

IOWA POLITICAL CONVENTIONS AND PLATFORMS

BY DAVID C. MOTT

We plan to publish in the ANNALS, so as to make available to the student of Iowa affairs, those of the platforms of the political parties of Iowa that have been promulgated since the beginning of its territorial existence, which have not already been placed in standard and recognized publications.

In 1881 Herbert S. Fairall of Iowa City published his "Manual of Iowa Politics," to which in 1882, 1883, and 1884 he published supplements. In this work he put in brief space a large amount of information concerning Iowa's conventions, platforms, and elections reaching from the beginning of the territory to and including 1883. A large part of the platform portions of this material was republished in 1883 by the Union Publishing Company of Springfield, Illinois, in a number of county histories of Iowa, but they added nothing new. In the "Iowa Official Register" of 1890 appear the political platforms of 1889, and since that date that invaluable document has contained the platforms of the state conventions of Iowa as they have been promulgated from year to year. It is our purpose to supply those of 1840, which were omitted from the "Manual of Iowa Politics," and those from 1883 to 1889, the interim between those published in the "Manual of Iowa Politics" and the "Iowa Official Register."

While there seems to be some effort on the part of the authors of platforms to take both sides of certain issues for political expediency, yet all in all these platforms from 1840 to now, show the gradual change or evolution of popular opinion in our state in a most interesting way. This is evident by what appears in them on human slavery, on the Mexican War, on the prosecution of the War for the Union, on the enfranchisement of the Negroes, on the resumption of specie payments, on the protective tariff, on prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, on the control of corporations, on the control of railway fares and freight rates, on the abolition of railway passes, on woman suffrage, and on numerous other subjects.

The history of the origin and growth of political conventions both for nominating candidates and making platforms, abounds in interest. At the time Iowa became a territory, 1838, the Republic of the United States was scarcely half a century old. Delegate political conventions were almost a new contrivance. They did not come at the beginning of the republic, but had to be evolved, and without the benefit of experience or precedents. The nominations of candidates for district and state officers were made for a long time in a miscellaneous and mixed way, mostly by acknowledged local leaders. At last members of some of the legislatures began to assume the responsibility of nominating candidates for state officers in caucuses, and that plan spread to practically all the states. Out of the state nominating legislative caucus arose the Congressional nominating caucus, which took a hand in nominating presidential candidates, encroaching on the prerogatives of the electors.¹

George Washington had no opposition in his two elections to the presidency, neither had John Adams to the vice-presidency. Adams had sufficient support in 1796 so there was no other Federalist candidate, and Jefferson was the Anti-Federalist candidate, and the election resulted in making Adams president and Jefferson vice-president. In 1800 the Federalist senators and representatives in Congress held a secret caucus to agree on whom their party would support, and the Anti-Federalists did the same, and from that time for the next twenty-five years the Congressional Caucus selected the party candidates for president and vice-president. It is true the Federalists were practically annihilated about 1800, but each four years the Anti-Federalists, or Republicans as they began to call themselves, held their Congressional Caucus each four years and agreed on their candidates. Thus Madison was selected in 1808 and Monroe in 1816. The electors became the obedient servants of the Congressional Caucus.

By 1824 great opposition had developed against the usurpations of "King Caucus." The people were coming to resent members of the legislative department taking it on themselves to select the executive, and they began to demand a more popu-

¹"Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties," by M. Ostrogorski, Vol. II, p. 12.

lar method of nomination. State legislative caucuses frequently nominated or recommended candidates for president, but while this was one step nearer to the people, it was still unsatisfactory in principle. Andrew Jackson and his friends led the fight against "King Caucus." The election of 1824 was one of confusion so far as the nominations and party organizations were concerned, and the Congressional Caucus to nominate candidates failed to function for the first time since 1800.² John Quincy Adams was elected, but by 1828 the plan of delegate nominating conventions had sprung up in many states, and it was principally by means of them and of popular assemblages that the candidates of that year were endorsed or nominated. Andrew Jackson was elected president.

In preparation for the election of 1832 the Anti-Masonic party held the first general or national convention at Philadelphia in September, 1830, with delegates present from nine states. They made no nomination then but referred it to another national convention to meet at Baltimore in September, 1831, each state to have as many delegates as it had members of Congress. That convention met according to call and nominated William Wirt for president, and it has the distinction of being the first national nominating convention in the United States.³ The National-Republican party (afterward called the Whig party) promptly followed with a national convention at Baltimore, December 12, 1831, with delegates apportioned to each state according to its number of electoral votes. Seventeen states were represented and Henry Clay was nominated. The Democratic-Republican party (soon afterward called the Democratic party) held the first national convention of that historic organization at Baltimore, May 21, 1832.⁴ Each state was apportioned as many votes in the convention as it had presidential electors, and two-thirds of the whole number of votes was made necessary for a nomination. As the party had already accepted Jackson for reelection by popular meetings, this convention was called only to

²McMasters' "History of the People of the United States," Vol. V, p. 62.

³McMasters' "History of the People of the United States," Vol. V, p. 127.

⁴This convention was presided over by Robert Lucas of Ohio, who that year was elected governor of Ohio, and who in 1838 was appointed the first governor of Iowa Territory.

nominate a candidate for vice-president, and it chose Martin Van Buren. Thus was evolved and launched the national conventions whose functions were to nominate candidates for president and vice-president, and they soon came also to promulgate platforms of principles. State conventions quickly began to co-ordinate with them.

On May 20, 1835, the Democrats held their national convention at Baltimore and nominated Van Buren as their candidate for the election to be held the next year. The Whigs held no national convention and their electoral votes were divided between William Henry Harrison and Daniel Webster.

We have now reached the place in the history of party government in the republic when Iowa became one of the units of political activity. Iowa was erected as a territory in 1838. The first election in the new territory was for members of the Territorial Legislative Assembly and for a delegate to Congress. Party lines were not closely drawn and the territory was overwhelmingly Democratic. No territorial conventions were held that year. The election resulted in William W. Chapman of Des Moines County being chosen by the following vote:⁵

William W. Chapman, Des Moines County, Democrat.....	1,490
Peter H. Engle, Dubuque County, Democrat.....	1,454
B. F. Wallace, Henry County, Whig.....	913
David Rorer, Des Moines County, Democrat.....	605
[Lawrence] Taliaferro [Indian Agent at St. Peters] ⁶	30
Total	4,492

The second election in Iowa Territory was in 1839 when the Second Legislative Assembly was chosen. It attracted little attention. But the election of 1840 stirred the country from end to end. The Whigs nominated Harrison while the Democrats re-nominated Van Buren. This became the famous "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," or "Log Cabin" and "Hard Cider" campaign. During it both the Democrats and Whigs of Iowa held territorial conventions.

⁵Fairall's "Manual of Iowa Politics," p. 11.

