

The Gubernatorial Campaign In Virginia In 1901

By JOHN RITCHIE*

INDEPENDENT Democrats in Virginia at the end of 1901 emblazoned the year in red on their political calendars, for in it they had reached a new political height when they controlled the gubernatorial nominating convention and the convention called to revise the Constitution of the State. It had not been an easy height to reach. They had struggled determinedly up from one ledge to another, scrambling back from each slip; and, as they paused for breath, the path ahead looked much easier. But this was deceptive. It was not just a height that they had reached, but a peak of their strength—a peak that they would look back to wishfully during the next decade as they rubbed bruises suffered in their struggle with the "machine."

Thomas S. Martin of Albemarle was the leader of the "machine" that had existed for less than ten years at this time. Martin was a quiet man relatively unknown by the average Virginia voter when he defeated the "ex-governor, hero, and idol of the State,"¹ General Fitzhugh Lee, for the Democratic senatorial nomination in 1893. Lee's supporters, numbering most of his fellow members of the Confederacy and casual followers of politics in Virginia, had gone to bed confident of his victory and awakened the next day to the shouts of the unknown Martin's victory.² Charges of the use of railroad money by Martin to secure his nomination kindled a slow-to-be-forgotten animosity to Martin and his cohorts in the hearts of many of Lee's shocked supporters.³ James Hoge Tyler, an independent popular with the farmers, had been supported by the "machine" for governor in 1897 in an effort to heal this wound, but it was freshly opened by the corrupt tactics of the "machine" in the election of 1899.⁴

It was a good psychological moment then for the clean-shaven, red-headed gubernatorial candidate of the Independents, Andrew

*This paper won first prize in the undergraduate division in 1954. Mr. Ritchie is a resident of Charlottesville, and attended Lane High School there and Episcopal High School in Alexandria. He graduated from the University of Virginia in 1954 and is now in the U. S. Army.

J. Montague, to step out as leader of the fight against the machinations of the "machine." Montague, nicknamed "the red fox of Middlesex," seized this heritage of animosity from the Confederate hero, Fitz Lee, organized his campaign, and gained a great deal of support in the state before the race began.

Montague's popularity throughout the state was a particular asset in this campaign. His family had been prominent residents of Campbell County for generations, and his father had been active in state politics, serving as a member of the House of Delegates and later as judge of the eighth circuit court. The "red fox," himself, was serving as attorney general of the state when he began his campaign for the governorship. Four years before he had won the Democratic nomination for attorney general largely because of his own personal popularity⁵ that was established by his able service as United States district attorney for the western district of Virginia, by his name, and by his "distinguished appearance and impressive oratory."⁶

Montague's leading rival for the Democratic nomination was Representative Claude A. Swanson. This lean young man was born in 1862, the same year as Montague, but he had traveled a rougher, dustier road to his political career. His father had lost all his money following the Panic of 1873 and Swanson had to leave school at fourteen to begin work on a farm. But he continued to educate himself during this period and at eighteen entered Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College in Blacksburg. After two years he had to leave there and take a job as grocery clerk in Danville. Then a voluntary loan from several local businessmen enabled him to study at Randolph-Macon and later take a law degree from the University of Virginia.⁷

While still in college at Randolph-Macon, Swanson had edited the Hanover and Caroline *News*, the Democratic organ for these counties. He had been a straight party man since this time and apparently had won Martin's favor in the 1897 gubernatorial convention and was promised his support in the next gubernatorial campaign.⁸ Swanson's straight party loyalties were pronouncedly straight "machine" loyalties, and he is reported to have said that a true Democrat was "one who does what the machine tells him to do and does it quickly."⁹

Swanson was not, however, so widely known through the state as Montague. In 1892, just six years after his graduation from the Law School of the University of Virginia, he had run successfully for the United States Congress and been re-elected each time after that. His growing prestige in state political circles had thus not

been accompanied by an equal rise in prestige in the general public's eye, for his election was a relatively local affair when compared to the election of the state's attorney general. The duties of his office, moreover, kept him out of the state a great part of his time. Montague, of course, was constantly in the public eye as he carried out the duties of the number three office in the state. The attacks Swanson aimed at Montague during the campaign for his role on the State Board of Education were tacit admissions of the advantage Montague had in his closer contact with state affairs.

