

1965

The Democratic Convention of 1924

Vic Provinzano

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [History](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Provinzano, Vic, "The Democratic Convention of 1924" (1965). *Masters Theses*. 4307.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4307>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

The Democratic Convention of 1924

(TITLE)

BY

Vic Provinzano

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts in History

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1965
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

April 19, 1965
DATE

April 19, 1965
DATE

To: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

Subject: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

If you have no objection to your thesis being reproduced, please sign the following statement.

Permission to Reproduce a Thesis

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

7/10/65
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several people have unknowingly made the writing of this thesis possible. I am grateful to Dr. Glenn Seymour, Dr. Hugh Rawls, and Dr. Donald Tingley for encouraging me to attend college during the summer months of 1958.

Many of my classmates have aided me with words of comfort and encouragement when I was discouraged to the point of giving up. My gratitude is extended to Sam Lilly, Charles Gillispe, Charles Evans, Jim Hill, Craig Chambers, Robert Whaley, Shirley Rawls, Jimmie Voglesanger, Lucille Lance, and Beth Massey.

In my search for information the following librarians and libraries have been most cooperative: Mrs. Mildred Eberle and Miss Florence Nichol at the Illinois State Library, Springfield, Illinois; Mr. Adams of the microfilmed newspapers section who gave me special aid in my quest for primary newspaper material at the same institution; Mrs. Paul Pittman at the Evans Library and Miss Alenia McCord at the Vandalia High School library in Vandalia, Illinois; Mrs. Frances Ferguson of the Mattoon Public

Library, Mattoon, Illinois and Miss Lee Anna J. Smock, reference librarian at Booth Library, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois who was very helpful; and Mildred Lawson, Public Library, Clarksburg, West Virginia, who furnished me with several leads and sent me two books which proved to be very valuable.

For the many hours spent typing this thesis I want to thank Mrs. Ruth Ann Scott with a special mention to Mr. G. V. Blythe, Superintendent of Vandalia Schools and his secretary, Mrs. Lois Wilson for making the typing of this thesis possible.

To Anna Ruth Kains of the English department at Vandalia High School and Sam Lilly, now Assistant Superintendent of Schools at Dieterich, Illinois, a sincere thank you for proof reading my manuscript; also to Dr. David J. Maurer and Dr. P. Rex Syndergaard, on my thesis committee, for their special assistance.

As for my teacher, friend, and adviser, Dr. Donald Tingley, words cannot express my deep appreciation for all of his assistance in research and in the writing of this thesis.

Finally, to my wife, Lucille, and my children Marilyn, Cathy, John, and Linda, I must express my gratitude for their patience, consideration, and understanding.

Vic Provinzano

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PRE-CONVENTION CONTENDERS FOR THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION	8
III. PRE-CONVENTION MANEUVERING	18
IV. PREPARATIONS FOR THE IMPENDING BATTLE	30
V. THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION CONVENES	38
VI. MAJORITY VERSUS MINORITY ON LEAGUE AND KLAN PLANKS	53
VII. DEADLOCK - BALLOTING RECORD SET	67
VIII. JOHN W. DAVIS	91
IX. CONCLUSION	101
APPENDICES	
VOTE ON MINORITY AMENDMENT TO LEAGUE OF NATIONS PLANK	106
BALLOT ON MINORITY REPORT OF PLATFORM COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENT TO RELIGIOUS LIBERTY PLANK	108
PRESIDENTIAL BALLOTS	110
ELECTION RETURNS	114
BIBLIOGRAPHY	115

INTRODUCTION

The Democratic National Convention met at Madison Square Garden, New York City, on June 24, 1924 and did not conclude its labors until 2:30 A.M. July 10, 1924. Its twenty-nine sessions made it the most protracted National Convention in the history of the country.

When the Convention was called to order by Congressman Cordell Hull, Chairman of the National Democratic Committee, there was no premonition of the turbulent sessions that were to take place and the acrimonious divisions that were to arise over the platform and the personality of the candidates. It was expected that there would be a number of ballots to reach a decision, but no one anticipated a deadlock such as occurred.¹

In sharp contrast to the Republican Convention in Cleveland, the Democratic Convention began its arduous labors in New York without a real leader, with actual issues unsettled, and a score of candidates for premier honors. United during the past four years as the opposition party, struggling boldly to overcome a 7,000,000

"The Democratic National Convention," Current History, Vol. XX (August, 1924), p. 730.

vote handicap, the Democratic Party had given too much energy to censuring Republican measures, too little in reaching unanimity on three great questions of principle - the League of Nations, the Ku Klux, Klan, and the Volstead Act. It had not developed an outstanding leader, it had not crystallized a program of constructive action to offer the American people. All of this was left to be accomplished within the span of a few hectic convention days.²

Behind closed doors the sub-committee of eleven carried on mysterious deliberations, while the convention itself exuded noise and commotion. In a platform of thirty-five planks, all but three were safely devoid of dynamite. So much controversy was aroused over the remaining three that the party was lucky to emerge united from the struggle. The disturbing elements in an otherwise bland mixture are the Ku Klux Klan, the League of Nations, and Prohibition.

In each case an outstanding party figure demanded drastic action and refused to follow soft-pedal tactics. Senator Oscar A. Underwood, Democratic leader in the Senate, forced the fight on the Klan. Ex-Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker battled for unequivocal support of the League of Nations, and William Jennings Bryan stood for no slippery plank on prohibition.³

² The Independent, Vol. CXIII, July 5, 1924, p. 6.

³ Ibid., p. 6.

The Democrats seemingly had an issue made to order in the scandals of the Harding Administration. But it was spoiled by unforeseen factors. Instead of being outraged by the exposures, people seemed to be callously indifferent in this postwar atmosphere of disillusionment and cynicism. In some quarters, notably among businessmen, there was actual resentment at the investigations, echoed in metropolitan journals.⁴ Exposures were unwelcome guests at the prosperity feast. A second factor was the death of Harding and the accession of Coolidge. The sourly honest New Englander was above reproach.⁵ All the attacks on Republican corruption left him untouched. He had eliminated the rascals and replaced them with good men.⁶ What more could the Democrats do?

A third factor was the cat-and-dog fight at the Democratic National Convention. The chances of the Democrats were wrecked

⁴Eugene H. Roseboom, A History of Presidential Elections (New York, 1957), p. 411.

⁵Ibid., p. 411. The same idea is expressed in William Allen White, A Puritan in Babylon (New York, 1958), p. 283. As the Cleveland Republican National Convention of 1924 in May began to take form, it was apparent that the Republican party was behind the President. It seemed likely that the country would accept Republican leadership again. The country did not burn with wrath against the Republican party because of the oil scandals. The country was slow to anger because a new President had come who was not to blame.

⁶White, A Puritan in Babylon, p. 294. Roseboom, A History of Presidential Elections, p. 412.

by the bitter dissensions that blazed up at the convention. The contenders were the urban machines of the East and the rural populace of the South and West. The alignment was old, but the issue was not.

The Ku Klux Klan provided the new issue. It appealed to culturally retarded and economically thwarted small-town and rural folk of older native stocks. These groups found compensation for their frustrations by participating in its secret rituals, its hooded parades, its mysterious burning of fiery crosses on hilltops at midnight, and its cult of Nordic Protestant supremacy.⁷ Lynchings, whippings, riots, and other acts of violence were more sinister outlets. Coating itself with that favorite whitewash of bigotry, the preservation of "Americanism," the Klan was anti-foreign, anti-Catholic, anti-Jewish, and anti-Negro, depending upon the locale. Its slick organizers, who made fortunes from membership dues and other graft, saw opportunities in politics, and soon candidates for office in many communities outside the urban East were joining the Klan or coming to terms with it.⁸

The Republicans with their predominantly Protestant and middle class dependence, quietly accepted the white-sheeted

⁷Roseboom, A History of Presidential Elections, p. 412. Also see Arnold S. Rice, The Ku Klux Klan in American Politics (Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C., 1962), p. 12.

⁸Roseboom, A History of Presidential Election, p. 412. Rice, The Ku Klux Klan in American Politics, p. 76.

brotherhood as an auxiliary where it was strong but otherwise ignored its existence. At the Cleveland Convention of 1924, the Klan issue was passed over quickly and quietly by the Republicans.

The Democrats were less fortunate. The Klan had infiltrated the party in many sections of the rural hinterlands; but in the urban centers of East and Middle West, where the voters were largely of immigrant stock and under Irish Catholic leadership it was extremely unpopular. The issue seemed bound to explode at the national convention. The matter of candidates was also at stake. These plebeian city Democrats felt that proper recognition in the first echelons of party leadership had been denied to them in the past.⁹

Tammany Hall in particular had been treated at times like a family alcoholic who could neither be cast off or be reformed. Metropolitan city halls and sometimes a state capital were suitable rewards for such Democrats. But by 1924 they were ready to demand their place in the sun. From their ranks emerged a man of national stature - Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York who was the idol of this eastern Democracy. He was anti-Klan, anti-prohibition, a Tammany Hall product and a Catholic of immigrant

⁹ Roseboom, A History of Presidential Elections, p. 412.

parentage. The Klansmen saw in his candidacy an amalgam of all their fears and hates.¹⁰

Out of the West came William Gibbs McAdoo, the choice of the Klan, a somewhat tarnished Lochinvar wielding the lance of Wilsonian liberalism and resolved to save the Madison Square Garden maiden from the eastern villains.¹¹ Son-in-law of Woodrow Wilson and once his Secretary of Treasury, Mr. McAdoo had in his camp Bernard Baruch and other staunch Wilsonians, the railway brotherhoods, many rural dry Democrats, some assorted liberals, and a corps of former federal officeholders.

McAdoo was well in the lead for the presidential nomination when the Walsh investigations revealed that he was a legal adviser to Edward L. Doheny, wealthy oil man, who was involved in the Fall bribery disclosures.¹²

In the bitter sectional rivalry between the forces of McAdoo and the forces of Al Smith one issue was "oil." For some time before the convention, certain Democratic leaders publicly or secretly charged that McAdoo had disqualified himself for the nomination. As the party's chief issue was corruption, they said,

¹⁰Ibid., p. 412.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 412-213.

¹²J. Leonard Bates, "The Teapot Dome Scandal and the Election of 1924," The American Historical Review, Vol. LX (January, 1955), pp. 302-322.

it would be senseless to nominate McAdeo, who was himself covered with oil. The party must have a clean government candidate.¹³

Thus McAdeo's implication in the oil scandals added one more detail to the unsavory disputes of a convention that succeeded before it was through in destroying the party chances for a victory.¹⁴

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 321.

Governor Pat M. Neff of Texas declared that neither Smith nor McAdeo should be a candidate: "Smith is too wet. McAdeo is too oily." The unfortunate division of our party at this moment between these two impossible candidates has caused the delegates to overlook temporarily the strength and virtues of many abler and better fitted men, such as Davis, Copeland, Ralston, Baker, and Bryan." New York Times, June 24, 1924, p. 2.

¹⁴ Bates, "The Teapot Dome Scandal and the Election of 1924," The American Historical Review (January, 1955), pp. 321-322.

PRE-CONVENTION CONTENDERS FOR THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION

During the winter of 1923 it seemed that the presidential candidates in the election of 1924 would be Calvin Coolidge for the Republicans and William G. McAdoo for the Democrats. Republican leadership staked itself to the Mellon Tax plan and it was to be a major issue in the campaign. However, the Tax plan met a setback in the House of Representatives and was later distracted by the cry of "oil" in the Senate. With the investigations of Elk Hills and Teapot Dome, both political parties had to alter their plan of attack.

How seriously Mr. McAdoo's candidacy would be affected by the disclosure of the fact, that while he had nothing to do with Mr. Doheny's oil leases, he had a great deal to do with Mr. Doheny's oil, would be hard to predict at that early date.¹ Just the mention of Mr. McAdoo being on the legal staff of an oil corporation was understood by many to put him in public disfavor and ruined his chances for the Democratic presidential nomination.²

One writer felt that nothing had been brought to light about Mr. McAdoo that should be allowed to cloud his reputation. He said,

¹ Charles Merz, "At the Two Conventions," The Century Magazine, Vol. CVIII (June, 1924), pp. 225-230.

²

~~American Review of Reviews~~, Vol. LXIX (March, 1924), p. 246.

"It was much better for McAdoo to have had the opportunity of explaining the relation of his law firm, that was retained by Mr. Doheny to protect interests of the Doheny companies amounting to several hundred million dollars that were threatened by the Mexican government, during the early days of February than to have his political enemies hold his Doheny connection in reserve, in order to use it against him at a time when explanations would have come too late. It is for the Democratic party to decide, but it will be hard to find either a lawyer or a businessman of success and standing who has not had some relationship to great enterprises in a corporate form."³

Several other candidates were frequently mentioned during the opening months of 1924. Mr. James Cox, Democratic standard-bearer in 1920, had become active in Ohio as a candidate. On January 10, Mr. John W. Davis was brought forward by the Democrats of West Virginia. Senator Oscar W. Underwood, an avowed candidate, had the support of his home state of Alabama. Senator Samuel A. Ralston of Indiana was admittedly a candidate, and Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York had by no means abandoned his candidacy. Senator Copeland of New York was also regarded as a possible choice. Senator Reed of Missouri had support in certain powerful quarters, and Governor Charles W. Bryan of Nebraska had been mentioned almost as prominently

³ "As to Political Availability," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXIX (March, 1924), p. 236.

as his more eminent brother, William Jennings Bryan.⁴

The Democratic primaries had focused interest upon Governor Smith and Mr. McAdoo with no other candidate looming up conspicuously by reason of any strength shown in state contests. The McAdoo movement developed much greater headway than was expected after the confusion produced by the Doheny testimony in the oil inquiry at Washington, D. C. So far as Mr. McAdoo was concerned, the oil disclosures seemed to have done no permanent political harm. It might be said that he was hardly stronger or weaker than he would have been in any case as the month of June approached.⁵

The most conspicuous change in the Democratic situation was the development of the "Smith boom." A powerful committee was formed in New York State to support Governor Smith's presidential candidacy under the chairmanship of Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt.⁶

Mr. Roosevelt sent a letter to every delegate giving them ten reasons why Governor Smith should be the Democratic candidate:

1. Smith was from a large state and could pull the votes from other large states.
2. He was elected Governor with a plurality of 384,000 votes for a record vote.
3. He had strength in doubtful states.
4. He had a following among independent voters.
5. He was an expert on affairs of government and his experience was unequalled by any man alive.
6. He had the support of Labor and the confidence of the business men.
7. Although Smith was personally against the Volstead Act, he fearlessly enforced it.

⁵ "McAdoo and Smith," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXIX (June, 1924), p. 575.

⁶ Ibid., p. 575.

8. He was a candidate in sixteen elections and was defeated only once. There were no flaws in his personal or public record.
9. His rise from newsboy to Governor made him a self-made man.
10. He has a vibrant and appealing personality.

"Can you think of another leader under whose banner we have a more splendid chance to succeed?"⁷

On June 4, Franklin D. Roosevelt announced that the New York delegation would not attack the prohibition issue before the Committee on Resolutions. Mr. Roosevelt believed that the paramount issue of the campaign should be "The restoration of confidence in our government both at home and abroad."⁸

Roosevelt praised Governor Smith and defended the facts that the Governor had held no national office, that he was a Catholic and a "wet." He felt that Smith could restore confidence on our Federal Government, confidence in it by our own citizens and friendship for it by the people of the world.⁹

Several women of prominence in New York public life also acclaimed Governor Smith's virtues. Mrs. Frances Perkins said, "He is a natural-born public servant. He has the temperament and he has the talent. He likes people and he believes in people and understands people." Miss Perkins concluded by insisting that, "If President,

⁷ New York Times, June 6, 1924, p. 1.

⁸ New York Times, June 4, 1924, p. 1.

⁹ Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "Smith - Public Servant," The Outlook (June 25, 1924), pp. 309-311.

Alfred E. Smith would never make the mistake of appointing men of dubious mental or moral character to office."¹⁰

Mrs. Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch said, "Governor Smith's rapid rise in politics was due to the fact that everyone of his friends stuck, and they stuck because they found that Smith always told the truth and never failed a cause when he had decided it was a good one."¹¹

Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Miss Harriet May Mills issued statements that were highly laudatory of Governor Smith. Miss Mills, a member of the New York State Hospital Commission, said, "Smith needs no x-ray machine to reveal to him the causes of the present political unrest and bad government."¹²

Smith forces were encouraged by Mayor Edward J. Woodhouse of Northhampton, Massachusetts, professor of civil government and history at Smith College, who wrote, "Smith is my man because he is the man of the people and for all the people and he is able to win"¹³

On the other hand, the Anti-Saloon league, through its counsel, Orville S. Pollard, attacked Smith, referring to the first statement issued by Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the prohibition question as a "jellyfish statement" and contending that the proposal to run Governor

¹⁰ New York Times, June 13, 1924, p. 21.