⁶St. Peters was on the St. Peters River, now called the Minnesota River, and some sixty miles southwest of the location of the present city of St. Paul. Nearly all of Minnesota, including St. Peter's location, as well as what is now the two Dakotas, except what is west of the Missouri River, was then a part of Iowa Territory.

DEMOCRATIC TERRITORIAL CONVENTION, 1840

The Democrats held a territorial convention at Bloomington (Muscatine) on July 9, 1840, and nominated a candidate for delegate to Congress and adopted a platform. This convention is of more than passing interest because it was the first territorial political convention ever held in Iowa, and because it adopted a "non-interference with slavery" platform. Des Moines, Lee, Van Buren, Louisa, Washington, Muscatine, Johnson, Scott, Cedar, Jones, Dubuque, Clayton, Delaware, Buchanan, Jackson, and Linn counties were represented. The following were made permanent officers of the convention: Major George Temple of Des Moines County, president; Samuel Holliday of Muscatine County, Silas Smith, of Van Buren County, John Reynolds of Louisa County, and D. Hendershot of Des Moines County, vice-presidents; and J. M. Isett of Muscatine County, Dr. J. N. Haslett of Lee County, Colonel Charles Nealley of Des Moines County, and F. H. Lee of Johnson County, secretaries.

On motion of General Finch of Van Buren County, it was resolved unanimously that a committee be appointed to address letters to the Honorable Thomas H. Benton of Missouri and to the Honorable John C. Calhoun of South Carolina and invite them to visit Iowa Territory. Augustus C. Dodge of Burlington was then nominated for delegate to Congress, receiving 130 votes to 75 for Francis Gehon of Dubuque. A platform was then adopted. As it was not included in Fairall's "Manual of Iowa Politics," we give it herewith:

Whereas, The time is not far distant when the territory of Iowa will add another star to our glorious banner, and it is very important that she should harmonize with the measures of the general government, thereby giving strength to the Union; and

Whereas, It is equally important that our delegate in Congress for the time being should represent the feelings and wishes of the people of Iowa, a vast majority of whom are decidedly Democratic; therefore

Resolved, That this convention approve of the course of Martin Van Buren as calculated to advance the interests of a majority of the people, and that he has administered the government upon the pure Republican principles of Washington and Jefferson, and that in him the Democracy have an individual pre-eminently qualified to carry out the great measures of the party, thereby rendering our Union permanent; and that in his re-election we have an additional guarantee for

the welfare and perpetuity of our beloved country and that the West can favorably look to him as the first president who has with an untiring zeal stood boldly forth in the defense of her rights and interests in the recommendation of a permanent pre-emption law in opposition to the Federal party, who with equal zeal have been opposed to the best interests of the great West, thereby cancelling all claims on her citizens for their support.

Resolved, That although we have no vote, we recommend Martin Van Buren to the Democracy of the Union for president, and Richard M. Johnson as vice-president.

Resolved, That this convention unanimously concur with his Excellency, M. Van Buren in the sentiments contained in his inaugural address on the subject of slavery, both in the District of Columbia and also in the states in which it exists.

"I then declare that if the desire of those of my countrymen who were favorable to my election was gratified, I must go into the presidential chair the inflexible and uncompromising opponent of every attempt on the part of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia against the wishes of the slaveholding states and also with a determination equally decided to resist the slightest interference with it in the states where it exists."

Resolved, That it is the banking system as conducted by the Federal party which has caused the derangements in the currency of our country by expansions and contractions to the amount of from between thirty-six and forty millions in order to force the people into the support of their measures, and that the banks and the Federal party are the sole cause of all the panics and the reduction of the price of labor and the products of our country.

Resolved, That we will yield our cordial support to General A. C. Dodge, the nominee of this convention, and that we pledge ourselves to use all fair means for his election.⁷

WHIG TERRITORIAL CONVENTION, 1840

On July 29, 1840, there was held at Bloomington (Muscatine) a Whig territorial convention, the first held in Iowa by that party. This was not a delegate convention, but was called a "congress of the people," and was attended by interested Whig citizens from Des Moines, Lee, Louisa, Cedar, Muscatine, Scott, and Linn counties, Des Moines and Lee furnishing the larger delegations.⁸ The meeting was held in a grove in the town.

⁷*Iowa Sun*, Davenport, July 25, 1840. (In the newspaper collection of the Historical Department of Iowa.)

⁸*Territorial Gazette and Advertiser*, Burlington, August 8, 1840. (In the newspaper collection of the Historical Department of Iowa.)

Previous to the organization a "very handsome standard was presented by the ladies of Bloomington, through Mr. Woodward, to the Tippecanoe Club of Muscatine County, which was responded to by the president of the club, Mr. Lowe." Mr. Whicher of Bloomington and Mr. Learned of Burlington also made addresses.

The convention, or "congress," was then organized by electing Isaac Leffler of Des Moines County, president; Joseph Webster of Lee County, Francis Ford of Cedar County, Levi Thornton of Louisa County, Mathew Mathews of Muscatine County, and Thomas J. McKean of Linn County, vice-presidents; and W. G. Woodward of Muscatine County, and E. Thomas of Wapello County, secretaries.

On motion of Mr. Learned the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That we unanimously pledge ourselves to give our warmest support to the candidate who shall be selected by this meeting to represent this territory in the next Congress, and that we will use all fair and honorable means to secure his election.

Resolved, That in order to obtain the sense of this meeting in regard to a candidate for delegate to Congress, the citizens form themselves into line, that two tellers be appointed to receive the votes as the citizens pass and give in the name of the candidate they prefer, that the votes so given shall be taken down by the secretaries, and if no one candidate shall receive a majority of all the votes given a second vote shall be taken in like manner for the two highest candidates, and the one having a clear majority of all the votes taken shall be declared the candidate selected by this meeting.

On the adoption of General Learned's second resolution, the vote was taken and resulted as follows:

Alfred Rich	120
Philip Viele	61
S. Whicher	11

Mr. Rich was declared the nominee and Mr. Viele addressed the meeting in Mr. Rich's support.

The following committee was appointed by the chair to report an address to the citizens of the territory: Messrs. Learned of Des Moines County, Whicher of Muscatine County, Taylor of Lee County, Watts of Scott County, and Grimes of Des Moines County.

A Territorial Central Committee was appointed as follows: R. P. Lowe, J. W. Brady, J. W. Richman, Moses Perrin, and W. G. Woodward.

The committee to draft an address to the people of the territory made their report, which was read and unanimously adopted. It is as follows:

Fellow Citizens: When you reflect that the Constitution has invested the people of these United States and territories with the privilege of selecting their public functionaries, and by their free and voluntary suffrages of placing them in power, you will readily see and understand what an important duty devolves on you and how sacredly that duty should be observed and performed. As a portion of the great body of the people of this territory, assembled here in a primary meeting of citizens to select and recommend to your consideration a suitable candidate to represent the people of Iowa in the next Congress of the United States to be supported by the friends of General Harrison at the approaching election in October next, we claim the privilege of addressing you upon the occasion, and of invoking your active and zealous co-operation to accomplish this important object.