Montague's campaign strategy centered about maintaining this early lead, and attacking the "machine" and Swanson's connection with it. Perhaps because of the steady attack that Montague kept on them, the "machine's" political maneuverings always lagged behind those of the "red fox." As Swanson finished his prefatory remarks and began to defend himself against Montague's latest charge, newsboys would appear on the streets hawking papers that contained a popular stand Montague had taken on some new issue that he had just injected into the campaign. Thus Swanson could only follow along and pick up the scraps when Montague announced his support of larger educational appropriations and better roads through the state, especially in the rural areas. Swanson also often had to take the lean side of the issue because this was the side that the "machine" was on. This was the case when Montague said that he wanted an employer's liability law, something that the "machine," with its corporation support,¹⁰ could never support strongly.

The strategy of the "red fox of Middlesex" to carry the fight to his opponent was generally successful in keeping Swanson on the defensive, and when the Congressman counterattacked, he tried to smear Montague with the mud in which the Attorney General charged Swanson waded. He first tried to do this through joint debates with Montague, and, when the latter declined to continue these after the first one, Swanson redoubled his charges and revelations of Montague's political maneuvering. At times, perhaps in the important Danville primary,¹¹ these blasts of personal abuse alienated more support than they gained.

The other major aims of Swanson's political maneuvering were to push the voting date as far as possible ahead to enable him to carve away some of Montague's early lead, and to obtain the maximum from his support through a minority representation plan. Much of the work for these goals was carried on behind the scenes and drew heated charges of illegal practices or unethical use of political pressure from the Independents.

Thus, through the unseasonably hot spring of 1901 charge and countercharge were hurled at one another by the two factions, led by their young candidates, while greyer and more conservative heads shook over this family fight that might strengthen "the enemy" (Republicans) dangerously. But the threat here appears to have been largely imaginary, for the Republicans, while still strong in some sections (especially the Southwest), had provided only token opposition in most of the state-wide contests since the defeat of William Mahone. The Walton Election Law that was now in force almost insured the party in power of victory through control of the polls.¹²

Three other men—J. Taylor Ellyson, Edward Echols, and James W. Marshall—were candidates when the Democratic primary began, but only Echols and Marshall actually made the race. All three of these men appear to have been connected with the "machine."¹³ Ellyson, from Richmond, was a well-known figure throughout the state as chairman of the Democratic State Committee. He had opposed Governor J. Hoge Tyler for the gubernatorial nomination in the primary of 1897 and had won great popularity when he dramatically appeared on the platform in the convention and moved that Tyler be elected unanimously on the first ballot to avoid schism in the party.¹⁴ Ellyson had immediately been chosen chairman of the State Committee by acclamation.¹⁵ He was a loyal party and "machine" man.¹⁶ Thus it appears possible that Ellyson's withdrawal early in the campaign may have been at the request of the "machine" leaders, because they feared his strength would weaken Swanson's candidacy too much. Ellyson's role as campaign manager for Swanson in his successful race for the governorship four years later adds support to this theory.

Marshall and Echols, on the contrary, did not possess the state-wide popularity of Ellyson, though they were each strong in their section. Moreover, their sections were ones in which Montague might have expected to gain the lion's share of the vote if running against Swanson alone, and it may be surmised that the "machine" leaders felt their candidacy would weaken the popular "red fox" much more than Swanson. Both men preferred Swanson to Montague in this campaign.¹⁷

Politics had been in the air almost from the first day of 1901. An extra session of the General Assembly passed a bill in February calling a convention to revise the Constitution of the state. The state newspapers reported that Governor Tyler muttered "God save the Commonwealth" as he signed the bill.¹⁸ Perhaps this was because he still tasted his defeat by the "machine" in the senatorial

primary of 1899 and thought that they would control the election of convention delegates. If it was, then he must have felt the Lord answered this well publicized prayer as he viewed later returns of the Independents' triumph in the choice of convention delegates.

The campaign for seats in the constitutional convention and the campaign for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination had interacting effects that aided the Independents. Eugene Withers was credited with first suggesting such a convention to bring economy into state government.¹⁹ Any feasible plan to reduce state expenses should have included thinning the ranks of state office holders and these men were the core of the "machine" that Martin was building.²⁰ So the supporters of Withers' plan immediately found themselves at odds with the "machine."²¹ Later, as this original aim of the convention was gradually swallowed in other issues, many of the "machine" came around to the support of such a convention.

