

NOTES

Introduction

1. Richard Rovere, *Senator Joe McCarthy* (New York: Meridian Books, 1960), pp. 5–6.
2. Cf., for example, Thomas A. Bailey, “The West and Radical Legislation 1890–1930,” *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 38 (January 1933), pp. 603–611; Edgar Eugene Robinson, “Recent Manifestations of Sectionalism,” *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 19 (January 1914), pp. 446–467.
3. Cf. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955); Seymour Martin Lipset, *Political Man* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1960); Edward Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956); Peter Viereck, *The Unadjusted Man* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1956); William Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959); Daniel Bell, *The End of Ideology* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959); Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955). *The New American Right* contains essays by Bell, Hofstadter, Lipset, Viereck, Talcott Parsons, David Riesman, and Nathan Glazer. It has been republished with some new material as Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963). Cf. also Will Herberg, “Government by Rabble-Rousing,” *The New Leader*, Vol. 37 (January 18, 1954), pp. 13–16; Oscar Handlin, “American Views of the Jews at the Opening of the Twentieth Century,” *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, Vol. 40 (June 1951), pp. 323–344; Edward Shils, “Authoritarianism: Right and Left,” in Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda (eds.), *Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1954).
4. David Riesman and Nathan Glazer, “The Intellectuals and the Discontented Classes,” Daniel Bell, “Interpretations of American Politics,” and Peter Viereck, “The Revolt Against the Elite,” in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 68,

27, and 95; Peter Viereck, *The Unadjusted Man*, *op. cit.*, p. 201; Seymour Martin Lipset, *Political Man*, *op. cit.*, p. 168; and Edward Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 98–99.

Chapter One

1. Many pluralists published books in the late 1940's sharply at variance with their views of a few years later. Hofstadter, for example, ended his introduction to *The American Political Tradition* (New York: Knopf, 1948) by defending himself against "pietistic biographers" of our national heroes. "A democratic society, in any case," he wrote (p. xi), "can more safely be overcritical than overindulgent in its attitude toward public leadership." Seven years later, Hofstadter focused on the dangerous American tendency to be suspicious of power and overcritical of political leadership. Similarly, Lipset's first book, *Agrarian Socialism* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1950), like Philip Selznick's first book, *TVA and the Grass Roots* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1949), is not concerned with the threat to stability posed by mass movements. Lipset and Selznick rather focus on the power that narrow groups have to erode the influence of mass movements and prevent the realization of broad goals.
2. Compare Hofstadter's treatment of Bryan in *The American Political Tradition*, *op. cit.*, pp. 186–205, with his analysis of Populism seven years later.
3. Edward Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956), pp. 38–41, 46, 98–108, 169–184; William Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959), pp. 59–60, 102–103, 131–134.
4. Others not concerned with McCarthyism and agrarian radicalism have also called themselves pluralists. Most notable are those political scientists whose pluralism derives primarily from their attention to local politics. Although their pluralism has some points of contact with the doctrine developed here, they are not the main focus of attention: Cf. Robert Dahl, *Who Governs* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961); Nelson Polsby, "How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 22 (August 1960); Edward Banfield, *Political Influence* (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961); James Q. Wilson, *The Amateur Democrat* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).
5. For a list of pluralist writings, see the Introduction, note 3. Cf. also Gabriel Almond, "Comparative Political Systems," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 18 (August 1956), pp. 391–409; Emil Lederer, *The State of the Masses* (New York: Norton, 1940). Let me stress that the pluralist writers have a variety of different emphases. Shils, for example, is relatively less interested in groups

and more interested in broad traditions. Lipset has a Marxist heritage and retains an interest in class analysis. Viereck, although his objections to mass movements are pluralist, relies for an alternative not on groups but on a substantively conservative and elitist tradition.

6. I would be the last to deny that modern pluralists value liberty. Their very concern with stability is to safeguard individual freedom. But their interest in the freedom of the nongroup member and in the problem of freedom within the group is minimal. Because the pluralists are so quick to see dangers to stability, their concern for liberty in practice can become secondary. Thus for the authors of *The New American Right*, the great danger of McCarthyism was its attack on social stability. The damage done to innocent individuals received much less notice.
7. José Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses* (New York: New American Library, Mentor Book).
8. Cf. Edward Shils, "Daydreams and Nightmares: Reflections on the Criticism of Mass Culture," *The Sewanee Review*, Vol. 54 (1957), pp. 587–608; Daniel Bell, "The Theory of the Mass Society," *Commentary*, Vol. 22 (July 1956), pp. 75–83.
9. José Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses*, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
10. Ortega, *ibid.* (p. 84) wrote, "America is the paradise of the masses." On the relation between the two theories of mass society, cf. William Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society*, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–37. For pluralist defenses of industrialization, cf. William Kornhauser, *ibid.*, p. 231; S. M. Lipset, *Political Man* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1960), pp. 45–76; and Daniel Bell, *The End of Ideology* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959), pp. 372–375. An excellent discussion of the relation between pluralism and industrialization is Ludwig Mahler, "Ideology and History in America," *New Politics*, Vol. 1 (Fall 1961). Many pluralists are friendly to Britain because of its preindustrial (aristocratic) elements. But they tend to believe that increased industrialization will dissolve the problems exacerbated on the continent by the early stages of industrialization. They believe that, in the protection of constitutional stability, mature industrialism is the functional equivalent of the British aristocratic tradition.
11. I have selected from Weber's total view those aspects most congenial to pluralism. Weber himself was by no means completely happy about the demystification of the world. See, for example, "Politics as a Vocation," in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Galaxy Books, 1958).
12. Cf. Joseph Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1952).

13. Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1947). See especially, "The Anomic Division of Labor," pp. 343–373.
14. David B. Truman, *The Governmental Process* (New York: Knopf, 1951). Adam Smith's political views are far more complex than the brief references in the text imply.
15. William Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society*, *op. cit.*, pp. 43–49.
16. Daniel Bell, "Interpretations of American Politics," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), pp. 25–28.
17. S. M. Lipset, "The Sources of the Radical Right," and Richard Hofstadter, "The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 168 and pp. 43–45.
18. T. W. Adorno *et al.*, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper, 1950).
19. S. M. Lipset, *Political Man* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1960), pp. 97–130. Lipset does recognize the importance of nonpsychological variables (see later). Note also Bell's friendly treatment of psychological explanations of Soviet behavior in *End of Ideology*, *op. cit.*, pp. 310–320. In *The Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955), pp. 23–93, Richard Hofstadter analyzes farmer psychology to explain the meaning of Populist political activity. In all three cases, the influence of social conditions is crucially mediated through psychological malformations.
20. Edward Shils, "Authoritarianism: Right and Left," in Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda (eds.), *Studies in the Scope and Method of Authoritarian Personality* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1954), pp. 43–45.
21. Richard Hofstadter, *Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955), pp. 137, 144–153, 215–216; David Riesman and Nathan Glazer, "The Intellectuals and the Discontented Classes," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 58–63. For a pluralist critique of policy made out of the jumble of special interests, cf. Daniel Bell, "The Three Faces of New York," in *Dissent*, Vol. 8 (Spring 1961), pp. 230–232.
22. Cf. Richard Hofstadter, "The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt" and Talcott Parsons, "Social Strains in America" in *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 53 and p. 139; Edward Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956), pp. 48–49.
23. William Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society*, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 43–44.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 48–49.
26. Emil Lederer, *The State of the Masses*, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–31.
27. Cf. Bernard R. Berelson *et al.*, *Voting* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 19–20, 27, 129–132, 283–285; Angus

- Campbell, *The Voter Decides* (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1954), pp. 130–132, 157–164, 202–203.
28. Angus Campbell, *ibid.*, pp. 130–132, 157–164, 202–203.
 29. Stanley Rothman, "Systematic Political Theory: Observations on the Group Approach," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 54 (March 1960), p. 22.
 30. Robert Michels, *Political Parties* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949 [First published 1915]).
 31. The influence of the study by Samuel Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1955) has been crucial. It should be noted, however, that Lipset and Glazer have written a critique of this study. They point out that many factors intervene between the expression of an attitude and its translation into action. Cf. Nathan Glazer and S. M. Lipset, "The Polls on Communism and Conformity," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*
 32. For example, cf. S. M. Lipset, "The Political Process in Trade Unions: A Theoretical Statement," in Walter Galenson and S. M. Lipset (eds.), *Labor and Trade Unionism* (New York: Wiley, 1960), pp. 238–239; S. M. Lipset, *New Politics*, Vol. 2 (Fall 1962), pp. 148–149.
Union Democracy, by Lipset, Martin Trow, and James Coleman, applies pluralist analysis to the internal structure of a voluntary association and defends a stable system of elite competition (democracy) within the International Typographical Union. But the authors conclude that the factors producing democracy within the I.T.U. are not duplicated in most other voluntary associations, that complex unions could not survive and be effective without an oligarchy controlling membership conflicts, and that the members would abridge minority rights more than the leadership. Cf. Seymour Martin Lipset, Martin Trow, and James Coleman, *Union Democracy* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1962), pp. 15, 89–90, 338–339, 346–347.
 33. Stanley Rothman, *loc. cit.*; Joseph R. Gusfield, "Mass Society and Extremist Politics," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 27 (February 1962), p. 29.
 34. Hofstadter, *Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, pp. 10–21, 303–324, especially pp. 315–316.
 35. Writing in 1963, Bell noted that McCarthyism had not been an organized movement but an "atmosphere of fear." From the pluralist point of view, if McCarthyism was not a mass movement it nevertheless generated mass appeals. Cf. Daniel Bell, "The Dispossessed," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963), p. 4.
 36. Cf. C. Vann Woodward, "The Populist Heritage and the Intellectual," *American Scholar*, Vol. 29 (Winter 1959), p. 61.
 37. Daniel Bell, "The Dispossessed," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 2–3, 22.

38. In addition to the works cited in note 3 of the "Introduction," cf. Angus Campbell *et al.*, *The American Voter* (New York: Wiley, 1960), pp. 425–440; Leslie A. Fiedler, "McCarthy," *Encounter*, Vol. 3 (August 1954), pp. 10–21; Victor C. Ferkiss, "The Populist Influences on American Fascism," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 10 (June 1957), pp. 350–373; Victor C. Ferkiss, "Populism: Myth, Reality, Current Danger," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (September 1961), pp. 737–740.
39. In a limited sense, this interpretation can be used to relate agrarian radicalism to McCarthy's strength among urban workers. This support showed up in nationwide survey data and in Trow's study of support for McCarthy in Bennington, Vermont. Workers are not farmers, but their support for McCarthy could have been analogous to rural support for agrarian radicalism. Trow suggested that pro-McCarthy workers, motivated by status envy, found sustenance in McCarthy's attack on prestigious persons and institutions. At the bottom of the industrial hierarchy, many workers resented the whole structure. This is an urban form of "status politics," of which agrarian radicalism could be a rural counterpart. Cf. Martin A. Trow, "Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of Support for McCarthy in a New England Town," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, 1957, p. 212.
40. S. M. Lipset, *Political Man*, *op. cit.*, pp. 131–133.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
42. Martin Trow, pp. 23–29. Trow summarizes his important findings in "Small Business, Political Tolerance, and Support for McCarthy," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 44 (November 1958), pp. 270–281. Lipset used Trow's data alone to justify his assertion that opinion surveys supported the fact "that McCarthy appealed to the same social groups as did 'left-wing' populism." Lipset, *Political Man*, *op. cit.*, pp. 168–169. However, more recent data reported by Lipset for a nationwide sample found no association between "nineteenth century liberalism" and support for McCarthy. The data did provide further evidence of small business support for the Wisconsin senator. Cf., Seymour Martin Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, and Birchers," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 333–336, 340–341.
43. See the works cited in note 38 of this chapter and note 3 of the "Introduction."

Chapter Two

1. Cf. David E. Apter, "The Role of Traditionalism in the Political Modernization of Ghana and Uganda," *World Politics*, Vol. 13 (October 1960), pp. 45–68.

2. Here should be noted the pervasive influence of Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Genius of American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953). Starting from Boorstin's analysis of the pragmatic character of the American consensus, one can either interpret the reform movements as ideological exceptions or absorb them into American politics alongside the various interest groups.
3. Cf. Talcott Parsons, *Structure and Process in Modern Societies* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960), pp. 173–174; Seymour Martin Lipset, "A Changing American Character," in Seymour Martin Lipset and Leo Lowenthal (eds.), *Culture and Social Character* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1961). Lipset quotes Hofstadter in support of his point of view, p. 161.
4. Cf. Norman Pollack, "Hofstadter on Populism: A Critique of the Age of Reform," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 26 (November 1960).
5. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Vol. 1 (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), p. 266.
6. Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1955).
7. A politics of narrow self-interest is certainly possible without a consensus and can even flourish in the absence of one. The politics of *interesse* in southern Italy is a good example. But a society with such politics cannot begin to solve its problems and is only kept from entirely flying apart by externally imposed force. Cf. Edward Banfield, *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958). Again in France, the politics of narrow favors (*incivisme*) is only the other side of the coin of fundamental social conflict. Since politics cannot solve problems, individuals seek only narrow favors from the state. American politics is distinguished from French not by its pragmatism but by the agreement on ends which makes that pragmatism workable.
8. Take the following example: I have been suggesting that the politics of American reform came out of the same American consensus that produced the economic actions of capitalists. It is currently fashionable to stress the guilt-ridden character of reformers as evidence that they were not concerned with reform but with expiation of their guilt. But guilt and concern with results are not mutually exclusive. Capitalists, too, were motivated by guilt. As their spokesman Elbert Hubbard put it, "Life without industry is guilt." But capitalist guilt meant a frenetic concern with results. One should not assume that, in the shift to politics, concern with results disappeared. The important question is not so much whether reformers were guilt-ridden as what changes were required to assuage their guilt.
9. Cf. Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Scribner's, 1958), p. 105.
10. Cf. Sven Ranulf, *Moral Indignation and Middle Class Psychol-*

- ogy (Copenhagen: Levin and Munkegaard, 1938), pp. 60–95. There is limited survey evidence supporting the authoritarianism of those with a commitment to puritan ideology. Gwynn Nettler reasoned that the belief in individual responsibility for actions was a Puritan notion that indicated punitive attitudes. On a questionnaire administered to social workers, belief in individual responsibility was related to the measures of authoritarianism utilized in *The Authoritarian Personality* and related studies. Cf. Gwynn Nettler, "Cruelty, Dignity, and Determinism," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 24 (June 1959), pp. 375–384. The special nature of the population sampled may, however, vitiate the significance of this finding.
11. In the *Second Treatise*, Locke seems to justify private property by the fact that great inequality will not exist, since no one is entitled to more than he can use before it spoils. But a few pages later, by the characteristically Lockean democratic myth of tacit consent, he introduces the use of money. This destroys his own limit on wealth. Cf. John Locke, *Of Civil Government* (New York: Dutton, Everyman's Library), pp. 131, 139–140.
 12. Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson* (New York: Henry Holt, 1948), pp. 43, 139.
 13. C. Wright Mills makes a similar point, namely that the freedom and rationality which had been united in eighteenth and nineteenth century thought split apart under the impact of a bureaucratic society. Rationality became located in large institutions, from where it challenged both the freedom and the rationality of the individual. Cf. C. Wright Mills, *White Collar* (New York: Oxford, 1956), p. xvii.
 14. Cf. Joseph A. Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (New York: Harper, 1950), pp. 81–106.
 15. Antiauthoritarian attitudes on survey questionnaires always express the optimistic side of the equation. Often, indeed, the optimism is unwarranted (Does the average man really have a lot to say about what goes on in Washington?). But it is nevertheless antiauthoritarian. The Stouffer study is instructive here. The greater the fear of an internal Communist threat, the lower the political tolerance. Cf. Samuel A. Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1955), pp. 188–210. For a discussion of the consequences of "realistic" attitudes, considering the character of the American consensus, see Chapter 9.
 16. Cf. Marvin Meyers, *The Jacksonian Persuasion* (New York: Vintage Books, 1960); David W. Noble, *The Paradox of Progressive Thought* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1958).
 17. Cf. Sidney Fine, *Laissez-Faire and the General Welfare State* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1956); Robert Green McCloskey, *American Conservatism in an Age*

of *Enterprise* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951); Benjamin R. Twiss, *Lawyers and the Constitution* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1942); Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).

18. On the latter question, cf. Reinhard Bendix, *Work and Authority in Industry* (New York: Wiley, 1956), pp. 254–340.
19. On this last point, Adams, for example, wrote, “There is no special providence for Americans, and their nature is the same with that of others.” Cf. *Works of John Adams* (Boston: Little, Brown, 6 vols., 1851–1865), Vol. 4, p. 401. Indeed, it is instructive to compare Adams on this point with Jefferson. Later in the *Defense* (at p. 487), Adams continued, “In the present state of society and manners in America, with a people living chiefly by agriculture, in small numbers, sprinkled over large tracts of land, they are not subject to those panics and transports, those contagions of madness and folly, which are seen in countries where large numbers live in small places in daily fear of perishing for want. We know, therefore, that the people can live and increase under almost any kind of government, or without any government at all. But it is of great importance to begin well; misarrangements now made will have great, extensive, and distant consequences; and we are now employed, how little so ever we may think it, in making establishments which will affect the happiness of a hundred millions of inhabitants at a time in a period not very distant.”

For Adams, Americans must create a government that would have to work when America became like Europe. In letters to Madison and Adams twenty-five years apart, Jefferson expressed a consistently different view. Indeed, in the second letter he looked forward to a time when Europe, becoming like America, could enjoy the advantages of our uniquely American form of government: “Educate and inform the whole mass of the people . . . they are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty. . . . This reliance cannot deceive us, as long as we remain virtuous; and I think we shall be so, as long as agriculture is our principal object, which will be the case, while there remain vacant lands in any part of America. When we get piled together upon one another in large cities, as in Europe, we shall become corrupt as in Europe, and go to eating one another as they do there.” And again: “Before the establishment of the American states, nothing was known to history but the men of the old world crowded within limits either small or overcharged, and steeped in the vices which that situation generates. A government adapted to such men would be one thing; but a very different one, that for the man of these states. . . . Everyone by his property, or by his satisfactory situation, is interested in the support of law and order. And such men may

safely and advantageously reserve to themselves a wholesome control over their public affairs, and a degree of freedom, which, in the hands of the *canaille* of the cities of Europe, would be instantly perverted to the demolition and destruction of everything public and private. . . . But even in Europe a change has sensibly taken place in the mind of man." (Cf. *The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Adrienne Koch and William Pedan (eds.) (New York: Random House, 1944), pp. 440–441, 633.)

The view of the Federalists adopted here follows Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America*, *op. cit.*, pp. 70–86. For confirmation from Adams' writings of the specific points made, cf. *Works of John Adams*, *op. cit.*, "A Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law," Vol. 3, pp. 449, 450–451, 454, 463–464; "Thoughts on Government," Vol. 4, pp. 193–196; "The Report of a Constitution or Form of Government for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts," Vol. 4, pp. 219–225; "A Defense . . .," Vol. 4, pp. 283–286, 292–293, 297–298, Vol. 6, pp. 50–62, 218; "Discourses on Davila," Vol. 6, pp. 232–237; "Letters to John Taylor," Vol. 6, pp. 457–458.