Whenever in the course of events a time arrives when the government has been so unwisely administered by the administration in power as to lose the confidence of the great body of the people of the country; if from any cause it has become grossly profligate and corrupt; if the true interests of the nation are disregarded, or are sacrificed in a struggle to continue in authority from a love of official power; if the honest confidence which the people have reposed in their public servants is abused and their wants and distresses are treated with careless indifference; when, year after year, a system of policy is pursued which proves that the interest of the government is separated from that of the people, and by a lavish waste of the public revenue heavy burthens are laid upon the country to provide for the current expenses of the government, which the people must pay—when these things become so apparent and oppressive that a change is imperiously demanded, and public opinion proclaims aloud its necessity, it becomes a paramount duty with every citizen who regards his own rights, and the honor, prosperity, and happiness of the country, to raise his voice in the general cry and unite in a vigorous effort to effect a reform. That time, it seems to us, has now arrived. And although we have but a single delegate to Congress to elect from our territory, and have no voice in the approaching election of a president of the United States, yet events of such thrilling interest have transpired under the present administration of the national government that we are called upon by one common destiny to stand to our rights in support of our principles and, if in no other way, by our approbation and example, to shed our influence upon others, and stimulate them to perseverance and active exertion.

It has not been our policy, at the present time, to make this election turn upon party politics. Our object has been to select an able and competent man, whose services we can command, to represent the interests of the people of this territory in the Congress of the United States. And if this whole matter had been left to the decision of the party to which we belong, that selection would have been made and our candidate would have been supported for his superior qualifications to fill the station, and not for his party predilections. But that calm and even course was not left us to pursue. The restless ambition of our political opponents, their warm zeal as partisans to manifest their devotion to Mr. Van Buren, and to approbate the measures of his administration, however disastrous to the nation those measures have proved in their practical operation, urged them to a different course. We believe, too, that a mistaken confidence in their numerical strength induced them early to change a noncommittal policy for an attitude of party defiance, trusting no doubt in their party strength, with the ready aid of official influence, to control the opinions of the free and independent citizens of this territory, to overawe their actions, and secure their votes to carry out their measures and sustain them in power. And to render this course doubly sure, a packed caucus of interested partisan politicians met together—interest, ambition and party management “kissed each other”—they selected their candidate, a gentleman and a citizen personally unexceptionable (but one who now holds a lucrative responsible office under the general government), to represent this territory in Congress, making the lines of party discrimination too palpable to be mistaken by any one. This is, indeed, “treading in the footsteps,” and carrying out the principle that “to the victors belong the spoils.” From the official station of their candidate under Mr. Van Buren, it is to be supposed that he will be supported for his devotion to his fortunes and strong attachment to his system of measures, and the general policy of his administration. We shall not censure him for such a course, presuming that he believes it to be right and proper, but it shows a reason why we should pursue a different line. We believe the general policy of Mr. Van Buren’s administration and the measures he has adopted and seems determined to pursue while he continues in power, if persevered in, will tend to subvert the free republican institutions of our country, and will prove destructive to our highest interests. We believe that a change in the administration is necessary to put a check to such a system of wild misrule, that a change is required to preserve our constitutional rights and our liberties.

We believe that, without this, we are rapidly progressing to an arbitrary and a despotic government, and a concentration of power in the hands of the executive as dangerous to the liberties of the people of this country as monarchy itself. Is not a timely check to such a system of wild experiments, gross mismanagement, and licentious doctrines, as have characterized our public affairs and the party which has con-

ducted them for years past, imperiously demanded? Amidst the intrigues and secret corruption that a reckless struggle for power generally originates and brings into requisition, will any friend to his country contend that a change of administration is not required, and if obtained, must prove salutary? It is the constitutional remedy placed in the hands of the people, to be used whenever occasion demands it. The remedy is now needed to restore the nation again to the sober guidance of the Constitution and strict republican principles of policy, such as have characterized our former days of prosperity and happiness.

In all of our proceedings, therefore, we have been actuated by a sense of duty, rather than by any desire to engage in a warm and exciting political controversy. We have been forced into this course of events, over which we have had no control, and we must have surrendered our privileges as free men into the hands of political opponents, and supinely have waited the election of a Van Buren delegate to Congress, to aid in sustaining that mischievous system of measures which has already brought so much distress upon the country, so far as his power and influence extend; and which by executive influence, party management, and intrigue has succeeded in such an organization of both houses in Congress, as insures their support. The passage of the Subtreasury Bill has fastened upon the country, for a time at least, that odious and unconstitutional measure of the present administration. The purse and the sword of the nation are now united in the hands of the executive, to be used under his dictation, through the creatures of his appointment, holding their offices at his will and pleasure.

The *Globe*, the supple organ of the administration, proclaims the passage of this bill in strains of lofty exultation, and calls it another declaration of independence. It is, indeed, too true! It declares the executive independent of the people and the Constitution, and substitutes in their place the sovereign will and pleasure of the President. Like Pandora's box, this Van Buren casket of political evils, which the senator from South Carolina has lent all his aid and influence to open upon us, and which he might more appropriately call a bill of abominations than he did General Jackson's Force Bill, received the signature of its illustrious God-father on July 4, 1840. Let this be remembered by the American people: that on this eventful day, hallowed by time, and the feelings of Americans, and consecrated to liberty, the Constitution that was framed by our fathers and purchased with their blood, has received its first deep and ghastly wound, from the hands of Mr. Van Buren and his partisans in power. Sixty-four years from the day of our Declaration of Independence from British tyranny, the government of the United States declared itself independent of the people, by the adoption of this odious scheme. Our first Declaration of Independence proclaimed our freedom from British despotism; the second proclaims the despotism of the people's servants who have been so long

pampered in power that they fearlessly assume the attitude of our masters—the despotism of our own government in which the people confided. Is not a change necessary? When this measure was first started General Jackson, with honest indignation, declared it “disorganizing and revolutionary.” “Has the leopard changed his spots, or the Ethiopian his skin,” by the fond dalliance of Mr. Van Buren and his associates?