¹¹ New York Times, June 13, 1924, p. 21. Mrs. Simkhovitch was a social worker and an associate of Lillian Wald who was active in Democratic circles.

¹² New York Times, June 8, 1924, p. 5.

¹³ Ibid., p. 5.

Bryan of Nebraska as Vice-President with Smith heading the ticket, showed how hard put to it the Smith forces are. It was held that Mr. Bryan was too conscientious a dry to let himself be used as a subject of barter. ¹⁴

Mr. Poland also sent a letter to every delegate coming to the Democratic National Convention making the charge that plans had been made to open "a convention barroom" and other barrooms and to dispense "Tammany hospitality in behalf of Alfred E. Smith. Mr. Poland also charged that a wide spread conspiracy existed to charge "exorbitant prices" for food and hotel accommodations in order to break the staying power of delegates in deadlock and to turn them in favor of some compromise candidate of "wet" tendencies. ¹⁵

Mr. Poland's charges were denied by the Democratic National Convention Committee. Mr. Roosevelt, Smith's campaign manager, said that the Anti-Saloon League letter was a slander and an insult leveled against the citizens of New York City. Although the letter was intended as an attack on Alfred E. Smith, it was seized on by his supporters as an important document in his behalf. Thus, Poland's letter was copied and distributed to the press at Smith's headquarters. ¹⁶

¹⁴ New York Times, June 8, 1924, p. 5.

¹⁵ Mr. Poland had handled all the publicity for the League since the former Superintendent, William H. Anderson, had been in Sing Sing Prison and in his letter Poland said that he was writing it at the request of that organization. New York Times, June 14, 1924, p. 1.

¹⁶ New York Times, June 14, 1924, p. 1.

A plan to deliver the "French vote" in the Presidential campaign to Governor Smith in the expectation that, if elected President he would work for the repeal of the prohibition and immigrants from Latin countries was revealed. The plan became known through a letter of protest written by Frank D. Pavey, President of the Federation of L 'Alliance Francaise in the United States and Canada, to Gaston Liebert, former Consul General of France in New York and now Director of the French Bureau of Information in New York City. The New York Times revealed that Clement Rueff, an importer, as President of the French Democrat Club of New York, Inc. , had sent a circular letter on May 19 to various French societies urging them to support Governor Smith's candidacy.¹⁷

The opinion of some leading Democrats in the early part of June, 1924, was that their party nominees would be chosen from the "favorite son" list. There had been a decided belief that the Old Guard faction, largely supporting Governor Smith, would turn finally to Senator Ralston. According to gossip in political quarters, the groups of delegates controlled by Tammany Hall, ex-Senator Taggart of Indiana and George Brennan of Chicago would make an effort to nominate Senator Underwood and, failing to name either Smith or Underwood would then turn to Ralston.

¹⁷ New York Times, June 1, 1924, pp. 1 and 6.

The second choice of the McAdoo following was said to be Senator Carter Glass of Virginia, but many Democratic leaders were opposed to a southern man for the head of the ticket. Mr. McAdoo and some of the conservatives, including drys, were expected to be advancing Senator Glass, who was credited with considerable strength in New York and Northern States which were in the pivotal or doubtful class.¹⁸

In both McAdoo and Smith camps whenever the possibility of a deadlock was mentioned, the names of Thomas Taggart and Senator Ralston, Taggart's favorite-son candidate from Indiana, was mentioned in conversation as if there was an underlying belief that in the crisis that was clearly looked for Taggart could be in the position of holding a balance of power. If he could put Senator Ralston over for President he would exchange the votes he controlled for the second place on the ticket for his man.¹⁹

Along with Senator Ralston, the name of John W. Davis, ex-Ambassador to Great Britain and backed by West Virginia supporters, was the second choice of many delegates. As delegates of various states arrived in New York there was renewed indication of a deadlock and the possibility of the collapse of the candidacies of both of the leading contenders. Friends of Mr. Davis asserted that the idea that the nature

¹⁸ New York Times, June 2, 1924, p. 2.

¹⁹ New York Times, June 9, 1924, p. 6.

of his extensive legal practice in New York might hurt him as a candidate had been greatly exaggerated.²⁰ The sentiment for the selection of Mr. Davis as the Democratic standard-bearer, in case of a deadlock, was said to be widespread and growing. He was assured of the support of his native state of West Virginia and had in addition strength in Ohio, Indiana and Missouri. He was also the second choice of a considerable number of Western and Southern delegates.

Democratic leaders from other states, who had been watching with interest the progress of the campaign to nominate Senator Ralston, were inclined to believe that the strategy of trying to keep him always in the rear position in the race for the Presidential nomination until a dash for the front might be good strategy. These tactics were attributed in part to Mr. Taggart and in part to a personal disinclination on the part of Senator Ralston to make an active pre-convention fight.²¹

As early as June 1, the New York Times in an editorial warned the Democrats to choose a wise and able leader who could conduct an aggressive and successful campaign and not to indulge in a feeling of false security that would be fatal. "Half way measures and undersized men ought not to be thought of," said the Times. Opportunity is knocking

²⁰ When Mr. Davis returned to America in 1921, he was made the leading member of the law firm of Stetson, Jennings and Russell of New York. One of their important clients was J. P. Morgan which led some Democrats to believe that Mr. Davis was a tool of Wall Street and Big Business.

²¹ New York Times, June 16, 1924, p. 1.

at the Democratic door if they do not make any blunders. ²²

The Democratic Convention was expected to be spirited and the Democratic platform was expected to develop into a real battle which would have an effect on the candidacies of the early chief contestants - Messrs, McAdoo, Smith and Underwood. Underwood, some said, would make his appeal for nomination by attacking the Ku Klux Klan and demanding the adoption of the "anti-Know-Nothing" plan of the 1916 platform. This would test McAdoo whose candidacy in part was founded on the support of the Klan and might bring to the surface religious prejudices against Governor Smith. Another issue, a liberal attitude toward the Volstead Act tended to unite Smith and Underwood against McAdoo who was against any change. ²³

This led the New York Times to predict that the Klan and Dry issue would bring the first test of strength between Smith and McAdoo.

By June 20 the boom for John W. Davis had spread to the Capital and Chicago. Mr. Davis in a letter to Mr. Robert L. Burch, Secretary of John W. Davis for President Club in Chicago, said that "he was not a candidate for the Presidential nomination but would answer the call of the Party to be the standard-bearer." He took the position that he was not a candidate and decision to the contrary would have to come from the Party. ²⁴

²² New York Times, June 1, 1924, Sec. II, p. 1.

²³ New York Times, June 2, 1924, p. 2.

²⁴ New York Times, June 20, 1924, p. 1.

PRE-CONVENTION MANEUVERING

During the weeks preceeding the opening of the Democratic National Convention there was much speculation concerning the importance of the two-thirds rule for nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President. Under the two-thirds rule, a vote of 732 was necessary to nominate, while a vote of 550 constituted a majority of the convention. There was also considerable interest in the unit rule which bound state delegations to vote for one candidate as a group, despite the delegate's personal choice for President or Vice-President.

It was apparent, as early as June 10, that the Democratic National Convention would open with a fight over the rules, with the two-thirds rule and the unit rule, the two bones of contention, and the two leading candidates for the Presidential nomination intensely interested, one in one rule and one in the other. The decision as to the rules could, in the long run, determine who would be the Democratic candidate.¹

Political strategists contended that Mr. McAdoo could win if the two-thirds rule were abrogated and the unit rule retained. Governor

¹ **New York Times, June 11, 1924, p. 8.**

Smith could possibly win if the unit rule were abrogated and the two-thirds rule retained. Both leaders through their managers were wary of any move, lest the other made a countermove.²

One writer felt that there was more danger to the country in the two-thirds rule of the Democratic Convention than in the "rotten borough" system of the Republican Convention.³ It seemed to be the plan to sidetrack national candidates by bringing forward as many local favorites as possible. With a long array of names presented in the convention, the friends of the two-thirds rule would have a better chance to organize a hard and fast minority against a candidate who had nation-wide support. A strong minority could so maneuver in the convention as to breakdown the majority and dictate the final result.⁴

According to men prominently identified with the McAdoo movement, McAdoo would receive more than 500 votes on the first ballot and had at least 110 votes more in sight. With these projected figures in mind, McAdoo's supporters realized that Mr. McAdoo had more than enough votes for a majority and not near enough for the necessary two-thirds. It was rumored in the early part of June that

² New York Times, June 11, 1924, p. 8.

³ "The Two-Thirds Rule Will Stand," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXIX (February, 1924), p. 127.

⁴ Ibid., p. 127.

most of McAdoo's managers would like to abrogate the two-thirds rule and that a brief on the precedents for such action had been prepared by a prominent Chicago lawyer under the direction of Judge David Ladd Rockwell, McAdoo's national campaign manager.⁵ They also felt that they could pick up votes if the unit rule could be changed in some state delegations. However, they were willing to admit that they would lose some votes.

It was the view of persons interested in the outcome of the convention that any attempt to change the two-thirds rule on the part of McAdoo's managers and its defeat would be fatal to Mr. McAdoo's chances of the nomination.⁶

According to an editorial in the New York Times, there was general agreement by June 20, that the movement to abolish the two-thirds rule in the Democratic Convention would be given up. Strongest objection to the proposal was that it would ignore the way in which the two-thirds rule for nomination was tied up with the unit rule for voting state delegations to the convention. It was regarded that the two-thirds rule was a projection, not against control of the

⁵ New York Times, June 2, 1924, p. 1. The attorney mentioned may have been Clarence Darrow.

⁶ Ibid., p. 1.

convention by a majority, but by a minority. McAdoo forces realized that if the unit rule were to be abandoned, the roster of votes which they expected to record on the first few ballots would be heavily cut down. McAdoo could not get rid of the rule that hindered his ambition while refusing to touch its twin that favored him.⁷

The Times learned definitely that the supporters of Governor Smith would oppose any change of the two-thirds rule. The Governor's friends were confident that considerably more than one-third, if not a majority, would stand out against McAdoo's nomination.⁸

Thomas B. Love, national committeeman from Texas, expressed belief in McAdoo's nomination upon arrival at New York Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. "No minority of the delegates to the Democratic National Convention will be able to block the nomination of William G. McAdoo." When asked about changing the two-thirds rule, he expressed belief that McAdoo's nomination was certain regardless of the rule.⁹

Governor W. J. Fields of Kentucky, who headed the McAdoo instructed delegation from his own state, came to the Democratic National Convention prepared to make an aggressive fight against the two-thirds rule.¹⁰ This was in opposition to the story that appeared in the New York Times, the previous day, June 16, that the campaign

⁷ New York Times, June 20, 1924, p. 3.

⁸ New York Times, June 15, 1924, p. 2.

⁹ Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁰ New York Times, June 17, 1924, p. 1.

managers of William G. McAdoo had decided to risk his candidacy upon an attempt to do away with the two-thirds custom of nominating a candidate for the Presidency. They seemingly believed that they had a majority of delegates for Mr. McAdoo and doubted that they could get the necessary two-thirds.¹¹ The Times stated on June 18, that unless the two-thirds rule was abolished there was every indication of a deadlock in the convention. The most frequently mentioned as a Presidential possibility among the darkhorses in case of a deadlock was John W. Davis.¹²

The Democrats finally got around to assailing the Republican ticket and platform chosen in Cleveland. The Democratic Senators and Representatives united in proclaiming that the Republican ticket and platform was one of the most reactionary in the history of the country. All of them expressed confidence that a Democratic victory in November was almost assured. It was evident from what these Democrats said that reaction was going to be stressed in the campaign.

Senator Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas, Democratic leader in the Senate, declared that the Republican platform was lacking in sincerity and frankness, while Senator Claude A. Swanson of Virginia, ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations,

¹¹ New York Times, June 16, 1924, p. 2.

¹² New York Times, June 18, 1924, p. 1.

asserted that not only the platforms but the nominees (Calvin Coolidge and Charles Dawes) proved that the Republicans were more reactionary than at any time in the history of the Party. Senator Samuel A. King of Utah characterized the Republican Party, as now organized, as "the puppet of the evil and sinister forces in the Republic." Senator A. O. Stanley of Kentucky when asked what he thought of the platform replied, " The platform means nothing and the nominees, 'Big Business, thy will be done.' " "The Republican Party," said Senator Key Pittman of Nevada, "has retained its motto, 'Stand pat and be silent.' " "The platform adopted and the candidates nominated," declared Senator A. A. Jones of New Mexico, "present a clean cut issue. Progressives and liberals are definitely told that they are no longer wanted in the Republican Party."¹³ Senator McKellar of Tennessee assailed the Republican planks. He said that the Republican platform was meaningless, courageless, spineless, colorless, hopeless, aggregation of wordy excuses, explanations, concealments and promises. It was a cross between New England standpatism and Old Guard devotion to the predatory interests.¹⁴

On June 14 a group of Democratic senators met in the office of Senator Key Pittman of Nevada to lay foundation for the platform to be adopted in New York.

¹³ New York Times, June 14, 1924, p. 2.

¹⁴ New York Times, June 13, 1924, p. 6.

One senator suggested that the document be short so that every voter could read it and understand the principles and policies on which the party would stand during the campaign. It was agreed that the Republican platform was too long to be effective. One member of the group suggested that the platform should not contain more than 500 words which could be put on billboards. Another suggestion was that the platform be short enough to be read from car windows. The conference lasted three hours and details of the meeting were not disclosed. Although no authoritative announcement was made, Senator Thoman J. Walsh of Montana was chosen to be Permanent Chairman of the Convention, although the nomination had to be confirmed by the Convention.¹⁵

Several pre-convention addresses were made by the leading contenders for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. On May 19 William G. McAdoo made the first speech of his campaign. He said that the Republican Party stood for "materialism resulting in moral debaucher, " and he demanded "the restoration of the high purposes which characterized the Wilson Administration. " Governor Smith of New York made a public statement on June 7 to the effect that he favored "strict enforcement of all laws; that he had faithfully enforced the prohibition laws of New York; but that the time had come for Congress to fix a maximum alcoholic content based on

¹⁵New York Times, June 15, 1924, p. 1.

science and sound reasoning, thereafter leaving every State to enact any statute it pleased with regard to regulation of the traffic in light wines and beer within that alcoholic content." Governor Smith also took a strong stand against the Ku Klux Klan, which he declared to be "contrary to the very principles upon which this country was founded."¹⁶

Mr. McAdoo arrived at Pennsylvania Station in New York City on June 18 and was greeted by 3,000 supporters and a band which struck up "Hail to the Chief" as he stepped from the station platform. In an impromptu address to the crowd, Mr. McAdoo made a plea for progressive democracy to stamp out the evils that still existed. When questioned by reporters, he denied making any statement that the two-thirds rule should be changed.¹⁷

A few days later Mr. McAdoo said that the Klan and Prohibition issues would have to be settled by the platform drafters. Former United States Senator James D. Phelan of California expressed confidence that Mr. McAdoo would be nominated. This expression of confidence was repeated later by Mr. McAdoo who emerged from the seclusion of his suite and submitted to questions by a score of newspapermen.¹⁸

¹⁶ Current History, Vol. XX (July, 1924), p. 660.

¹⁷ New York Times, June 19, 1924, pp. 1-2.

¹⁸ New York Times, June 22, 1924, p. 1.

A few weeks prior to Mr. McAdoo's arrival in New York, Judge Rockwell had charged that McAdoo was a victim of a press conspiracy. He claimed that almost the entire partisan Republican press and all the reactionary Democratic press had combined to suppress all news favorable to Mr. McAdoo's candidacy. "Though the wet interests may make an unholy alliance with greedy big business and the blind partisan press," Rockwell continued, "it will not avail against the honest moral electorate within the Democratic Party."¹⁹

Henry Morgenthau doubted any statements that McAdoo would win the nomination. "To nominate him is to condone the crimes of the Republican Administration. The Democratic Party won't let any man take away its issues. Al Smith, John W. Davis or Carter Glass could be elected if nominated," said Morgenthau, who had been chairman of the Finance Committee during the two campaigns of Woodrow Wilson.²⁰

The New York Times was in agreement with Mr. Morgenthau because the following headlines appeared on June 21:

'Have McAdoo stopped, Foes Assert.
Boom for John W. Davis Shows Gains
Smith Now Says He's Sure of Victory'²¹

¹⁹ New York Times, June 4, 1924, p. 3

²⁰ New York Times, June 19, 1924, p. 3.

²¹ New York Times, June 21, 1924, p. 1.