20. The natural harmony Jefferson saw in society and the artificial harmony Madison thought to create through politics are not very different. For the European analogue cf. Elie Halevy, *The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), pp. 15–19.
21. On Adams and lions, cf. *Works of John Adams*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 287. Consider also Madison's famous refusal, in *Federalist No. 10*, to assign to every citizen "the same opinions, the same passions and the same interests." Since Madison believed the causes of faction were inevitable, he relied on size and diversity to mitigate its effects. In fact, Americans had more homogeneous opinions, passions, and interests than he realized. Had Madison not ignored the Lockean consensus and exaggerated the majoritarian threat to property rights, his solution to the problem of faction would have been precarious indeed. In perceiving the unique character of America, Jefferson the idealist was more realistic than Madison (see note 19 of this chapter).
22. Cf. Seymour Martin Lipset and Paul Seabury, "The Lesson of Berkeley" and Nathan Glazer, "What Happened at Berkeley," in Seymour Martin Lipset and Sheldon S. Wolin (eds.), *The Berkeley Student Revolt* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor, 1965), pp. 285–303 and 340–349; James F. Petras and Michael Shute, "Berkeley '65," *Partisan Review*, Vol. 32 (Spring 1965), pp. 314–323.
23. Particularly interesting sources here are Marvin Meyers, *The Jacksonian Persuasion* (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), pp.

- 234–275; and Stanley Elkins, *Slavery* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959).
24. America does have a patrician-in-politics tradition, but the patricians have had to couch their political appeal in democratic terms. Moreover, at the turn of the century the big business elite was not yet sufficiently established to produce its own patricians. One need only compare Nelson Rockefeller with John, Henry Ford II with Henry Ford I, and the Carnegie foundation with Andrew Carnegie. Influential Republican patri- cians at the turn of the century tended, like Henry Cabot Lodge, to be similar to other conservative Republicans — or else they were themselves progressives.
 25. Cf. Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America*, *op. cit.*, pp. 89–113.
 26. Lee Benson, *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 10. Cf. in addition pp. 11–54, 86–106, and Louis Hartz, *Economic Policy and Democratic Thought: Pennsylvania, 1776–1860* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948).
 27. Andrew Carnegie, *Triumphant Democracy* (New York: Scrib- ner's, 1887), pp. 5–6.
 28. Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America*, *op. cit.*, pp. 203– 227. The whole treatment of conservatism here owes much to Hartz.
 29. Philip Selznick, *T.V.A. and the Grass Roots* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1949).
 30. When one notes the brilliant use conservatives have made of an apparently democratic rhetoric, it is most difficult to argue that these “leftist values” have placed American conservatives on the defensive. The ideology of democratic capitalism has been at least as friendly to conservative as to liberal ends. But cf. Sey- mour Martin Lipset, *Political Man* (Garden City, N.Y.: Double- day Anchor, 1963), pp. xxi, xxv.
 31. Cf. Lee Benson, *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy*, *op. cit.*; Louis Hartz, *Economic Policy and Democratic Thought*, *op. cit.*, p. 309 and *passim*.
 32. Cf. Sidney Fine, *Laissez-Faire and the General Welfare State*, *op. cit.*, pp. 3–29, 96–125; Louis Hartz, *Economic Policy and Democratic Thought*, *op. cit.*, pp. 3–33, 289–320.
 33. B. R. Twiss, *Lawyers and the Constitution*, *op. cit.*, p. 158.
 34. There is no intent to accuse all conservatives of failing to appre- ciate the importance of shared power. But the tenor of the ideology is not as moderate as might first appear.
 35. B. R. Twiss, *Lawyers and the Constitution*, *op. cit.*, p. 114.
 36. *Ibid.*, pp. 197–198. Note that lawyers have often been referred to since de Tocqueville as the aristocracy of America. Moreover, modern critiques of Populism emphasize antagonism to lawyers as a revealingly irrational aspect of Populist ideology.

37. *Hammer v. Dagenhard*; 247 U.S. 251.
38. Andrew Carnegie, *Triumphant Democracy*, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
39. This has often been noted. For an excellent analysis of the industrializing ideology of Britain, cf. Reinhard Bendix, *Work and Authority in Industry*, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–116.
40. Andrew Carnegie, *Triumphant Democracy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 281–282.
41. William G. Cornwall, *Free Coinage from the Businessman's Standpoint* (Buffalo, N.Y.: Matthews-Northrup Co., 1891), pp. 7–8.
42. Henry Cabot Lodge, "The Meaning of the Votes," *North American Review*, Vol. 164 (January 1897), p. 2. Fear of the anarchist "conspiracy" dominated conservative thinking. Recall conservative reaction to the trial of the Haymarket anarchists and also the attitude toward the Pullman boycott and other labor union activity.
43. Walter R. Nugent, "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888–1900" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Chicago, 1961), p. 37n (now published as *The Tolerant Populists* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963]). For further evidence of anti-Populist conservative hysteria, cf. Norman Pollack, *The Populist Response to Industrial America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), pp. 129 ff.
44. Robert L. Morlan, *Political Prairie Fire* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1955), pp. 61, 68, 103.
45. *The Authoritarian Personality*, quoted by Richard Hofstadter, "The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), p. 35.

Chapter Three

1. Peter Viereck, "The Revolt Against the Elite," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), pp. 93–95, 112.
2. Cf. Leon D. Epstein, *Politics in Wisconsin* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958), Chapter 1.
3. The seminal works here are Samuel Lubell, *The Future of American Politics* (New York: Harper, 1952), pp. 129–157; V. O. Key, Jr., and Frank Munger, "Social Determinism and Electoral Decision, The Case of Indiana," in Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck (eds.), *American Voting Behavior* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955).
4. A factor analysis was also carried out for a table of correlation coefficients of North Dakota elections from 1889 to 1928. This method is explained in Chapter 4 and Appendix B.
5. State Representative Hall and the remnants of Populist leadership in northern Wisconsin were closely associated with La Follette after 1900. Cf. Robert S. Maxwell, *La Follette and the*

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

- Rise of the Progressives in Wisconsin* (Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1956), p. 58.
6. Donald R. McCoy, "The Development and Dissolution of the Wisconsin Progressive Party of 1934–1946" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1949), p. 19.
 7. In this period, the progressive vote correlated only .22 with the percentage rural-farm, as the economics of sectional politics overcame rural-urban divisions in the state as a whole.
 8. The major exception is 1926, when progressive Blaine attracted German support with a probeer platform.
 9. Harold F. Gosnell, *Grass Roots Politics* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1942), pp. 55–56.
 10. Nevertheless, one should not ignore working-class support for progressivism before the depression both in Wisconsin and other states. As early as 1920 Wisconsin progressive Blaine ran best in farm villages and working-class wards, although the German factor may explain the working-class vote. In Minnesota, Farmer-Labor candidate Shipstead got farm and labor support in 1920 and his major opposition came from the small towns. In the years after 1920, the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party was strongest in the cities. Finally, workers in Iowa supported insurgent Smith Brookhart in 1920. Cf. Stuart A. Rice, *Farmers and Workers in American Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1924), pp. 153–163; Murray S. Stedman and Susan W. Stedman, *Discontent at the Polls* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), p. 138; Jerry Alvin Neprash, *The Brookhart Campaigns in Iowa, 1920–26* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), pp. 76–78.
 11. Samuel Lubell, *The Future of American Politics* (New York: Harper, 1952), pp. 144–145.
 12. The 1942 Progressive vote for governor was a deviant election. It has a closer relation to the warborn progressive vote of 1918–1930 than to the progressive vote of the depression. Like that earlier progressivism, it was unrelated to the modern Democratic vote.
 13. For other evidence of a nonethnic isolationist tradition, cf. Ralph M. Smuckler, "The Region of Isolation," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 47 (June 1953), and the reply in Samuel Lubell, *The Revolt of the Moderates* (New York: Harper, 1956).
 14. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955), pp. 298–299; Samuel Lubell, *The Future of American Politics*, *op. cit.*, pp. 3, 34–39.
 15. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, p. 298. In fact, the German components of the two votes made them fairly similar. Indeed, Hofstadter recognized the German support for both candidates. The implication is that when the Germans voted for La Follette in 1924 they were voting their reaction to

the war rather than “genuine” liberalism, but when they voted for Smith in 1928 they were pragmatic precursors of the New Deal (cf. pp. 281, 296–299).

16. Samuel Lubell, *The Future of American Politics*, *op. cit.*, pp. 34–39 and *passim*; V. O. Key, Jr., “A Theory of Critical Elections,” *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 17 (February 1955), pp. 4–11; Duncan MacRae, Jr., and James A. Meldrum, “Critical Elections in Illinois: 1888–1958,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 54 (September 1960), pp. 678–681.
17. Lipset has pointed out to me that La Follette, as the most outspoken anti-Klan candidate, also received substantial Catholic backing.
18. Baggaley has shown that the Catholic and anti-Catholic votes were bigger factors in the Smith election than in the Kennedy vote but that the religious issue was still very important in 1960. Cf. Andrew R. Baggaley, “Religious Influence on Wisconsin Voting, 1928–1960,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 56 (March 1962), pp. 66–70.
19. H. F. Gosnell, *Grass Roots Politics*, *op. cit.*, pp. 54–56.
20. Progressive James Thompson’s 1918 vote, which has revealed German sensitivity to the war, was highly related to Roosevelt’s 1936 vote and Wilkie’s 1940 vote. Note that the 1948 Republican vote was actually slightly more German than the vote in 1940 (.52 to .48), indicating no tendency for Germans to return to the Democratic Party after the war.
21. The first Democratic election to be positively related to the modern Democratic vote was the Wilson election of 1916. Wilson is supposed to reflect the old party politics and Smith the new, but Wilson’s vote was more clearly a precursor of the modern Democratic vote than Smith’s.

The Wilson election aside, the modern party vote is closer to the pre- than to the post-Bryan party vote. Again, this pattern began not with Smith but with the vote for Coolidge in 1924.

22. Since the German counties in Wisconsin tend also to be the most highly industrialized, the relationship between class, ethnicity, and the party vote is not a simple one. The percentage of Germans in 1930 and the percentage Republican in 1948 were related .52 and the percentage Republican and the percentage in manufacturing —.17. But with German background held constant, this relationship jumped to —.44. The relationship between German background and the Republican vote with manufacturing held constant was .63 — as high as 1906 but with the sign reversed. Baggaley found a correlation of .95 between the percentage of white-collar workers and the 1954 Republican vote in Milwaukee’s wards.

Epstein has shown that the Democratic Party is strongest in cities with more than 50,000 people and weakest in cities and villages below 10,000. Showing that workers in large cities are

more likely to vote Democratic than workers in small cities, he argues that size itself creates a diversity that permits a break with a Republican past. This seems plausible; ethnic analysis might help explain the data. Cf. Andrew R. Baggaley, "White Collar Employment and the Republican Vote," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 20 (Summer 1956), pp. 471-473; Leon Epstein, *Politics in Wisconsin, op. cit.*, pp. 58-70.

23. The average county vote for McCarthy was 62.6 percent. The twenty-six counties high on the 1904 La Follette index gave McCarthy 60.4 percent of their votes.
24. In 1950, Len Schmitt, an old Progressive, ran against Walter Kohler in the Republican gubernatorial primary. Seven years later, northern Wisconsin Congressman O'Konski, a demagogic and illiberal agrarian radical, ran in the Republican primary which was to choose a successor to McCarthy. Both these men got virtually all their support from northern Wisconsin. Proxmire's vote correlated .5 with both, but these primary votes were unrelated to the vote in the 1952 senatorial election (see Table 3.5).
25. The formula for these computations is $(M - R) - (m - \bar{r})$. A numerical example may make the process clearer. Let us say county Z was 4 percent above the state average for Republican governor in 1950, 8 percent above for Eisenhower, and 3 percent below for Dewey. Its average Republican strength would then be +3. If county Z was 6 percent above the state average for McCarthy, its score on the McCarthy index would be $6 - 3$, or 3.

In his analysis of McCarthy's strength in 1952, Louis Bean compares McCarthy's strength with his showing in 1946. However, three regular Republican elections in which McCarthy was not involved give a better indication of the regular Republican vote than one election in which the Senator was involved. Bean's findings in part support and in no case successfully contradict the findings reported here. Cf. Louis Bean, *Influences in the 1954 Mid-Term Elections* (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Institute, 1954), pp. 10-16, 37-41.

26. The other three Catholic counties contained cities of more than 10,000 population, while less than half of the twelve did.
27. The tenth county was Dane county in the south, home of La Follette and of the University of Wisconsin. Dane county supported McCarthy in 1944 not on a "friends-and-neighbors" basis but because McCarthy's opponent was an antiprogressive. It voted strongly against McCarthy in 1952, opposing him slightly more than it opposed other Republicans. Thus, the one county that supported McCarthy in 1944 but not in 1952 was the home of the La Follette movement.
28. James G. March, "McCarthy Can Still Be Beaten," *Reporter*, Vol. 7 (October 22, 1952), pp. 17-19.
29. The percentages are the averages of ward totals in each CD and

are not the same as the direct popular vote. Unfortunately, ward lines in Milwaukee were not redrawn to conform to the 1950 census until after 1952, so it is difficult to identify working- and middle-class wards.

30. Note that only one progressive county that was not also either a Catholic, Czech, or "friends-and-neighbors" county was in the more pro-McCarthy of the two groups on the scatter diagram demonstrating the relationship between industrialization and McCarthyism. Progressive counties supported McCarthy in proportion to their ruralness, not out of proportion to it.

The Proxmire election produces similar evidence. We have seen that both Proxmire and McCarthy deviated from the traditional party vote in a progressive direction. Here again the explanation appears to be the common rural support they attracted rather than any particular progressive appeal. The counties shifting most radically from McCarthy to Proxmire were disproportionately rural, but the rural corn belt counties were more prominent in this group than were ex-progressive counties.

31. There is a possible ambiguity here. There were many more progressive than Czechoslovakian counties in the state. A slight tendency for progressive counties disproportionately to support McCarthy might have a greater total effect than a stronger tendency confined to the few Czech counties. My point is that the source of pressure to support McCarthy was apparently weakest in the progressive case.
32. Trow, "Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of Support for McCarthy in a New England Town" (unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, 1959), pp. 41-45, 153-166.
33. Talcott Parsons, "Social Strains in America," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 136-137.
34. David Riesman and Nathan Glazer, "The Intellectuals and the Discontented Classes," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-71.
35. Nelson W. Polsby, "Toward an Explanation of McCarthyism," *Political Studies*, Vol. 8 (October 1960), p. 257.
36. Cf. Edgar A. Schuler and Carl C. Taylor, "Farm People's Attitudes and Opinions," in Carl C. Taylor *et al.*, *Rural Life in the United States* (New York: Knopf, 1949), p. 505.
37. The correlations between his vote and progressive elections ran from $-.3$ to $-.5$.
38. The correlations run from $.3$ to $.5$; his relation to McCarthy's vote in the general election was no higher. Davis was stronger in German than in Scandinavian counties, though within each group there was no relation between ethnicity and the vote.
39. Cf. James Q. Wilson, *The Amateur Democrat* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 267.

40. Samuel Lubell, *The Future of American Politics*, *op. cit.*, p. 143.
41. Lemke did get 20 percent of the vote in a heavily German, Catholic town in Fond du Lac county in southeastern Wisconsin. Since this town responded sharply to both world wars, the German rather than the Catholic factor may well explain the high Lemke vote. Cf. Baggaley, "Religious Influence on Wisconsin Voting, 1928–1960," *op. cit.*, p. 70.

Chapter Four

1. Howard G. Williams, "Nye — A Lost Leader," *Nation*, Vol. 158 (June 24, 1947), p. 730.
2. Ross B. Talbot, "The North Dakota Farmers Union and North Dakota Politics," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 10 (December 1957), pp. 879–880.
3. Peter Viereck, "The Revolt Against the Elite," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), p. 94. Lipset recognizes the role foreign policy played in the switch. But in more cautious language than Viereck, he suggests that "liberal isolationists" now vote for "right-wing nationalists." As I suggest later, this oversimplifies and distorts the evolution. Cf. S. M. Lipset, "The Sources of the 'Radical Right,'" in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
4. I.e., people born in Russia, or with at least one parent born there.
5. Eighteen percent to 13 percent. When one considers third and fourth generation Norwegians, the disproportion is even greater.
6. As in South Dakota and Wisconsin, the traditional Republican vote was not significantly rural.
7. This is the best measure of agricultural wealth available in the 1890 census. In the 1910 census, this figure was not easily computed, and a longer term measure of agricultural wealth was available. Hence, in all three states the average value of land per acre was used to measure the relationship between wealth and progressivism.
8. Before 1930, the census gives no county breakdown of the percentage of the population living on farms. However, it is possible to compute the relation of farm homes to all homes. This is a good approximation to the rural-farm population. Thus, where there has been no great change in the relative ruralness of the counties, as in North Dakota between 1910 and 1930, the farm-home index for 1910 correlates .9+ with the rural-farm measure for 1930. This indicates that for a given year the two indexes would be virtually identical. I use the farm-home measure for political movements in the Dakotas that flourished before 1930. Cf. Duncan McRae, Jr., and James A. Meldrum, "Critical Elections in Illinois, 1888–1958," *Amer-*

- ican Political Science Review*, Vol. 54 (September 1960), p. 679n.
9. Within the Red River Valley, the best explanation of the Populist vote is that it went down as the wealth of the counties increased. The fewer the percentage of farms in the six counties, the smaller the Populist vote, but there are too few counties to be confident of this relationship. Throughout North Dakota as a whole, there was no relationship between the percentage of farmers and the Populist vote.
 10. Raymond C. Miller, "The Populist Party in Kansas" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1928), pp. 141, 233, 280, 306.
 11. Stanley Parsons, "Nebraska Populism Reconsidered," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, 1962, pp. 13–14.
 12. Benton H. Wilcox, "An Historical Definition of Northwestern Radicalism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 26 (December 1939), pp. 383–386; S. M. Lipset, *Agrarian Socialism* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1959), pp. 10–17.
 13. Stanley Parsons, "Nebraska Populism Reconsidered," *op. cit.*, pp. 13–15, and Chapter 5.
 14. Hallie Farmer, "The Economic Background of Frontier Populism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 10 (March 1924), pp. 421–422.
 15. Cf., Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (New York: International Publishers, 1963), pp. 122–128. There is a certain ambiguity in mass theory concerning this Marxian insight. The pluralists predict that the more isolated will be more easily mobilizable into mass movements. But Lipset has gone beyond this in pointing out that the most isolated are the least easily mobilizable by anyone. They vote the least and are the most apathetic. He therefore believes that a mass movement must first be organized among the more involved though still isolated groups. The "lower depths" will only be drawn into support once the movement appears powerful. Lipset has empirical evidence for this Marxian improvement of mass theory. Nazism in Germany did not receive support in its early stages in proportion to the decline in nonvoting. This rather happened after the movement was established. Similarly, Lipset reports data that skilled workers are more likely than unskilled to join nascent Communist parties. Cf. S. M. Lipset, *Political Man* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1960), pp. 121–126, 149–152.
 16. S. M. Lipset, *Agrarian Socialism*, *op. cit.*, pp. 165–169.
 17. Occasionally there was a Populist factor in later North Dakota elections. The vote to prohibit Sunday theater performances had a large Populist component (.5 on the original matrix and .3 on

- the factor matrix). Examination of the county election returns suggests that this was the ethnic rather than the economic component of Populism: Scandinavians were against Sunday theaters, Germans and Catholics for them.
18. These correlations are by no means completely dependent on one another. With percentage Scandinavian held constant, the Progressive index is correlated $-.58$ with the percentage Russian-German; with percentage Russian-German held constant, the Scandinavian correlation is $.51$.
 19. Cf., D. Jerome Tweton, "Sectionalism in North Dakota Politics: The Progressive Republican Revolt of 1900," *North Dakota History*, Vol. 25 (January 1958), pp. 21–27.
 20. Alfred D. Chandler, "The Origins of Progressive Leadership," in Elting E. Morrison, Jr. (ed.), *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt*, Vol. 8 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 1462–1465.
 21. Cf., Robert L. Morlan, *Political Prairie Fire* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1955), pp. 6–21.
 22. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955), p. 183; cf., pp. 175–184.
 23. For the progressive and League legislation, see Roy P. Johnson, "John Burke," *North Dakota History*, Vol. 28 (Winter 1961), p. 30; Benton H. Wilcox, "A Reconsideration of the Character and Economic Basis of Northwestern Radicalism" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Wisconsin, 1933), pp. 93–94; Robert L. Morlan, *Political Prairie Fire*, *op cit.*, p. 106.
 24. La Follette's 1924 vote was actually negatively correlated with his 1916 vote ($r = -.23$).
 25. Cf., Victor C. Ferkiss, "Populism: Myth, Reality, Current Danger," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (September 1961), p. 738.
 26. Robert L. Morlan, *Political Prairie Fire*, *op cit.*, p. 73.
 27. The correlation is $.42$; when the Russian-German population is controlled, the correlation rises to $.47$.
 28. Cf. G. A. Lundberg, "The Demographic and Economic Basis of Political Radicalism and Conservatism," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 32 (March 1927), pp. 727–728. Since the greatest increase in population between 1910 and 1920 was in the cities, the percentage increase in population does not predict League strength. But clearly the farming areas of the west were more recently settled and in a more primitive state than those of the east.
 29. Both correlations are only $.3$. The percentage of wheat farms in North Dakota corresponds to the percentage of cash-grain farms. General farming and wheat-and-cattle farming are more prevalent in both the richest and the poorest areas of the state.