A portion of the people of this territory, among whom may be ranked most of this assembly, cherish with grateful pride the recollection that the framers of the Constitution were among the first to resist the odious attempts of the British government to reduce the American colonies to abject despotic servitude. As their descendants we have long enjoyed the peace, prosperity, and freedom secured to us by our Revolutionary struggle, and we can neither forget the price at which these blessings were obtained, nor our duty to preserve them unimpaired, and hand them down to future ages as the richest legacy that posterity can receive from us. In a republican government like ours the officers of government rank no higher than the humblest citizen; for here station confers only the means of doing good by an upright and faithful discharge of public duty, without rank or prerogative, and without any exclusive privileges or claim to rule, except in the name and by the authority of the people. Hence it is the unquestionable right and an imperious duty enjoined upon the people at all times and upon all political occasions to take the control of their own affairs into their own hands, to express their will upon all subjects of public concern, and when the occasion demands it, to visit with their sternest rebuke every dark intrigue, every ambitious project and abuse of confidence which threaten to subvert their interests and to innovate upon their constitutional rights and privileges.

The present time is full of admonition. We have reason to fear that the process of innovation, which has proved fatal to every free government that has hitherto existed, has been and still is actively exerting its baneful influence in our own country. If history furnishes us with any guide, all human institutions are prone to corruption and abuse; and the most efficient and salutary check that can be opposed is to be found in the virtues and intelligence of an enlightened people, and in their constant vigilance. We need not expect what the world has never yet seen—a perfect government. And while we would exercise a proper charity towards those who may differ with us in opinion of public men and public measure, yet we deem it necessary on this occasion to speak with perfect freedom, but with candor, on every pertinent subject of interest to our country.

We have not forgotten that our federal and state governments have been founded upon principles of mutual conciliation and compromise. It would be both unwise and unjust, therefore, to indulge in a spirit of hostility towards any portion of our country where local interests

may differ from our own. We only mean on this occasion to invite our fellow citizens, who have congregated in our territory from every state in the Union, to reflect seriously and calmly upon the great and portentous questions of policy which involve not only the highest interests of our whole country, but its future destiny.

It is a subject to be deeply regretted that the election of any public functionary should in any degree become the subject of a high and often of a dangerous excitement. And this is now, in a great degree, owing to the reckless and licentious spirit of the press. The vast power and patronage conferred upon the executive of the nation by the Constitution, without seeking to extend them by unfair means or by implication—power and patronage that have naturally resulted from the legitimate operations of the government and the unexampled increase of our population and national resources—would have alarmed the framers of our Constitution, if they could have foreseen such results within the short period of little more than half a century. It probably would have taught them that, as it is the nature of power to concentrate itself, it would be wise to restrain this tendency, and by some greater safeguards than the Constitution now possesses, to check such an immense accumulation of power in the hands of the executive. But with this daily augmentation of power, the present chief magistrate is not satisfied. His craving ambition is daily seeking, through the sub-treasury, the standing army bill, and other contingent measures, to increase it. The power and patronage conferred upon the executive by the Constitution, and wisely and discreetly exercised, is sufficient to tempt the ambition of the best man, and certainly is enough to encourage the machinations and intrigues of those less scrupulous. The experience of the last few years should teach us that the apprehensions which were felt by many of the framers of the Constitution, that too much power had been given to the executive department, were justly entertained. Too much power in the hands of the executive has always been most dreaded by the Republican party in the nation. This had always been considered by them as the most dangerous feature in our system, and the weakest point in the Constitution, and one that threatens to become most dangerous to the liberties of the people. Power in the hands of one man has no other restraints than the dictates of his will, but when diffused among a number it becomes weakened in degree, because all must be consulted and be united in its exercise. Thus each serves as a check to the other, and in this rests the safety of the people and the public interest. The executive branch of our government is the great absorbent of political power, and unless it is timely checked in its career, sooner or later, will swallow up all that the people will suffer to be wrested from them. How strongly does this fact appeal to their firmness, and their constant vigilance!

The powers that are necessarily delegated to any department of government for any purposes of general good, if improperly directed, be-

come a power also to do evil. What powerful reasons therefore the last few years have furnished the American people with, to induce them to desire a change of measures by the administration, and to effect that object, a change of men in power.

Among the innovations that time and human frailty have stamped upon democratic institutions, there are none more dangerous and alarming than those which seek to unite, in the hands of the executive, the two great levers of political power, the purse and the sword. By the union of this power all the ancient republics of the world have been overturned and destroyed. The subtreasury has united them in the hands of Mr. Van Buren; and with the aid of Mr. Poinsett's Army Bill, with a hundredth part of the military talents, and bold and manly daring of a Jackson, our Constitution would prove but a rope of sand, the first revolutionary breath would drift it to the four winds of heaven.

With the incorruptible virtue of Washington, the wisdom of Jefferson, the profound political intelligence of Madison, the calm benignity and inflexible fortitude of Monroe, with numerous others, high examples of public worth and private virtue before the eyes of the American people, and on whom they have been accustomed to look with confidence and not with distrust, it is natural that they should have learned to bestow their confidence readily and without suspicion. They have been long accustomed to witness the integrity of the patriot rather than to suspect the chicanery of the demagogue, in those who aspired to their favor. It is true that these venerable sages of former and better days in this republic had high claims upon their country's gratitude which the people were anxious to acknowledge. But they have passed away like the years that blessed us with the efforts of their wisdom, and have left their exalted stations to be filled by others who, if their deeds bear testimony of their desires, would not repine if memory had lost its power, and moral and political virtue its influence upon the American people, that no invidious comparisons between the past and the present could be drawn to wound them by regret, or admonish them of evils to come.

The one hundred and thirty thousand office holders under the general government are dependent on the executive will, either directly or indirectly, and they are thus interested to preserve his favor and secure that of his successor. Hence the impropriety and mischief resulting from any executive using his immense official influence in favor of a successor. It is in this way that the hopes of those who desire office within the gift of the president, as well as the fears of those in office who hold their offices under him, are brought to bear with concentrated force upon our elections. Thus in England and the United States, the government throughout all its branches and dependencies may effectually be arrayed against the people before they feel its influence. But the people should not be surprised at this. Let them reflect that innovations are always practised under some popular guise or name that is

dear to the people, and with ardent professions for their interests and respect for their rights. Hence the name of Republican, and of Democrat, have often been assumed by parties in England, France, and in this country. In the two former, to establish a monarchy upon the ruins of republican institutions—in this country, to conceal monarchial doctrines, and engraft them upon the ruins of republican principles. It is so even now, the Democracy of Mr. Van Buren and his administration was the ultra Federalism of 1798-1800. Nor is it strange that it should be so when almost every ultra Federalist of that time who now survives is enlisted in his ranks, and supports and applauds his measures. The man was formerly esteemed a Federalist who was in favor of increasing the power of the general government in some one of its departments. Is not this the policy of Mr. Van Buren and his modern democracy of numbers? Look, fellow citizens, once more at his Subtreasury Bill and the standing army. That man was formerly held to be a Democrat who was opposed to any increase of executive power and patronage, and who advocated the doctrine of checking the powers of the general government and confining them within their constitutional limits; and who was in favor of preserving as much power as possible in the hands of the people, by whom it is not likely to be abused, and in whose hands it has no natural tendency to accumulate. Such was the policy of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe. Such was the policy and doctrines of the Democrats under the administration of Mr. Jefferson, when many of the modern Van Buren Democrats, the Federalists of that time, by way of reproach for such principles of policy, branded the whole Jeffersonian Democracy of the country with the opprobrious names of Jacobins. Such has ever since been the policy and doctrine of the Whigs throughout this country, and yet these subtreasury champions style themselves Democrats now, and do not blush at the base fabrication when they brand the whole Jeffersonian Democracy of the country, with their own legitimate title, Federalist. But "by their works ye shall know them," and they deceive themselves if they think that the mark of Cain is so easily effaced, or that the people are to be thus deceived.