The West Virginia supporters of John W. Davis for President must be given credit for keeping his name before the public. The spark of interest in their candidate had to be kept burning because it was apparent that there would be a deadlock between the two leading contenders. The West Virginia delegates must have had this in mind as they arrived in New York to open headquarters for Mr. Davis at the Waldorf-Astoria. J. Horner Davis, cousin of John W. Davis, one of the delegates who was a strong advocate of the former Ambassador for President nomination said, "In John W. Davis we think we are offering the Democratic Party a candidate for which we need offer no apologies. It is up to the delegates to draft him to lead the Democratic forces in the coming national election."²²

The West Virginia delegation thought very little of Governor Smith's chances to gain the nomination. R. K. Littlepage, one of the West Virginia delegates, said, "that there was a total absence of sentiment in West Virginia for the Governor." He added, "that the West Virginia delegation was opposed to any change in the Volstead law and looked with disfavor on any proposal to take a stand in the convention against the Ku Klux Klan." Some of the West Virginia delegates admitted that they would switch to Mr. McAdeo, should Mr. Davis fall due to lack of sufficient support, but they hoped this

²² Ibid., p. 2.

would not be necessary.²³

The candidates seeking the nomination began to make statements as the time neared for the convention to convene. Mr. McAdee called for a program of "War on Reaction." James M. Cox urged a "Housecleaning in Washington." Governor Smith demanded a return from "Normalcy to Honesty." Senator Thomas J. Walsh pointed out the lessons of the oil scandal and demanded a "Progressive" in office.²⁴

A. H. Ulm, New York Times writer, made a startling prediction that "candidates leading at the start often lose." The political odds were against the front runners when the real fight for nomination began. Mr. Ulm based his conclusion on research of past conventions and elections and it seemed to him that the stampede to a darkhorse would come after the sixth or seventh ballot.²⁵

Choosing the right combination for candidates led to some interesting speculations. "Davis and Davis would make a good national ticket," a delegate from West Virginia suggested to a delegate from Kansas. "It would be all right geographically and would carry an appeal to both the East and the West." "John and Jonathan, it's

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ New York Times, June 22, 1924, Section VIII, p. 1.

²⁵ Ibid., Section VIII, p. 1. Mr. Ulm was correct in his prediction that early leaders lose but he was off by 93 ballots on the stampede for a darkhorse.

a good combination," said the delegate from Kansas.²⁶

²⁶ New York Times, June 24, 1924, p. 4. The two men mentioned were John W. Davis of West Virginia and Jonathan M. Davis, Governor of Kansas.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE IMPENDING BATTLE

The announcement was made on January 15, 1924 that New York City had been chosen as the site for the Democratic National Presidential Convention which would open June 24. Many preparations had to be made before the delegates and visitors began to assemble in New York.

Miles of wires were installed for telephone and telegraph equipment at Madison Square Garden where the Convention would be held. Facilities were provided for twelve radio stations to broadcast the proceedings. It was planned that the broadcast of the convention would be sent as far west as Kansas City. The circuit included the following stations: WEAJ and WJZ, New York; WCAP and WRC, Washington, D. C.; WGY, Schenectady; WGR, Buffalo; KDKA, Pittsburgh; WGN, WMAQ, and WLS, Chicago; KSD, St. Louis, and WDAF, Kansas City.¹

The innovation of including prominent Republican women on the committee to receive and entertain the Democrats was to be followed. Many special hostesses were announced by Mrs. Anna Naughton, Chairman of the Subcommittee of General Sightseeing and Excursions.

¹ New York Times, June 10, 1924, p. 9.

New York was going to say it with flowers. As each delegate stepped off the train, a pretty girl would offer fresh cut flowers, boutonnieres to the men and corsages to the women. This announcement was sent out by Stanley J. Quinn, Vice-Chairman of the Executive Committee of the New York Convention Committee.

The Mayor's Committee announced that 200 city employees would act as attendants in scores of information booths. There would be one attendant at every hotel which housed delegates.²

Mayor John Hylan also made plans to preside at dinner to be held at the Hotel Commodore on Monday night, June 23, when 3,500 Democratic convention delegates, alternates, and political leaders were expected as guests of the City of New York.³

The vast majority of people in New York City were foreign born or the descendants of comparatively recent arrivals from Europe. They were Catholics and Jews rather than Protestants, and they had been aroused by the New York newspapers to a degree of animosity against the Ku Klux Klan that was more intense than the circumstances merited.⁴

John F. Curry, Tammany Hall leader in the Fifth Assembly district, proposed to the reigning powers to get busy at once framing

² Ibid., p. 9.

³ New York Times, June 21, 1924, p. 3.

⁴ American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXX (August, 1924), p. 123.

an anti-Klan plank and take steps to have it incorporated in the Democratic platform when the convention met. In his letter to Hon. Frank J. Goodwin, Chairman of the Committee of Seven, he stated in part that the Klan issue should not be dodged.

' This hooded organization of darkness was un-American, intolerant, prejudiced and narrow. It was founded on the absurd proposition that only one type of citizen was a good American. The Ku Klux Klan was repulsive to the decent Protestant as to the decent Catholic or Jew It flouted the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

How can we continue to be silent on this great issue? Are we through this continued policy of do-nthingism to be placed in the position of approving the Ku Klux Klan which aims to divide the country into racial and religious factions and which, if it succeeds, will not only weaken us as a nation, but will disgrace us? The Ku Klux Klan is a source of dissension at home and shame to us abroad. '

Mr. Curry continued to ask for action on this matter and then concluded with these words:

' By doing so you will help to place Tammany Hall in a position where it will have something to do with leading public opinion along American lines instead of drifting with the tide and seemingly only to be hunters of office and contracts. '

The Democratic delegates of New York State disagreed on how the Klan issue should be handled. Some of the delegates wanted it to come from the floor of the Convention, while others thought that it should be handled through the Resolutions Committee by the New York delegation. All of the delegates were in favor of coming

⁵ New York Times, June 8, 1924, p. 5.

out for an anti-Klan policy.⁶

The advance guard of the Klan strategy arrived in New York to do battle to prevent the insertion of the anti-Klan plank in the Democratic platform. These leaders let it be known that if they could prevent the Democrats, as they did the Republicans, from mentioning the Klan by name in the platform, they would credit themselves with an important victory. With the platform adopted, they would turn to preventing the nomination of anyone outspokenly critical of their order.⁷

Although the Klan leaders refused to divulge the exact number of Knights sitting in the various state delegations, they did assert that in the impending fight to prevent the adoption of an anti-Klan plank, the Invisible Empire could count on the support of 85 per cent of the Georgia delegation, 80 per cent of the Arkansas, Kansas, and Texas delegations, 75 per cent of the Mississippi delegation, and more than 50 per cent of the Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, and West Virginia delegations.⁸

⁶ New York Times, June 13, 1924, p. 17.

⁷ New York Times, June 22, 1924, p. 3. Rice, The Ku Klux Klan in American Politics, p. 80. In a five-room suite on the fifteenth floor of the Hotel McAlpin, the Imperial Wizard, Hiram Wesley Evans conferred continually with a handful of Grand Dragons: Walter F. Bossert of the Realm of Indiana, James A. Comer of the Realm of Arkansas, James Esdale of the Realm of Alabama, Nathan Bedford Forrest of the Realm of Georgia, Fred L. Gifford of the Realm of Oregon, N. C. Jewett of the Realm of Oklahoma, and Z. E. Marvin of the Realm of Texas.

⁸ Rice, The Ku Klux Klan in American Politics, pp. 80-81.

Those delegates in favor of Governor Smith were prepared to take a few cudgels against Mr. McAdoo when the convention opened. Some of them planned to work the Klan issue against Mr. McAdoo by accusing the delegates in favor of McAdoo as being Klan members or of having Klan sympathies. This was in retaliation of the McAdoo men criticising Governor Smith on the Prohibition question by saying, "The country is dry and Al Smith is Wet."⁹

On the eve of the convention the anti-Klan plank suddenly assumed the importance of a main issue, with 590 delegates pledged to its support, and the followers of Governor Smith pressing the issue. Mr. McAdoo, in a fiery preconvention speech, accused his opponents of attempting to raise false race and religious issues and of obscuring the real issue - which was to rescue the country from the control of a "sinister, unscrupulous, invisible government."¹⁰

The arrival of Newton D. Baker, former Secretary of War, brought to the fore the League of Nations issue and caused the platform makers to revise their previous view, that the League issue could not be vitalized at this convention and that the opposition to the Ku Klux Klan and other domestic questions, the inefficiency of the Republican Administration were to comprise the outstanding issues.¹¹

⁹ New York Times, June 13, 1924, p. 17.

¹⁰ The Independent, Vol. CXIII, July 5, 1924, p. 24.

¹¹ New York Times, June 24, 1924, p. 1.

The leading candidates' managers were urging planks on which rivals could not stand. To seek moderate declarations on controversial questions would help their own chances.

The platform had to be adopted by a majority vote and acted upon before the candidates for President were placed before the convention. Therefore the struggle made by the managers for the different candidates, representing opposite views on prohibition, on the Klan issue, on the League of Nations and the World Court, railroads and agriculture was preliminary to the tryout of the candidates. If the platform adopted the day before the convention represented the position of the candidates, the managers argued, then there was every reason to believe that such a candidate started the balloting with a better chance of breaking down the two-thirds rule than those who did not fit the platform limitations.

Conferences were held to frame a platform that would be broad enough for either Mr. McAdoo or Governor Smith to stand on, but they were broken up without any results. The best opinion was that none of the three leading candidates - Smith, McAdoo, and Underwood - would find himself in entire harmony with the platform declarations and therefore, those representing the compromise candidates are the most active in advising moderation in all the planks, believing that such a course would eliminate those candidates who took extreme or radical views on most of the issues agitating

the people.¹²

Out of town leaders arriving for the Democratic National Convention were prepared for a long stay. They believed a new record in number of ballots would be established before a candidate for President was nominated. A record was set in Baltimore in 1912 when 46 ballots were taken before Woodrow Wilson was nominated. In 1920, 44 ballots were taken to nominate James M. Cox. At most Democratic National Conventions nominations had been effected on or before the eighth ballot.

Deadlock appeared certain with a score of other candidates ready to begin a royal battle, in the event the two leaders killed each other off.¹³

To the discouraged professionals Franklin D. Roosevelt argued that Governor Smith was the only candidate who could win, since he could carry Illinois, and the three essential New England States, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. The South would stay in line, despite his wetness and his religion. There would be an awful howl from the Ku Klux Klan, but Georgia and Texas, the hotbed of the Klan, would not go Republican in any event. The eastern "progressive" could carry the West if he campaigned there. Actually they were running scared.

¹² New York Times, June 22, 1924, p. 1.

¹³ New York Times, June 19, 1924, p. 1.

Louis McHenry Howe, Franklin Roosevelt's personal friend and adviser, complained that the convention arrangements were in McAdoo's hands. They desperately fought a claim that the two-thirds rule had lapsed, and Roosevelt joked sadly with Josephus Daniels:

'There is still, of course, a chance you and I can end the deadlock dramatically and effectively by putting your candidate and mine into a room together armed with a complete Navy outfit ranging from bean soup to 16" guns with orders that only one man can come out alive and a grateful convention will give us the nomination by acclamation.'¹⁴

¹⁴ Alfred B. Rollins, Jr., Roosevelt and Howe, New York, 1962, pp. 212-213. Josephus Daniels's favorite candidate was William G. McAdoo.

THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION CONVENES

On Tuesday, June 24, Madison Square Garden was stuffed with sweltering men and women. Thousands of American flags were on the walls and balconies. Acres of flags were across the top of the hall, accented here and there by Oriental lamp shades which seemed to have served a term with the "Thief of Bagdad" company. On the walls were four large portraits of dead Democratic worthies - Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Cleveland. Twelve sizzling searchlights were scattered in the huge hall, and in their white glare one felt like a discovered Zeppelin and waited for the shrapnel to burst.¹

Everywhere palm-leaf fans flickered and flapped. Each fan was marked "Law not War." On the platform, leaders posed and strutted, shook hands elaborately and conversed with gestures.

The convention was supposed to convene at twelve o'clock but it was past twelve-thirty when Cordell Hull, the presiding officer from Tennessee who was Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, called the convention to order and introduced Cardinal Hayes who gave

¹ "Democracy Tunes up on Jazz," The Independent, Vol. CXIII (July 5, 1924), pp. 4-6.

the invocation to Almighty God. The ceiling curtains were parted and thousands of little silk American flags floated down upon the delegates like confetti while the band played "The Star Spangled Banner."²

After the official Convention photograph was taken, Mr. Charles A. Greathouse, Secretary of the Democratic National Committee from Indiana, read the names of the temporary officers of the national convention. Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi was named Temporary Chairman.

Senator Harrison, as Temporary Chairman, started the Democratic National Convention with a slashing and aggressive keynote speech, which assailed the alleged misrule of the Harding-Coolidge Administration all along the line and contrasted it with the golden times of Democratic rule in the past. He attacked the Republican Party, emphasizing especially the recent revelations in the oil scandal. The leadership of President Coolidge, the methods by which the Cleveland Convention was conducted, the Republican tariff policy, the Mellon plan and the ship subsidy were severely criticized. Senator Harrison claimed credit for the Democrats for the Disarmament Conference, severely criticized the Republican Party for its attitude toward the League of Nations and the World Court, and dwelt with considerable detail on the distress of the farmers, which he ascribed to Republican

² Ibid., p. 4.

legislation.³

Elmer Davis, New York Times and St. Louis Globe-Democrat writer, wrote that it was a fighting speech, an excellent keynote for a fighting campaign, but the assembled Democrats did not display as much enthusiasm as might have been expected. Mr. Davis conjectured that it may have been the heat that depressed the Democrats who crowded into Madison Square Garden. Perhaps the Senator did not leave those strategic pauses in his speech which would have demanded applause. Senator Harrison's assault on the political enemy was extremely able from a technical point of view, and that it provoked a much less enthusiastic response than it deserved was a fact. However, there were two real spontaneous outbursts of enthusiasm, the biggest one coming when Senator Harrison first mentioned Woodrow Wilson. This was expected but Senator Harrison paused in surprise as delegates shouted and cheered and applauded when he made a passing mention of Grover Cleveland.⁴

An address by Mayor John F. Hylan welcoming the delegates to New York City followed Senator Harrison's keynote speech. The remainder of the first day was spent in making resolutions, selecting committees, and making announcements of meetings, official receptions

³ "The Democratic National Convention," Current History Vol. XX (August, 1924), p. 731. Official Report of the Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924 (Indianapolis, 1924), pp. 7-25.

⁴ New York Times, June 25, 1924, p. 1.

and entertainments. Just before adjournment, Mrs. Frank Reeves, Washington, read a resolution lamenting the death of Woodrow Wilson and paid tribute and homage to his memory.⁵

The second session began with a report from the Committee on Credentials who presented the permanent roll of delegates and alternates. The report was unanimously adopted. The next order of business was the report of the Committee on Permanent Organization presented by Chairman Thomas H. Ball of Texas who presented the following names:

Hon. Thomas J. Walsh of Montana, Permanent
Chairman of the Convention
Charles A. Greathouse of Indiana, Secretary.
E. G. Hoffman of Indiana, Associate Secretary.
Burt New, District of Columbia, Executive Secretary.

Upon request of the ladies that a woman be named Vice-Chairman of the Convention, Col. Hall submitted the name of Miss Mae Kennedy of the Bronx, New York, for consent of the Convention. He made it clear that he was unable to contact all the Committee members for confirmation of Miss Kennedy but stated that there was no dissension among the members that he did contact.

⁵ Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924,
pp. 25-44.

This report was unanimously adopted.⁶

In his acceptance speech Senator Walsh practically covered the same ground as Senator Harrison, severely criticizing the Republican Administration and policies.⁷ He aired the oil scandal and asserted that the issue was whether they (the American people) would return to power the Party in which corruption had been revealed. He lamented the public's easy tolerance and indifference to fraud, assailed Coolidge for defending the delinquents, paraded administration ghosts before the delegates, and warned the public to be on guard against false campaign issues.⁸

⁶ Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, pp. 79-80. When Miss Mae Kennedy was named Vice-Chairman of the Convention, it was the first time in the history of political national conventions in the United States that a woman would preside over the Convention. This appointment stirred an undercurrent of protest among the women who were national leaders in the party. Miss Kennedy did not hold the gavel long. After a thank you speech of appreciation for the honor bestowed upon her, she recognized Governor Sweet of Colorado who seconded Mr. McAdoo's nomination. Some Democrats expressed the opinion that a woman higher in the national party councils than a ward worker in the Bronx should have been selected to represent the Democratic women of the nation. She was also criticized for ignorance of, or ignoring parliamentary procedure. St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 27, 1924, p. 6.

⁷ "The Democratic National Convention," Current History, Vol XX (August, 1924), p. 730.

⁸ Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, pp. 80-88.

Senator Walsh received a long and prolonged applause. Several announcements were made and the report of the Committee on Rules and Order of Business was given by Chairman Lew G. Ellingham of Indiana:

'Resolved, That the rules of the last Democratic National Convention, including the two-thirds rule for the nomination of candidates for the office of President and Vice-President, and including the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress, so far as applicable,⁹ be the rules of this Convention.

It was recommended that the candidates for President should be presented before the report of the Committee on Platform and Resolutions. The committee also asked that the platform be accepted before the balloting for Presidential candidates began.