30. Cf., Lawrence H. Larsen, "William Langer: Senator from North Dakota" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of History, University of Wisconsin, 1955).
31. With percentage Russian-German held constant, Langer's relation to the farm vote remains .59.
32. The correlations are .63 and .6. With the farm vote held constant, the ethnic relation is .54.
33. Thus it correlated $-.5$ with the percentage Russian-German, but was still $-.2$ with rural-farm after controlling for the Russian-German vote.
34. The Smith vote correlated .64 with a referendum supporting the repeal of prohibition.
35. With the Russian-German vote held constant, his rural support was .51; the zero-order correlation was .59.
36. The correlations were .89 in 1940 and 1944, .87 in 1948, .82 in 1952 and 1956, and (with control for the Catholic vote) .73 in 1960. The off-year correlations were lower but generally approached .7.
37. Ross B. Talbot, "The North Dakota Farmers Union and North Dakota Politics," *Western Political Quarterly*, *op. cit.*, p. 890.
38. Martin A. Trow, "Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of Support for McCarthy in a New England Town" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, 1951), p. 21.
39. Frank J. Kendrick, "McCarthy and the Senate" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1962), pp. 256–257. And after he voted against the censure of McCarthy, Langer spoke for a group whose membership included Communist sympathizers.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 191.
41. Lawrence H. Larsen, "William Langer: A Maverick in the Senate," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 44 (Spring 1961), pp. 191–192.
42. Samuel Lubell, *The Future of American Politics* (New York: Harper, 1952), pp. 143–145.
43. Lemke's career after 1936 is instructive in this regard. When Lemke ran for governor in 1940, he was the candidate of the conservative opposition to the Non-Partisan League. The anti-League rich eastern counties supported him strongly. The wheat farmers who had supported him in 1936 opposed him in 1940. The regular Republican organization subsequently pushed Lemke for congress. Cf. Howard G. Williams, "Nye — A Lost Leader," *Nation*, *op. cit.*, p. 730.
44. Bob Faulds, "Dakota Points the Way," *New Republic*, Vol. 119 (August 16, 1948), p. 10; Henry Wallace, "Report on the Farmers," *New Republic*, Vol. 116 (June 30, 1947), p. 12.
45. On these developments, cf. Ross B. Talbot, "The North Dakota Farmers Union and North Dakota Politics," *op. cit.*

46. With ethnicity controlled, Burdick's vote correlated .57 with the percentage rural-farm, compared to less than .3 for the Democratic gubernatorial candidate in 1954.
47. John A. Crampton, "Yours for Humanity . . .': The Role of Ideology in the Farmers Union" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of California, 1962), pp. 39-45, 70.
48. Ross B. Talbot, "The North Dakota Farmers Union and North Dakota Politics," *op. cit.*, p. 890.

Chapter Five

1. John Gunther, *Inside U.S.A.* (New York: Harper, 1947), p. 237.
2. The intercorrelations of Populist strength vary from .63 to .87, with only the first Populist election ever falling below .8.
3. In computing the relationship between Populism and demographic variables, the 1893 Populist vote was used because it had the highest intercorrelations with the other Populist elections.
4. The Populist vote in the urban county was substantially below that in the three counties of the same ethnic background, wealth, and crop pattern which border on it. For urban desertion of the Democratic Party because of the Bryan campaign in other states, cf. Lee Benson, "Research Problems in American Political Historiography," in Mirra Komarovsky (ed.), *Common Frontiers of the Social Sciences* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957), pp. 177-181; V. O. Key, Jr., "A Theory of Critical Elections," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 17 (February 1955), pp. 11-16; Duncan MacRae, Jr., and James A. Meldrum, "Critical Elections in Illinois 1888-1958," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 54 (September 1960), pp. 673-678. Benson reports findings on New England and New York, Key on New England, MacRae and Meldrum on Illinois.
5. The exception is Minnehaha, the county with the largest city. This is further evidence of an urban vote against Populism.
6. Cf. Stanley Parsons, "Nebraska Populism Reconsidered," Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, 1962, pp. 3-9; Raymond C. Miller, "The Populist Party in Kansas" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Chicago, 1928), pp. 141, 271-272, 305; Roscoe B. Martin, *The People's Party in Texas* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1933), pp. 59-68, 211; J. Rogers Hollingsworth, "Populism: The Problem of Rhetoric and Reality," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 39 (April 1965), p. 83.
7. The correlation coefficient between the percentage of Scandinavians in 1910 and the Thorson vote was .52. Holding the value of land constant reduced the correlation to .33. Holding the percentage Scandinavian constant reduced the progressive relation to wealth to .58.

8. The progressive votes were for Thorson for Congress in 1910, Sterling for Senator in 1912, Crawford for Senator in 1914, and against Taft (for La Follette or Roosevelt) in the 1912 presidential primary. The only relations between these and other votes are between Crawford's 1914 vote and the 1889 prohibition referendum (.49) and between Taft's vote and the 1889 Democratic and antiprohibition votes (.41, .53). Crawford's 1908 support was unrelated to the votes on prohibition, the initiative, woman's suffrage, and the prohibition of Sunday theater performances, although most of these measures were part of his program.
9. Interestingly enough, Norbeck was far more for La Follette in 1912 than was Crawford and only supported Teddy Roosevelt reluctantly. This corresponds to his economic base, which was between Crawford's and La Follette's. Cf. Gilbert Courtland Fite, *Peter Norbeck, Prairie Statesman* (Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1948), p. 39.
10. The vote against Norbeck in the 1920 primary was simply a Non-Partisan League vote, although the candidate opposing Norbeck was a stalwart. Norbeck's 1916 and 1920 votes correlated .14.
11. By 1920, Germans and Russian-Germans were voting Republican more than League. The 1918 League vote tended to go in 1920 to the Farmer-Labor candidate for President. But the negative correlation between the 1918 League vote and the 1920 Republican presidential vote was low. The counties with the biggest increase in the GOP vote between 1918 and 1920 were clearly German and Russian-German.
12. The 1922 and 1918 League votes were correlated only .35. Rice found some relationship between wheat and the Non-Partisan League vote in South Dakota; wheat counties averaged 7 percent above the state average. But this finding is misleading. In 1918 and 1920, it simply reflects the concentration of Germans in the wheat belt. In 1922, it reflects League weakness in the west; wheat counties were not significantly more pro-League than corn counties that year.
Rice also found insurgency in the early 1920's in Iowa and Nebraska weakest in the rich corn counties, a development that took place in South Dakota in the late 1920's. Cf. Stuart A. Rice, *Farmers and Workers in American Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1924), pp. 169-176.
13. In the corn belt $r = .69$. The index used here to determine agricultural wealth was compiled by the Department of Agriculture. Cf. Margaret Jarmon Hagood, *Farm-Operator Family Level-of-Living Indexes for Counties of the United States: 1930, 1940, 1945, and 1950* (Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture, 1952), pp. 43-44.
14. Moreover, the correlation of the Smith vote with the Democratic vote for Senator in 1930 against McMaster was only .17

- and that of F.D.R. only .09. Their correlations with the 1930 Democratic governor, whose opponent was not a progressive, were thirty points higher.
15. The relationships between wealth and the Roosevelt vote in the corn and western areas and between McMaster and wealth in the corn area would all be considerably higher were it not for the drop in the Roosevelt and McMaster strength in the poorest counties. The three poorest corn belt counties (including the only two west of the Missouri River) and the poorest western county were all less for Roosevelt and McMaster than their wealth would have predicted.
 16. Actually, the Smith and first Roosevelt votes correlated $-.43$ and $-.45$ with the Republican vote of 1918. In North Dakota and Wisconsin, the unusual combination of Germans and progressives brought about by World War I also anticipated not McCarthyism but the Smith vote.
 17. For comparable developments in Illinois and Indiana, cf. Duncan MacRae, Jr., and James A. Meldrum, "Critical Elections in Illinois, 1888–1958," *op. cit.*, pp. 678–681; V. O. Key, Jr., and Frank Munger, "Social Determinism and Electoral Decision: The Case of Indiana," in Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck (eds.), *American Voting Behavior* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955), pp. 288–290. The modern South Dakota Democratic vote is usually correlated below .5 with the Smith and 1932 Roosevelt votes, lower than its correlations with the 1902–1910 Democratic vote. The 1930 McMaster vote remains correlated with the modern Democratic vote ($r = .3$ to $.5$).
 18. With the correlation between the Democratic vote in 1908 and 1948 held constant, the relationship between the number of cattle per farm and the Democratic vote changes from .45 in 1908 to $-.45$ in 1948. The change would be even more striking were it not for seven noncattle counties, also much less Democratic in 1948 than in 1908; all were highly German or Russian-German. Holding constant the number of cattle per farm, the relationship between the 1908 and 1948 Democratic votes rises from .54 to .64. The decline of Democratic strength in the west means the party is no longer stronger among native-stock than foreign-stock inhabitants.
 19. Campbell, *et al.*, pp. 418–419, make the point that small farmers are in general more Democratic than large farmers. However, in view of the small number of cases they report and the absence of any distinction between types of farming, this finding is at best provisional.
 20. The Democratic Party remains a clear minority party in South Dakota politics. However, in the second half of the 1950's the party increased its vote substantially and in 1958 elected the first Democratic governor since the New Deal. Farm unrest in the Plains states in the late 1950's is generally associated with

the Democratic resurgence. In South Dakota there was evidence of rural desertion of the Republican Party within the corn belt, but not among the farmers of the state as a whole.

The 1960 presidential election did not continue the 1958 pattern. Its relationship to 1958 was less than its relation to any Democratic vote since 1942. Kennedy's vote closely resembled that given to other postwar Democratic presidential candidates, but its correlation with the percentage of Catholics was .37, some twenty points higher than was typical for the postwar Democratic vote. In 1958, rural Protestants had voted unusually Democratic. In 1960, they voted unusually Republican.

21. Taft's vote had no relation to the 1922 Non-Partisan League vote, but was correlated .33 with the 1918 League vote. The big issue in the primary was Universal Military Training. Taft backers attacked Ike for being a militarist. Cf. "Dakota's Decision," *Newsweek*, Vol. 39 (June 16, 1952), p. 39. Lubell found that in the presidential primary in Wisconsin in 1952 Taft got a German vote. Cf. Samuel Lubell, *The Revolt of the Moderates* (New York: Harper, 1956), pp. 268-269.
22. The correlation between percentage of Germans and the Republican vote for President in 1948 was .47.
23. "Too Busy to Win," *Time*, Vol. 55 (June 19, 1950), pp. 21-22.
24. Each election that might have indicated either support for McCarthy or the regular Republican vote contained idiosyncrasies. Thus, Case, previously a congressman for western South Dakota, ran disproportionately strong in a few northwestern counties. To take Mundt's vote as a measure of McCarthyism, on the other hand, may inflate support for McCarthy in the corn belt. By 1954 an agricultural recession had begun in the Middle West, and it seems to have hurt the GOP more in the wheat belt than in the corn belt. (Cf. Samuel Lubell, *The Revolt of the Moderates*, *op. cit.*, p. 168.) That Mundt was relatively stronger in the corn than in the wheat belt may have had nothing to do with McCarthyism.

There are also problems with measures of regular Republicanism. One cannot use presidential elections alone, since there are clear differences in the vote in presidential and off-years. In the only postwar off-year election, 1946, George Michelson was elected governor. Michelson's Scandinavian background may have given him disproportionate support among that ethnic group.

25. $r = .22$. The relation would be much higher were it not for the opposition to McCarthy among wheat belt counties with few Scandinavians.
26. Louis Bean, *Influences in the 1954 Mid-Term Elections* (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Institute, 1954), pp. 26-28.
27. Cf. Chapter 7 on the Farmers Union and Chapter 3 for a discussion of the Wisconsin corn counties. The Lemke vote in

South Dakota was concentrated in the corn belt, although his vote was even more scattered in South Dakota than it was in Wisconsin. In no county did Lemke get 10 percent of the vote. But six of the eleven counties in which he got 5 percent of the vote or better were the six rich counties in the southeast corner of the corn belt. These are close to the Iowa border and were probably influenced by the strength of the Farm Holiday Movement in Iowa. Dr. John L. Shover informs me that the Farm Holiday movement was strongest in northwestern Iowa in the counties adjacent to southeastern South Dakota. The largest city in the area is Sioux City, Iowa, only a few miles from the South Dakota border. Its newspapers service the neighboring South Dakota counties, and the *Sioux City Unionist and Public Ledger* supported Lemke. (As in Wisconsin and North Dakota, the Lemke vote was neither German nor Catholic.)

Chapter Six

1. Adam B. Ulam, *The Unfinished Revolution* (New York: Random House, 1960), pp. 28–57 and *passim*.
2. David W. Noble, *The Paradox of Progressive Thought* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1958), pp. vi–viii, and *passim*.
3. Quoted in Norman Pollack, *The Populist Response to Industrial America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), pp. 15–16, 22–25.
4. William A. Peffer, *The Farmer's Side: His Troubles and Their Remedy* (New York: Appleton, 1891), pp. 3–64, 75–123.
5. Populist and Alliance platforms can be found in John R. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt* (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), pp. 427–444.
6. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955), pp. 62–63.
7. Frederic Howe learned from his environment that individual morality was at the root of politics. His education as a reformer taught him the importance of the system. This was a common experience. Cf. Frederic C. Howe, *Confessions of a Reformer* (New York: Scribner's, 1925); C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), p. 82.
8. See also the excellent and more extended comments by Norman Pollack in "Hofstadter on Populism: A Critique of 'The Age of Reform,'" *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 26 (November 1960), pp. 482–489.
9. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955), pp. 70–81; Walter R. Nugent, "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888–1900" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Chicago, 1961), pp. 81–83.
10. Stanley Parsons, "Nebraska Populism Reconsidered," Paper de-

- livered at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, 1962, pp. 3–8; J. Rogers Hollingsworth, "Populism: The Problem of Rhetoric and Reality," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 39 (April 1965), p. 83.
11. Benjamin R. Twiss, *Lawyers and The Constitution* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1942), pp. 141–146.
 12. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, p. 80; S. M. Lipset, *Political Man* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1960), p. 167; Peter Viereck, *The Unadjusted Man* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1956), p. 202; Daniel Bell, *The End of Ideology* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960), pp. 104–107.
 13. Oscar Handlin, "American Views of the Jew at the Opening of the Twentieth Century," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, Vol. 40 (June 1951), p. 338.
 14. Leon W. Fuller, "Colorado's Revolt Against Capitalism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 11 (December 1934), pp. 355–357.
 15. E.g., see Norman Pollack, *The Populist Response to Industrial America*, *op. cit.*, pp. 43–67; Roscoe B. Martin, *The People's Party in Texas* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1933), pp. 217–218.
 16. Viereck, however, retells the story to make Jewishness the focal point and then concludes that the vast popular reception for *Caesar's Column* was an example of Populist anti-Semitism at the mass level. Peter Viereck, *The Unadjusted Man*, *op. cit.*, p. 202.
 17. Oscar Handlin, "American Views of the Jew at the Opening of the Twentieth Century," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, Vol. 40 (June 1951), pp. 325–328.
 18. Ignatius Donnelly, *Caesar's Column* (Chicago: J. Regan, n.d.), p. 36.
 19. Cf. Norman Pollack, "The Myth of Populist Anti-Semitism," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 43 (October, 1962), pp. 76–80; Norman Pollack, "Hofstadter on Populism: A Critique of 'The Age of Reform,'" *op. cit.*, p. 500; Walter R. Nugent, "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888–1900" *op. cit.*, pp. 86–89; John Higham "Anti-Semitism in the Gilded Age," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 53 (March 1957).
 20. Oscar Handlin, "American Views of the Jew at the Opening of the Twentieth Century," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, *op. cit.*, p. 338. In the Cross of Gold speech, Bryan used the crucifixion metaphor to attack hard-money advocates. To assume that "gold-bugs" were identified with the Jews (who killed Christ) is to assume just what has not been proved — that the Populists were anti-Semitic.
 21. Cf. C. Vann Woodward, "Tom Watson and the Negro in Agrarian Politics," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 4 (February, 1938), pp. 16–23; C. Vann Woodward, "The Populist

- Heritage and the Intellectual," *American Scholar*, Vol. 29 (Winter 1959), p. 65; William R. Gnatz, "The Negro and the Populist Movement in the South" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Chicago, Department of History, 1961), p. 39.
22. On Populist support in the south cf. V. O. Key, Jr., *Southern Politics in State and Nation* (New York: Knopf, 1949), pp. 138–142, 232–237, and 549 for South Carolina, Mississippi, and Georgia; Melvin J. White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 5 (June 1918), pp. 14–15; Perry H. Howard, *Political Tendencies in Louisiana 1812–1952* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1957), pp. 90–99; Alex Matthews Arnett, *The Populist Movement in Georgia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1922), map facing p. 184; C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), pp. 160–161, 217; Roscoe B. Martin, *The People's Party in Texas*, *op. cit.*, pp. 60–68, 86–111, 136–137. Virginia, where Populism was not strong, is an exception to Populist strength in the hills and weakness in the black belt. Cf. William Du Bose Shelton, *Populism in the Old Dominion* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1935), pp. 86–87.
 23. Cf. Walter Ellsworth Nydegger, "The Election of 1892 in Iowa," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. 25 (July 1927), pp. 442–444; Stanley Parsons, "Nebraska Populism Reconsidered," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, 1962, pp. 11–13; Walter R. Nugent, "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888–1900," *op. cit.*, pp. 204–215.
 24. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, pp. 87–91.
 25. Cf. Roscoe B. Martin, *The People's Party in Texas*, *op. cit.*, pp. 103–111, 132; Donald E. Walters, "Populism in California, 1889–1900 (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of California, 1952), pp. 70, 148–150, 289.
 26. John Higham, "Anti-Semitism in the Gilded Age," *op. cit.*, pp. 565–566.
 27. John Higham, *Strangers in the Land* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955), pp. 95–98, 346; Walter R. Nugent, "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888–1900," *op. cit.*, p. 45. Populist and Alliance platforms before 1892 contained nothing about immigration restriction.
 28. Nugent writes, "It hardly helped [the farmer's] peace of mind to learn that the Sante Fe railroad was now in the hands of the Barings of London, and that Englishmen alone and in companies owned large tracts of land in Kansas, and that London bankers had close ties with both the eastern bankers, who had bought up their mortgages at bargain-basement prices, and to American statesmen, including John Sheridan and Cleveland, to whom the contraction policy was economic dogma." Walter R. Nugent, "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888–1900," *op. cit.*, p. 34.

