIIC, 945.

158. Outlook. "Revolt Against the Primary." CIVL,  
8.
159. Outlook. "The Presidential Primary." C,  
165-170.
160. Outlook. "The Right of the People to Rule."  
C, 618-626.
161. Oakley, Imogen, B. "Direct Primary." Atlantic  
Monthly, CXXXV, 742-748.
162. Overacker, Louise. "Operation of the State-  
Wide Direct Primary in New York State." An-  
nals of the American Academy, CVI, 142-147.
163. Overton, Gwendolen. "Democracy and the Recall."  
Forum, IIII, 157-168.
164. Payne, G. H. "The Tory and the Primary." Forum,  
LXX, 1845-1850.
165. Political Science Quarterly Supplement. XXXIII,  
XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, IXL, XL.
166. Powers, H. H. "Rising Tide of Democracy." At-  
lantic Monthly, CXXXIII, 456-467.
167. Pulsifer, H. T. "Pig and the Primary." Outlook,  
CXXVI, 19-21.
168. Ray, P. O. "Legislative Notes and Reviews."  
American Political Science Review, XX, 349.

170. Reed, Thomas H. "Notes on Municipal Affairs."  
American Political Science Review, XVII, 426.
171. Reinsch, Paul S. "The Initiative and Referendum." Annals of American Academy, III, 203-209.
172. Review of Reviews, VI, 515-525.
173. Review of Reviews. "Democracy and Its Alternatives." LXXIII, 89.
174. Review of Reviews. "Progress of the World." VI, 515-535.
175. Roosevelt, Theodore. "The Right of the People To Rule." Outlook, C, 618-626.
176. Roosevelt, Theodore. "Who Is a Progressive?" Outlook, C, 809-814.
177. Smith, Herbert. "The Referendum in Canada." American Bar Association Journal, X, 511-512.
178. Snell, Bertrand. "The Direct Primary." Forum, LXV, 90-97.
179. Shoup, E. I. "Initiative and Referendum in Thirty-Six American Cities in the Years 1921-1922." National Municipal Review, XII, 610-615.
180. Sowers, D. C. "Recall Election of Denver Mayor." National Municipal Review, XIII, 609-611.

181. Wadsworth, James W. Jr. "The Direct Primary."  
Forum, LXV, 90-97.
182. Wallace, S.C. "Pre-Primary Conventions."  
Annals of American Academy, CVI, 97-104.
183. Wallace, W.L. "Direct Primary Little Used in  
County Elections in Iowa." National Munic-  
ipal Review, XIII, 667-668.
184. West, V.J. "California Direct Primary." An-  
nals of American Academy of Political Science,  
CVI, 116-127.
185. Williams, B.H. "Prevention of Minority Nomina-  
tions for State Office in the Direct Primary."  
Annals of American Academy, CVI, 111-115.
186. Williams, Talcott. "Presidents, Primaries and  
People." Independent, CII, 358.
187. Woodruff, C.R. "Nomination Reformers In America."  
Forum, VIIIIL, 493-505.
188. World's Work. "Presidential Primary." XXIII,  
260-263.
189. World's Work. "Trusting The Peoples Judgment."  
XXII, 1437-1438.
190. World's Work. "Wanted : A New Method of Nom-  
inating Presidents." XL, 433-434.