The next order of business was the presentation of candidates for the nomination for President of the United States. The Secretary was to call the roll of states, and as the various States were called, those speaking for the candidates would come to the platform.¹⁰

⁹ Ibid., 91-92. The proposal to change the two-thirds rule had been put forward by W. L. Thornton, Texas delegate, but was rejected speedily by the Rules Committee by a vote of 40 to 3. New York Times, June 25, 1924, p. 1.

¹⁰ In order to expedite business at the convention, it was decided that the nominating speeches should precede the report of the Committee on Platform, which was delayed because it was rumored, there were serious differences among members of the committee on the subject of the League of Nations and on the question of whether a specific denunciation of the Ku Klux Klan should be made by name. "Democratic Convention," Current History, Vol. XX (August, 1924), p. 731.

A handsome young Southerner, Forney Johnston, a practicing attorney in Washington, D. C., son of the late senator from Alabama and accredited to that state as a delegate, appeared on the speaker's stand at the beginning of the roll call asking for nominations for President.

Mr. Johnston began to read a rather instructive essay about Senator Oscar Underwood of Alabama without actually naming his man. The delegates visited, fumed a bit, walked around the lobby when suddenly out of the rather dull essay appeared a clear-cut jab at the Ku Klux Klan without naming the Klan. Whoops of joy and yells of approval rose from the convention. It was a great day for the Irish. They grabbed banners and marched. It took ten minutes for the clamor to subside. Then the young orator spoke for four or five minutes and again landed upon the plexus of the Klan by naming them outright. Once more the roof was lifted, but this time the Klan forces made their angry disapproval obvious. Fist fights and near fights occurred during the demonstration which followed the declaration that no secret society had any place in politics, particularly the Ku Klux Klan. Missouri furnished one of these diversions. Texas, Colorado, and Pennsylvania delegations also contributed a couple of short rounds with bare knuckles.¹¹

¹¹ William Allen White, Politics: The Citizen's Business (New York, 1924), pp. 62-63. St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 26, 1924, p. 1.

At last a subject had been injected into the proceedings of the convention about which the delegates had opinions deep enough to reach their emotions. The twenty-five minutes devoted to cheering the man who bravely and publicly branded the Klan afforded the first genuinely dramatic moment in the two-day session of the convention.¹² Charles P. Keyser, Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, attributed the outburst of emotions to a different brand of heat - hot tempers, which resulted from frazzled constitutions due to sleepless nights, too much entertainment of the Tammany brand, and the direct injection into the convention of the Ku Klux Klan issue.¹³

Following the nomination of Senator Oscar W. Underwood, the Chair recognized the former governor of Arkansas, Charles H. Brough who presented the name of Senator Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas for nomination for the presidency. His name did not bring forth the applause and demonstration that should have been accorded to a senatorial leader of his party.¹⁴

Ex-senator of California, James D. Phelan did produce a genuine demonstration when he placed the name of William Gibbs McAdoo of California in nomination. Senator Phelan's speech was one of those

¹²White, Politics: The Citizen's Business, p. 63.

¹³St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 26, 1924, p. 1.

¹⁴White, Politics: The Citizen's Business, p. 64.

inspired orations which candidates force upon nominating orators. The discourse was filled with dissertations about McAdoo's record, and the senator did his best with the package that was handed to him. In the last climactic moment of the oration, Phelan raised his arms and his voice in a burst of fervor and named his man.

The McAdoo demonstration burst upon the convention like a set piece of fireworks in a park.¹⁵ The parade of states started and for five minutes surged around the floor of the convention. The little states, the mountain states, and the South were surging while the great delegations remained unmoved. The galleries cheered and from all the delegations there was bandanna waving, handclapping and the clatter of genuine applause. Twenty minutes passed while the din continued. A fight arose in the Colorado delegation, which was divided, and the state banner fell in the melee. Half an hour passed, and still the din kept on. It was apparent that the Klan, which had been taking its medicine as a result of Forney Johnston's speech, was having its sweet revenge

¹⁵ William Allen White felt that the demonstration that followed the naming of William Gibbs McAdoo for president was so evidently prearranged that the effect of what followed was badly hampered by its conspicuous mechanical contrivance. *Ibid.*, p. 64. According to the New York Times, Senator Phelan declared that McAdoo's candidacy for President was the answer to the call expressed at the polls. New York Times, June 26, 1924, p. 6.

in boosting Mr. McAdoo.¹⁶

The demonstration had begun at 3:10 and terminated at 4:27 o'clock p.m. when the chairman's gavel finally stopped the McAdoo show. With the motion of Mr. George E. Brennan of Illinois to recess and the seconding motion of Mr. J. Bruce Kremer of Montana, the convention voted in favor of adjourning until ten-thirty the next morning.¹⁷

The third session opened at 11:25 o'clock a.m., June 26, 1924 with the invocation delivered by Reverend William W. Porter of Boston. An announcement was read by the reading secretary inviting all of the delegates and alternates to be guests of the New York County Democratic Organisation at a reception to be given at Tammany Hall that evening.

After a short address by Miss May Kennedy of New York, the Vice-Chairman of the Convention, the chairman recognized Governor William E. Sweet of Colorado, who seconded the nomination of William Gibbs McAdoo. Governor Sweet was interrupted with cries of "Oil, oil, oil!" and these outbursts were answered with hisses,

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 65. Judge Robert F. Walker, Chief Justice of the Missouri Supreme Court attacked the candidacy of Mr. McAdoo. Judge Walker said, "McAdoo is intellectually a mediocre, below average in ability as a lawyer and has an 'itching palm,' as indicated by his taking employment with Doheny and Morse." St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 27, 1924, p. 1.

¹⁷ Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, pp. 106-116.

catcalls and boos. The gavel hammered and the chair called vainly for order, and for five minutes the crowd threatened to get away from the chairman. The raps of the gavel finally quieted the crowd. Chairman Walsh admonished the gallery for their outburst and asked that all speakers be treated with respect.¹⁸

Connecticut was called next and yielded to New York. The Chair recognized Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York. Crippled in 1921 by an attack of poliomyelitis, Roosevelt was making his return to national politics. He was wheeled to the platform in a chair; then, leaning on crutches, he walked to the speaker's desk. The galleries went wild when he hailed Alfred Smith as "the 'Happy Warrior' of the political battlefield."¹⁹ The galleries were filled with New Yorkers who had come to pay tribute to their governor. Cynics said the hall was packed, that the gates were opened with the password "Smith." Packed or not, the hall was for Smith, and the crowd was happy, noisy and proud of itself.²⁰

Mr. Roosevelt stressed Governor Smith's experience and his long record of law enforcement. His twenty years of public service proved that he stood on the Constitution. The Warrior's record proved

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 123. White, Politics: The Citizen's Business, p. 66.

¹⁹ Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Crisis of the Old Order, 1919-1933 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1957), p. 98. Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, p. 128.

²⁰ New York Times, June 27, 1924, p. 1.

that the Democratic Party could win with Alfred E. Smith.²¹ "The speech," Walter Lippmann wrote to Roosevelt, was "a moving and distinguished thing. I am utterly hardboiled about speeches, but yours seemed to me perfect in temper and manner and most eloquent in its effect."²²

Elmer Davis wrote that all noise records were broken by the ovation tendered to Al Smith, and that when he was named the bedlam created exceeded that of McAdoo's demonstration. Mr. Davis also stated that "Today's protracted outburst showed that Smith can carry New York, or, more accurately that he can carry Tammany Hall."²³

Following the demonstration for Alfred E. Smith, which lasted over an hour, the Chair recognized Mr. Thomas F. Bayard of Delaware who presented the name of a favorite son, Senator Willard Saulsbury of Delaware in nomination for President. When the Chair recognized Illinois, Mr. Lewis G. Stevenson addressed the Convention. He began by admitting that he was not the spokesman for the Illinois delegation which contained strong champions of Governor Smith, ardent advocates of Mr. McAdoo, and great admirers

²¹ Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, pp. 122-129.

²² A. M. Schlesinger, Jr., Crisis of the Old Order, p. 98.

²³ St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 27, 1924, p. 1.

of Ambassador Davis. He came to express his personal preference, and he was grateful to the Illinois delegation for allowing his courtesy. This proved that Illinois was not boss ruled. Mr. Stevenson nominated Mr. David Franklin Houston of New York, who had been Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of Treasury under the two administrations of Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Stevenson concluded his address by quoting Woodrow Wilson, who had said, "He is the best qualified man in the United States to be President. " ²⁴

Before calling the State of Indiana, the Chair recognized two delegates from Illinois. Mr. Michael L. Igoe of Chicago seconded the nomination of Alfred E. Smith, and Mr. James A. Meeks of Danville, Illinois, seconded the presentation of William Gibbs McAdoo for President. The Secretary then proceeded with the call of the roll of states. Mr. Frederick Van Nuys of Indianapolis presented the name of a former Governor of Indiana and now United States Senator Samuel M. Ralston of Indiana in nomination for President. Following the loud applause, Miss Anna Case sang "On the Banks of the Wabash" with the Convention delegates joining in the song. ²⁵

²⁴ Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, pp. 133-136. Mr. Lewis G. Stevenson was the son of Adlai E. Stevenson, Vice-President with Grover Cleveland, 1893-1897, and father of Adlai E. Stevenson, presidential candidate for the Democratic Party in 1952 and 1956.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 136-140.

Three more men were to be nominated before the Convention voted to adjourn the third session. Mr. W. A. Ayres of Wichita presented the name of Governor Jonathan M. Davis of Kansas; Mr. Howard Bruce of Elkridge presented the name of Governor Albert Cabell Ritchie of Maryland; and Mr. Alva M. Cummins of Lansing presented the name of United States Senator Woodbridge N. Ferris of Michigan for President.

A host of seconding speeches and six new candidates were placed before the Convention on the fourth day. The six new names presented to the Convention were former Governor and Democratic Presidential candidate in 1920, James M. Cox of Ohio; Governor Charles W. Bryan of Nebraska; Governor Fred H. Brown of New Hampshire; Governor George S. Silzer of New Jersey; Senator Carter Glass of Virginia; and former Ambassador to England, John W. Davis of West Virginia.²⁶

Mr. Davis was the last nominee and, despite the very evident fact that the convention was tired of hours of oratory and noisy demonstrations, both Judge John H. Holt of Clarksburg, West Virginia, who nominated Davis, and Mrs. Ixetta Jewel Brown, who seconded the nomination, received cordial hearings. The nominee was roundly

²⁶ Elmer Davis commented that it was a pretty poor Democrat who could not find somebody to stand up before the convention and nominate him. He also stated that if the people did not see their favorite candidate among the sixteen already nominated, not to worry, because many more would be voted for on the first ballot, or later. New York Times, June 28, 1924, p. 1.

cheered by more people than the loyal West Virginia delegates who led the demonstration. In an interview Mrs. Brown stated that the strength for Mr. Davis would not be revealed until after the first smoke of battle in balloting had cleared away. She also insisted that Mr. Davis was not asking that he be chosen but that his West Virginia friends were asking the convention to draft him for high services.²⁷

²⁷ Mrs. Brown, in her seconding speech, said that the West Virginia candidate was "a man among men and a woman's ideal of what a man should be." This drew great applause from the lady delegates. Elmer Davis commented that this statement may not get Davis the nomination, but that he ought to cash in on it somehow. St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 28, 1924, p. 2. Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, pp. 165-220.

MAJORITY VERSUS MINORITY ON LEAGUE AND KLAN PLANKS

An announcement was made by Homer S. Cummings of Connecticut, Chairman of the Committee on Platform and Resolutions, on the fifth day of the convention concerning the delay on presenting a report. Mr. Cummings reported that every plank of the platform had been unanimously passed on except two issues which had caused considerable difference of opinion.

There was a difference of opinion on whether a specific denunciation of the Ku Klux Klan should be made by name and as to the phraseology to be employed in connection with the plank on the League of Nations. After a prolonged debate, the Committee on Resolutions would present a majority report; however, it was understood that a minority report would be presented by Mr. Newton D. Baker of Ohio. The greatest difficulty was encountered on the plank dealing with the question of religious freedom. On the plank dealing with the question of religious freedom. On the request of the Committee, Mr. Cummings asked that the convention be recessed

until three o'clock that afternoon. The motion was unanimously carried.¹

At four o'clock Chairman Thomas J. Walsh introduced Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, a delegate from the State of New York, who gave the invocation. The next order of business was the reading of the Democratic platform by Chairman Homer S. Cummings, Secretary of the Committee; Mr. Key Pittman of Nevada; and the Reading Secretary, Mr. P. J. Haltigan of the District of Columbia.²

The Democratic platform was very long and it covered many subjects, but overwhelming party and public interest was concentrated upon two questions that it discussed. As to these, the Resolutions Committee was unable to reach any agreement though it wrestled with them continuously for four days and nights and finally resorted to prayer led by William Jennings Bryan. In the end the Committee was forced to submit the questions to the convention for decision. Whether the decision was wise or otherwise, these questions created sharp divisions, whose results party leaders regarded with grave apprehension.

On the floor of the convention, Newton D. Baker warned the

¹ Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, pp. 221-226.

² The complete text of the Democratic platform can be found in the Official Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, pp. 227-245.

delegates that if they voted for the referendum plank in place of one frankly advocating American membership in the League of Nations, they would be "repudiating Woodrow Wilson and substituting in the Democratic party the leadership of Henry Cabot Lodge."³

The convention gave Mr. Baker, whose speech pleading for the League of Nations and for which Woodrow Wilson gave his life, a tremendous ovation and then proceeded to abandon the League as a party principle.⁴

The Baker plank was mild and persuasive, and it did not advocate unconditional membership in the League. It accepted responsibility and did not try to shift the question over to a non-partisan "advisory referendum, which Mr. Baker denounced as a mere subterfuge. He believed that the League question was the most important one to be considered."⁵ He was personally

³ "The League as a Campaign Issue," The Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 12, 1924), pp. 10-11.

⁴ Ernest Hamlin Abbott, "A Party Civil War," The Outlook, Vol. CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), pp. 381-384. The convention exalted Woodrow Wilson as a hero and a saint, but declined to follow his leadership.

⁵ Colonel Edward House, who was in Europe, had sent Cordell Hull, Chairman of the Democratic convention, suggestions on the League of Nations plank. Mr. Baker was asked to work out the modified plank on the League after consultation with peace advocates and others interested in making the League an outstanding issue in the foreign relations plank. Colonel House had been President Wilson's chief adviser. He had been a member of the commission that framed the covenant of the League of Nations.

complimented by his fellow Democrats, but his stand on the League was swept away by a vote that would seem to indicate that the Democrats were just as far from favoring immediate membership in the League of Nations as the Republicans.⁶

By a vote of 742.5 to 353.5 the delegates rejected the plank submitted by the minority of the Resolutions Committee favoring membership in the League and adopted one proposing a national referendum on the question.⁷

The fight over the league plank was a minor incident compared to the one over the Klan plank. Here was a question that involved fundamental principles of American government, and there was strong and insistent pressure for a definite and specific condemnation of the Klan. Expediency demanded that it be ignored, or evaded by an indirect declaration, as the Republican convention had done. A very large and influential proportion of the Democratic party was composed of elements bitterly antagonistic to the Klan, with good reason, and they would be content with nothing less than a declaration of war against the religious and political activities of the Klan.

Expediency won, if it really had won, by a single vote. But no one can say that anything thereby was settled. A religious controversy

⁶ Review of Reviews, Vol. LXX (August, 1924), p. 119.

⁷ For voting on the plank submitted by the minority of the Resolutions Committee favoring membership in the League of Nations by states, see Appendices, pp. 1-2.

had been injected into the party; and of all controversies none was so bitter, so uncompromising, so productive of hatred and of fanaticism as that which grew out of religious differences. That such a controversy was utterly un-American could not be questioned, but the Klan had thrust religion into politics and the natural reaction had caused it to burst into flame in the Democratic convention. Undoubtedly the bitter feeling that had been aroused would increase the difficulty of making a nomination; for the religious question, once infused into politics, permitted no compromise.⁸ There was a determined effort to have a plank adopted which should denounce the Ku Klux Klan by name.

A minority report was brought in which added a few sentences to the majority report in order to denounce the Klan by name. Two hours were allotted for debate. Ex-governor William R. Pattangall of Maine led the forces against the Klan while Homer Cummings of Connecticut, Chairman of the Platform Committee, managed the debate on behalf of the majority report.

Mr. Cummings yielded fifteen minutes to Senator Robert L. Owen of Oklahoma, ten minutes to Governor Cameron Morrison of North Carolina, ten minutes to Jared Y. Sanders of Louisiana and twenty-five minutes to William Jennings Bryan of Florida who spoke in support of the majority report on religious liberty.

⁸ St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 30, 1924, p. 14.