29. Walter R. Nugent, "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888–1900," *op. cit.*, pp. 180–182.
30. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, pp. 89–90. Of even more dubiousness as evidence of Populist jingoism are citations from a "west-coast newspaper" (Populist?) and "the silver senator from Nevada." (The Populists ran a ticket against the silver ticket in that state.) Similarly, Hofstadter is more impressed (p. 286) by the unsubstantiated statement that some Klan members supported La Follette in 1924 than by La Follette's forthright attack on the Klan — an attack not matched by David and Coolidge.
31. Indeed, the charges against the Populists might better be made against the APA. In Wisconsin the APA was for the rule of the people against the special interests. The workingmen and small businessmen were alleged to be the bulwark of democracy and liberty. "The time is not far distant when class legislation will be a thing of the past, and the workingmen will have as much to say in the making of laws as the millionaire. . . ." This was to be accomplished in a purely "American" way; it would "never come about through the radical methods proposed by Populists or Socialists." Cf. Gerald K. Marsden, "Patriotic Societies and American Labor: The American Protective Association in Wisconsin," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 41 (Summer 1958), pp. 288–289.
32. Walter R. Nugent, "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888–1900," *op. cit.*, pp. 132–136; John Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, *op. cit.*, pp. 80–86. In the 1870's anti-Catholicism had been strong among respectable Republicans; *ibid.*, pp. 28–29.
33. John Locke, *Of Civil Government* (New York: Dutton, Everyman's), pp. 177–179, 183–203.
34. John P. Roche, "The Curbing of the Militant Majority," *Reporter*, Vol. 29 (July 18, 1963), pp. 34–38.
35. Frederic C. Howe, *Confessions of a Reformer* (New York: Scribner's, 1925), pp. 17–18.
36. Cf. Roscoe Martin, *The People's Party in Texas*, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
37. In Texas in November 1892, there were 3,170 Populist clubs. *Ibid.*, pp. 142–149.
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 84–85, 166–167; John R. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt* (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), *passim*.
39. Victor Ferkiss, "Populism: Myth, Reality, Current Danger," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (September 1961), pp. 737–740, and S. M. Lipset, "The Sources of the Radical Right," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), p. 174, charge that the Populists often interfered with academic freedom. So does Peter Viereck. He cites the example of the removal of Veblen from the University of Minnesota because of the "democratic, egalitarian, Populist milieu." (*The Unadjusted Man*, *op. cit.*, p. 46.) In fact, the

- Populists were never close to power in Minnesota. At the time of Veblen's removal, the state was in firm Republican hands.
40. The "overeducation" charge is made by Edward Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956), p. 99. See the anti-Populist report of G. T. Fairchild, "Populism in a State Agricultural College," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 3 (November 1897).
 41. Prohibition and woman suffrage were allied in part because of fears by Germans and other antiprohibitionists that the women would support prohibition.
 42. Cf. Glenn Lowell Brudvig, "The Farmer's Alliance and the Populist Movement in North Dakota (1884-1896)" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of North Dakota, 1956), p. 115; Walter R. Nugent, "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888-1900," *op. cit.*, pp. 53, 118; Herbert S. Schell, *History of South Dakota* (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), p. 232; Herman Clarence Nixon, *The Populist Movement in Iowa*, reprinted from the January 1926 number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* (Iowa City, Iowa: State University of Iowa), p. 157; J. Rogers Hollingsworth, "Populism: The Problem of Rhetoric and Reality," *op. cit.*, p. 85; Roscoe B. Martin, *The People's Party in Texas*, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-81. The North Dakota Populist Party, which supported prohibition, generally fused with the Democrats at election time. In Wisconsin during the 1930's, the Progressive Party vote was related to the vote for prohibition, as one would expect of a Scandinavian and native-stock movement. But if this was because of the agrarian radical crusade, how to explain the even higher relationship of the Republican vote to prohibition? Cf. H. F. Gosnell, *Grass Roots Politics* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1942), p. 56.
 43. Cf. Allan F. Westin, "The Supreme Court, the Populist Movement and the Campaign of 1896," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 15 (February 1953), pp. 3-41. "It was in this period (1876-1896) that the Supreme Court created a wide disenchantment with constitutional processes on the part of the Populist Party."
 44. Cf. Benton H. Wilcox, "An Historical Definition of Northwestern Radicalism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 26 (December 1939), pp. 378-379, 394, and *passim*; Carl C. Taylor, *The Farmers' Movement 1620-1920* (New York: American Book Co., 1953), pp. 49-99 and *passim*.
 45. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-47.
 46. *Ibid.*, pp. 109-112; Richard Hofstadter, "The Pseudo Conservative Revolt," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-44.
 47. C. Vann Woodward, "The Populist Heritage and the Intellectual," *op. cit.*, p. 63.
 48. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-109.

49. William Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959), pp. 39–40.
50. Cf. Allan F. Westin, "The Supreme Court, the Populist Movement, and the Campaign of 1896," *loc. cit.*
51. German fascism owed a real debt to the failure of the German revolution of 1918 to end the inaccessibility and independent power of the army, the police, and the bureaucracy.
52. William Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society*, *op. cit.*, p. 44. Kornhauser adds that not all concern with remote objects is a manifestation of mass behavior, but he insists that all mass behavior has such concerns and that there is a tendency for remote concerns to lead to mass behavior.
53. Karl Ernest Meyer, "The Politics of Loyalty: From La Follette to McCarthy in Wisconsin: 1918–1952" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Princeton University, 1956), pp. 79–116.
54. This is not to say that Populists displayed the sophistications of Karl Marx. It is emphatically to deny that the similarities between Marxism and Populism show that America was developing on the European pattern. But cf. Norman Pollack, *The Populist Response to Industrial America*, *op. cit.*, pp. 82–83. For the notion of Populism as a surrogate for socialism, cf. Michael N. Shute, "Populism and the Pragmatic Mystique" (unpublished manuscript, n.d.).
55. Cf. Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick, "A Meaning for Turner's Frontier," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 114 (September 1954), pp. 324–339.
56. At the turn of the century, North Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin had higher percentages of foreign-born in their population than any other rural states. In 1920, almost 60 percent of the Swedish farmers in America lived in seven midwestern states. Cf. Carl C. Taylor, "The Evolution of American Rural Society," in Carl Taylor, *et al.*, *Rural Life in the United States* (New York: Knopf, 1949), p. 27. Norwegians were the second-largest ethnic group in the Dakotas and Wisconsin.
Lubell has argued that progressivism in the Middle West served a function for German and Scandinavian immigrants analogous to that served in cities by the machine. This is persuasive in the Scandinavian case, but flies in the face of German opposition to progressivism. Cf. Samuel Lubell, *The Future of American Politics* (New York: Harper, 1952), p. 206.
57. The figures are from Fred A. Shannon, *The Farmer's Last Frontier: Agriculture 1860–1897* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1945), pp. 350–351. Shannon points out that since 1920, when the census began to count farmers and their families as a percentage of the total population, the ratio of those living on farms to total population has been the same as the ratio of farmers to the gainfully employed. Therefore, one can use the

NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN

- latter figures as a measure of the farm population before 1920.
58. Margaret Jarmon Hagood, "The Dynamics of Rural Population," in Carl Taylor, *et al.*, *Rural Life in the United States*, *op. cit.*, pp. 241–243.
 59. Douglas Ensminger, "Rural Neighborhoods and Communities," in *ibid.*, p. 73.
 60. The phrase is in Fred Shannon, *The Farmer's Last Frontier*, *op. cit.*, p. 359.

Chapter Seven

1. Cf. Grant McConnell, *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1953), pp. 1–35; Michael Rogin, "Voluntarism: The Political Functions of an Anti-Political Doctrine," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 15 (July 1962), p. 523.
2. This is not to say, with Hofstadter, that the "hard" post-Populist farm organizations were practical while the "soft" Populists were not. Hofstadter achieves this result by focusing on Populist rhetoric and farm psychology in the Populist chapters and on farm organization activities later on. In fact, the Farm Bureau was practical for many of its members. But its perpetuation of the yeoman myth and its glorification of rural life surpassed Populist romanticism. Often the Farm Bureau, like manufacturers of farm products and other industrialists, utilized the agrarian myth to disguise its purposes and power. Cf. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955), pp. 109–130; Grant McConnell, *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy*, *op. cit.*; C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), pp. 51–137; Gilbert C. Fite, *George N. Peek and the Fight for Farm Parity* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954), pp. 20, 123–125, 281; Paul M. Johnstone, "Old Ideals vs. New Ideas in Farm Life," in U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Farmers in a Changing World; Yearbook of Agriculture* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1940), p. 165.
3. Writers like Croly and Weyl explicitly focused their analysis around the fragmenting of rural homogeneity. Cf. Walter Weyl, *The New Democracy* (New York: Macmillan, 1912); Herbert Croly, *The Promise of American Life* (New York: Macmillan, 1910).
4. Much contemporary progressive historiography centers around whether the progressives remained rooted in the moral certainties of the past or left the nineteenth century behind. Cf. Morton White, *Social Thought in America: The Revolt Against Formalism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957); Eric F. Goldman, *Rendezvous with Destiny* (New York: Knopf, 1952); Richard Hofstadter, *Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955); Henry F.

May, *The End of American Innocence* (New York: Knopf, 1959); Charles Forcey, *The Crossroads of Liberalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961); Samuel P. Hays, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959); David Noble, *The Paradox of Progressive Thought* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1958); Gabriel Kolko, *The Triumph of Conservatism* (New York: Free Press, 1963); George E. Mowry, *The California Progressives* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1951); Sam Haber, "Scientific Management and the Progressive Movement" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of California at Berkeley, 1961), now published as *Efficiency and Uplift* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964). Footnote references are to the dissertation.

5. Charles McCarthy, *The Wisconsin Idea* (New York: Macmillan, 1912), pp. 302–303.
6. Eric F. Goldman, *Rendezvous with Destiny*, *op. cit.*, pp. 306–314.
7. Hofstadter, *Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–16.
8. Cf. Gerd Korman, "Politics, Loyalties, Immigrant Traditions, and Reform: The Wisconsin German-American Press and Progressivism 1909-1912," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 40 (Spring 1957).
9. Cf. Sam Haber, "Scientific Management and the Progressive Movement," *op. cit.*, pp. 108, 117, 131–133, 141–153; Charles Forcey, *The Crossroads of Liberalism*, *op. cit.*, p. 312; Gabriel Kolko, *The Triumph of Conservatism*, *op. cit.*, pp. 160–164. My interpretation here owes much to a conversation with Arthur Lipow. Note that as long as Populists were confident of winning a majority of the population to their organization, they cared little about direct democracy. These reforms occupied a prominent place in the Populist program only after 1896. It should be noted, however, that a progressive like La Follette did think of direct democracy as increasing popular control over decision makers.
10. V. O. Key, Jr., and Winston W. Crouch, *The Initiative and the Referendum in California* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1939), pp. 565–574.
11. Cf. Duane Lockard, *The Politics of State and Local Government* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), pp. 226–238; Charles R. Adrian, *Governing Urban America* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), pp. 100–102; Charles R. Adrian, "Some General Characteristics of Non-Partisan Elections," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 46 (September 1952), pp. 766–776; Eugene C. Lee, *The Politics of Nonpartisanship* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1960).
12. Cf. John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (Chicago: Gate-

NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN

- way Books, 1946), Mary Parker Follett, *The New State* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1918).
13. Cf. Sam Haber, "Scientific Management and the Progressive Movement," *op. cit.*, pp. 71–74.
 14. Cf. George E. Mowry, *The California Progressives*, *op. cit.*, pp. 39–50. Hofstadter concentrates on this type of progressive; cf. *The Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, pp. 200–211.
 15. Cf. Sam Haber, "Scientific Management and the Progressive Movement," *op. cit.*, pp. 149–163.
 16. Cf. Mowry, pp. 45–56, 90–94; Walton Bean, *Boss Ruef's San Francisco* (Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 1952), pp. 260–316.
 17. Charles McCarthy, *The Wisconsin Idea*, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
 18. AFL, *Proceedings*, 1930, p. 318.
 19. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourses* (New York: Dutton, Everyman's Library), pp. 13–14. Rousseau's belief was also predicated on social homogeneity and harmony of interests.
 20. Cf. Henry S. Kariel, *The Decline of American Pluralism* (Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1961), pp. 68–113; Marver H. Bernstein, *Regulating Business by Independent Commission* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1955); Philip O. Foss, *Politics and Grass* (Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 1960); and a host of similar studies.
 21. Cf. Grant McConnell, *Private Power and American Democracy* (New York: Knopf, 1966), pp. 38–50.
 22. Cf. Sam Haber, "Scientific Management and the Progressive Movement," *op. cit.*, pp. 112–113, 122–125, 154, 219–220; Charles Forcey, *The Crossroads of Liberalism*, *op. cit.*, p. 299; Grant McConnell, *Private Power and American Democracy* (New York: Knopf, 1966), pp. 52–70. Note the active role Taft's Department of Commerce and Labor played in the formation of the Chamber of Commerce.
 23. Cf. Andrew M. Scott, "The Progressive Era in Perspective," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 21 (November 1959).
 24. Cf. Arthur J. Altmeyer, "The Wisconsin Idea and Social Security," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 42 (Autumn 1948).
 25. Pro-war Socialists like John Spargo and William English Walling also became more conservative as the Socialist Party opposed the war.
 26. For a treatment of the war's impact on progressivism, cf. Henry F. May, *The End of American Innocence*, *op. cit.*, pp. 361–398.
 27. George Mowry, *The California Progressives*, *op. cit.*, pp. 286–301.
 28. And in each case, a brief flurry of radical political activity preceded the prosperity and normalcy of the postwar years.
 29. Cf. Arthur S. Link, "What Happened to the Progressive Move-

- ment in the 1920's?" *American Historical Review*, Vol. 64 (July 1959), p. 840.
30. Arthur S. Link, *ibid.*, p. 845.
 31. Farm movements had favored special demands before, such as the exemption of farm coops from antitrust laws and the exemption of farm improvements from taxation. However, McNary-Haugen was the first agrarian reform measure of a special interest character to dominate agrarian reform politics.
 32. Sylvia Snowiss, "Roosevelt and Congress, The First Hundred Days" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1962), pp. 10–13, 29–39, 56–67, 94–95, provides statistical evidence for this assertion.
 33. Grant McConnell, *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy*, *op. cit.*
 34. There is no evidence of disproportionate Populist support for noneconomic authoritarian movements. Lipset writes that the Ku Klux Klan was a latter-day expression of provincial Populism; S. M. Lipset, *Political Man* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1960), p. 167. Oscar Handlin asserts that the mass of Klan members came from areas strongly radical in the 1890's: "American Views of the Jew at the Opening of the Twentieth Century," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, Vol. 40 (June 1951), p. 325. However, in his own history of the Jews in America, Handlin lists the states in which the Klan was strongest at its height — Oregon, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Populism was insignificant in all but Oregon, and even this state was not a center of Populist strength. Cf. Oscar Handlin, *Adventures in Freedom* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1954), pp. 203–204. The Great Plains, the heartland of midwestern Populism, did not support the Klan.
 35. Louis J. Ducoff, "Farm Laborers," in Carl Taylor, *et al.*, *Rural Life in the United States* (New York: Knopf, 1949), pp. 284–291; C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), pp. 218–219, 401–405.
 36. Evidence on farmer sensitivity to depressions is contained in Leon Epstein, *Politics in Wisconsin* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958), pp. 71–74; Angus Campbell *et al.*, *The American Voter* (New York: Wiley, 1960), pp. 417–422; Samuel Lubell, *The Revolt of the Moderates* (New York: Harper, 1956), pp. 155–174.
 37. Bernard Berelson *et al.*, *Voting* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 194–198.
 38. Cf. Stuart Rice, *Farmers and Workers in American Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1924), pp. 214–220.
 39. Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (New York: International Publishers, 1963).
 40. Cf. Charles P. Loomis and J. Allen Beagle, "The Spread of German Nazism in Rural Areas," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 11 (December 1946); Rudolph Heberle, *From*

Democracy to Nazism (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1945). For a classic analysis of the petit bourgeois roots of German Nazism cf. Leon Trotsky, *What Next?* (New York: Pioneer Publishers, 1932).

In Canada, the neofascist Social Credit Party is strong in the wheat areas of Alberta, while similar Saskatchewan areas produced the social-Democratic Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

41. Victor Ferkiss, "The Populist Influences on American Fascism," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 10 (June 1959), pp. 353, 356.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 350–351. The second of Ferkiss' arguments — that the Populist "plebiscitarian" ideology produced fascism — is better dealt with in analyzing McCarthyism. Ferkiss himself admits that the Populist economic theories are dead, but he asserts that McCarthyism proves that the Populist theories of plebiscitary democracy are still dangerous. Cf. Victor Ferkiss, "Populism: Myth, Reality, Current Danger," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (September 1961), p. 340.
43. Cf. David J. Saposs, "The Role of the Middle Class in Social Development: Fascism, Populism, Communism, Socialism," in *Economic Essays in Honor of Wesley Clair Mitchell* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935).
44. Perry Howard, *Political Tendencies in Louisiana: 1812–1952* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1957), pp. 90–98, 112–114, 123. Even this evidence is of dubious validity in demonstrating the authoritarian predispositions of agrarian radical supporters. At the time of his first victory, Long's antidemocratic characteristics were hardly clear. Indeed, one finds many historians who feel that the benefits Long brought to Louisiana's farmers and workers far outweigh his political strong-arm tactics at the state level. His national activities prior to his assassination are another story. But in state politics, Long was far from the typical southern demagogue: He was not a racist, and he made many concrete reforms. Cf. T. Harry Williams, "The Gentleman from Louisiana: Demagogue or Democrat," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 26 (February 1960).
45. Gerald R. McCoy, "The Development and Dissolution of the Wisconsin Progressive Party of 1934–46" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1949), p. 68.
46. John A. Crampton, "Yours for Humanity: The Role of Ideology in the Farmers Union" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of California at Berkeley, 1962), pp. 67–68, 189–196.
47. Gerald R. McCoy, "The Development and Dissolution of the Wisconsin Progressive Party of 1934–46," *op. cit.*, p. 70.
48. Its absence of anti-Semitism was no accident in this regard. As

Lipset and others have pointed out, because the Jews are perceived to have a close relation to money and usury, an authoritarian rural economic revolt will have anti-Semitic overtones. Cf. S. M. Lipset, "The Sources of the 'Radical Right,'" in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), p. 219n.