Amidst the scenes of atrocity upon the bloodstained fields of France during her Revolution, various expedients were resorted to which, while they seemed to give freedom and effect to the popular will, absolutely overawed and controlled it. The establishment of clubs, cabals, and caucuses were composed of a few selected partisans who were devoted to the interest of some popular leader, or of such as desired to lead public opinion themselves, assembled together, devised and proclaimed their measures in the name of the people, as if the people had been consulted, and they had derived their powers of action from them. Such was the character of the caucus lately held in this place by our modern Democracy, or the history of that memorable assemblage of 260 delegates, *multum in parvo*, is a libel. In various portions of the United

States this caucus system has been in full practice, and in none with more skill and success than in the state of New York. In this school of caucuses Mr. Van Buren received his education in political tactics, and few scholars have discovered a greater aptitude to learn. His partisans, quite familiarized now "to treading in the footsteps," "deem it glory enough to serve under such a chief," and strange as it may seem, the practice has reached this territory, distant as it is from the focus of power and the influence of example.

Although we have no voice in the presidential election, yet we have as deep an interest in a change in the national administration as the citizens of the states. All the evils to be apprehended from a continuance of the present dominant party in power, and the good that we believe will result to the nation by the election of General Harrison to the presidency, we share in common with our fellow citizens throughout the country. All seem to feel and admit now that a change is necessary, at least all those who believe that it is wise and salutary to retrace our steps, and endeavor to get back again to those plain republican principles of policy when the government was administered in the pure spirit of the Constitution; when the whole nation was prosperous, contented, and full of hope and confidence; when we had a sound currency, and the principle prevailed that the money which answered all the business purposes of the people likewise answered all the purposes of the people's government which received its revenue from the people, and disbursed it again to the people; and when our rulers sought their highest reward for their services in the approbation of their consciences, and of their fellow citizens. And is it strange when the intelligent people of the country compare the measures of the present administration with those that have preceded, that they should lose their confidence in its wisdom and its purity? When they review Mr. Van Buren's past and present public conduct, is it calculated to inspire the nation with confidence? We think not, and we will lay before you some of our reasons for this opinion.

Mr. Van Buren seems to have commenced his political career in hostility to the Republican administration of this national government, and in support of Federal measures and the Federal party. In 1812 we find him arrayed against Mr. Madison, and uniting with the Federal party to defeat his re-election, and to elect Mr. Clinton. The triumph of Mr. Madison shed new light upon his political path, and he shortly after abandoned his Federal allies. In 1820 Mr. Van Buren was a member of the Senate of New York, which adopted the resolutions instructing Rufus King, their senator in Congress, to vote for the admission of Missouri into the Union as a state, only upon the condition that slavery was abolished there. Soon after this we find him voting for the re-election of Mr. King to the United States Senate under these instructions. And is it not well known that Mr. King until his death ranked at the head and front of the Federal party, and was an ultra

of the old Federal school of '98? Did this look like Democracy, or like Federalism? In 1812 Mr. Van Buren was a member of the state convention to revise the constitution of the state of New York. Without impugning his motives, he voted to extend the right of suffrage to free Negroes with a property qualification, while he supported a measure which would have denied the right to the poor white citizen without such qualification.

Mr. Van Buren has been charged with being the author of that reckless system of proscription for political opinions, which is so dangerous to the freedom of opinion in our country, and which has been so frequently abused. This system had its origin in the state of New York, in that subtle school of Machiavelian politics where he received his training. The advocates of that system have long practiced upon, and avowed this apt and modern Democratic maxim, and which has been found congenial to their policy, that "the spoils belong to the victors." Was this proscriptive power ever seriously felt, or complained of from the national government, until Mr. Van Buren came into the cabinet? Mr. Van Buren seems to be the only American statesman who ever openly attempted to enlist the influence of foreign governments in the struggles of parties at home. If any one doubts this, let him look at his correspondence with the British government and the Pope of Rome when he was secretary of state. Is there another man in the nation who would seek to gratify his ambition for office by thus sacrificing the independence of his country? Notwithstanding his constitutional objections to a United States Bank, previous to the veto of General Jackson to the bill to recharter the old bank, he applied for the establishment of a branch of that monster at the city of Albany, the headquarters of his safety-fund system.

If we regard the means employed, the influence brought to bear, and prostitute the purity of the elective franchise in order to re-elect Mr. Van Buren to the presidency—or the whole course and tenor of his public conduct, we feel constrained by a sense of duty we owe to ourselves, by the rectitude of our principles, and the deep interest we feel for the lasting interests, prosperity and happiness of the nation, and the permanence of our institutions, to deprecate them all, and boldly express our opinions against them as being entirely of Federal origin, and anti-Democratic throughout. We have no confidence in the wisdom of his measures, the purity of his administration, or in his integrity and intelligence as a statesman, nor in his Democracy.

The man who now stands conspicuously opposed to him before the nation, and who is his formidable competitor, is one renowned in the history of our country, and endeared to the affections of the people. William Henry Harrison has passed an eventful life, full of peril and high responsibility. He has passed the ordeal of public criticism, and party malignity, unharmed. He has filled many distinguished public stations under the government with eminent skill and ability, in all of

which he has been distinguished for his integrity, republican simplicity, manly firmness and independence, and a high order of intelligence. He is among the few men in our day in any exalted station of life who, amidst the bitter excitements of party, has preserved the love, veneration, and esteem of all who know him. As a virtuous and incorruptible statesman, he has long been known to the American people. He does not come before the people, now, recommended by any system of political drilling, after the manner of the New York school of tactics. No official influence, no intrigue, no hopes of reward, or fear of punishment, are his precursors into power. He has been nominated by the people, he is the people's candidate, and as such the people will support and elect him.