In support of the minority report William Pattangall spoke for twelve minutes and then yielded five minutes to Mrs. Carroll Miller of Pennsylvania, fifteen minutes to Bainbridge Colby of New York, eleven minutes to David I. Walsh of Massachusetts, seven minutes to Edmund H. Moore of Ohio, three minutes to Andrew C. Erwin of Georgia, two minutes to C. M. Bryan of Tennessee, and five minutes to Francis X. Busch of Illinois.

Bainbridge Colby, former Secretary of State in the Wilson administration, was the principal speaker against the Klan. In his speech he exclaimed, "If you are against the Klan, for God's sake say so!"⁹ Mrs. Carroll Miller begged the women present to face the issue if the men were afraid and "not to flinch, now. If we do, we leave our children a tarnished heritage."¹⁰

Perhaps the most enthusiastic outburst of cheering was

⁹ "The Klan Enters the Campaign," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 12, 1924), p. 10. Speeches in support of the minority and majority report can be read in Official Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924, pp. 279-309.

¹⁰ Ibid.

occasioned by Delegate Erwin of Georgia, who said,

To my mind the Ku Klux issue is the most vital one which the Democratic party has to determine. You have two courses you may follow. You can by adopting the report of the majority, evade the issue, which would in effect, give your approval to the activities of this organization. Follow this course and you may prepare for an ignominious defeat at the polls in November. Meet the issue squarely, as the people of this country expect you to meet it, and a glorious victory will be yours.¹¹

Urging the body to favor the denunciation of the Klan, he started a demonstration that he did not expect; the convention went into an uproar. After finishing his speech and going back to sit with his delegation, a young woman rushed forward from another delegation and kissed him. Then a parade of the standards from other states to the Georgia space on the floor followed. In all, about twenty-five states were represented, including Illinois. Georgia's delegates refused to rise from their seats. The men from the other delegations hoisted Erwin to their shoulders and carried him around the hall in a demonstration that lasted ten minutes before the band played the "Star Spangled Banner," bringing everyone to attention.¹²

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² "Bed-sheet Brigade finds few defenders in Convention," St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 29, 1924, p. 7.

William Jennings Bryan made the chief speech for the report that would avoid mentioning the society by name. Mr. Bryan submitted five arguments before the convention:

1. This plank, and these three words are not necessary.
2. It is not necessary to protect any Church. The Catholic Church does not need a great party to protect it from a million men.
The fourteen members of the minority group were raising the Klan to a higher altitude than the Ku Klux ever raised a fiery cross.
3. We have no moral right to let them divert us from as great a mission as the party ever had.
It requires more courage to fight the Republican Party than it does to fight the Ku Klux Klan.
4. He was not willing to bring discord into the Party.
5. He was not willing to divide the Christian Church.
He owed more to the Party than the Christian Religion. His father taught him that he could afford to be in a minority, but that he could not afford to be wrong on any subject.
It was Christ on the Cross who said, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' The best way to exterminate Ku Kluxism was by recognizing their honesty and teaching them that they are wrong.¹³

At the conclusion of the speech there were boos and hisses mixed

¹³"William Jennings Bryan's plea for not naming Klan," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 12, 1924), p. 9.

with applause. The Chairman had threatened to clear the galleries several times during the speech.¹⁴

The delegates became so agitated during the hectic debate that extra police were present in anticipation of a free-for-all fight.

The one thousand blue-coated policemen who held the floor of the Democratic convention were called so that the vote on the Klan issue could be taken with every delegate's head in reach of a night stick, put a fitting cap on the turmoil and tension of the convention's first week. It was fitting, also, that this final scene should take place on the floor of the convention and thus bring into the open at least a part of the intrigue and quarreling which had been more or less hidden in the lobbies and bedrooms of hotels.¹⁵

The policemen were no stage effects. They were needed. The tension between the two factions of the Democratic Party, which had been piling up for months, became raw and ugly as the

¹⁴ Mr. Bryan was taken to task for his speech in The Catholic World, August, 1924, pp. 690-695. "When he alleged, as another reason for not speaking the horrendous three words, Ku Klux Klan, that he feared to 'divide the Christian Church into warring factions,' one was compelled to ask, 'What can he mean?' Does he conceive that some Christian Churches are for the Klan, and some against the Klan? If so, would he care to say which Churches are for it? And if they are for it, are they really Christian Churches?"

¹⁵ Mr. Edmund H. Moore of Ohio in his speech supporting the minority report stated that there were 343 delegates who were Klan members.

delegates gathered and wrangled. The police were the alternative precaution and it is probable that they alone made it possible to take the vote without riot and perhaps without bloodshed.¹⁶

Polling of the delegates took place after Bryan's speech. For nearly two hours the convention was in an uproar. Chairs were overturned, state standards were broken, and fist-fights were started. The roll call was interrupted time and again by delegates who wanted to change their votes or challenge the accuracy of the final votes of their states as cast by their chairmen. Voting was close from the beginning to the end. Because of the confusion and closeness of the result of the first poll, Chairman Walsh had to order a recapitulation of the entire vote. The total votes cast was 1,083 6/20. "Ayes" - 541 3/20 and "Noes" - 542 3/20.¹⁷

Miss Marion Colley, Washington, Georgia, whose vote won for the Klan said that she was against it but she feared a Party split. She had changed her mind at the last moment after she had backed Erwin in demanding the polling of delegates. Claiming that she did not change her vote because of any action of Klansmen or anyone in

¹⁶ Stanley Frost, "The Klan's $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent Victory," The Outlook, Vol. CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), pp. 384-387.

¹⁷ Rice, Ku Klux Klan in American Politics, pp. 77-79. For voting by states, see Appendices, pp. 3-4.

her delegation.¹⁸

It was inevitable that the Ku Klux Klan should be the main issue at the convention pointed out the Democratic Macon Telegraph. "The Democratic party being the party of the South, and the Klan being the most engrossing problem the South had to face, it was inevitable that the Klan forces should appear at Madison Square Garden."¹⁹

According to L. C. Speers, staff writer for the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and the New York Times, the Democratic party was attempting to win the election on a "both ways" platform by pussyfooting and generally dodging the Klan issue. Mr. Speers

¹⁸ Many reporters suspected that word had come from McAdoo forces. Reporters heard the statement made that McAdoo had sent word, "You are stabbing me in the back." St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 30, 1924, p. 1.

¹⁹ "The Klan enters the Campaign," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 12, 1924), pp. 9-10.

further stated:

It was the opinion of many of the leaders in the convention, men who were not of the Klan, and who had no sympathy with bigotry, that the handling of the Klan issue was one of the worst bungles in the history of the party. These men insisted that the wise course would have been to have passed a simple resolution, if necessary, reaffirming the Jeffersonian principles of religious freedom and then left the Klan to go its own way, a way which they declared was becoming more and more downhill every day.

Klanesmen expressed the opinion that the convention had handled the problem in such a fashion that would bring thousands of new members into the 'invisible empire' in all parts of the union.²⁰ As the situation now stood, the Republican party was certain to be the chief beneficiary.²¹

Nothing but passion could explain the spectacle of the second week of the convention. Passion was inflamed until reasoning was dead, consequences were of no importance, and all intelligence was fixed on a stubborn and ruthless battle to exhaustion.²²

²⁰ The membership in the Klan was estimated to between four and five million in 1924. Frederick Lewis Allen Lewis, Only Yesterday (New York, 1957) p. 66. Preston William Slosson, The Great Crusade and After, 1914-1928 (New York, 1930), p. 308.

²¹ St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 29, 1924, p. 11.

²² Stanley Frost, "Fear and Prejudice in Deadlock," The Outlook, Vol. CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), pp. 422-424.

Charles G. Palmer, grand dragon for the Klan realm of Illinois had roused the tempers of the thirteen Illinois delegates to the convention who had voted against specifically naming the Ku Klux Klan in the party platform. Palmer, a Chicago attorney, had sent them a telegram of congratulations on their stand, but the delegates protested that they were not Klansmen and had voted "on principle."²³

In many delegations the unit rule held men against their will. In many cases the situation at home was such as to control the delegate's vote, unless his convictions were such that he was willing to risk political suicide.

It was the disagreements and dissensions of the convention, rather than the agreements, that impressed the American public. For the first time in history people were able to listen in by radio on the convention proceedings, and they were a little shocked at some of the things they heard. Unseemly conduct always attracts attention; ten plays on Broadway had to close during the convention for lack of business. If the spectacle made interesting news, it did the Democrats no good to have their dirty linen washed in the open. "How true was Grant's exclamation," wrote Hiram Johnson, "that the Democratic Party could be relied upon at the right time to do the

²³ Chicago Daily Tribune, July 4, 1924, p. 3.

wrong thing!"²⁴

The darkhorses were probably the only Democrats who took cheer in the tense struggle over naming the Klan. They believed that both McAdoo and Smith would be eliminated and the deadlock would enhance their chances as a compromise candidate. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat predicted that it would take forty ballots before a compromise candidate would be chosen and that the deadlock would swing McAdoo and Smith votes to John W. Davis. They also stated that either Governor Charles Bryan, Nebraska, or Governor Jonathan M. Davis, Kansas, would be second on the compromise ticket.²⁵

After a ten hour continuous session, in which some of the most disorderly scenes in convention history were enacted, two decisions were made:

1. The Democratic platform would not contain a Wilsonian plank on the League of Nations.
2. The Democratic platform would not single out the Ku Klux Klan by name.

At two o'clock a.m., Sunday, June 29, Franklin Delano Roosevelt moved that the convention be adjourned until nine thirty Monday morning.

²⁴ John D. Hicks, Republican Ascendancy, 1921-1933 (New York, 1960), pp. 96-97.

²⁵ St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 30, 1924, p. 1.

DEADLOCK - BALLOTING RECORD SET

Chairman Walsh called the seventh session of the convention to order at 10:29 o'clock a.m., June 30, 1924. Reverend Gustave Arnold Carstensen of the Holy Rood Protestant Episcopal Church in New York City offered the invocation. The next order of business was the roll call of states for the selection of a nominee for President, and the secretary was instructed to proceed with the roll call.

At the end of the first ballot William G. McAdoo led the nineteen candidates receiving votes with a total of 431.5. Alfred E. Smith was second with 241 votes, and the remaining seventeen, mostly favorite sons, received from one to fifty-nine votes. John W. Davis obtained 31 votes, primarily from West Virginia and Louisiana. 1,096 votes were cast with 731 necessary for a choice under the two-thirds rule.

Fifteen ballots were taken before adjournment without producing any significant change. McAdoo still led with 479, and Alfred Smith

trailed in second place with 305.5 votes. John W. Davis ended the day with 61 after a high of 64.5 on the thirteenth and fourteenth ballots. The first break in balloting came on the tenth ballot when twenty of the Kansas delegates voted solidly for McAdoo. They had been held for Governor Jonathon Davis and this announcement was a signal for a demonstration from the McAdoo forces. Standards of nineteen states were held aloft by cheering and dancing McAdoo men and women, who seemed to anticipate a drift toward their hero that had been so confidently predicted by his manager, David Ladd Rockwell. After a full ten minute demonstration, roll call was resumed with no appreciable influence on the rest of the delegates.

New Jersey gave her 28 votes to Alfred Smith to off-set the Kansas vote and Mayor Hague of Jersey City explained the switch to Smith:

New Jersey is interested in a Democratic victory, for New Jersey has produced the only two Democrat Presidents in the last sixty years, Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson

. . . .

This sacrifice is characteristic of Governor Silzer of New Jersey who is ready to take any step that may bring Democratic victory.¹

Discontent was evident among several delegations which were bound by the unit rule. On the first ballot Mr. Joseph B. Shannon

¹ Chicago Daily Tribune, July 1, 1924, p. 2.

protested against the unit rule for the reason that it was not an expression of the people of Missouri. A poll of the delegation showed 25 votes for McAdoo, 3 for John W. Davis, and 8 present but not voting.

They say we have a gentlemen's agreement, but a gentlemen's agreement never sells a state in a Democratic convention. The rule does not compel me to vote, nor does it authorize any one to vote for me.²

Mr. Shannon felt that Senator Jim Reed who was ill in Kansas City was the real choice of the people. He stated that some of the Missouri delegates had been bought by McAdoo money: "We decline to be delivered, even if we were sold."³

Mr. Frank H. Farris, delegate-at-large from Rolla, Missouri and pledged to McAdoo answered Mr. Shannon. He reminded the delegates that they were committed to the candidacy of Mr. McAdoo by instruction from their state convention under the unit rule.⁴

On the eighth and ninth ballot three anti-McAdoo delegates from Balboa, the Canal Zone, tried to break the unit rule, but to no avail.

² Democratic Proceedings, pp. 342-343. It was interesting to note that Mr. Shannon and Tom J. Pedergast of the fifth district from Kansas City were two of the eight that refused to vote when the delegation was polled.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 344-345.

With the thirtieth ballot the Democratic party was still groping for a candidate and has shattered all but four of the party's records in nominating candidates for President. McAdoo was still leading with 415.5 votes, a net loss of 16 from the first ballot. Al Smith was over 400 votes short of the necessary 732, with 323.5 votes, a gain of 65 from the first ballot. With 126.5 votes, John W. Davis loomed up as a favorite darkhorse candidate with an increase of nearly 100.

After the twentieth ballot, John W. Davis took the lead in the Wall Street betting, becoming the favorite at $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, against 4 to 1 previously. The odds against McAdoo widened to 7 to 1.

William Jennings Bryan in a dictated statement confirmed earlier reports that he had taken a firm stand opposing John W. Davis as candidate for President. Mr. Bryan was opposed to Davis because of his corporated connections. He added that he had made no plans to take the floor against Mr. Davis, if his nomination seemed imminent. Likewise Mr. Bryan declared that he had not publicly stated that he was for any man as second choice.

"I have no personal objection of any kind to Mr. Davis," Mr. Bryan said, "He is a man of high character. So is Mr. Coolidge. There is no difference between them."⁵

⁵ Chicago Daily Tribune, July 2, 1924, p. 2.

Mr. Bryan also denied a current report that he had been in conference with either Mr. McAdoo or his manager. However, he left no doubt in anyone's mind that he was for McAdoo when Florida was called on the thirty-eighth ballot. The chairman recognized Mr. Bryan who was given consent to explain his vote. Admitting there were many good candidates from the North and South, he named eight in particular, such men as Dr. A. A. Murphree, president of Florida University; Joseph Robinson, minority leader of the Senate from Arkansas; Josephus Daniels, North Carolina, Secretary of Navy under President Wilson; Samuel Ralston, senator from Indiana; E. T. Meredith, Iowa, Secretary of Agriculture under Wilson; Senator Thomas T. Walsh, Montana, Chairman of the convention; and his brother Charles, who had polled 50,000 votes majority when elected Governor of Nebraska.

Without naming Al Smith, he stated that the Democratic candidate should be a man whose record on the liquor question was such that every mother would know that every home would be protected. He also did not desire a reactionary, implying John W. Davis, and that was the reason that William G. McAdoo was getting his vote.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, delegate from New Jersey, demanded that Bryan tell the convention about Deheny and McAdoo and Oil. There was applause, hisses and the constant yelling of "Oil," "Oil," "Oil,"

from the galleries. Mr. Bryan finally answered the New Jersey delegate by explaining that Mr. McAdoo's retainers had to do with oil in Mexico and that if any oil had ever touched him, the intense, persistent, virulent opposition of Wall Street had washed all the oil away. No man who allowed Wall Street to influence his action had any right to criticize McAdoo, who could not be controlled by Wall Street.⁶

Mr. D. F. Dunlavy of Ohio asked Bryan if Youngstown, Ohio was in Mexico where McAdoo had received \$200,000 for getting \$2,000,000.⁷ The question was followed with tremendous cheers and cries before Bryan could answer. He replied that the gentlemen who found fault with Mr. McAdoo's fees had a right to present their complaint to the bar associations and have McAdoo disbarred, if his conduct had not been ethical.⁸

In an editorial the Chicago Daily Tribune took issue with

⁶ This was an obvious slam at John W. Davis and his supporters.

⁷ McAdoo had indicated that shortly after he had resigned as Secretary of Treasury, his law firm had handled tax cases before the Treasury Department, which implied influence peddling. He further admitted that Doheny had promised his firm a contingent fee of one million dollars if certain oil cases in Mexico were successfully terminated. Bates, "The Teapot Dome Scandal and the Election of 1924," American Historical Review, p. 308.

⁸ Official Proceedings, pp. 527-536.

William Jennings Bryan for being inconsistent. "Bryan said that Davis's character was high, but that he took retainers from big business and that made him unfit for the Presidency. Does not the same fact fit Bryan's candidate, McAdoo?"⁹

Following Bryan's speech the eleventh session was adjourned until 8:00 o'clock that evening. The voting at the end of thirty-eight ballots had McAdoo still leading with 444; Alfred E. Smith, 321; and John W. Davis was still third with 105 votes.

By the end of the twelfth session, forty-two ballots had been taken and McAdoo had increased his total votes to 503.4 at the expense of Davis, who had dropped to 67, with Al Smith hanging on to second place with 318.6.