Chapter Eight

1. Seymour Martin Lipset, *The First New Nation* (New York: Basic Books, 1963), pp. 262, 271.
2. Cf. Robert A. Dahl, *Who Governs* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), pp. 321–324. Dahl runs into difficulty because at the same time that he makes this argument he recognizes that McCarthy did not have significant active support outside the political stratum. He therefore retreats to a position close to that discussed later, pp. 256–260.
3. Talcott Parsons, "Social Strains in America," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), p. 136. Italics in original.
4. Daniel Bell, "Interpretations of American Politics," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
5. Cf. Julius Turner, *Party and Constituency: Pressures on Congress* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1951), pp. 145–160; Ralph H. Smuckler, "The Region of Isolation," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 47 (June 1953); Ray Allen Billington, "The Origins of Middle Western Isolationism," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 60 (March 1945); Samuel Lubell, *The Revolt of the Moderates* (New York: Harper, 1956), p. 274.
6. *Congressional Quarterly*, "McCarthy's Strength Centered in West, Midwest," Vol. 12 (December 3, 1954), p. 1409.
7. Cf. Charles J. V. Murphy, "McCarthy and the Businessman," *Fortune*, Vol. 49 (April 1954). Texas was also a center of pro-McCarthy business sentiment. Cf. Charles J. V. Murphy, "Texas Businessmen and McCarthy," *Fortune*, Vol. 49 (May 1954).
8. Leslie A. Fiedler, "McCarthy," *Encounter*, Vol. 3 (August 1954), p. 15.
9. Every daily paper in the state of Georgia opposed the Populists. Cf. C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), p. 242. In addition to opposing the Populists and the Non-Partisan League, the newspapers of North Dakota opposed progressive governor John Burke. Cf. Benton H. Wilcox, "A Reconsideration of the Character and Economic Basis of Northwestern Radicalism" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Wisconsin, 1933), p. 94.

NOTES TO CHAPTER EIGHT

10. James M. Burns, *The Deadlock of Democracy* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 188.
11. Cf. Talcott Parsons, "Social Strains in America," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 136–137; Senator Joe McCarthy, *The Story of General George C. Marshall* (1952), pp. 132, 140–141. McCarthy's anti-British appeals did not have Populist roots so much as Irish and German roots.
12. Charles Murphy, "McCarthy and the Businessmen," *Fortune*, *op. cit.*, p. 180. For evidence of the consistently conservative character of McCarthy's voting record, cf. George Belknap, "A Study of Senatorial Voting by Scale Analysis" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1951), pp. 49, 59, 64, 69; Miles McMillan, "Calling the Roll on McCarthy," *Progressive*, Vol. 17 (May 1954), pp. 13–16. Ferkiss, however, writes, "His voting record was, in fact, somewhat left of center on major issues of government economic intervention." Cf. Victor C. Ferkiss, "Political and Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism, Right and Left," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 344 (November 1962), p. 5.
13. Charles Murphy, "Texas Businessmen and McCarthy," *Fortune*, *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 216.
14. By the time the Korean War ended, McCarthy controlled a Senate committee, had terrorized the Republican Party, and was front-page news daily. He had achieved such notoriety that he could not be expected to fade away immediately. Therefore, it is not surprising that a year elapsed between the end of the war and his censure.
15. Samuel A. Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1955), pp. 57, 71.
16. Talcott Parsons, "Social Strains in America," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.* Cf. also David Riesman and Nathan Glazer, "The Intellectuals and the Discontented Classes," and Peter Viereck, "The Revolt Against the Elite," in *ibid.*
17. Seymour Martin Lipset, "The Sources of the Radical Right," in *ibid.*, p. 212.
18. Daniel Bell, "Interpretations of American Politics," in *ibid.*, p. 20.
19. Daniel Bell, *The End of Ideology* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960), pp. 294, 373–375.
20. Since then Lipset has published a valuable analysis of survey data bearing on support for McCarthy. Cf. Seymour Martin Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, and Birchers (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor, 1964).
21. Cf. William F. Buckley and L. Brent Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies* (Chicago: Regnery, 1954), pp. 282–285, 308–330. On

- page 285, for example, the authors write, "It is curious that what is widely thought of as a contemptible aspect of Senator McCarthy's method actually amounts to nothing more than his intimacy with the people."
22. Martin A. Trow, "Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of Support for McCarthy in a New England Town" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, 1957), p. 281.
 23. Nelson W. Polsby, "Towards an Explanation of McCarthyism," *Political Studies*, Vol. 8 (October 1960), pp. 269–270.
 24. Martin A. Trow, "Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of Support for McCarthy in a New England Town," *op. cit.*, p. 281 and references there cited.
 25. *Memorial Services Held in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, Together with Remarks Presented in Eulogy of Joseph McCarthy* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1957), pp. 343–344.
 26. Richard Rovere, *Senator Joe McCarthy* (New York: Meridian, 1960), p. 248.
 27. Reported in Nelson Polsby, "Towards an Explanation of McCarthyism," *op. cit.*, p. 253.
 28. Cf. Richard Rovere, *Senator Joe McCarthy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 167–168.
 29. Frank J. Kendrick, "McCarthy and the Senate" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1962), p. 33.
 30. Cf. Michael Straight, *Trial by Television* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1954), pp. 146–148.
 31. Similarly, it is hard to agree with Luthin that McCarthy's participation in a county picnic in Wisconsin demonstrates his demagoguery. Cf. Reinhard H. Luthin, *American Demagogues* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1954), p. 307.
 32. Cf. *supra*, Chapter 2.
 33. Samuel Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties*, *op. cit.*, pp. 26–57.
 34. Cf. Herbert H. Hyman, "England and America; Climates of Tolerance and Intolerance (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right*, *op. cit.*, particularly p. 288.
 35. Cf. S. M. Lipset and Nathan Glazer, "The Polls on Communism and Conformity," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.* S. M. Lipset, *The First New Nation*, *op. cit.*, pp. 277–281, makes a parallel point about personality and politics.
 36. Cf. William Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959), pp. 59–60, 102–103, 131–134; Edward Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956), pp. 38–41, 46, 98–108, 169–184; S. M. Lipset, *The First New Nation*, *op. cit.*, pp. 262–271.

NOTES TO CHAPTER EIGHT

37. Nelson Polsby, "Towards an Explanation of McCarthyism," *op. cit.*, p. 262. Republicans comprised 46 percent of those for McCarthy and 24 percent of those against him; 30 percent of those for McCarthy and 58 percent of those against him were Democrats.
38. Cf. Frank Kendrick, "McCarthy and the Senate," *op. cit.*, pp. 330–331, Nelson Polsby, "Towards an Explanation of McCarthyism," *op. cit.*, pp. 258–262. The contrast between Jewish and Catholic support for McCarthy provides the only exception. That case aside, the biggest percentage point spread in this data is the 27 points separating farmers from business and professional people.

Those who attended a Christian Anti-Communist Crusade school in Oakland, California, in 1962 were overwhelmingly Republican. Ninety percent had voted for Nixon in 1960. Cf. Raymond E. Wolfinger, *et al.*, "America's Radical Right: Politics and Ideology," in David E. Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent* (New York: Free Press, 1964), pp. 267–268.
39. Cf. Angus Campbell and Homer C. Cooper, *Group Differences in Attitudes and Votes* (Survey Research Center: University of Michigan, 1956), p. 92.
40. S. M. Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 397. Note also that party differences are exaggerated by the lack of southern support for McCarthy. Democratic party allegiance and anti-Catholic attitudes limited support for McCarthy in the South. If one considered only northern respondents, the effect of party on attitudes toward McCarthy might be considerably reduced.
41. *Ibid.*, pp. 408–410. Lipset suggests that the relations are weak, but they are as strong as the relationships between party and demographic variables and support for McCarthy. Survey data from the 1952 election further reveal that ". . . rudimentary ideological patterns on questions of foreign policy were at least as firmly crystallized as on matters of domestic policy. Moreover, despite the efforts of Eisenhower and his leading followers to narrow the range of competition of foreign issues, the ideology of his supporters diverged from that of Stevenson in foreign policy to a degree equal to, if not greater than, that encountered in domestic politics." Morris Janowitz and Dwaine Marvick, *Competitive Pressures and Democratic Consent* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, 1956), pp. 115–116.
42. S. M. Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 408.
43. Martin A. Trow, "Small Businessmen, Political Intolerance, and

- Support for McCarthy," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 64 (November 1958), pp. 275–278.
44. S. M. Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right, op. cit.*, pp. 410–411. Analysis of another national sample in the middle 1950's also indicates that among political leaders and educated followers, those with a prolabor orientation were much more opposed to congressional witch-hunts than those with a probusiness orientation. Cf. Jerry Mandel, "The Effect of Class Consciousness and Political Sophistication on Working-Class Authoritarianism" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Sociology, University of California at Berkeley, 1964), pp. 53–59. On the conservative issue position of those who attended the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade school in Oakland, California, cf. Raymond E. Wolfinger, *et al.*, "America's Radical Right: Politics and Ideology," *op. cit.*, pp. 271–273.
 45. S. M. Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right, op. cit.*, p. 400; A. Campbell and H. C. Cooper, *Group Differences in Attitudes and Votes, op. cit.*, pp. 145–149; Frank Kendrick, "McCarthy and the Senate," *op. cit.*, pp. 330–331; Immanuel Wallerstein, "McCarthyism and the Conservative" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, 1957), pp. 82–85. The exceptions are the surveys reported by Campbell and Cooper, and Kendrick; but in these, as in some of the other surveys, professionals and businessmen are classed together. Note that the clientele of the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade school in Oakland was overwhelmingly wealthy and college-educated. Cf. Raymond E. Wolfinger, *et al.*, "America's Radical Right: Politics and Ideology," *op. cit.*, pp. 268, 276–277.
 46. S. M. Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right, op. cit.*, p. 400; A. Campbell and H. C. Cooper, *Group Differences in Attitudes and Votes, op. cit.*, pp. 145–149; Martin Trow, "Small Businessmen, Political Intolerance, and Support for McCarthy," *American Journal of Sociology, op. cit.*, pp. 274–276. The retired, listed in only one poll, were the most pro-McCarthy group of all. (Cf. Lipset, *Radical Right*, p. 400.)
 47. Nonunion members supported McCarthy no more than union members did, but they opposed him less. (More were neutral or had no opinion.) This suggests that union membership exposed workers to anti-McCarthy union leaders but not that workers without unions focused their discontent on McCarthy's targets rather than union targets. The latter interpretation would require greater support for McCarthy among nonunion workers. Cf. A. Campbell and H. C. Cooper, *Group Differences in Atti-*

- tudes and Votes, op. cit.*, pp. 145–149; Martin Trow, “Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of the Support for McCarthy in a New England Town,” *op. cit.*, pp. 153–166.
48. S. M. Lipset, “Three Decades of Support for the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962),” in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right, op. cit.*, p. 400; A. Campbell and H. C. Cooper, *Group Differences in Attitudes and Votes, op. cit.*, pp. 145–149; Frank Kendrick, “McCarthy and the Senate,” *op. cit.*, pp. 330–331.
 49. A. Campbell and H. C. Cooper, *Group Differences in Attitudes and Votes, op. cit.*, pp. 145–149; Nelson Polsby, “Towards an Explanation of McCarthyism,” *op. cit.*, p. 261; Frank Kendrick, “McCarthy and the Senate,” *op. cit.*, pp. 330–331.
 50. A. Campbell and H. C. Cooper, *Group Differences in Attitudes and Votes, op. cit.*, p. 149; S. M. Lipset, “Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962),” in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right, op. cit.*, p. 404.
 51. S. M. Lipset, “Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962),” in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right, op. cit.*, p. 406.
 52. Nelson Polsby, “Towards an Explanation of McCarthyism,” *op. cit.*, p. 261; A. Campbell and H. C. Cooper, *Group Differences in Attitudes and Votes, op. cit.*, pp. 145–149; Frank Kendrick, “McCarthy and the Senate,” *op. cit.*, pp. 330–331; Immanuel Wallerstein, “McCarthyism and the Conservative,” *op. cit.*, pp. 75–78. The greatest educational differences are reported in John M. Fenton, *In Your Opinion* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1960), pp. 135–136, 140–141.
 53. S. M. Lipset, “Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962),” in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right, op. cit.*, p. 398.
 54. Martin A. Trow, “Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of Support for McCarthy in a New England Town,” *op. cit.*, p. 109.
 55. S. M. Lipset, “Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962),” in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right, op. cit.*, pp. 412–414.
 56. Cf. Charles D. Farris, “‘Authoritarianism’ as a Political Behavior Variable,” *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 18 (February 1956), pp. 69–78. Within the lower class, the more authoritarian supported Folsom more than the less authoritarian. This could be accounted for by education or income, or it may be a truly psychological factor. Within the middle class, there was no relationship between authoritarianism and support for Folsom.

Those who attended the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade school were “joiners,” felt more politically efficacious than was typical for white, college-educated northerners, and were ex-

- tremely active politically. Cf. Raymond E. Wolfinger, *et al.*, "America's Radical Right: Politics and Ideology," *op. cit.*, pp. 276–277.
57. Richard Hofstadter, "The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 49–50.
 58. Martin A. Trow, "Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of the Support for McCarthy in a New England Town," *op. cit.*, pp. 94–100.
 59. S. M. Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 414–417. Lack of support for McCarthy in the ethnocentric South does not corrupt this finding, since one reported poll excluded the southern states. On greater southern intolerance and authoritarianism, cf. Samuel A. Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Rights*, *op. cit.*, pp. 110–111, and the study reported by E. Terry Prothro and Levan Milikian, in "The California Public Opinion Scale in an Authoritarian Culture," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 17 (Fall 1953), p. 354.
 60. Reported by S. M. Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 402–403.
 61. Data from files of National Opinion Research Center, Chicago.
 62. David Riesman and Nathan Glazer, "The Intellectuals and the Discontented Classes," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 70–71. In his latest work, but not in his original article on McCarthyism, Lipset stresses the importance of the Communist issue. Cf. S. M. Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, Birchers (1962)," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The Radical Right*, *op. cit.*, pp. 392–393.
 63. Samuel A. Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties*, *op. cit.*, pp. 230–231. In other words, 2½ percent of the population singled out McCarthy as their general, anti-Communist hero. This corresponds to the 5 percent of the population which said it would support him for President on a third-party ticket. Cf. John Fenton, *In Your Opinion*, *op. cit.*, p. 143.
 64. S. M. Lipset, "The Sources of the Radical Right," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 214.
 65. A. Campbell *et al.*, *The Voter Decides* (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1954), p. 52; A. Campbell *et al.*, *The American Voter* (New York: Wiley, 1960), pp. 50, 182, 198–199. The Republican's foreign policy advantage rests on the peace issue not the war issue; thus Goldwater's saber rattling lost that traditional advantage in 1964.
 66. Immanuel Wallerstein, "McCarthyism and the Conservative," *op. cit.*, pp. 75–78. Even so, there was no greater tendency for the college educated to approve of McCarthy personally but oppose his methods than for the high-school educated. This

- tendency was significantly more apparent among the grade-school educated, but the difference in percentage point spread should not be exaggerated. At the college level, the spread between approval of McCarthy and disapproval of his methods is 32, at the high-school level 33, and at the grade-school level 19. This interpretation differs from John Fenton, *In Your Opinion*, *op. cit.*, p. 136, where the figures are reported.
67. Louis Bean, *Influences in the 1954 Mid-Term Elections* (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Institute, 1954), pp. 22, 32–33, and *supra*, Tables 8.1 and 8.4.
 68. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
 69. *Ibid.*, pp. 18–21; Nelson Polsby, “Towards an Explanation of McCarthyism,” *op. cit.*, pp. 265–268; *supra*, Chapters 3–5. Bean (p. 32) only found an important pro-McCarthy influence in 1950 in Maryland. In 1952, Republican moderates ran better for the senate than Republican conservatives, and were less likely to run behind Eisenhower. Cf. Louis Harris, *Is There a Republican Majority?* (New York: Harper, 1954), pp. 203–204, 223.
 70. Louis Bean, *Influences in the 1954 Mid-Term Elections* (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Institute, 1954), p. 26; *supra*, Chapters 3, 5.
 71. *Supra*, Chapter 3. According to Fiedler, the “working class districts of Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee, ordinarily safe for the Democrats,” helped to elect McCarthy. The only basis for this assertion is that in McCarthy’s 1946 primary victory workers did not vote as heavily for La Follette as they had in 1940. McCarthy carried working-class areas. But to relate this, as Fiedler does, to “the revolt of the community against its intelligence,” is perverse. Because of La Follette’s anticommunism, the then Communist-controlled CIO sought to defeat La Follette. In addition, many pro-La Follette workers probably did not vote in the Republican primary. It is ascribing intelligence indeed to the working class to assume that in 1946 it could perceive that McCarthy was an anti-intellectual revolutionary and hence support him. (Cf. Leslie Fiedler, “McCarthy,” *op. cit.*, pp. 14, 20.)
 72. A. Campbell, *et al.*, *The American Voter*, *op. cit.*, p. 301.
 73. As Trow has pointed out, status concerns kept white-collar workers and those in the managerial hierarchy from supporting McCarthy, since he seemed to be attacking that hierarchy. Cf. Trow, “Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of the Support for McCarthy in a New England Town,” *op. cit.*, pp. 41–43, 101–102, 132.
 74. This view extrapolates from Samuel Lubell’s interpretations in *The Future of American Politics* (New York: Harper, 1952).
 75. It could be argued that McCarthy had no strength at the polls because his followers were completely disenchanted with tra-

ditional political activity. As Lipset suggests, much of McCarthy's support may have come from people too alienated to vote. Cf. S. M. Lipset, "The Sources of the 'Radical Right,'" in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 199. But if these people were too alienated to vote, they were also probably too alienated to exert influence in any other way. Voting is almost always the first step. Moreover, Lipset has shown that Nazism in Germany did not grow originally because of the support of previous nonvoters. He argues that these elements will wait until a movement has demonstrated strength before supporting it at the polls. Cf. S. M. Lipset, *Political Man*, *op. cit.*, pp. 121–122, 149–152. One might still argue that a totally latent McCarthy mass support could have erupted suddenly into prominence, but this would be pure speculation.