In pursuance of the republican principles we profess we have assembled together, in this primary meeting of the people. We have consulted each other's feelings and opinions upon the selection of a candidate to be recommended for your support, as a delegate to Congress. We have mutually agreed with each other in the choice we have made, and unanimously commend him to your support, and bind ourselves to each other, and to you, to use all fair, upright, and honorable means to insure his election. To this duty we invoke your aid, your counsel, and advice, in all matters necessary to effect our object, and insure the friends of General Harrison a glorious triumph in the choice of our delegate.⁹

Following our plan as explained at the beginning of this article, we will now take up the conventions and platforms of the years not covered either by Fairall's "Manual of Iowa Politics," or by the "Iowa Official Register," namely, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, and 1888.

THE TEMPERANCE CONVENTION, 1884

A state temperance convention was held at Des Moines on January 23 and 24, 1884, on call of the State Temperance Alliance by Aaron Kimball, president. Delegates were present from fifty-eight counties. Rev. H. O. Pratt, former congressman from the Fourth District, presided, and Rev. H. W. Bennett of Dubuque was secretary. Addresses were made by General A. J. Baker of Appanoose County, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Rev. Henry Wallace of Winterset, Rev. S. S. Hunting, and Dr. George F. Magoun of Grinnell. The following resolutions were adopted:

Four times has Iowa recently spoken in unmistakable tones and given notice to all within her borders, as well as to the world, that her people will no longer submit to the heavy burdens and demoralizing in-

⁹*The Hawkeye and Iowa Patriot*, Burlington, August 6, 1840.

fluence of the liquor traffic. Twice in electing a legislature that were in favor of the people deciding upon the question by a direct nonpartisan vote; once by that vote on June 27, 1882, and again in the last election by choosing a legislature to crystallize into law the clearly expressed will of the people. With deep gratitude to Him who overrules all events for the highest good of our race, and who has so wonderfully led the hosts of temperance through unexpected ways and up to the proud and commanding position now held by them, and still relying on that wisdom which is promised to all those who seek it, to guide one in the paths that lead to final victory, we, the delegates and representatives of temperance and prohibition sentiment in Iowa in convention assembled, do declare and resolve,

First, That when a great and free people have distinctly and repeatedly expressed their will in regard to a public policy that commends itself to the universal sense of right, that that policy no longer remains a matter of mere party action, but becomes a subject demanding the best thought of every statesman to carry out that will, irrespective of party.

Second, That we fully trust and confidently expect that our present legislature will promptly meet the wishes of the people in not only repealing the statute permitting the sale of ale, wine, and beer as beverages, but enact and provide suitable penalties to enforce the law so that the citizens in any part of the state can effectually close up and put a stop to all traffic in intoxicating beverages of whatever name or nature, whether sold or given away in a saloon, hotel, club room, drug store, private house, or any other place or in any manner.

Third, That however wise, judicious, and stringent prohibitory laws our General Assembly may pass (and pass such it unavoidably will) it still will remain as much the imperative duty of the friends of temperance to keep up their several organizations for the purpose of seeing that such laws shall be executed and enforced, as it was for them to create the public sentiment that brought these laws into being, and upon the practical carrying out of this purpose depends largely the success of the prohibition movement in our state.

Fourth, That we realize with unfeigned pleasure and satisfaction the unequivocal and manly stand taken by the governor of our state on the prohibition question, and that this convention does most gratefully appreciate the powerful aid rendered to the prohibition cause by the press of the state.

Fifth, That we heartily endorse the action of our state Senator Logan in regard to memorializing Congress to refuse to issue permits to sell intoxicating liquors to individuals in any state unless such individuals first obtain permits from such states.

Sixth, That the Executive Committee of the State Temperance Alliance be requested to fix a ratio of representation, call, and provide for the organization of state conventions when, in their judgment, it is

deemed necessary for the furtherance of the temperance cause. And to this end we recommend that the several counties of the state organize under the auspices of the State Temperance Alliance.¹⁰

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, 1884, FIRST CONVENTION

The state convention to select delegates to the Democratic National Convention of 1884 met at Burlington on April 24, 1884. General J. H. Shields of Dubuque was temporary chairman and B. J. Hall of Burlington, permanent chairman. The following were selected as delegates to the National Convention:

At large—L. G. Kinne, Tama County; H. H. Trimble, Davis County; E. H. Thayer, Clinton County; D. M. Harris, Harrison County.

First District—George F. Smith, Van Buren County; John Walback, Henry County.

Second District—W. F. Brannan, Muscatine County; S. R. Wadleigh, Clinton County.

Third District—F. Schroeder, Dubuque County; P. C. Dithlefsen, Grundy County.

Fourth District—F. D. Bayless, Clayton County; A. O. Doolittle, Floyd County.

Fifth District—George J. Beal, Johnson County; John Ryder, Benton County.

Sixth District—L. B. Perry, Monroe County; E. H. Gibbs, Mahaska County.

Seventh District—L. W. Goode, Polk County; J. R. North, Dallas County.

Eighth District—J. H. Duggan, Union County; William Bradley, Appanoose County.

Ninth District—Dan Farrell, Mills County; J. M. Emmert, Cass County.

Tenth District—N. B. Hyatt, Hamilton County; John Cleggett, Cerro Gordo County.

Eleventh District—P. M. Guthrie, Carroll County; P. O. Cassidy, Palo Alto County.

Following are the resolutions adopted:

Resolved, That the Democracy of Iowa recognize the duty we owe to the Union soldiers of our late war. We favor the passage of the bill now pending before Congress to grant to them a warrant of 160 acres of land to be taken from the public domain.

Resolved, That we reaffirm the principles of the Democratic party as expressed in the platforms of the national conventions of 1876 and 1880.

¹⁰*Iowa State Register*, Des Moines, January 25, 1884. (In the newspaper collection of the Historical Department of Iowa.)

Resolved, That "in view of the late prohibitory legislation in this state we hereby emphasize the utterances of the platform of the National Democratic Convention of 1876. That we are in favor of the liberty of individual conduct unvexed by sumptuary laws."

Resolved, That the Democracy of Iowa reaffirm the resolution of our last state convention, in favor of a tariff for revenue, a gradual and persistent reduction of tariff duties.

Resolved, That in Samuel J. Tilden and his official record we recognize a man and platform combined, and one who represents more than any other Democrat the principles of the Democracy and whose name is a guarantee of victory.¹¹

Democratic State Central Committee, 1884:

L. G. Kinne, Tama County, Chairman.

Cato Sells, Black Hawk County, Secretary.

First District—George Rodman, Washington County.

Second District—G. L. Johnson, Jackson County.

Third District—Cato Sells, Black Hawk County.

Fourth District—T. C. Medary, Allamakee County.

Fifth District—D. H. Ogden, Linn County.

Sixth District—P. G. Ballingall, Wapello County.

Seventh District—E. T. Likes, Madison County.

Eighth District—Edward H. Hunter, Adams County.

Ninth District—Frank P. Bradley, Audubon County.

Tenth District—C. O. Bailey, Wright County.