Chairman Walsh brought the convention to order for the ninth day and the thirteenth session on July 3, 1924. Twelve ballots were cast during the day with no significant change, however, two breaks occurred during the evening session.

On the sixty-fourth ballot, Tom Taggart, the Indiana boss, withdrew the candidacy of Senator Ralston who had sent a telegram stating that he was withdrawing in the interest of party harmony. Senator Ralston had received 97 votes on the fifty-fifth, fifty-sixth, and fifty-seventh ballots for his high total, and had dropped to 37.5 on the sixty-first and up to 56 on the sixty-third.

⁹ "Bryanisms," Chicago Daily Tribune, July 3, 1924, p. 6.

Former Representative of Ohio, J. Henry Goeks rose on the sixty-sixth ballot and withdrew the name of James M. Cox who, as Democratic standard bearer, had been badly defeated in 1920.

McAdoo reached 530 votes on the sixty-ninth ballot, and pandemonium tore loose for a brief space of time. This was McAdoo's highest total and he was only twenty votes short of a majority of the convention. It was still 203 votes less than the required two-thirds necessary to nominate. The theory of the McAdoo managers had been that if a majority could be registered, a band-wagon rush would bring the necessary votes.¹⁰

As the deadlock continued and a new record established for the number of ballots necessary to nominate a candidate, tempers were lost in the heated battle. A row was started in the Louisiana delegation involving Genevieve Clark Thompson, daughter of the late Champ Clark, with Mrs. Antoinette Funk, a McAdoo worker, and Margaret Wilson, daughter of the late President.

Mrs. Funk charged down upon the Louisiana delegation and demanded that Mrs. Thompson prove the charges she had made about McAdoo, who Mrs. Thompson said would be indicted for violating federal statutes. "You hate Mr. McAdoo for personal

¹⁰ 530 votes was McAdoo's highest mark during the 103 record ballots taken.

reasons," said Mrs. Funk. "Yes, I hate him and we'll beat him," replied the daughter of the late speaker. Margaret Wilson came down from a box nearby and joined forces with Mrs. Funk. "I think it is terrible the way Mrs. Thompson is attacking McAdoo," she said. As Mrs. Thompson moved from delegation to delegation fighting McAdoo, Mrs. Funk and Miss Wilson followed her and pleaded the Californian's cause.¹¹

Several motions were made to suspend the convention rules, but they did not carry. Franklin Delano Roosevelt made a resolution to suspend the rules and allow Alfred E. Smith to address the convention. The vote was by roll call and the resolution did not receive the two-thirds necessary to carry.

Some of the delegates left the sixteenth session laughing as they thought about Edward Frensdorf of Hudson, Michigan who had presented a resolution requesting that William McAdoo and Alfred Smith withdraw from the race. "It was obvious after seventy ballots that neither could receive the nomination; therefore, they should withdraw and give their support and influence in choosing a worthy candidate who would restore harmony to the Democratic party and bring victory in November."¹²

¹¹ Chicago Daily Tribune, July 4, 1924, p. 1.

¹² Official Proceedings, pp. 729-730.

A recapitulation of the seventy-third ballot produced no change in the top three, with the candidates receiving about the same number of votes. McAdoo was still 203 votes short of the necessary two-thirds for nomination.

Mr. Gilbert M. Hitchcock of Nebraska requested that the rules be suspended and offered a resolution to end the deadlock. Beginning with the seventy-fifth ballot, the candidate receiving the lowest vote should withdraw until only five candidates remained, but the withdrawals would be effective for one day only. The motion did not carry.

A. H. Ferguson of Oklahoma created a furor with his resolution. "If after seventy-five ballots, no candidate had received the nomination, the convention would adjourn to meet at Convention Hall in Kansas City, Missouri on Monday, July 21, 1924 at 12 o'clock noon for the purpose of completing the business for which it was called." After much argument, the resolution was brought to a vote and soundly defeated.¹³

Before adjournment the seventy-seventh ballot was taken with McAdoo slipping to 513; Alfred Smith, 367; John W. Davis, 76.5; and Oscar Underwood maintained his highest total, 47.5. Franklin Delano Roosevelt received one vote from a Wisconsin admirer which

¹³ Ibid., pp. 74-756.

was the first time his name was entered on the ballot.

Thomas Taggart made a motion that the representatives of the candidates held a conference for the purpose of reaching an understanding on concluding the convention. This motion carried.

The seventeenth session was adjourned until Monday morning, July 7, 1924.

At 11:25 a.m. the eighteenth session was called to order. Reverend William L. Philipps, Assistant Rector of the Little Church Around the Corner, New York City, offered the invocation and Mr. Charles R. Wilson of West Virginia asked permission to depart from the regular order of business to propose a resolution expressing the sympathy of the convention to President and Mrs. Coolidge on the illness of their son, Calvin, Junior. The sixteen year old youth was fighting a losing battle with death, resulting from a blister on the foot that caused septic poisoning. Chairman Walsh suggested that the resolution be acted on by a rising vote and the motion was unanimously carried.

Cordell Hull, Chairman of the National Committee, was asked to present the report of the Conference Committee. He reported that all the candidates except Mr. McAdoo agreed to release each and every delegate from any pledge, instruction or obligation in so far as their

candidacy for President was concerned. The candidates or their authorized representatives that signed the pledge were:

Albert C. Ritchie	by Howard Bruce
Joseph T. Robinson	by T. H. Caraway
Willard Saulsbury	by Thomas F. Bayard
George S. Silzer	by James Kearney
Oscar W. Underwood	by Forney Johnston
James M. Cox	by J. Henry Goeke
Alfred Smith	by George E. Brennan
	Franklin D. Roosevelt
Fred H. Brown	by Robert Jackson
Charles W. Bryan	by T. S. Allen
Jonathon M. Davis	by Fred Robertson
John W. Davis	by Clem L. Shaver
Woodbridge N. Ferris	by William A. Comstock
Carter Glass	by Claude A. Swanson
David Franklin Houston	by Louis G. Stevenson
Samuel M. Ralston	by Thomas Taggart

In a letter from McAdoo to the Convention, he proposed not only the release of the delegates, but to abrogate the unit rule and substitute a majority rule for the two-thirds rule in choosing a President and Vice-President, and that the candidate receiving the lowest number of votes be dropped each succeeding ballot until a nomination was made.¹⁴

J. Bruce Kremer of Montana asked that the proposals of the Conference Committee be referred to the Committee on Rules. The motion did not carry.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 781-784

Some of the McAdoo leaders were preparing for the eventual elimination of the Californian. They indicated that they would prefer Senator Ralston of Indiana as a compromise, while others suggested Senator Glass of Virginia. John W. Davis was still figured as a possibility.

Ten ballots were cast on the twelfth day and the recapitulation of the eighty-seventh ballot produced a new leader, Alfred E. Smith. The main feature of the day's session was the steady slipping of McAdoo. Indiana returned to Ralston after voting 20 for McAdoo for several days. Michigan gave 20 to Ralston, and Mississippi contributed 20 more on the eighty-fourth ballot. Iowa broke away from its allegiance to McAdoo and cast 26 votes for former Secretary of Agriculture, Meredith. Kansas was polled and stayed with McAdoo, but on the roll call, the vote was switched, and 20 votes were given to Governor Jonathon Davis. Kentucky refused to release her delegates on the eighty-third ballot and pledged her votes to McAdoo for as long as his name appeared before the convention. McAdoo polled 336.5 to Alfred Smith's 361.5 votes. Other contenders still in the running were Ralston, 93; Glass, 71; John W. Davis, 66.5; Underwood, 38; Robinson, 23.5; and Ritchie with 23 votes.

A resolution by A. A. Jones of New Mexico to hold a conference

with one member from each delegation was tabled.

As announcement of the death of Calvin Coolidge, Junior was read and a motion was made that the convention adjourn as a mark of sympathy for the bereaved family.

Six ballots were taken during the twentieth session on July 8. The drive for Senator Ralston was the only interesting feature during the day's voting. Ballot after ballot McAdoo was whittled down and Ralston received his votes. On the eighty-eighth ballot North Carolina deserted McAdoo completely and on the ninetieth Missouri plumped its entire 36 votes for Ralston. Oklahoma went for Ralston and Ohio gave him 17 votes. On the ninety-first ballot Kansas switched from Governor Davis to Ralston, as did Wyoming, while New Hampshire and North Carolina added their votes to the Hoosier's column.¹⁵ Ralston climbed from 93 on the eighty-seventh to 196.25 on the ninety-third ballot.

What Taggart, Ralston's manager, had wanted most of all was the Catholic support for Ralston, for such would go far toward removing suspicions of Ralston's klan affiliations and might start a band wagon to his standard.

After the ninety-third ballot, which developed no changed of importance, the leaders of all factions were in favor of adjournment

¹⁵ Chicago Daily Tribune, July 9, 1924, p. 2.

and conference. George Brennan urged that those with the interest of the party at heart utilize the recess to reach an agreement.

Bruce Kremer, representing the McAdoo management, seconded the adjournment motion.

Charles M. Hay of Missouri was recognized on the adjournment motion and as a McAdoo delegate took the occasion to denounce the Smith contingent, accusing the followers of the New York governor of obstructing agreement on a compromise candidate. He said that he was willing to enter a conference with fair-minded men from all the delegations to seek a candidate, but he was not willing to enter into a conference with a hundred or more candidates for President who were in the hall. There were so many Presidential lightning rods in the hall that it was impossible to get through the aisles.¹⁶

The more tired and anxious to go home that the delegates became the more they realized that McAdoo could not be nominated. Mr. Roosevelt said, "That fact is becoming more evident daily. Governor Smith's steady increase in the balloting plainly showed that delegates are becoming convinced that he is the logical man to be nominated and the most likely candidate the Democrats could put up to sweep the polls on election day."¹⁷

¹⁶ Official Proceedings, pp. 884-885

¹⁷ Chicago Daily Tribune, July 9, 1924, p. 2.

George Brennan had been maneuvering to obtain an agreement on Senator Robinson of Arkansas, but he also ran into difficulties. He was unable to get enough support promised to make a drive for Robinson safe.

Brennan began surveying the possibilities of putting over John W. Davis. He immediately encountered objections from the New York delegates, who said that Davis would be unpopular because he had been counsel for the New York City Telephone Company in its successful effort to get its rates raised and from the Irish delegates in several states who were prejudiced against the West Virginian because he had been ambassador to Great Britain.

Nevertheless Brennan proceeded with his negotiations in favor of Davis. He had in view the proposal that the ticket might be Davis for President and Mayor Dever of Chicago for Vice President. This was in accord with Brennan's contention that there should be a Catholic on the ticket. Mayor Dever was a Catholic, as was Senator Thomas J. Walsh who was also being considered for the nomination of either President or Vice President.

Before the ninety-fourth ballot was taken in the evening session, a telegram from Samuel M. Ralston to Thomas Taggart was read withdrawing the Senator from further consideration by the convention.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was recognized by the Chairman and granted permission to address the convention. Roosevelt stated that he was authorized by Smith to withdraw his name from consideration if the name of Mr. McAdoo would also be withdrawn. As one of the representatives of Governor Smith, he would only add that until a withdrawal had been made by McAdoo, Smith's supporters would continue to vote for Governor Smith.

A Florida delegate later wrote Franklin D. Roosevelt that at the time he offered to withdraw Smith's name, the Florida and North Carolina delegations were conferring on whether to throw their votes to Roosevelt, but were so angered because he announced Smith would not withdraw until McAdoo did, they decided not to do so. The Lieutenant Governor of Ohio wrote that he would have liked to see Ohio switch to Roosevelt. An Arkansas delegate informed Franklin Roosevelt, "Like the over-whelming majority of the delegates who attended the convention, I became a very ardent admirer of yours, and had your physical condition permitted, you would have been nominated." The New York World declared, "The popularity of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the convention stood the test of all its bitterness. He was a gallant and generous figure at all times, and by sheer force of his personality did more to offset

the unsportsmanlike and often brutal behavior of some of those in the galleries than any other man."¹⁸

McAdoo refused to withdraw and with the completion of the ninety-fourth ballot, McAdoo regained the lead with 395 to Alfred Smith's 364.5, followed by John W. Davis with 81.75; Underwood, 46.25; Ralston, Robinson, and Glass with 37 votes.

John W. Davis increased his votes from 68 on the ninety-third to 203.5 on the one hundredth ballot, and became a strong contender for the nomination.

After the ninety-ninth ballot Mr. McAdoo withdrew his name for the good of the party because of the hopeless deadlock. The McAdoo leaders then instituted a drive for former Secretary of Agriculture, E. T. Meredith of Iowa. However, they could only muster 75.5 votes by the one-hundredth ballot.¹⁹

On the motion of W. J. Quinn of Minnesota to adjourn, the convention recessed at 4:00 o'clock a.m., Wednesday, July 9th, 1924, to meet at 12 o'clock noon on the same day.

When the convention adjourned Mr. Davis loomed up as the most probably compromise. George Brennan, Al Smith,

¹⁸ Frank Froidel, Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Ordeal (Boston, 1954), pp. 178-180.

¹⁹ "The Democratic Convention," Current History, August 24, 1924, pp. 730-733.

Joe Guffey of Pennsylvania, and Frank Hague of New Jersey surveyed the situation shortly before the convention reassembled at noon and found the prospects for the nomination of Davis favorable.

The strategy decreed by Brennan was that the "Old Guard" should hold back and allow nature to take its course. If the Old Guard started in to put Davis over, the progressives and other followers of Bryan and McAdoo might be frightened off. Brennan thought it would be better for the drift to Davis to come from others first.

The drift to Davis became apparent on the one hundred and second ballot and on the one hundred and third when one McAdoo state after another swung into line, the Old Guard saw it was time to join the procession.²⁰

The chief weapon of George E. Brennan and his crowd in the convention had been exhaustion. The secondary weapon had been Alfred Smith. He was held to the front so long and so vigorously that the opposition of the South and West, of the wets and the progressives, and the klansmen became concentrated on him and blind to all other factors. Thus Davis seemed a desirable compromise after the weary grind of one hundred and three ballots.

²⁰ Chicago Daily Tribune, July 10, 1924, p. 2.

One important part of Brennan's strategy had been secrecy. If the McAdoo and Klan factions had realized for a moment that Davis was favored by an Eastern crowd his nomination would have been impossible.

The Klan-McAdoo crowd had been outgeneraled, outfought, and outstayed. This phase of the fight was shown by the strong control exercised by the Eastern faction over their delegates. The South had ruined the chances of Senator Ralston, its second choice, by too open support, and this was done in spite of the Klan's boasting of secrecy and of control of its members.²¹

As successor to Roger Sullivan in Illinois and chief ally of Boss Murphy of Tammany, Brennan had won his spurs at the 1920 convention in San Francisco. With Murphy's death prior to the 1924 convention, George Brennan unmistakably became the new big boss in the Democratic party by securing the nomination of John W. Davis.

Governor Austin Peay head of the Tennessee delegation, went to see Cordell Hull with excitement just before the end of the convention. "The inside leaders are in conference," he said, "to determine whom to nominate. I am directly informed that

²¹ Stanley Frost, "Nomination by Exhaustion," Outlook, Vol. CXXXVII (July 23, 1924), pp. 464-466.

they will decide on John W. Davis or you."²² Other friends of Hull confirmed this report to him, but he did not consider the possibility favorably.

A last minute drive was also instituted for Oscar Underwood and Thomas Walsh on the one hundred and first and one hundred and second ballots. Underwood had polled an average of about 40 votes including 24 votes cast by his home state of Alabama leading off for Underwood on one and hundred and two ballots. New York contributed 86.5; Illinois, 20; New Jersey, 16; Connecticut, 11; Michigan and Rhode Island each added 10 votes to give Underwood 229.5 on the one hundred and first ballot. With a few added votes from several states and 32.5 from Pennsylvania, Underwood reached his peak on the one hundred and second ballot with 317 votes. His proposal to denounce the Ku Klux Klan by name had hindered any chance of being accepted as a compromise candidate. Most of his support came from the Smith followers who were still fighting the McAdoo-Klan supporters.

Thomas J. Walsh received 52.5 votes on the one hundredth ballot and his supporters could only muster 123 votes on the one hundred and second ballot. This was hardly enough to hold back the Davis bandwagon.

²²The Memoirs of Cordell Hull, Vol. I (New York, 1948), pp. 122-123.

Mr. Davis had managed to remain free from any involvement in the destructive warfare over the platform plank on the Ku Klux Klan. He did not incur any hatred or displeasure from the Catholics or the Klansmen.

Alabama started the Davis bandwagon by casting her 24 votes for John W. Davis on the one hundred and third ballot. He received new support from California, Connecticut, Georgia, and Idaho. Illinois contributed 50; New York, 60; Ohio, 46; Pennsylvania, 76; and Texas, 40 votes, which helped secure the necessary two-thirds necessary for nomination.