76. S. M. Lipset, *The First New Nation*, *op. cit.*, p. 262.
77. Cf. Paul E. Breslow, "The Relationship between Ideology and Socio-Economic Background in a Group of McCarthyite Leaders" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1955), pp. 82–103.
78. Quoted in Nelson Polsby, "Towards an Explanation of McCarthyism," *op. cit.*, p. 263.
79. S. M. Lipset, *The First New Nation*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1–2, 262–273, 318–343.
80. There were, of course, other reasons for the absence of something similar to McCarthyism in Britain. Unlike America, Britain was not entering the world stage as a preeminent power for the first time. The Communist "menace" was much more salient in America. But McCarthyism arose out of the response of American elites to these new challenges, not primarily out of the response of American masses.
81. Cf. Donald R. Matthews, *U.S. Senators and Their World* (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1960), pp. 64–66, 254–255 and letter from Professor Matthews to the author.
82. Peter Viereck, "The Revolt Against the Elite," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
83. Frank Kendrick, "McCarthy and the Senate," *op. cit.*, p. 145.
84. *Ibid.*, pp. 173–174; K. E. Meyer, "The Politics of Loyalty: From La Follette to McCarthy in Wisconsin: 1918–1952" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Princeton University, 1956), pp. 90–91.
85. Cf. Michael Straight, *Trial by Television*, *op. cit.*, p. 140. Cf. also Norman A. Graebner, *The New Isolationism* (New York: Ronald Press, 1956), p. 199; Telford Taylor, *Grand Inquest* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), pp. 114–123; Aaron Wildavsky, "Exploring the Content of McCarthyism," *The Australian Outlook* (June 1955).
86. Dwaine Marvick (in personal conversation) has suggested some relevant findings from survey data on members of the John

- Birch Society in California. The Birchers justify their views by pointing to prestigious members of their local communities who are also Birchers. As in support for McCarthy, deference can be more important than anti-elitism.
87. Cf. Frank Kendrick, "McCarthy and the Senate," *op. cit.*, pp. 317–323; Aaron Wildavsky, "Exploring the Content of McCarthyism," *op. cit.*
 88. Aaron Wildavsky, "Exploring the Content of McCarthyism," *loc. cit.*
 89. Quoted in *ibid.*
 90. Daniel Bell, "Interpretations of American Politics," in Daniel Bell (ed.), *The New American Right*, *op. cit.*, p. 25; Leslie Fiedler, "McCarthy," *op. cit.*, p. 13.
 91. Cf. Jack Anderson and Ronald W. May, *McCarthy the Man, The Senator, The Ism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1952), pp. 266–270.
 92. Cf. Reinhard Luthin, *American Demagogues*, *op. cit.*, pp. 293–294.
 93. Cf. Nelson W. Polsby and Aaron B. Wildavsky, *Presidential Elections* (New York: Scribner's, 1964), pp. 40–46.
 94. This point was suggested, in correspondence, by Nelson Polsby.
 95. Cf. Edward Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 46–47, 102–109.
 96. This argument is developed more fully in the following chapter.
 97. Charles Murphy, "McCarthy and the Businessmen," *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 216.
 98. Cf. William S. White, *Citadel* (New York: Harper, 1965), p. 137.

Chapter Nine

1. Cf. Karl Marx, *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (New York: International Publishers, 1963).
2. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1955), p. 16.
3. For a form of this argument that links McCarthyism to aspects of American politics in general rather than to agrarian radicalism in particular, cf. Hans J. Morgenthau, *The Purpose of American Politics* (New York: Knopf, 1960), pp. 146–157.
4. Cf. C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson: Agrarian Radical* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), *passim*.
5. Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
6. We will note later than those same contrasting attitude syndromes are found at the popular level.
7. What "homogenization" means here may be pictured by imagining what would happen to several apples placed in a powerful Waring blender. The apples would first become small particles and then turn into mush.

8. Perhaps the most influential book written in the 1950's from this point of view was John Kenneth Galbraith, *American Capitalism* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1952), pp. 1-34, 89-170. One consequence is that when liberals move from complacency to concern, as Galbraith did when he wrote *The Affluent Society* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958), they see no problem of power standing in the way of their public policy goals. It is only necessary to educate the people (cf. pp. 13-14).
9. Cf. William Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959), pp. 15, 48-49.
10. This division is affected by social stratification. Educated and wealthy people tend to be close to the leadership stratum whereas those of low education, sophistication, and social class predominate in the "followers" stratum: workers, farmers, and Negroes, for example.
 Note also that classical Marxism sees social stratification as a horizontal division and minimizes the importance of horizontal *political* stratification. Pluralists argue that social stratification creates vertical cleavages in politics, since business is not significantly more powerful than labor, and so on.
11. *Supra*, Chapter 1.
12. For a developed theory of the dangers of taking issues outside the leadership stratum, cf. Robert Dahl, *Who Governs* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961), pp. 80-94, 318-325. Also cf. *supra*, Chapter 1.
13. Cf. Jerry Mandel, "The Effects of Class Consciousness and Political Sophistication on Working Class Authoritarianism" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Sociology, University of California at Berkeley, 1964), p. 65.
14. Cf. Herbert McClosky, "Conservatism and Personality," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 52 (March 1958), pp. 35-44.
15. Cf. Herbert McClosky, *et al.*, "Issue Conflict and Consensus among Party Leaders and Followers," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 54 (June 1960), pp. 422-423.
16. The literature on this subject is necessarily impressionistic but of considerable substance. Cf., for example, Robert Michels, *Political Parties* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949); Grant McConnell, *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1953); Philip Selznick, *T.V.A. and the Grass Roots* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1949); J. D. Greenstone, "Labor in Three Cities" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1963); Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Harvest Books), pp. 118-119.
17. AFL, *Proceedings*, 1924, pp. 5-6.
18. Cf. Grant McConnell, *Private Power and American Democracy* (New York: Knopf, 1966), pp. 52-154. Michael Rogin, "Voluntarism: The Political Functions of an Anti-Political

Doctrine," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 15 (July 1962).

19. Cf. Angus Campbell, *et al.*, *The American Voter* (New York: Wiley, 1960), pp. 188–265.

Appendix A

1. For further explication of the techniques of correlation analysis, cf. V. O. Key, Jr., *A Primer of Statistics for Political Scientists* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1954), pp. 78–153.

Appendix B

1. For a more detailed and precise explanation of the basic principles and methods of factor analysis, see John M. Butler, *et al.*, *Quantitative Naturalistic Research* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963). Cf. also, L. L. Thurstone, *Multiple Factor Analysis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947).
2. The adequacy of this approximation can be checked by performing mathematical operations on the factor matrix. Consider a factor matrix with the following loadings for the first two rows:

row	I	II	III
1	.3	-.7	.8
2	.8	-.2	.1

One multiplies corresponding elements of the two rows together and adds: $(.3 \times .8 = .24) + (-.7 \times -.2 = .14) + (.8 \times -.1 = -.08) = .30$. The computed relationship between rows one and two can be compared with the actual relationship on the original matrix. If the two approximate each other satisfactorily, then the factor matrix has accounted for the relationship. If not, additional factors should be extracted.

In the present analysis, the fifth and sixth factors essentially loaded high on only one row each of the original matrix. Since the seventh, eighth . . . *n*th principal axes would account for progressively less of the original data, it seemed reasonable to believe that after the fourth principal axis one was extracting principal axes unique to one row of the original matrix rather than common to several rows.

3. On the concept of simple structure, cf. L. L. Thurstone, *Multiple Factor Analysis, op. cit.*, pp. 319–346.
4. Cf. John M. Butler, *et al.*, *Quantitative Naturalistic Research, op. cit.*, Chapter 4. The first principal axis was ignored because it is an average of all the data rows. It should also be noted that in selecting data vectors around which to rotate, those with a negative loading on the first principal axis were ignored.
5. The method of this rotation is described in *ibid.*, Chapter 4 and Appendix B. First an oblique rotation was made from the

orthogonal principal axis matrix to the new matrix. This new matrix was then orthogonalized by a method that makes successive approximations to an orthogonal structure. In the present analysis, it was necessary to orthogonalize only once.

6. The usual procedure for plotting scatter diagrams is used to examine the relation of each factor to each other by pairs. This gives six graphs in an analysis with four factors such as this one.
7. On the method of graphical rotation cf. L. L. Thurstone, *Multiple Factor Analysis, op. cit.*, pp. 194–216. In the present rotation the Populist and traditional Democratic factors became intercorrelated ($r = -.33$).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Election Statistics

NORTH DAKOTA

Robert Byrne, Secretary of State. *Compilation of Election Returns National and State, 1914–1928*. Bismarck, N. D., 1930.

The Fargo Forum. November 5, 1958, p. 2; June 30, 1960, p. 2.

Thomas Hall, Secretary of State. *Compilation of Election Returns National and State, 1930–1944*. Bismarck, N. D., 1945.

Ben Meier, Secretary of State. *Compilation of Election Returns National and State, 1946–1954*. Bismarck, N. D., 1956.

State of North Dakota. *Legislative Manual*. Bismarck, N. D., 1912.

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota Legislative Manual. Pierre, S. D., 1913–1956.

WISCONSIN

The Wisconsin Blue Book. 1887–1958.

GENERAL

Robinson, Edgar Eugene. *The Presidential Vote, 1896–1932*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1934.

Scammon, Richard M. (ed.). *America Votes*. 3 Vols. Vols. I and II, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956, 1958; Vol. III, Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958.

The 1961 World Almanac and Book of Facts. New York: *World Telegram and Sun*, 1961.

Census Material

- Department of the Interior, Census Office. *Report on the Population of United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890*. Vol. I, Part 1, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1897.
- Department of the Interior, Census Office. *Statistics of Agriculture in the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1895.
- Department of the Interior, Census Office. *Report on Farms and Homes: Property and Indebtedness at the Eleventh Census: 1890*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1896.
- Department of the Interior, Census Office. *Report on Statistics of Churches of the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1894.
- Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Thirteenth Census of the United States; Vol. VII, Agriculture, 1909–1910; Report by States, Nebraska to Wyoming*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.
- Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Thirteenth Census of the United States; Vol. III, Population, 1910; Report by States, Nebraska to Wyoming*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.
- Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Religious Bodies, 1916; Part I, Summary and General Tables*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919.
- Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Fourteenth Census of the United States; Vol. III, Population, 1920; Report by States, Nebraska to Wyoming*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1922.
- Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930; Population, Vol. III, Part 2*. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1932.
- Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930; Agriculture, Vol. II, Type of Farm; Part I, The Northern States*. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1932.
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Religious Bodies: 1936; Vol. I, Summary and Detailed Tables*. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1941.
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Census of Population: 1950; Characteristics of the Population; Part 34: North Dakota.* Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1952.
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population: 1950; Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population; Part 41: South Dakota.* Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1952.
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Census of Agriculture: 1950; Counties and State Economic Areas; Vol. 1, Part 11: North and South Dakota.* Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1952.

Books

- Aaron, Daniel. *Men of Good Hope.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Adorno, T. W., et al. *The Authoritarian Personality.* New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.
- Anderson, Jack, and Ronald W. May. *McCarthy the Man, the Senator, the Ism.* Boston: The Beacon Press, 1952.
- Arnett, Alex Matthews. *The Populist Movement in Georgia.* New York: Columbia University, 1922.
- Auerbach, M. Morton. *The Conservative Illusion.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Banfield, Edward. *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.
- Bean, Louis. *Ballot Behavior.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1940.
- . *How to Predict Elections.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.
- . *Influences in the 1954 Mid-Term Elections.* Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Institute, 1954.
- Bean, Walton. *Boss Ruef's San Francisco.* Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1952.
- Bell, Daniel. *The End of Ideology.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.
- (ed.). *The New American Right.* New York: Criterion Books, 1955.
- (ed.). *The Radical Right.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., Anchor Books, 1964.
- Bendix, Reinhard. *Work and Authority in Industry.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956.

- Benson, Lee. *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- . *Merchants, Farmers, and Railroads*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- Berelson, Bernard, Paul F. Lazarfeld, and William N. McPhee. *Voting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Blum, John Morton. *The Republican Roosevelt*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Bogue, Allan G. *Money at Interest: The Farm Mortgage on the Middle Border*. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955.
- Bogue, Donald J., and Calvin L. Beale. *Economic Areas of the United States*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. *The Genius of American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- . *The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1948.
- Bowers, Claude G. *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932.
- Bramson, Leon. *The Political Context of Sociology*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Buck, Solon Justus. *The Granger Movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Buckley, William F., and L. Brent Bozell. *McCarthy and His Enemies*. Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1954.
- Butler, John M., et al. *Quantitative Naturalistic Research*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960.
- , and Homer C. Cooper. *Group Differences in Attitudes and Votes*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1956.
- , Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller. *The Voter Decides*. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1954.
- Capper, Arthur. *The Agricultural Bloc*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1922.
- Carnegie, Andrew. *Triumphant Democracy*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.
- Carr, Robert K. *The House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1945–1950*. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1952.
- Christie, Richard, and Marie Jahoda (eds.). *Studies in the Scope*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- and Method of The Authoritarian Personality*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.
- Clark, John B. *Populism in Alabama*. Auburn, Ala.: Auburn Printing Co., 1927.
- Cole, Wayne S. *America First*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953.
- Cornwall, William G. *Free Coinage from the Businessman's Standpoint*. Buffalo, N. Y.: Matthews-Northrup Co., 1891.
- Crawford, Lewis F. *History of North Dakota*. Vol. I. Chicago, Ill.: American Historical Society, 1931.
- Croly, Herbert. *The Promise of American Life*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910.
- Curti, Merle, et al. *The Making of an American Community*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Dahl, Robert A. *Who Governs*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961.
- David, Henry. *A History of the Haymarket Affair*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1936.
- Destler, Chester McArthur. *American Radicalism: 1865–1901*. New London, Conn.: Connecticut College, 1946.
- Dewey, John. *The Public and Its Problems*. Chicago: Gateway Books, 1946.
- Doan, Edward N. *The La Follettes and the Wisconsin Idea*. New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1947.
- Donnelly, Ignatius. *Caesar's Column*. Chicago: J. Regan and Co., n.d.
- Donner, Frank J. *The Un-Americans*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1961.
- Dunne, Finley Peter. *Mr. Dooley's Opinions*. New York: R. H. Russell, 1901.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Division of Labor*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1947.
- Epstein, Leon D. *Politics in Wisconsin*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.
- Fenton, John M. *In Your Opinion*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1960.
- Filler, Louis. *Crusaders for American Liberalism*. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1950.
- Fine, Nathan. *Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States: 1828–1928*. New York: Rand School, 1928.
- Fine, Sidney. *Laissez Faire and the General-Welfare State*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1956.

- Fite, Gilbert C. *George N. Peek and the Fight for Farm Parity*. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.
- . *Peter Norbeck, Prairie Statesman*. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1948.
- Follett, Mary Parker. *The New State*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1918.
- Forcey, Charles. *The Crossroads of American Liberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Fox, Dixon Ryan (ed.). *Sources of Culture in the Middle West*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1934.
- Gates, Paul W. *The Farmer's Age: Agriculture 1815–1860*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
- Goldman, Eric F. *Rendezvous with Destiny*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.
- Gore, Leroy. *Joe Must Go*. New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1954.
- Gosnell, Harold F. *Grass Root Politics*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1942.
- Graebner, Norman A. *The New Isolationism*. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1956.
- Gunther, John. *Inside U.S.A.* New York: Harper and Bros., 1947.
- Handlin, Oscar. *Adventures in Freedom*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1954.
- . *The Uprooted*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1951.
- , and Mary Flug Handlin. *Commonwealth*. New York: New York University Press, 1945.
- Harris, Louis. *Is There A Republican Majority?* New York: Harper and Bros., 1954.
- Hartz, Louis. *Economic Policy and Democratic Thought: Pennsylvania, 1776–1860*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- . *The Liberal Tradition in America*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1955.
- Hays, Samuel P. *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- . *The Response to Industrialism 1885–1914*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Heberle, Rudolf. *From Democracy to Nazism*. Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1945.
- Hesseltine, William B. *The Rise and Fall of Third Parties*. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1948.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hicks, John D. *The Populist Revolt*. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Higham, John. *Strangers in the Land*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955.
- Hitchborn, Franklin. *The System*. San Francisco, Calif.: James H. Barry, 1915.
- Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
- . *The American Political Tradition*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.
- Holcombe, Arthur N. *The Political Parties of Today*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1924.
- Howard, Perry H. *Political Tendencies in Louisiana: 1812–1952*. Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1957.
- Howe, Frederic C. *Confessions of a Reformer*. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1925.
- Janowitz, Morris, and Marvick, Dwaine. *Competitive Pressures and Democratic Consent*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Bureau of Government Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, 1956.
- Jones, Alfred Winslow. *Life, Liberty, and Property*. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1941.
- Kelley, Samuel C., Jr., et al. *The Population, Labor Force and Income of North Dakota, 1900–1965*. Grand Forks, N.D.: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of North Dakota, 1954.
- Key, V. O., Jr. *American State Politics*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.
- . *A Primer of Statistics for Political Scientists*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1954.
- . *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.
- , and Winston W. Crouch. *The Initiative and the Referendum in California*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1939.
- Kolko, Gabriel. *The Triumph of Conservatism*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- Kornhauser, William. *The Politics of Mass Society*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1959.
- Kraenzel, Carl Frederick. *The Great Plains in Transition*. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1957.
- La Follette, Belle Case, and Fola La Follette. *Robert M. La Follette*. 2 Vols. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1953.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- La Follette, Robert M. *La Follette's Autobiography*. Madison, Wis.: The Robert M. La Follette Co., 1913.
- Link, Arthur S. *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1954.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Agrarian Socialism*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1959.
- . *The First New Nation*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1963.
- . *Political Man*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1960.
- Lloyd, Henry Demarest. *Wealth Against Commonwealth*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1894.
- Locke, John. *Of Civil Government*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Everyman's Library.
- Lowenthal, Leo, and Norbert Guterman. *Prophets of Deceit*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949.
- Lubell, Samuel. *The Future of American Politics*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1952.
- . *The Revolt of the Moderates*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1956.
- Luthin, Reinhard H. *American Demagogues*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1954.
- McCarthy, Charles. *The Wisconsin Idea*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912.
- McCarthy, Senator Joe. *McCarthyism: The Fight for America*. New York: The Devin-Adair Co., 1952.
- . *The Story of General George C. Marshall*. New York: The Devin-Adair Co., 1952.
- McCloskey, Robert Green. *American Conservatism in an Age of Enterprise*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- McConnell, Grant. *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1953.
- MacKay, Kenneth Campbell. *The Progressive Movement of 1924*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947.
- MacRae, Duncan, Jr. *Dimensions of Congressional Voting*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Publications in Sociology and Social Institutions, University of California Press, 1958.
- Martin, Roscoe B. *The People's Party in Texas*. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas, 1933.
- Matthews, Donald R. *U.S. Senators and Their World*. New York: Random House, Inc., Vintage Books, 1960.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Maxwell, Robert S. *La Follette and the Rise of the Progressives in Wisconsin*. Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1956.
- May, Henry F. *The End of American Innocence*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.
- Mayer, George H. *The Political Career of Floyd B. Olson*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1951.
- Mecklin, John Moffatt. *The Ku Klux Klan*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1924.
- Memorial Services Held in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, together with Remarks Presented in Eulogy of Joseph Raymond McCarthy*. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1957.
- Meyers, Marvin. *The Jacksonian Persuasion*. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.
- Miller, Perry. *Jonathan Edwards*. New York: Meridian Books, 1959.
- Mills, C. Wright. *White Collar*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Morlan, Robert L. *Political Prairie Fire*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1955.
- Mowry, George E. *The California Progressives*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1951.
- . *The Era of Theodore Roosevelt*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1958.
- . *The Progressive Movement 1900–1920: Recent Ideas and New Literature*. Washington, D. C.: Service Center for Teachers of History, 1958.
- . *Theodore Roosevelt and the Progressive Movement*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1946.
- Murray, Robert K. *Red Scare*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1955.
- Nelson, Bruce. *Land of the Dakotahs*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1946.
- Neprash, Jerry Alvin. *The Brookhart Campaigns in Iowa 1920–26*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.
- Newman, William J. *The Futitarian Society*. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1961.
- Nixon, Herman Clarence. *The Populist Movement in Iowa*. Reprinted from the January 1926 Number of the Iowa Journal of History and Politics. Iowa City, Iowa: State Historical Society of Iowa.