Eleventh District—M. Miller, Carroll County.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, 1884, FIRST CONVENTION

The state convention to select delegates to the Republican National Convention of 1884 met at Foster's Opera House, Des Moines, April 30, 1884. M. M. Walden acted as temporary chairman, John A. Kasson was permanent chairman, and H. S. Fairall, secretary. Following are the delegates selected:

At large—J. S. Clarkson, Polk County; N. M. Hubbard, Linn County; John Y. Stone, Mills County; W. G. Donnan, Des Moines County.

First District—Dennis Morrison, Lee County; William Wilson, Jr., Washington County.

Second District—John Hilsinger, Jackson County; W. T. Shaw, Jones County.

Third District—H. C. Hemenway, Black Hawk County; W. H. Norris, Delaware County.

Fourth District—A. G. Stewart, Allamakee County; O. H. Lyon, Floyd County.

¹¹*The Daily Gazette*, Burlington, April 24, 1884. (In the newspaper collection of the Historical Department of Iowa.)

Fifth District—J. W. Willett, Tama County; Merritt Greene, Marshall County.

Sixth District—H. S. Winslow, Jasper County; Calvin Manning, Wapello County.

Seventh District—C. H. Gatch, Polk County; E. W. Weeks, Guthrie County.

Eighth District—W. H. Christy, Union County; W. W. Wilson, Clarke County.

Ninth District—E. A. Consigny, Pottawattamie County; T. M. C. Logan, Harrison County.

Tenth District—Charles T. Morris, Boone County; T. G. Alvord, Hardin County.

Eleventh District—A. B. Funk, Dickinson County; J. Ainsworth, Monona County.

Following are the resolutions adopted:

The Republican party reaffirms its former annunciation of principles, both state and national, and points with pride to its record showing that it has faithfully fulfilled every pledge given to the people.

We denounce as unwise and unpatriotic the present effort which the Democratic party in Congress declare to be only their first step to further derange trade and oppress American industry by an indiscriminate reduction of duty on foreign products and manufactures which compete with our own. Their threatened persistence in this policy, if successful, will make the United States a mere tributary to England; will destroy that domestic competition which must surely keep down prices; will rob our American laborers of their fair wages of labor; will diminish the market at home for the products of our agriculture, without enlarging it abroad; will stop the developments of our natural resources and stimulate that of foreign countries; will exhaust the wealth of one section to enrich Great Britain, where they would send us for our supplies, and will finally result in the same widespread bankruptcy and ruin which the same policy produced in 1837.

In the common interest of all our industries, of all our laborers, and of our natural prosperity, we call upon Congress to halt in this destructive work.

We demand of Congress that immediate provision be made for the reconstruction of a navy adequate to the protection of both native and naturalized citizens abroad, and of our commercial rights on the high seas, for the defense of our harbors, and for the support of our rank among the nations of the earth. A nation that cannot strike will be struck, and we want no parsimony at the expense of our honor.

That we recognize and cordially endorse the efforts of our distinguished senator, James F. Wilson, in his efforts to introduce measures relative to the regulation of interstate commerce. We urge upon Congress the necessity of speedily adopting such measures as will insure to

the producer the largest possible fruit of his labor, equitably harmonizing all conflicting interests, and settle the various questions relative to common carriers.

As the debt of gratitude due to the soldiers and sailors can never be fully paid by the nation, we demand pensions or bounty lands for all who were honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the late war.

We congratulate the country and the Republican party on the wise, honest, and patriotic administration of President Arthur, who has justly merited the confidence and respect of the country.

Resolved, That the Honorable James G. Blaine is the choice of the Republicans of Iowa for president, and while thus expressing our preference, we pledge the state by its old time majority for the nominee of the Republican National Convention.¹²

Republican State Central Committee, 1884:

William P. Wolf, Cedar County, Chairman.

First District—C. M. Junkin, Jefferson County.

Second District—W. P. Wolf, Cedar County.

Third District—E. C. Perkins, Delaware County.

Fourth District—E. S. Fonda, Mitchell County.

Fifth District—Charles Waer, Linn County.

Sixth District—W. H. Needham, Keokuk County.

Seventh District—E. L. Baker, Warren County.

Eighth District—M. F. Stookey, Decatur County.

Ninth District—W. Waddell, Cass County.

Tenth District—John R. Hays, Story County.

Eleventh District—T. B. Hotchkiss, Calhoun County.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, 1884, SECOND CONVENTION

The Republican State Convention to nominate a state ticket met in the Grand Opera House at Des Moines on August 20, 1884. J. P. Dolliver was temporary chairman and thus was introduced to a state-wide audience, and delivered the speech that started him on his national career as a political orator. Sam M. Clark of Keokuk was permanent chairman and J. Fred Meyers, secretary. General William T. Sherman was a visitor in the city and addressed the convention. The following ticket was nominated:

Secretary of State, Frank D. Jackson, Butler County.

Auditor of State, John L. Brown, Lucas County.

Treasurer of State, Voltair P. Twombly, Van Buren County.

Attorney-General, Andrew J. Baker, Appanoose County.

¹²*Iowa State Register*, Des Moines, May 1, 1884. (In the newspaper collection of the Historical Department of Iowa.)

Judge of Supreme Court, James H. Rothrock, Cedar County.

The following resolutions were adopted:

The Republicans of Iowa hereby affirm the full platform of the national Republican party as adopted at Chicago in June last, and that with reference to state issues the Republican party of Iowa reaffirms the platform adopted at the state convention of 1883, declaring furthermore their respect for law and their demand for allegiance to law; and that they also heartily support the declarations as set forth in the letters of acceptance of James G. Blaine, the nominee for president, and of John A. Logan, the nominee for vice-president.

Whereas, Congress provided for the establishment of a soldiers' home to be located west of the Mississippi River, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention urge upon the commissioners appointed to locate the said home the claims of the state of Iowa for such location.

Resolved, That a committee of one from each congressional district be appointed by this convention to take such action as may be deemed advisable to secure the location of said soldiers' home in the state of Iowa.

Resolved, That our national senators and representatives be requested to use their efforts and influence to secure the location of this branch of the home in the state of Iowa.¹³

THE NATIONAL (GREENBACK) PARTY, 1884

The National (Greenback) State Convention met at Des Moines on August 28, 1884. Sanford Kirkpatrick was chairman and J. R. Sovereign, secretary. Sixty-five counties were represented. They nominated one half of an electoral ticket and one half of a state ticket. Following are the candidates they nominated on the state ticket:

Secretary of State, James Dooley, Keokuk County.

Treasurer of State, George Deer, Union County.

Following is the platform adopted:

The National party of Iowa in convention assembled this 28th day of August, 1884, declare:

Once more the financial system of the United States, to which we have so often called attention, and which for so many years we have struggled to reform, has broken down, betrayed the people, precipitated panic, failures, loss of labor, reduction of wages, lockouts, foreclosures and sheriffs' sales, inflicting more misery than did the devastation of a cyclone.