Tom Taggart finally caught the eye of Chairman Walsh and was recognized. Standing on a chair in the middle of the Indiana delegation, Taggart shouted, "Mr. Chairman, I move that the nomination of John W. Davis be made by acclamation."²³

With an instant roar of acceptance the motion was carried without Walsh's intervention. Cheering and parading of standards by the thankful delegates followed the motion until Chairman Walsh stepped forward to bring the jubilee to a close. He simply declared that the Honorable John W. Davis of West Virginia was the nominee of the convention for President of the United States.²⁴

²³ Chicago Daily Tribune, July 10, 1924, p. 6.

²⁴ Official Proceedings, p. 968

W. A. McCorkle, Governor of West Virginia, received unanimous consent to be heard by the delegates. He thanked his fellow-Democrats for the honor bestowed on John W. Davis and the state of West Virginia.

Chairman Walsh recognized Josephus Daniels, delegate from North Carolina, who made a motion to adjourn until 8:30 o'clock p. m. Mr. Michael Igee of Chicago, Illinois was recognized by the Chair and he tried to place Mr. Walsh in nomination for vice-president, and was ruled out of order. Mr. Walsh skillfully adjourned the convention before the delegates could nominate him by acclamation.

After the convention recessed about twenty leaders caucused in a room beneath the platform and decided on Mr. Walsh, but he declined. E. T. Meredith of Iowa was then agreed on, however at 7:45 o'clock, Meredith's refusal to run was received and the leaders became confused, not knowing what to do. Someone said to William Jennings Bryan, who was making his final appearance at a Democratic convention, "Why not persuade your brother to take the nomination?" Bryan replied, "It might not take much persuading." Charles Wayland (Charlie) Bryan readily acquiesced with no one voicing any objections. At that juncture, Davis appeared

and was introduced to "Charlie, his running mate" by Bryan.

Mr. Davis accepted the selection then and there and the nomination would be put through a few minutes later. A more unplanned casual vice-presidential choice had never been made.²⁵

The first roll call gave Governor Charles W. Bryan 740 votes; more than the necessary two-thirds. Other candidates receiving votes were Alvin Owsley, Commander of the American Legion from Texas, 16; George L. Berry of Tennessee, President of the Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, 208; George S. Silzer, Governor of New Jersey, 10; Mrs. LeRoy Springs of South Carolina, 18; Governor Jonathon M. Davis of Kansas, 4; and John F. Hyman, Mayor of New York City, 6.

²⁵ Irving G. Williams, The Rise of the Vice-Presidency (Washington, D. C., 1956) p. 129.

JOHN W. DAVIS

John W. Davis was fifty-one years old when he was nominated for the Presidency in Madison Square Garden on July 9, 1924. For forty-seven of those years he had done nothing for which he could be attacked in the political arena. A true Jeffersonian Democrat, he had a long and impressive record as a liberal. His name had been connected with the writing, passage, and defense before the Supreme Court of legislation which liberals and labor alike held in high repute. As Solicitor General during the administration of Woodrow Wilson he had fought the good fight. But in 1920, with the passing of Democracy from Washington, he had gone to New York to become a Wall Street lawyer. J. F. Morgan and Company, the Erie Railroad, Standard Oil, and the New York Telephone Company were among his clients.¹

In spite of his Wall Street associations, in spite of his Manhattan town house and his Long Island estate, John W. Davis

¹ Karl Schriftgiesser, This Was Normalcy (Boston, 1948), p. 183.

would probably have made a good President. Unlike Al Smith he was not a "man of the people," but he had the same high understanding of their rights and privileges and needs that characterized the Squire of Hyde Park, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who was later to succeed where both he and Al Smith failed.²

John William Davis's father was a lawyer and a politician. Born in Clarksburg, West Virginia, the son of a saddle maker, the elder Davis stuck to the region of his birth. When the Civil War came, he was among those who helped keep his part of Virginia loyal to the Union and later helped establish the new state of West Virginia. He served his district in Congress for four years in the 1870's.

John William Davis was born in Clarksburg, Harrison County, West Virginia, April 13, 1873.³ His early education was directed by his mother, Anna Kennedy Davis, who was a remarkable woman. A native of Baltimore, she had been graduated from a college for women there and, although she reared five daughters and one son, she never gave up the pursuit of knowledge.

² Ibid.

³ At the time of John W. Davis's birth, Clarksburg was referred to as a pastoral community of some 2,000, and a trading center of the grazing and farming region around it. Theodore A. Huntley, The Life of John W. Davis (New York, 1924) p. 23.

She transmitted her love of knowledge to her only son, who grew up in a rambling, comfortable, book-filled house.⁴

He attended several private schools and was graduated from the literary department of Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia in 1892. He taught school, re-entered the university, and helped earn his way through law school by tutoring. Graduating from its law department in 1895, he was admitted to the bar the same year and commenced practice as a clerk in his father's law office in Clarksburg. After practicing for a year, he returned to Washington and Lee University to teach law for two years. He resumed his law practice in Clarksburg in 1897 and was nominated and elected to the West Virginia Legislature in a traditionally Republican district in 1898.

Mr. Davis married Miss Julia MacDonald in 1899 and they had one child, a daughter Julia, before Mrs. Davis's death the following year. He was saddened by her death and poured all of his energy into his law practice.⁵

During the next twelve years he refused the nomination for Congress and for the governorship of his state. He did serve the

⁴ Schriftgiesser, This Was Normalcy, p. 184. Melville Davisson Post, "John W. Davis," Review of Reviews (August, 1924), pp. 149-156.

⁵ Mr. Davis's personal life is revealed in an autobiography written by his daughter. Julia Davis, Legacy of Love (New York, 1961).

party as county chairman of the Democratic Party and delegate to the Democratic National Convention at St. Louis in 1904.

He was elected president of the West Virginia Bar Association in 1906 and was appointed a member of the West Virginia Commission on Uniform State Laws in 1909.

When the Democratic state convention met in 1910, John Davis attended mainly for the purpose of preventing his nomination for Congress. He was pressured into accepting the nomination and was easily elected.

Mr. Davis's ability was utilized when he was placed on the Judiciary Committee which was an honor for a freshman Representative. He wrote the final draft of the Clayton Antitrust Act and was author of its famed section forbidding the courts to enjoin workers from striking and of the clause which forbade judges to jail strikers for contempt of court without a jury trial. His speeches before the committee and on the floor, which had a great effect in bringing about passage of the act, were of that brief, penetrating quality which later led Chief Justice White to say to President Wilson: "The Court thinks so much of John Davis that when he appears for the government the other side hardly gets 'due process of law.'"⁶

⁶ Schriftgiesser, This Was Normalcy, p. 185.

In 1912 the House of Representatives appointed Mr. Davis one of the managers to conduct the impeachment proceedings against Robert W. Archbald, judge of the United States Commerce Court. Re-elected, he returned to his work on the Judiciary Committee in 1913 and served until August 29, 1913 when he resigned to accept the position of Solicitor General, a post he held for five years.⁷

Although he lost his plea for the child labor amendment, which the court found unconstitutional, he won his defense of the constitutionality of the Adamson "eight-hour" act. It was Davis who convinced the court of the President's right to withdraw from public sale lands known to contain oil or minerals necessary for the national defense. He prosecuted the Steel Trust under the Clayton Act which he had written. And he brought many an industrialist and banker, including J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and Charles M. Schwab, before the bar of justice. So successful was he and so highly regarded by the members of the highest bench, that he would have been

⁷ Davis returned to Congress with the definite ambition of securing a vacancy on the United States Circuit Court. Although political friends pressed Woodrow Wilson for the appointment the President, who did not know him, passed him by. Soon after this, they became good friends, and the President appointed Davis Solicitor General.

named to the Supreme Court had a vacancy occurred.⁸

While a member of the American delegation for a conference with Germany on the treatment and exchange of prisoners of war, held in Berns, Switzerland in September, 1918, President Wilson appointed Mr. Davis Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain.

No American ambassador had ever been as friendly towards the British as his predecessor, Walter Hines Page. The British were chagrined at the assignment of an unknown to the proud Court of St. James, but they quickly got over it for they found him "handsome, suave, soft of voice, precise in phrase, dignified without assertion, well informed without pedantry, a lawyer without legalism . . . easy, shrewd, sympathetic, candid." Or, as the King said, "one of the most perfect gentleman I have ever met."⁹

John Davis returned to the United States in the spring of 1921 with little funds. His party had been badly defeated at the polls in 1920 diminishing any chance he had of a political appointment. He accepted a position as the leading member of the New

⁸ Schriftgiesser, This Was Normalcy. p. 186.

⁹ Ibid.

York Law firm of Stetson, Jennings and Russell.¹⁰ As a leading Wall Street lawyer and corporation counsel, he was elected president of the American Bar Association in 1922.

In 1923 friends in Clarksburg began building up Davis as a possible nominee for President. He had been mentioned at the 1920 convention at San Francisco and had received enough token votes to put him in the running for 1924. Clem Shaver, an astute politician with wide acquaintanship, spearheaded the movement and was getting results. Davis protested, as usual, but Shaver and his friends would not listen.

The Pittsburgh Post suggested it would be easier to nominate Davis for President if he were practicing law in West Virginia or running for the Senate.¹¹

In a letter from Davis to Theodore Huntley concerning breaking his relationship with Morgan and Wall Street, Davis said, "No one in all this list of clients has ever controlled or even fancied

¹⁰ Post, "John W. Davis, "Review of Reviews (August, 1924), pp. 149-156. In 1912 Mr. Davis married Ellen Bassel of Clarksburg, W. Va., daughter of John Bassel, one of the prominent lawyers of the State. Karl Schriftgiesser commented that they had outgrown Clarksburg and preferred the social and professional life of Washington and London. Ibid., pp. 186-187.

¹¹ Huntley, The Life of John W. Davis, pp. 132-133.

that he could control my personal or my political conscience. I am vain enough to imagine that no one ever will"¹²

At the headquarters established by admirers of John W. Davis his supporters were most optimistic. Mr. Davis, it was learned, had met and talked with a host of delegates at the uptown home of Frank Polk, who had been acting Secretary of State under President Wilson. After looking him over the delegates came away declaring that Davis looked, acted, and talked like a president. Some delegates gave assurances of favoring him for second choice.

The Davis backers were quiet so far as publicity was concerned. They continued to spread the idea to delegates that if there was a deadlock in the convention, Mr. Davis offered a logical solution to their problem.¹³

By having one foot in the North and one in the South, and by virtue of his West Virginia origin, Davis was the logical choice to heal the wounds that the party had inflicted on itself in the Smith-McAdoo deadlock caused by bitter differences over the Ku Klux Klan, prohibition and the League of Nations issues.¹⁴

¹² Ibid., p. 133. New York Times, March 30, 1924, p. 1.

¹³ New York Times, June 26, 1924, pp. 1, 3.

¹⁴ Sidney Hyman, "Size-up of the Dark Horse Species," Elections - U. S. A. (New York, 1956), pp. 49-50

Mr. Davis was aided by the persistence shown by the McAdoo forces led by Judge David Ladd Rockwell of Ohio who could see no reason why the candidate who was far in the lead of all the others should confess defeat and throw up the sponge to oblige the hungry little Oliver Twists who were jealously crowding one another and demanding more.¹⁵

The nomination of John W. Davis for President by the Democratic National Convention on July 9 at Madison Square Garden, New York, was the climax of an episode that had no parallel in political history. There had been convention deadlocks before in the camps of both parties but never had a group of delegates sat for two weeks taking a hundred ballots without any one of the candidates attaining even a bare majority of the votes cast. The Republicans at Cleveland in their three-day conference early in June had given a clear illustration of effective party leadership, if nothing more. At New York, on the other hand, aspirants for party favor were many, while leaders seemed wanting.¹⁶

¹⁵ Review of Reviews. Vol. LXX (August, 1924), p. 124.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 115.

The choice of Mr. Davis by the convention was praised by both the Republican and Democratic press. Few men were better qualified for the presidency, but he was vulnerable as a candidate because he was a Wall Street attorney.

CONCLUSION

There is little doubt that the prolonged deadlock between the McAdee and Smith forces in the Democratic convention of 1924 reacted against the fortunes of the party. The bitterness engendered by one hundred and three ballots before a compromise presidential choice, John W. Davis, emerged left a disgruntled party seriously divided for the race ahead. Little enthusiasm was displayed by the rank and file of the party during the campaign.¹

The Democrats could have made a better showing at the polls if all factions of the party could have quickly healed the wounds of a bitterly contested convention and rallied to the support of Mr. Davis.

William Allen White stated that a united Democratic party with a vigorous leader - a man like Governor Smith, if he could have been nominated quickly and with unanimity - might have made real headway against President Coolidge by making the oil scandals the only issue of the campaign.²

¹ Charles Edward Merriam and Harold Foote, The American Party System (New York, 1949), p. 340.

² William Allen White, A Puritan in Babylon (New York, 1938), pp. 306-307.

Gavin McNab pointed out to Franklin D. Roosevelt that the convention had been the sort of wake in which "you and I had acted as pallbearers for the party, and where the crepe was hung on the door before the election instead of after the election as was the custom." Another delegate said, While it may be true that most of the crooks are to be found in the Republican ranks, one must admit that we have most of the d--- fools."³

He may have been referring to the party's choice of Governor Charles W. Bryan of Nebraska for the Vice-Presidency. The western radicals who deplored Davis's intimacy with the House of Morgan were not appeased, while the very name of Bryan frightened and irritated eastern conservatives. If the convention had deliberately set out to displease as many voters as possible with its nominees, it could hardly have done worse.⁴

So much emotional energy had been expended by the westerners in hating the Tammany Catholic and by the Tammanyites in singing "The Sidewalks of New York" for Governor Smith that the Democratic party never really collected itself, and the unimpassioned Calvin Coolidge, with his quiet insistence upon economy and tax reduction and his knack for making himself appear the personal embodiment

³ Friedel, Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 180-181.

⁴ Hicks, Republican Ascendancy, p. 97.

of prosperity, would be carried into office by a vast majority.⁵

For Mr. Davis the greatest handicap would be prosperity. Except for the farmers, there was little economic distress anywhere in the nation, and even farm prices took a convenient turn upward during the campaign.

The Republican campaign was a vast, pervading and mysterious silence, broken only by Charles G. Dawes (Vice-President candidate) warning the American people that under every bedstead lurked a Bolshevik ready to destroy them.

President Coolidge had one outstanding virtue. He knew the tremendous value of saying nothing. Time and again Coolidge was attacked by Davis in a vain effort to draw him out on the issues, but just as often as he was attacked - for his indifference to the fascistic evils of the Ku Klux Klan, for instance - he said exactly nothing.⁶ He was truly - "Silent Cal."

Perhaps Coolidge sensed that the vast populace was indifferent to the Ku Klux Klan, the Bolshevik bogey, and the oil scandals. A commuter riding daily to New York from his suburban home during the summer of 1924 observed that on the 7:00 o'clock train there was

⁵ Allen, Only Yesterday, p. 193. For election returns, see p.114, appendices.

⁶ Schriftgiesser, This Was Normalcy, pp. 205-213.

some indignation at the scandals, but that on the 8:00 o'clock train there was only indignation at their exposure and that on the 9:00 o'clock train they were not even mentioned. When a few months later John W. Davis, campaigning for the Presidency on the Democratic ticket, made political capital of the Harding scandals, the opinion of the majority seemed to be that what he said was in bad taste, and Davis would be snowed under at the polls. The fact was that any relentless investigation of the scandals threatened to disturb, if only slightly, the "status quo," and disturbing of the "status quo" was the last thing that the dominant business class or the country at large wanted.⁷

The Democrats could have made a better showing if all factions of the party could have quickly healed the wounds of a bitterly contested convention and rallied to the support of Mr. Davis during the campaign. However, he must have sensed that winning the nomination was only a hollow victory. When a newspaperman congratulated him, Davis said, "Thanks," with a wry smile, "but you know how much it is worth."⁸

⁷ Allen, Only Yesterday, p. 155.

⁸ Schlesinger, Crisis of the Old Order, p. 100.

One shining star that would emerge from the Convention of 1924 and lead the Democrats to victory in 1932 was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who made his return to national politics after being crippled by an attack of poliomyelitis.