- Noble, David W. *The Paradox of Progressive Thought*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1958.
- Nye, Russel B. *Midwestern Progressive Politics*. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State College Press, 1951.
- Palamountain, Joseph Cornwall. *The Politics of Distribution*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- Parsons, Talcott. *Structure and Process in Modern Societies*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.
- Peffer, William A. *The Farmer's Side: His Troubles and Their Remedy*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1891.
- . *Government Control of Money*. Washington, D. C.; Senate of the United States, 1892.
- . *The Way Out*. Topeka, Kan.: Kansas Farmers Co., 1890.
- Pollack, Norman. *The Populist Response to Industrial America*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Pye, Lucian. *Guerilla Communism in Malaya*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1956.
- Ranulf, Svend. *Moral Indignation and Middle Class Psychology*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Levin and Munksgaard, 1938.
- Rice, Stuart A. *Farmers and Workers in American Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1924.
- . *Quantitative Methods in Politics*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1928.
- Riesman, David, with Nathan Glazer, and Ruel Denney. *The Lonely Crowd*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Anchor Books, 1953.
- Rorty, James, and Moshe Dechter. *McCarthy and the Communists*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1954.
- Rosenberg, Bernard, and David Manning White (eds.). *Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.
- Rovere, Richard H. *Senator Joe McCarthy*. New York: Meridian Books, 1960.
- Saloutos, Theodore, and John D. Hicks. *Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West, 1900–1939*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1951.
- Schaar, John H. *Loyalty in America*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1957.
- Schell, Herbert S. *History of South Dakota*. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Selznick, Philip. *T. V. A. and the Grass Roots*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1949.
- Shafer, Joseph. *A History of Agriculture in Wisconsin*. Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1922.
- Shannon, Fred A. *American Farmers' Movements*. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1957.
- . *The Farmer's Last Frontier: Agriculture 1860–1897*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1945.
- Shelton, William Du Bose. *Populism in the Old Dominion*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1935.
- Shils, Edward A. *Torment of Secrecy*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956.
- Simkins, Francis Butler. *The Tillman Movement in South Carolina*. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1926.
- Smith, Henry Nash. *Virgin Land*. New York: Random House, Inc., Vintage Books, 1959.
- Smith, J. Allen. *The Spirit of American Government*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1907.
- Stedman, Murray S., Jr., and Susan W. Stedman. *Discontent at the Polls*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.
- Stember, Charles Herbert. *Education and Attitude Change*. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1951.
- Stouffer, Samuel A. *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1955.
- Straight, Michael. *Trial by Television*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1954.
- Talmon, Jacob. *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1952.
- Taylor, Carl C. *The Farmers' Movements 1620–1920*. New York: American Book Co., 1953.
- , et al. *Rural Life in the United States*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.
- Taylor, Telford. *Grand Inquest*. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1955.
- Thurstone, Louis Leon. *Multiple Factor Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. 2 Vols. New York: Random House, Inc., Vintage Books, 1959, 1960.
- Turner, Frederick Jackson. *The Frontier in American History*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1920.
- Turner, Julius. *Party and Constituency; Pressures on Congress*. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1951.

- Twiss, Benjamin R. *Lawyers and the Constitution*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1942.
- Ulam, Adam B. *The Unfinished Revolution*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1960.
- Viereck, Peter. *The Unadjusted Man*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1956.
- Webb, Walter Prescott. *The Great Plains*. New York: Ginn and Co., 1931.
- Weber, Max. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.). New York: Galaxy Books, 1958.
- . *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- Wechsler, James A. *The Age of Suspicion*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1953.
- Weyl, Walter. *The New Democracy*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912.
- White, Morton. *Social Thought in America: The Revolt Against Formalism*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1957.
- Wisconsin Citizens' Committee on McCarthy's Record. *The McCarthy Record*. Madison, Wis., 1952.
- Wood, Robert C. *Suburbia*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1959.
- Woodward, C. Vann. *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1938.

Articles

- Abrams, Richard M. "Paradox of Progressivism: Massachusetts on the Eve of Insurgency," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 75 (September 1960), pp. 379–399.
- Adrian, Charles R. "The Origins of Minnesota's Nonpartisan Legislature," *Minnesota History*, Vol. 33 (Winter 1952), pp. 155–163.
- Allinsmith, Wesley, and Beverley Allinsmith. "Religious Affiliation and Politico-Economic Attitudes," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 12 (Fall 1948), pp. 377–389.
- Altmeyer, Arthur J. "The Wisconsin Idea and Social Security," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 42 (Autumn 1948), pp. 19–25.
- Apter, David E. "The Role of Traditionalism in the Political Modernization of Ghana and Uganda," *World Politics*, Vol. 13 (October 1960), pp. 45–68.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baggaley, Andrew R. "Patterns of Voting Change in Wisconsin Counties, 1952-1957," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 12 (March 1959), pp. 141-144.
- . "Religious Influence on Wisconsin Voting, 1928-1960," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 56 (March 1962), pp. 66-70.
- . "White Collar Employment and the Republican Vote," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 20 (Summer 1956), pp. 471-473.
- Bailey, Thomas A. "The West and Radical Legislation 1890-1930," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 38 (January 1933), pp. 603-611.
- Baker, Oliver E. "Agricultural Regions of North America," *Economic Geography*, Vol. 2 (October 1926), pp. 459-493; Vol. 3 (January 1927), pp. 50-86; Vol. 3 (July 1927), pp. 309-339; Vol. 3 (October 1927), pp. 447-466; Vol. 4 (January 1928), pp. 44-73; Vol. 4 (October 1928), pp. 399-433.
- Barnes, James H. "Myths of the Bryan Campaign," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 34 (December 1947), pp. 367-401.
- Barnhart, John D. "Rainfall and the Populist Party in Nebraska," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 19 (August 1925), pp. 522-540.
- Bates, J. Leonard. "Fulfilling American Democracy: The Conservation Movement 1907-1921," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 44 (June 1957), pp. 29-57.
- Becker, Karl Lotus. "Kansas," in *Essays in American History Dedicated to Frederick Jackson Turner*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1910, pp. 85-112.
- Bell, Daniel. "The Theory of Mass Society," *Commentary*, Vol. 22 (July 1956), pp. 75-83.
- Benson, Lee. "Research Problems in American Historiography," in Mirra Komarovsky (ed.). *Common Frontiers of the Social Sciences*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957, pp. 113-183.
- Billington, Ray Allen. "The Origins of Middle Western Isolationism," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 60 (March 1945), pp. 44-64.
- Bowers, William J. "The Fruits of Iowa Progressivism 1900-1915," *Iowa Journal of History*, Vol. 57 (January 1959), pp. 34-60.
- Briggs, Harold E. "Early Bonanza Farming in the Red River

- Valley of the North," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 6 (January 1932), pp. 26–37.
- . "The Development and Decline of Open Range Ranching in the Northwest," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 20 (March 1934), pp. 521–536.
- Bunzel, John H. "The General Ideology of American Small Business," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 70 (March 1955), pp. 87–102.
- Caldwell, Martha B. "The Woman Suffrage Campaign of 1912," *The Kansas Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 13 (1943), pp. 300–318.
- Canning, Ray R., and James M. Baker. "Effect of the Group on Authoritarian and Non-Authoritarian Persons," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 64 (May 1959), pp. 579–581.
- Carleton, William G. "Isolationism and the Middle West," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 33 (December 1946), pp. 377–390.
- Case, Herman M. "Guttman Scaling Applied to Center's Conservatism-Radicalism Battery," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 48 (March 1953), pp. 556–563.
- Chandler, Alfred D. "The Origins of Progressive Leadership," in Elting Morison, Jr. (ed.). *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt*. Vol. VIII. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Chapman, Philip C. "The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism vs. Political Philosophy," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 75 (March 1960), pp. 17–34.
- Colletta, Paolo E. "Tempest in a Teapot? Governor Ponter's Appointment of William V. Allen to the United States Senate," *Nebraska History*, Vol. 38 (June 1957), pp. 155–163.
- . "The Morning Star of Reformation: William J. Bryan's First Congressional Campaign," *Nebraska History*, Vol. 37 (June 1956), pp. 103–120.
- . "The Nebraska Democratic State Convention of April 13–14, 1892," *Nebraska History*, Vol. 39 (December 1958), pp. 317–334.
- Congressional Quarterly*, "The McCarthy Censure," Vol. 12 (December 3, 1954), pp. 1404–1407.
- . "McCarthy's Strength Centered in West, Midwest," Vol. 12 (December 3, 1954), p. 1409.
- Danker, Donald F. "Nebraska and the Presidential Election of 1912," *Nebraska History*, Vol. 37 (December 1956), pp. 283–310.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Diamond, William. "Urban and Rural Voting in 1896," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 46 (January 1941), pp. 281–305.
- Doster, James F. "Were Populists Against Railroad Corporations? The Case of Alabama," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 20 (1954), pp. 395–399.
- Duffus, Robert L. "The Ku Klux Klan in the Middle West," *World's Work*, Vol. 46 (August 1923), pp. 363–372.
- Edwards, Everett E. "American Agriculture — The First 300 Years," in United States Department of Agriculture, *Farmers in a Changing World. Yearbook of Agriculture*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1940, pp. 171–276.
- . "Middle Western Agricultural History as a Field of Research," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 24 (December 1937), pp. 315–328.
- Elkins, Stanley, and Eric McKittrick. "A Meaning for Turner's Frontier," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 64 (September 1954), pp. 321–353.
- Emerick, C. F. "Analysis of Agrarian Discontent in the United States," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 11 (September 1896), pp. 433–463; (December 1896), pp. 601–639.
- Engberg, George B. "The Knights of Labor in Minnesota," *Minnesota History*, Vol. 22 (December 1941), pp. 367–390.
- Fairchild, G. T. "Populism in a State Education Institution, The Kansas State Agricultural College," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 3 (November 1897), pp. 392–404.
- Farris, Charles D. "A Method of Determining the Ideological Groupings in the Congress," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 20 (May 1958), pp. 308–338.
- . "'Authoritarianism' as a Political Behavior Variable," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 18 (February 1956), pp. 61–82.
- . "Selected Attitudes on Foreign Affairs as Correlates of Authoritarianism and Political Anomie," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 22 (February 1960), pp. 50–67.
- Farmer, Hallie. "The Economic Background of Frontier Populism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 10 (March 1924), pp. 406–427.
- Faulds, Bob. "Dakota Points the Way," *New Republic*, Vol. 119 (August 16, 1948), pp. 9–10.
- Ferkiss, Victor C. "Political and Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism, Right and Left," *Annals of the American Acad-*

- emy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 344 (November 1962), pp. 1–12.
- . “The Populist Influences on American Fascism,” *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 10 (June 1957), pp. 350–373.
- . “Populism: Myth, Reality, Current Danger,” *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (September 1961), pp. 737–740.
- Fiedler, Leslie A. “McCarthy,” *Encounter*, Vol. 3 (August 1954), pp. 10–21.
- Findley, James C. “Cross-Filing and the Progressive Movement in California Politics,” *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 12 (September 1959), pp. 699–701.
- Fite, Gilbert C. “The Agricultural Issue in the Presidential Campaign of 1928,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 37 (March 1951), pp. 653–672.
- . “Republican Strategy and the Farm Vote in the Presidential Campaign of 1896,” *American Historical Review*, Vol. 45 (June 1960), pp. 787–806.
- Fletcher, Ralph, and Mildred Fletcher. “Consistency in Party Voting from 1896–1932,” *Social Forces*, Vol. 15 (December 1936), pp. 281–285.
- Francis, Clara. “The Coming of Prohibition to Kansas,” *Collections of the Kansas State Historical Society*, Vol. 15 (1919–1922), pp. 192–227.
- Friedrich, Carl J. “The Agricultural Basis of Emotional Nationalism,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 1 (April 1937), pp. 50–61.
- Fuller, Leon W. “Colorado’s Revolt against Capitalism,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 21 (December 1934), pp. 343–360.
- Gilman, Rhoda R. “Ramsey, Donnelly, and the Congressional Campaign of 1868,” *Minnesota History*, Vol. 36 (December 1959), pp. 300–308.
- Glazer, Nathan. “The Method of Senator McCarthy,” *Commentary*, Vol. 15 (March 1953), pp. 244–256.
- Goffman, Irwin W. “Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution,” *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 22 (June 1957), pp. 275–281.
- Gosnell, Harold F., and Norman N. Gill. “An Analysis of the 1932 Presidential Vote in Chicago,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 29 (December 1935), pp. 967–984.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. “Mass Society and Extremist Politics,”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Sociological Review*, Vol. 27 (February 1962), pp. 19–30.
- Halich, Wasyl. "Ukrainian Farmers in the United States," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 10 (January 1936), pp. 25–39.
- Handlin, Oscar. "American Views of the Jew at the Opening of the Twentieth Century," *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, Vol. 40 (June 1951), pp. 323–344.
- Harrington, Elbert W. "A Survey of the Political Ideas of Albert Baird Cummins," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. 39 (October 1941), pp. 739–786.
- Herberg, Will. "Government by Rabble-Rousing," *New Leader*, Vol. 37 (January 18, 1954), pp. 13–16.
- Hicks, John D. "The Legacy of Populism in the Western Middle West," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 23 (October 1949), pp. 225–236.
- . "The People's Party in Minnesota," *Minnesota History*, Vol. 5 (November, 1924), pp. 531–560.
- . "The Third Party Tradition in American Politics," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 20 (June 1933), pp. 3–28.
- Higham, John. "Anti-Semitism in the Guilded Age," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 43 (March 1957), pp. 559–578.
- Hill, Perry C. "Wisconsin Votes for President," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 36 (Autumn 1952), pp. 11–16.
- Holbo, Paul S. "Wheat or What? Populism and American Fascism," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 16 (September 1961), pp. 727–736.
- Hollingsworth, J. Rogers. "Populism: The Problem of Rhetoric and Reality," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 39 (April 1965), pp. 81–85.
- Horton, John E., and Wayne E. Thompson. "Powerlessness and Political Negativism: A Study of Defeated Local Referendums," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 67 (March 1962), pp. 485–493.
- Huntington, Samuel P. "The Electoral Tactics of Nonpartisan League," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 36 (March 1950), pp. 613–632.
- Janowitz, Morris, and Dwaine Marvick. "Authoritarianism and Political Behavior," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 17 (Summer 1953), pp. 185–201.
- Jarchow, Merril E. "King Wheat," *Minnesota History*, Vol. 29 (March 1948), pp. 1–28.

- Johnson, Roy P. "John Burke," *North Dakota History*, Vol. 28 (Winter 1961), pp. 29–31.
- Johnson, Walter. "Politics in the Midwest," *Nebraska History*, Vol. 32 (March 1951), pp. 1–17.
- Johnstone, Paul H. "Old Ideas Versus New Ideas in Farm Life," in United States Department of Agriculture. *Farmers in a Changing World. Yearbook of Agriculture*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1940, pp. 111–170.
- . "Turnips and Romanticism," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 12 (July 1938), pp. 224–255.
- Kennedy, Padriac M. "Lenroot, La Follette, and the Campaign of 1908," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 42 (Spring 1959), pp. 163–174.
- Kern, Jean B. "The Political Career of Horace Boies," *Iowa Journal of History*, Vol. 47 (July 1949), pp. 214–246.
- Key, V. O., Jr. "A Theory of Critical Elections," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 17 (February 1955), pp. 3–18.
- , and Frank Munger. "Social Determinism and Electoral Decision: The Case of Indiana," in Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck (eds.). *American Voting Behavior*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- Korman, Gerd. "Politics, Loyalties, Immigrant Traditions, and Reform: The Wisconsin German-American Press and Progressivism 1909–1912," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 40 (Spring 1957), pp. 161–168.
- Lamphere, George N. "History of Wheat Raising in the Red River Valley," *Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society*, Vol. 10 (February 1905), pp. 1–33.
- Lane, Robert E. "Politics, Personality, and Electoral Choice," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 49 (March 1953), pp. 173–190.
- Larsen, Lawrence H. "William Langer: A Maverick in the Senate," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 44 (Spring 1961), pp. 189–198.
- Link, Arthur S. "What Happened to the Progressive Movement in the 1920's?" *American Historical Review*, Vol. 64 (July 1959), pp. 833–851.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. "A Changing American Character," in Seymour Martin Lipset and Leo Lowenthal (eds.), *Culture and Social Character*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961, pp. 136–171.
- . "Socialism — Left and Right — East and West," *Confluence*, Vol. 7 (Summer 1958), pp. 173–192.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- . "Social Stratification and 'Right-Wing' Extremism," *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 10 (December 1959), pp. 346–382.
- , *et al.* "The Psychology of Voting," in G. Lindzey (ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Vol. II. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954.
- Lodge, Henry Cabot. "The Meaning of The Votes," *North American Review*, Vol. 165 (January 1897), pp. 1–11.
- Loomis, Charles P., and J. Allan Beegle. "The Spread of German Nazism in Rural Areas," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 11 (December 1946), pp. 724–734.
- Lowitt, Richard. "George Norris, James J. Hill, and the Railroad Rate Bill," *Nebraska History*, Vol. 40 (June 1959), pp. 137–146.
- . "George Norris and Agricultural Relief During the Twenties," *Nebraska History*, Vol. 36 (September 1955), pp. 173–182.
- . "Populism and Politics: The Start of George W. Norris' Political Career," *Nebraska History*, Vol. 42 (June 1961), pp. 75–94.
- Lundberg, George A. "The Demographic and Economic Basis of Political Radicalism and Conservatism," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 32 (March 1927), pp. 719–732.
- Luthin, Reinhard H. "Smith Wildman Brookhart of Iowa: Insurgent Agrarian Politician," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 25 (October 1951), pp. 187–197.
- Lynn, Erwin L. "The Influence of Liberalism and Conservatism on Voting Behavior," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 8 (Summer 1949), pp. 299–309.
- Macmahon, Arthur W. "Political Parties and Elections: Presidential Vote," *Political Science Quarterly*, Supplement, Vol. 40 (1925), pp. 51–56.
- MacRae, Duncan, Jr. "Occupations and the Congressional Vote, 1940–1950," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 20 (June 1955), pp. 332–340.
- , and James A. Meldrum. "Critical Elections in Illinois, 1888–1958," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 54 (September 1960), pp. 669–683.
- McClosky, Herbert. "Conservatism and Personality," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 52 (March 1958), pp. 27–45.
- , *et al.* "Issue Conflict and Consensus among Party Leaders and Followers," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 54 (June 1960), pp. 406–427.