In the midst of abundant harvests, with the blessings of a beneficent

¹³*Iowa State Register*, Des Moines, August 21, 1884. (In the newspaper collection of the Historical Department of Iowa.)

providence scattered all about us, we are suffering a money panic which chokes our industries much as if the railroads should burn their freight cars.

In this emergency the dominant parties mock the people by declaring in favor of continuing a system that has through usury, contractions, and panics already enabled about three per cent of our people to absorb one half the wealth of our lands; created an aristocracy of idlers more powerful than any similar class in any other country, and threatens if not overthrown, to destroy all independence among the producing classes.

In this emergency the dominant party locks up hundreds of millions of dollars in the United States Treasury, refusing to redeem more bonds with it and relieve the pressure.

The national banks enjoy the right of calling upon the United States treasurer for bank money, which costs them only one per cent, and with which they could speedily supply the demands of business; they not only fail to do so, but have actually contracted their currency \$18,000,000 in the last six months. Thus the usurers, the mortgage owners, and bond holders triumph. The people are at their mercy. They can obtain our crops at their own price, and keep our sheriffs busy selling our farms. Shall we submit forever, or will the people of Iowa rise in their might and help elect candidates for Congress who will maintain the rights of our people, and supply the country with money enough to transact business upon a cash basis and forever banish panics?

As if to complicate our difficulties, by a recent pool of railroads, freights on our products have been doubled.

While holding the same views which we have so often declared, and endorsing our national platform and the excellent letter of our candidate, yet we insist that the paramount issue is the overthrow of banks of issue, and an adequate circulating medium that shall enable us to build up our great country, without the certainty that panics will throw everything into the insatiate hands of the money loaners.

We have nominated a candidate for president in sympathy with the toiling millions upon this and all other issues. A man whose record as a soldier and statesman places him side by side with Washington and other heroes of the past. A man who rushed to the rescue when our Capital was in danger. A man who is universally acknowledged to be the greatest executive in America. A man whose charity and brotherly sympathies rank him with the lamented Cooper, our first standard bearer. A man who should be, and we believe is, the most popular man in America, and fully abreast of the most advanced reforms. A man who has the courage of his convictions and has nothing in his record to hide.

We believe the people only desire an opportunity to elect General Butler, and therefore ally ourselves in various states with each of the old parties with a purpose not of aiding them but of receiving enough

electoral votes to make a combination in the Electoral College in his favor.

We believe alliance in this holy struggle for freedom is as justifiable as was the alliance between our fathers and France in order to overthrow British tyranny.

We have placed upon our ticket one of the noblest sons of the South as a candidate for vice-president, in order to heal the wounds of war and perfect our union of states.

We now appeal to the people of this state to rise in their independence, shake off party ties and help us secure six electoral votes in Iowa and elect the great candidate whom monopolists fear more than any other man in America. Now is your golden opportunity. Now is your day of salvation.¹⁴

National (Greenback) State Central Committee, 1884:

L. H. Weller, Chickasaw County, Chairman.

W. H. Shaw, Secretary.

First District—J. M. Holland, Henry County.

Second District—

Third District—M. S. Hitchcock, Buchanan County.

Fourth District—L. H. Weller, Chickasaw County.

Fifth District—L. S. Wood, Linn County.

Sixth District—J. A. Ramsey, Monroe County.

Seventh District—J. Bellangee, Polk County.

Eighth District—J. L. Brown, Taylor County.

Ninth District—W. H. Sanders, Cass County.

Tenth District—F. Q. Lee, Hamilton County.

Eleventh District—J. R. Sovereign, Greene County.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, 1884, SECOND CONVENTION

The Democratic State Convention met at Davenport on September 3, 1884. Fred W. Lehmann of Des Moines was temporary chairman, J. F. Duncombe of Fort Dodge, permanent chairman, and A. B. Keith of Crawford County, secretary. Following is the ticket nominated:

Secretary of State, James Dooley, Keokuk County.

Treasurer of State, George Derr, Union County.

Auditor of State, J. E. Henriques, Marshall County.

Attorney-General, M. V. Gannon, Scott County.

Judge of Supreme Court, E. L. Burton, Wapello County.

Following is the platform adopted:

Resolved, That the Democratic party of Iowa in convention assembled fully endorses the principles laid down in the national Democratic

¹⁴*Iowa State Register*, Des Moines, August 29, 1884. (In the newspaper collection of the Historical Department of Iowa.)

platform this year adopted at Chicago, and cordially approves the sentiments contained in Governor Cleveland's letter of acceptance and, in the language of said letter, we express our conviction that "laws unnecessarily interfering with the habits and customs of any class of our people which are not offensive to them or the moral sentiment of the civilized world, and which are consistent with good citizenship and public welfare, are unwise and vexatious." Therefore we pledge ourselves to use all honorable and legal means to secure the speedy repeal of laws in conflict therewith.¹⁵

¹⁵*The Daily Gazette*, Burlington, September 4, 1884. (In the newspaper collection of the Historical Department of Iowa.)

(To be continued)

NORTHERN IOWA IN 1845

In Niles's *National Register* under date of October 18, 1845, (copy in Iowa State Library) is published an interesting letter from A. Whitney, a projector of the so-called Oregon Railroad. He had made a preliminary trip across northern Iowa, which was not then surveyed or carefully mapped, and wrote an interesting letter descriptive of this trip, of which the following is a portion:

St. Louis, Sept. 22, 1845.

Hon. James B. Bowlin:—

Dear Sir—As your city and state are deeply interested in the project which I have brought before the public, and believing that yourself and others may desire to have some particulars of my exploration, with my present views relative to the project, induces this communication which, if meeting your approbation, be pleased to transfer to the public, through the press of your city.

We left Milwaukee June 19, 1845, passed in a northerly direction to near Fond du Lac; thence, westerly to Fox Lake, thence to Fort Winnebago, thence down the south bank of the Wisconsin to Prairie du Chien, crossing the Wisconsin a few miles above Prairie du Chien. At Prairie du Chien I expected a guide, and again, at Fort Atkinson, fifty miles west of the Mississippi, but was disappointed. Without a guide and with but one laboring man, I felt a heavy responsibility and no small reluctance in leading the young gentlemen with me into probable danger and severe hardships and fatigue; but they, to a man, said "Go on, we will follow you, we cannot turn back." And they have fully redeemed their pledge, having gone through many hardships, much fatigue, hard labor, hunger, and thirst. I cannot say too much for them, nor can too much praise be awarded for their conduct. Unused to any labor, I feared it would be hard upon them, but they never flinched; were ready

Copyright of Annals of Iowa is the property of State of Iowa, by & through the State Historical Society of Iowa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.