Vote On Minority Amendment To League Of Nations Plank

<u>STATE</u>	<u>AYE</u>	<u>NO</u>
Alabama	12.5	11.5
Arizona	1.5	4.5
Arkansas	3	15
California	4	22
Colorado	9.5	2.5
Connecticut	5	9
Delaware	6	..
Florida	5	7
Georgia	..	28
Idaho	8	..
Illinois	10	48
Indiana	..	30
Iowa	..	26
Kansas	..	20
Kentucky	9.5	16.5
Louisiana	..	20
Maine	11	1
Maryland	..	16
Massachusetts	8	28
Michigan	6	24
Minnesota	10	14
Mississippi	..	20
Missouri	2	34
Montana	..	8
Nebraska	..	16
Nevada	..	6
New Hampshire	8	..
New Jersey	..	28
New Mexico	..	6
New York	35	55
North Carolina	6	18
North Dakota	1	9
Ohio	48	..
Oklahoma	..	20
Oregon	1	9
Pennsylvania	52	22
Rhode Island	..	10
South Carolina	18	..
South Dakota	..	10

<u>STATE</u>	<u>AYE</u>	<u>NO</u>
Tennessee	15	9
Texas	..	40
Utah	5.5	2.5
Vermont	2	6
Virginia	24	..
Washington	..	14
West Virginia	16	..
Wisconsin	4	22
Wyoming	3	3
Alaska	1	5
District of Columbia	..	6
Hawaii	..	6
Philippines	2	4
Puerto Rico	1	5
Panama Canal Zone	..	6
	<u>353.5</u>	<u>742.5</u>

The minority report is not agreed to.

**Ballot On Minority Report Of Platform Committee On
Amendment To Religious Liberty Plank**

<u>STATE</u>	<u>NO. OF VOTES</u>	<u>AYE</u>	<u>NO.</u>
Alabama	24	24	..
Arizona	6	1	5
Arkansas	18	..	18
California	26	7	19
Colorado	12	6	6
Connecticut	14	13	1
Delaware	6	6	..
Florida	12	1	11
Georgia*	28	1	19.5
Idaho	8	..	8
Illinois	58	45	13
Indiana	30	5	25
Iowa*	26	13.5	12.5
Kansas	20	..	20
Kentucky	26	9.5	16.5
Louisiana *	20	..	20
Maine	12	8	4
Maryland	16	16	..
Massachusetts	36	35.5	.5
Michigan	30	12.5	16.5
Minnesota	24	17	7
Mississippi	20	..	20
Missouri	36	10.5	25.5
Montana	8	1	7
Nebraska	16	3	13
Nevada	6	..	6
New Hampshire	8	2.5	5.5
New Jersey	28	28	..
New Mexico	6	1	5
New York	90	90	..
North Carolina	24	3 17/20	20 3/20
North Dakota	10	10	..
Ohio *	48	32.5	15.5
Oklahoma	20	..	20
Oregon	10	..	20
Pennsylvania	76	49.5	24.5
Rhode Island	10	10	..

<u>STATE</u>	<u>NO. OF VOTES</u>	<u>AYE</u>	<u>NO.</u>
South Carolina	18	..	18
South Dakota	10	6	4
Tennessee	24	3	21
Texas	40	..	40
Utah	8	4	4
Vermont	8	8	..
Virginia	24	2.5	21.5
Washington *	14	..	14
West Virginia	16	7	9
Wisconsin	26	25	1
Wyoming	6	2	4
Alaska	6	6	..
District of Columbia	6	6	..
Hawaii	6	4	2
Philippines	6	2	2
Porto Rico	6	2	4
Panama Canal Zone	6	2	4
	<u>1,098</u>	<u>542 7/20</u>	<u>543 3/20</u>

Minority vote not agreed to

*The votes of Georgia, Iowa, Louisiana, Ohio and Washington were challenged and the delegations were polled.

Vote of Georgia was 2.5 aye, 17 no.

Iowa waived the unit rule and voted 13.5 aye and 12.5 no.

Louisiana delegation was polled and voted 3 aye and 17 no, but under the unit rule the vote remained 20 no.

After being polled, the Ohio vote was 31.5 aye and 16.5 no.

Washington's vote remained the same, 14 no.

Ohio's vote was changed on the recapitulation to 32 "ayes" and 16 "Noes."

Georgia - 1.5 aye, 21.5 no - and then to 1 aye and 22 no.

The final vote cast was 1,083 6/20; voting aye 541 3/20, no 542 3/20.

CANDIDATE	BALLOTS						
	1	15	20	25	27	30	39
Oscar Underwood	42.5	39.5	45.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	38.5
Joseph T. Robinson	21	20	21	23	23	23	23
William G. McAtee	431.5	479	432	436.5	413	415.5	499
Alfred E. Smith	241	305.5	307.5	308.5	316.5	323.5	320.5
Willard Saulsbury	7	6	6	6	6	6	6
Samuel M. Ralston	30	31	30	31	32	33	32
Jonathan M. Davis	20	11	10	5	6	6	3
Albert Cabell Ritchie	22.5	17.5	17.5	17.5	18.5	17.5	18.5
Woodbridge N. Ferris	30						
James M. Cox	55	60	60	59	59	57	55
Charles W. Bryan	18	11	11				
Fred H. Brown	17	9					
George S. Silser	38						
Carter Glass	25	25	25	29	29	24	25
John W. Davis	31	61	122	126	128.5	126.5	71
William E. Sweet	12						
Pat Harrison	43.5	20.5					
Houston Thompson	1						
John B. Kendrick	6						
Thomas J. Walsh		1	8	16	7	1.5	1
Newton D. Baker		1	1				
William E. Dever			1.5				
Gilbert M. Hitchcock			1				
Robert L. Owen					20	25	4
J. Holmes Jackson							1

CANDIDATE	BALLOTS						
	40	50	60	70	80	85	87
Oscar Underwood	41.5	42.5	42	37.5	46.5	40.5	38
Joseph T. Robinson	24	44	23	21	29.5	27.5	20.5
Wm. G. McAdoo	506.4	461.5	469.5	528.5	454.5	380.5	336.5
Alfred E. Smith	315.1	330.5	334	367.5	363	361.5	354.5
Willard Saulsbury	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Samuel M. Ralston	31	58	42.5		5	87	93
Jonathan M. Davis	3	2					20
Albert Cabell Ritchie	17.5	16.5	16.5		16.5	16.5	23
Woodbridge N. Ferris					17.5		
James M. Cox	55	54	54				.5
Charles W. Bryan			2	3	4.5	9.5	7
Carter Glass	24	24	25		68	67.5	71
John W. Davis	70	64	60	67	73.5	68	66.5
Thomas J. Walsh		1	3		4	3	4
Newton D. Baker				56		6	
Robert L. Owen	4	4	24	2	1	20	20
Franklin D. Roosevelt					1	1	1
Josephus W. Daniels					1		
Edwin T. Meredith							26
Mrs. Belle Miller							1

CANDIDATE	BALLOTS						
	90	91	93	95	98	99	100
Oscar Underwood	42.5	46.5	44.75	44.25	38.25	39.5	41.5
Joseph T. Robinson	20	20	19	31	25	25	46
Wm. G. McAdoo	314	318	314	417.5	406.5	353.5	190
Alfred E. Smith	354.5	355.5	355.5	367.5	354	353	351.5
Willard Saulsbury	6	6	6		6	6	6
Samuel M. Ralston	159.5	187.5	196.25				
Jonathan M. Davis	20	22	4				
Albert Cabel Ritchie	16.5	16.5	16.5	20.5	18.5	17.5	17.5
Charles W. Bryan	18	8	8	9	5	5	2
Carter Glass	30.5	28.5	27	34	36	38	35
John W. Davis	65.5	68.5	68	139.25	194.75	210	203.5
Thomas J. Walsh	5	4.5	4.5	2	6	4	52.5
Newton D. Baker			2				4
Robert L. Owen					1		
Franklin D. Roosevelt				2			
Josephus W. Daniels	19						24
Edwin T. Meredith	26	26	26	26		37	75.5
Homer S. Cummings		8.5	8.5				
Royal S. Copeland				2			
Thomas R. Marshall					3	2	
George L. Berry						1	1
David M. Houston							9
James W. Gerard							10

CANDIDATE	BALLOTS		
	101	102	103
Oscar Underwood	316	317	102.5
Joseph T. Robinson	22.5	21	20
Wm. G. McAdoo	52	21	11.5
Alfred E. Smith	121	44	7.5
Albert Cabell Ritchie	.5	.5	
Charles W. Bryan		1	
Carter Glass	59	67	23
John W. Davis	316	415.5	844
Houston Thompson		1	
Thomas J. Walsh	98	123	58
Newton D. Baker	1	2	
Josephus W. Daniels	1		
Edwin T. Meredith	130	66.5	
George L. Berry	1	1.5	
James W. Gerard	16	7	
Cordell Hull	2	1	
Dr. A. A. Murphree	4		
Henry T. Allen		1	

Mr. George E. Brennan of Illinois made the first motion to change the vote of Illinois upon completion of the 103rd ballot. With the completion of Washington's 14 votes for John W. Davis, the chairman was swamped. Cries of "Mr Chairman" were heard to change their votes. The first to be recognized was Mr. J. R. Files of Iowa who desired to have Iowa's 26 votes changed from Edwin T. Meredith to John W. Davis. After several states, including Illinois, New York and Pennsylvania, changed their votes in order to vote for Mr. Davis, Mr. Thomas Taggart of Indiana was recognized by the chairman. He moved that the rules be suspended and that John W. Davis be made the nominee of President by acclamation. This motion was followed by cries of "I second the motion" and loud applause. The vote was taken with no "noes" heard. John W. Davis was declared to be the nominee of the convention for President of the United States.

Election Returns, 1924

Candidate	Popular	Electoral	States Carried
Coolidge	15,275,003	382	35
Davis	8,305,586	136	12
LaFollette	4,826,471	13	1
Others	<u>160,644</u>		
Totals	28,647,709	<u>531</u>	<u>48</u>

One obvious lesson learned from the campaign was that the Democrats, if they wished to win future elections, had to come forward with a liberal candidate and a liberal program. Independent voters in 1924 turned to LaFollette to register their protest, rather than to Davis, because LaFollette was a liberal and Davis was not.¹

¹ Hicks, Republican Ascendancy, p. 104.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NEWSPAPERS (ON MICROFILM)

Chicago Daily Tribune, 1924.

New York Times, 1924.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat, 1924.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Abbott, Ernest Hamlin, "A Party Civil War," The Outlook, Vol. CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), pp. 381-384.

"As the Democrats Assemble," The Outlook, Vol. CXXXVII (July 2, 1924), pp. 333-335.

"As to Political Availability," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXIX (March, 1924), p. 236.

Bates, J. Leonard, "The Teapot Dome Scandal and the Election of 1924," The American Historical Review, Vol. LX (January, 1955), pp. 303-322

"Brother Charlie Bryan for Vice-President," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 26, 1924), pp. 5-7.

Burns, James MacGregor, "The Case for the Smoke-filled Room," Elections - U. S. A. (New York, Henry Holt and Company), 1956.

"Can John W. Davis Reunite the Democratic Party," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 19, 1924), pp. 6-9.

"Cash, Coolidge and Economy," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII
(July 19, 1924), pp. 14-15

"Dark Horses," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXX
(August, 1924), p. 124.

"Davis and Bryan," Nation, Vol. CXIX (July 23, 1924), p. 88.

"Democracy Tunes up on Jazz," The Independent, Vol. CXIII
(July 5, 1924), pp. 4-6.

"Democratic Platform and Nominees," editorial, The Independent, Vol. CXIII (July 19, 1924), pp. 29-30.

Frost, Stanley, "Democratic Dynamite," The Outlook,
Vol. CXXXVII (June 18, 1924), pp. 265-268.

_____, "Fear and Prejudice in Deadlock," The Outlook,
Vol. CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), pp. 422-424.

_____, "Nomination by Exhaustion," The Outlook,
Vol. CXXXVII (July 23, 1924), pp. 464-466.

_____, "The Klan's One-half of One per cent Victory,"
The Outlook, Vol. CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), pp. 384-387.

Hart, Albert Bushnell, "The Presidential Elections in the
United States," Current History (December, 1924),
pp. 325-328 and 436-438.

Hyman, Sidney, "Size-up of the Dark Horse Species,"
Elections - U. S. A. (New York, Henry Holt and Company),
1926.

"John W. Davis," New Republic, Vol. XXXIX (July 23, 1924),
pp. 224-226.

"McAdoo and Smith," The American Review of Reviews,
Vol. LXIX (June, 1924), p. 575.

Merz, Charles, "At the Two Conventions," The Century Magazine,
Vol. CVIII (June, 1924), pp. 225-230.

- Michelet, Simon, "The Millions of Americans Who Fail to Vote," Current History (November, 1924), pp. 247-249.
- "Mr. Davis Accepts," Nation, Vol. CXIX (August 20, 1924), pp. 176-177.
- "Mr. McAdoo as an Oil Attorney," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXIX (March, 1924), pp. 235-236.
- Noggle, Burl, "The Origins of the Teapot Dome Investigation," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, Vol. XLIV (September, 1957), pp. 237-266.
- "Nomination of John W. Davis," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 19, 1924), p. 24.
- Official Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924 (Indianapolis, Bookwalter-Ball-Greathouse Printing Company), 1924.
- "On William Jennings Bryan and the Klan," The Catholic World (August, 1924), pp. 690-695.
- "Other Democratic Favorites," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXIX (February, 1924), p. 127.
- Post, Melville Davisson, "John W. Davis," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXX (August, 1924), pp. 149-156.
- Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, "Smith-Public Servant," The Outlook, Vol. CXXXVII (June 25, 1924), pp. 309-311.
- "Tammany's New Chief," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 26, 1924), pp. 9-10.
- The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXX (August, 1924), pp. 115-119.
- "The Democratic Convention," The Independent, Vol. CXIII (July 5, 1924), p. 24.
- "The Democratic Line of Attack," Literary Digest, Vol. CXIII (July 5, 1924), pp. 10-14.

- "The Democratic Platform," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 12, 1924), p. 8.
- "The Democratic Platform," Current History, Vol. XX (August, 1924), pp. 736-740.
- "The Democratic National Convention," Current History, Vol. XX (August, 1924), pp. 730-733.
- "The Final Rush to Davis," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXX (August, 1924), p. 125.
- "The Klan Enters the Campaign," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 12, 1924), pp. 9-10.
- "The League as a Campaign Issue," Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXII (July 12, 1924), pp. 10-11.
- "The Result of the Democratic Convention," The Outlook, Vol. CXXXVII (July 23, 1924), pp. 457-459.
- "The Two-thirds Rule Will Stand," The American Review of Reviews, Vol. LXIX (February, 1924), p. 127.
- Thompson, Charles Willis, "John W. Davis: A Character Sketch," Current History, Vol. XX (August, 1924), pp. 734-736.
- Walling, William English, "Labor's Attitude Toward a Third Party," Current History (October, 1924), pp. 32-40.
- Wheeler, Wayne B., "Prohibition Issue in the Presidential Campaign," Current History (September, 1924), pp. 987-988.

BOOKS

- Allen, Frederick Lewis, Only Yesterday (New York, Harper & Brothers), 1957.
- Binkley, Wilfred E., American Political Parties - Their Natural History (New York, Alfred A. Knopf), 1962.
- Davis, Julia, Legacy of Love, (New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.), 1961.

- Friedel, Frank, Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Ordeal (Boston, Little, Brown and Company), 1954.
- Gibbs, Philip, Since Then (New York, Harper & Brothers), 1930.
- Handlin, Oscar, Al Smith and His America (Boston, Little, Brown and Company), 1958.
- Hicks, John D., Republican Ascendancy, 1921-1923 (New York, Harper & Brothers), 1960.
- Huntley, Theodore A., The Life of John W. Davis (New York, Duffield & Company), 1924.
- Kent, Frank R., The Democratic Party (New York, The Century Company), 1928.
- Key, V. O. Jr., Politics and Pressure Groups (New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company), 1958.
- Leighton, Isabel, ed., The Aspirin Age, 1914-1941 (New York, Simon and Schuster), 1949.
- Leuchtenburg, William E., The Perils of Prosperity, 1914-1932 (Chicago, University of Chicago Press), 1958.
- Miller, Robert Moats, American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939 (Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press), 1958.
- Memoirs of Cordell Hull, 2 Vol. (New York, The MacMillan Company), 1948.
- Merriam, Charles Edward and Gosnell, Harold Foote, The American Party System (New York, The MacMillan Company), 1949.
- Minor, Henry, The Story of the Democratic Party (New York, The MacMillan Company), 1928.
- Rice, Arnold S., The Ku Klux Klan in American Politics (Washington, D. C., Public Affairs Press), 1962.

- Rollins, Alfred B. Jr., Roosevelt and Howe (New York, Alfred A. Knopf), 1962.
- Roseboom, Eugene H., A History of Presidential Elections (New York, The MacMillan Company), 1957.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr., The Crisis of the Old Order: 1919-1933 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company), 1957.
- Schriftgiesser, Karl, This Was Normalcy (Boston, Little, Brown and Company), 1948.
- Slosson, Preston William, The Great Crusade and After, 1914-1928 (New York, The MacMillan Company), 1930.
- Sullivan, Mark, Our Times, Vol. VI, The Twenties (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons), 1935.
- Williams, Irving G., The Rise of the Vice-Presidency (Washington D. C., Public Affairs Press), 1956.
- White, William Allen, A Puritan in Babylon (New York, The MacMillan Company), 1938.
- White, William Allen, Politics: The Citizen's Business (New York, The MacMillan Company), 1924.