- McCoy, Donald R. "The National Progressives of America, 1938," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 54 (June 1957), pp. 75–93.
- McGovern, George. "Mission to the Hungry," *Progressive*, Vol. 26 (March 1962), pp. 19–22.
- McMillan, Miles. "Calling the Roll on McCarthy," *Progressive*, Vol. 17 (May 1954), pp. 13–16.
- McVey, Frank L. "The Populist Movement," *Economic Studies*, Vol. 1 (August 1896), pp. 135–209.
- McWilliams, Carey. "North Dakota Showdown," *Nation*, Vol. 178 (March 1952), pp. 295–296.
- Mahler, Ludwig. "Ideology and History in America," *New Politics*, Vol. 1 (Fall 1961), pp. 132–143.
- March, James G. "McCarthy Can Still Be Beaten," *Reporter*, Vol. 7 (October 22, 1952), pp. 17–19.
- Margulies, Herbert F. "The Background of the La Follette-McGovern Schism," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 40 (Autumn 1956), pp. 21–29.
- . "The Election of 1920 in Wisconsin: The Return to 'Normalcy' Reappraised," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 41 (Autumn 1957), pp. 15–22.
- . "The La Follette-Phillip Alliance of 1918," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 37 (Summer 1955), pp. 248–249.
- Marsden, K. Gerald. "Patriotic Societies and American Labor: The American Protective Association in Wisconsin," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 41 (Summer 1958), pp. 287–294.
- Merton, Robert. "Social Structure and Anomie," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 3 (October 1938), pp. 672–682.
- Miller, Raymond Curtis. "The Background of Populism in Kansas," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 11 (March 1925), pp. 469–489.
- Mitau, G. Theodore. "The Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party Schism of 1948," *Minnesota History*, Vol. 34 (Spring 1955), pp. 187–194.
- Murphy, Charles J. V. "McCarthy and the Businessman," *Fortune*, Vol. 49 (April 1954), pp. 156–158, 180–194.
- Murray, Stanley N. "Railroads and the Agricultural Development of the Red River Valley of the North, 1870–1890," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 31 (October 1957), pp. 57–66.
- National Farmers Union Washington Newsletter*, Vol. 8 (November 17, 1961), p. 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- . "Farm Bureau Drags God into Debate," Vol. 8 (December 15, 1961), p. 1.
- Nettler, Gwynne. "Cruelty, Dignity, and Determinism," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 24 (June 1959), pp. 375–384.
- New Republic*. "North Dakota Barometer," Vol. 142 (April 11, 1960), pp. 6–7.
- Newsweek*. "Dakota's Decision," Vol. 39 (June 16, 1952), pp. 27–28.
- . "Duel in North Dakota," Vol. 11 (June 27, 1938), p. 12.
- . "The Governor To Be," Vol. 43 (June 14, 1954), p. 29.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. "Beria and McCarthy," *New Leader*, Vol. 37 (January 4, 1954), pp. 3–4.
- Nixon, Herman Clarence. "The Economic Basis of The Populist Movement in Iowa," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. 21 (July 1923), pp. 373–396.
- Nydegger, Walter Ellsworth. "The Election of 1892 in Iowa," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. 25 (July 1927), pp. 359–449.
- O'Connor, James R. "National Farm Organizations and United States Tariff Policy in the 1920s," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 32 (January 1958), pp. 32–43.
- Ogburn, William F., and Lolagene C. Combs. "The Economic Factor in the Roosevelt Elections," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 34 (August 1940), pp. 719–727.
- , and Estelle Hill. "Income Classes and the Roosevelt Vote in 1932," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 50 (June 1935), pp. 186–193.
- , and Abe J. Jaffe. "Independent Voting in Presidential Elections," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 42 (September 1936), pp. 186–201.
- , and Delum Peterson. "Political Thought of Social Classes," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 31 (June 1916), pp. 300–317.
- , and Nell Snow Talbot. "A Measurement of the Factors in the Presidential Election of 1928," *Social Forces*, Vol. 8 (December 1929), pp. 175–183.
- O'Neill, W. M., and Daniel J. Levinson. "A Factorial Exploration of Authoritarianism and Some of Its Ideological Concomitants," *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 22 (June 1954), pp. 449–463.
- Pollack, Norman. "Hofstadter on Populism: A Critique of 'The

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Age of Reform,'” *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 26 (November 1960), pp. 478–500.
- . “The Myth of Populist Anti-Semitism,” *American Historical Review*, Vol. 68 (October 1962), pp. 76–80.
- Polsby, Nelson W. “Towards an Explanation of McCarthyism,” *Political Studies*, Vol. 8 (October 1960), pp. 250–271.
- Prothro, E. Terry, and Levan Melikian. “The California Public Opinion Scale in an Authoritarian Culture,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 17 (Fall 1953), pp. 353–363.
- Ridge, Martin. “Ignatius Donnelly: Minnesota Congressman 1863–69,” *Minnesota History*, Vol. 36 (March 1959), pp. 173–183.
- . “Ignatius Donnelly and the Granger Movement in Minnesota,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 42 (March 1956), pp. 693–709.
- Roberts, Alan H., and Milton Rokeach. “Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice: A Replication,” *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 61 (January 1956), pp. 355–358.
- Robinson, Edgar Eugene. “Recent Manifestations of Sectionalism,” *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 19 (January 1914), pp. 446–467.
- Robinson, Elwyn B. “The Themes of North Dakota History,” *North Dakota History*, Vol. 26 (Winter 1959), pp. 5–24.
- Robinson, Daniel M. “Tennessee Politics and the Agrarian Revolt 1886–1896,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 20 (December 1933), pp. 365–380.
- Ronald, Malcomb B. “The Dakota Twins,” *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 158 (September 1936), pp. 359–365.
- Ruggles, Clyde O. “The Economic Basis of the Greenback Movement in Iowa and Wisconsin,” *Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association*, Vol. 6 (1912–1913), pp. 142–165.
- Russ, William A., Jr. “Godkin Looks at Western Agrarianism: A Case Study,” *Agricultural History*, Vol. 19 (October 1945), pp. 233–234.
- Saposs, David J. “The Role of the Middle Class in Social Development: Fascism, Populism, Communism, Socialism,” in *Economic Essays in Honor of Wesley Clair Mitchell*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1935, pp. 393–424.
- Schell, Herbert S. “Adjustment Problems in South Dakota,” *Agricultural History*, Vol. 14 (April 1940), pp. 65–75.
- . “The Granges and the Credit Problem in Dakota Terri-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- tory," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 10 (April 1936), pp. 59–73.
- Schmidt, Louis Bernard. "The Agricultural Revolution in the Prairies and the Great Plains of the United States," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 8 (October 1934), pp. 169–195.
- . "The Internal Grain Trade of the United States 1860–1890," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. 19 (April 1921), pp. 196–245; Vol. 19 (July 1921), pp. 414–455; Vol. 20 (January 1922), pp. 70–131.
- . "The Role and Technique of Agrarian Pressure Groups," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 30 (April 1956), pp. 49–57.
- . "Some Significant Aspects of the Agrarian Revolution in the United States," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. 17 (July 1920), pp. 271–295.
- . "The Westward Movement of the Corn-Growing Industry," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. 21 (January 1923), pp. 112–141.
- . "The Westward Movement of the Wheat-Growing Industry in the United States," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. 18 (July 1920), pp. 396–412.
- Scott, Andrew M. "The Progressive Era in Perspective," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 21 (November 1959), pp. 685–701.
- Shenton, James P. "The Coughlin Movement and the New Deal," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 73 (September 1958), pp. 352–373.
- Sherman, Richard B. "The Status Revolution and Massachusetts Progressive Leadership," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 78 (March 1963), pp. 59–65.
- Shils, Edward. "Daydreams and Nightmares: Reflections on the Criticism of Mass Culture," *The Sewanee Review*, Vol. 75 (1957), pp. 587–608.
- . "Populism and the Rule of Law," The Law School of the University of Chicago, Conference on Jurisprudence and Politics, April 30, 1954, pp. 91–107.
- Smith, Guy-Harold. "Notes on the Distribution of the German-Born in Wisconsin in 1905," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 13 (1929–1930), pp. 107–120.
- . "Notes on the Distribution of the Foreign-born Scandinavian in Wisconsin in 1905," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. 14 (1930–1931), pp. 419–436.
- Smuckler, Ralph H. "The Region of Isolation," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 47 (June 1953), pp. 386–401.
- Steckler, Gerard G. "North Dakota Versus Frederick Jackson

- Turner," *North Dakota History*, Vol. 28 (Winter 1961), pp. 33-43.
- Stevenson, George M. "Nativism in the Forties and Fifties, with Specific Reference to the Mississippi Valley," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 9 (December 1922), pp. 185-202.
- Stewart, Ernest D. "The Populist Party in Indiana," *Indiana Magazine of History*, Vol. 14 (December 1918), pp. 332-367.
- Talbot, Ross B. "The North Dakota Farmers' Union and North Dakota Politics," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 10 (December 1957), pp. 875-901.
- Throne, Mildred. "The Grange in Iowa, 1868-1875," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. 47 (October 1949), pp. 289-324.
- Time*. "Eighteenth Year," Vol. 43 (June 19, 1944), p. 20.
- . "Fourteen Delegates," Vol. 69 (June 16, 1952), p. 23.
- . "Too Busy to Win," Vol. 55 (June 19, 1950), pp. 21-22.
- . "Trouble for Gerald," Vol. 44 (October 16, 1944), p. 21.
- Tinsley, James A. "Texas Progressives and Insurance Regulation," *Southwest Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. 36 (December 1955), pp. 237-247.
- Tracy, Frank Basil. "The Rise and Doom of the Populist Party," *Forum*, Vol. 16 (October 1893), pp. 241-250.
- Trow, Martin. "Small Businessmen, Political Intolerance, and Support for McCarthy," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 64 (November 1958), pp. 270-281.
- Tryon, Warren S. "Agriculture and Politics in South Dakota 1889-1900," *South Dakota Historical Collections*, Vol. 13 (1926), pp. 284-310.
- Tucker, William P. "Populism Up-to-Date, The Story of the Farmers Union," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 21 (October 1947), pp. 198-208.
- Tweton, D. Jerome. "North Dakota in the 1890's: Its People, Politics, and Press," *North Dakota History*, Vol. 24 (April 1957), pp. 113-118.
- . "Sectionalism in North Dakota Politics: The Progressive Republican Revolt of 1900," *North Dakota History*, Vol. 25 (January 1958), pp. 21-28.
- Wallace, Henry. "Report on the Farmers," *New Republic*, Vol. 116 (June 30, 1947), pp. 12-13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Warner, Donald F. "The Farmers' Alliance and the Farmers' Union. An American-Canadian Parallelism," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 23 (January 1949), pp. 9–19.
- . "Prelude to Populism," *Minnesota History*, Vol. 32 (September 1951), pp. 129–146.
- Washington Correspondent. "The Progressives of the Senate," *American Mercury*, Vol. 16 (April 1929), pp. 385–393.
- Watson, Richard L., Jr. "Woodrow Wilson and His Interpreters," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 44 (September 1957), pp. 207–236.
- Westin, Alan Furmin. "The Supreme Court, The Populist Movement, and the Campaign of 1896," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 15 (February 1953), pp. 3–41.
- White, Melvin J. "Populism in Louisiana During the Nineties," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 5 (June 1918), pp. 3–19.
- Wiebe, G. D. "The Army-McCarthy Hearings: The Public Conscience," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 22 (Winter 1958–1959), pp. 490–502.
- Wilcox, Benton H. "An Historical Definition of Northwestern Radicalism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 26 (December 1939), pp. 377–394.
- Wildavsky, Aaron. "Exploring the Content of McCarthyism," *The Australian Outlook* (June 1955).
- Williams, Howard G. "Nye — A Lost Leader," *Nation*, Vol. 158 (June 24, 1947), pp. 730–731.
- Williams, T. Harry. "The Gentleman from Louisiana: Demagogue or Democrat," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 26 (February 1960), pp. 3–21.
- Woodburn, James Albert. "Western Radicals in American Politics," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 13 (September 1926), pp. 143–168.
- Woodward, C. Vann. "The Populist Heritage and the Intellectual," *American Scholar*, Vol. 29 (Winter 1959), pp. 55–72.
- . "Tom Watson and the Negro in Agrarian Politics," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 4 (February 1938), pp. 14–33.
- Wrong, Dennis. "Theories of McCarthyism — A Survey," *Dissent*, Vol. 1 (Autumn 1955), pp. 385–392.
- Zucker, Norman L. "George W. Norris: Nebraska Moralizer," *Nebraska History*, Vol. 42 (June 1951), pp. 95–124.

Department of Agriculture Pamphlets

- Agricultural Research Service. *Farming in the Great Plains*. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture, 1961.
- Durost, Donald D. *Index Numbers of Agricultural Production by Regions, 1939–1958*. Washington, D. C.: Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 1960.
- Generalized Types of Farming in the United States*. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture, 1960
- Hagood, Margaret Jarmon. *Farm-Operator Family Level-of-Living Indexes for Counties of the United States 1930, 1940, 1945, and 1950*. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, 1952.
- McElveen, Jackson V. *Family Farms in a Changing Economy*. Washington, D. C.: Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 1957.
- Strand, Edwin G., and Earl O. Heady. *Productivity of Resources Used on Commercial Farms*. Washington, D. C.: Technical Bulletin No. 1128, United States Department of Agriculture, 1955.
- Strickler, Paul E., and Charles A. Hines. *Numbers of Selected Machines and Equipment on Farms*. Washington, D. C.: Agricultural Research Service and Agricultural Marketing Service, Statistical Bulletin No. 258, United States Department of Agriculture, 1960.

Unpublished Material

- Balknap, George. "A Study of Senatorial Voting by Scale Analysis." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1951.
- Breslow, Paul E. "The Relationship Between Ideology and Socio-Economic Background in a Group of McCarthyite Leaders." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1955.
- Brudvig, Glenn Lowell. "The Farmers' Alliance and Populist Movement in North Dakota (1884–1896)." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of North Dakota, 1956.
- Grampton, John A. "'Yours for Humanity . . .': The Role of Ideology in the Farmers Union." Unpublished Ph.D. disser-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- tation, Department of Political Science, University of California, 1962.
- Gnatz, William R. "The Negro and the Populist Movement in the South." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of History, University of Chicago, 1961.
- Haber, Sam. "Scientific Management and the Progressive Movement, 1910–1929." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of California, 1961.
- Huntington, Samuel Phillips. "The Politics of the Non-Partisan League." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1948.
- Kendrick, Frank J. "McCarthy and the Senate." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1962.
- Larsen, Lawrence Harold. "William Langer, Senator from North Dakota." Unpublished Master's dissertation, Department of History, University of Wisconsin, 1955.
- Mandel, Jerry. "The Effects of Class Consciousness and Political Sophistication on Working Class Authoritarianism." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Sociology, University of California at Berkeley, 1964.
- McCoy, Donald R. "The Development and Dissolution of the Wisconsin Progressive Party of 1934–46." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1949.
- Meyer, Karl Ernest. "The Politics of Loyalty: From La Follette to McCarthy in Wisconsin: 1918–1952." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Princeton University, 1956.
- Miller, Raymond Curtis. "The Populist Party in Kansas." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Chicago, 1928.
- Naftalin, Arthur. "A History of the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota, 1948.
- Nugent, Walter R. "Populism and Nativism in Kansas, 1888–1900." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Chicago, 1961.
- Parsons, Stanley. "Nebraska Populism Reconsidered." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, Washington, 1962.
- Parzen, Herbert. "A Comparative Study of the Progressive Presidential Campaigns of 1912 and 1924." Unpublished Mas-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ter's thesis, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, 1926.
- Snowiss, Sylvia. "Roosevelt and Congress: The First Hundred Days." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1962.
- Thorndal, Otto Nelson. "La Follette's Record in Congress 1885-1891." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of History, University of Chicago, 1925.
- Trow, Martin A. "Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of Support for McCarthy in a New England Town." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, 1957.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. "McCarthyism and the Conservative." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, 1954.
- Wilcox, Benton Harold. "A Reconsideration of the Character and Economic Basis of Northwestern Radicalism." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Wisconsin, 1933.

INDEX

- Academic freedom, Populists and, 180–181
Adams, John, 47
Agrarian radicalism, 119, 261–267
 and Alfred Smith election of 1928, 81, 151, 154
Catholics and, 122
 causes of, 187–189
 decline of, 189–191, 208–210
 and extremism, 211–215
 and industrialization, 34–58 *passim*
 and McCarthyism, 27–31, 131–136, 220–222, 240
 and the Russian-Germans, 120–124
 see also Non-Partisan League; Populist movement; Progressive movement
Alien and Sedition Acts, 47
America First Committee, 106, 214
American Civil Liberties Union, 178
American Farm Bureau Federation, 192
American Federation of Labor, 192, 278
American Medical Association, 21
American Protective Association, 177
Anti-Saloon League, 21, 181, 208
Anti-Semitism, Populism and, 173–174
Arnold, Thurman, 41
Authoritarian personality, support for McCarthy and, 28, 33, 94–95, 240
Authoritarian Personality, The, by T. W. Adorno *et al.*, 18

Beard, Charles, Populist movement and followers of, 183
Bell, Daniel, 6, 11, 17, 27–28, 173, 226
Bennington, Vt., 29, 227–228, 235, 240
Benton, William, 245, 256
Bill of Rights, 178
Blaine, John, 75
Brandeis, Louis, 37, 41, 197n, 199, 203n
Britain
 Langer and, 130–131
 McCarthy and, 131, 223, 251
 Populists and, 176
Bryan, William Jennings, 55, 66, 174, 190
Bundenz, Louis, 250
Burdick, Quentin, 133–134, 135, 267
Burdick, Usher, 106, 128, 133, 134
Bureaucracy, 28, 265–267
 and conservatism, 221–222
 and progressivism, 193–194, 199–202, 205–206
 Weber on, 12–13
Businessmen, McCarthy and, 29, 201–204, 222–223, 236, 259
Calvinism, 38
Carlson, Frank, 253
Carnegie, Andrew, 49, 50
 quoted, 54
Case, Francis H., 161, 162n, 164
Catholics, 176, 177, 262
 and McCarthyism, 238–239, 246
 in North Dakota, 131
 in Democratic Party, 109
 opposition to Non-Partisan League, 122, 123
 in South Dakota
 and Smith election of 1928, 151, 156
 in Wisconsin, 61, 69, 70n
Chamberlain, John, 250
Child labor, 53, 196
China, “loss of,” 224, 243
Choate, Rufus, 51–52
Class politics, 17, 47, 49, 59–60, 186, 273
 and Populist movement, 114–115, 182–183
 and progressive movement, 118–119
Cleveland, Grover, 176
Cohn, Roy, 253
Cold war, 99, 100
Communism, McCarthy support and, 99, 223–225, 228, 242–244
Congress of Industrial Organizations, 191, 279, 280
Consensus, *see* Lockean consensus; Social cohesion
Conservatism, 49, 207, 210–211, 215
 agrarian radicalism and, 55–57, 58
 and attacks on state, 53–54
 factors influencing character of, 57–58
 and McCarthyism, 220–226, 229–231, 234–236, 251–253
 and Populist rhetoric, 50–57 *passim*
 pseudo versus real, 56–58
 social legislation and, 53
 and utopianism, 54
 see also Federalists; Lockean moralism and conservative ideology; Whigs
Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, 109, 115
Corn belt, *see* listings under Farmers
Cornwall, William, quoted, 54–55
Coughlin, Father, 103, 105, 131, 213
 see also Union Party
Crawford, Coe, 66, 72, 146, 148
Croly, Herbert, 197n, 198, 203n
Cross pressure, 23–24
Cuba, Populists and, 177
Cummins, Albert B., 66