One of the issues that overlapped economy was disenfranchisement of the Negroes. Since the Democrats had regained control of state politics and conducted the primaries (under the Walton Election Law), there had been a growing amount of corruption at the polls to insure Democratic victory. This was especially the case in the Black Belt where there was a large Negro vote that might have been combined with the white Republicans to overthrow the Democrats as Mahone had done. It was a comparatively easy matter for the Democratic party members working at the polls to trick the uneducated Negroes into voting incorrectly or to counteract their votes by such maneuvers as stuffing the ballot boxes. Many Democrats of otherwise unimpeachable character gave tacit consent to such practices because they appeared to be the only way to keep the hated Republicans out of power.

They were chagrined, however, that such means had to be used; and, as the use of these methods became more common and Democrats began to use them against Democrats, they became disgusted. The *Richmond Times* warned in 1900 that the elections were beginning to resemble the time when "to protect ourselves from the Negro carpetbaggers' rule we resorted to expedients of the ballot box which brought our elections into contempt."²² A great many Democrats in the state saw disenfranchisement of the Negro as the only solution to this problem and this could only be accomplished through a revision of the Constitution.²³

The breath of reform that such ideas wafted over the public was seized by the "progressives" and turned into a howling gale that ripped at the structure of the "machine" that Martin built.

A great deal of the "progressives'" gubernatorial campaign was devoted to connecting the "machine" with corruption in the public mind. They were aided by a note of amateurism that jangled harshly against the idea of "machine" politics and was injected into the convention campaign when a number of leading citizens who had not before been closely connected with politics entered their names in the primaries for delegates to the convention. These men did this with the altruistic idea of serving their state. This amateurism was demonstrated in Richmond when John Garland Pollard proposed that all the candidates for the convention pledge not to spend any money on their campaign.²⁴ And this pledge was made, though grudgingly by some.

The combination of the "progressives," attacks and the new note of amateurism took their toll of the "machine," and when the results were in and tabulated, the "progressives" found they had control of the convention. This vote against the "machine" came almost at the same time as the gubernatorial primaries—the convention primaries being in the early spring and the gubernatorial primaries in the late spring; therefore the "progressive" victory gave a lift to Montague's campaign.

The contest for the nomination was gaining momentum at the end of March and the Richmond *Dispatch* reported that Swanson had set up his headquarters in Murphy's Hotel, the political focal point of Richmond and hence the state, and that both candidates were conducting a heavy correspondence.²⁵ But several other important developments had taken place before this. The press had obtained a personal letter of Martin's that stated that two senators and several congressmen supported Swanson. This letter was published in papers throughout the state and created an extremely unfavorable reaction among the public to the thought of "machine" pressure supporting Swanson. As if this was not enough, a second letter of Martin's, this one marked "confidential," was leaked somehow to the newspapers. In this letter Martin said that he would regard it as a "personal reflection" upon himself if Swanson should not win. Almost a roar of disapproval could be heard from some quarters of the state when this letter appeared. A dispatch from Richmond to the Baltimore *Sun*, written two months later in retrospect, described these letters, perhaps too severely, as the "most serious blunders ever committed in a campaign in this State."²⁶ The Clark *Courier* examined the trend of political thought through the state and concluded that the attack on the "machine" was "one of the reasons of Mr. Montague's strength with the masses.

They believe that he stands against the boss idea and that idea is noxious to them."²⁷

As March ended every politician had his smile firmly fixed and was rashly promising to deliver every vote within sight. But even the rashest of Montague's supporters felt that George Cabell had gone a trifle too far when he said that Montague would carry Danville,²⁸ in the heart of Swanson's territory, despite the fact that Montague was also from the area. This claim, however, echoed the growing confidence of the "progressives" in their strength in the cities of the state where they did not have to face the powerful clique of county office-holders that were the backbone of the "machine."²⁹ City officials were never so adept at controlling the vote, although they, too, were organized in the "machine."³⁰ This ascendancy of the "progressives" in the cities was doubly important because of the large block of votes a city controlled and the prestige gained throughout the state by a victory in one of the leading cities.

Montague stepped up his campaign in the first week in April, and, while Swanson continued his correspondence with political figures through the state, newspaper headlines reported that "Montague Ate Oysters and Gained Favor in Princess Anne County."³¹ This was in the territory of Representative William A. Jones who was a supporter of Montague.³² A few days later Montague clubs sprang up in Manchester and Swansboro. Swanson's supporters were quick to organize a rival Swanson club in Manchester, a city that was to figure prominently in early political maneuvering.

During the third week in April the *Richmond Dispatch* excitedly reported that the candidates might stump the state.³³ There was no precedent for this in Democratic primaries in Virginia,³⁴ but both candidates had reason to favor this breach of precedent. Montague's calm, reasoned speeches, sparked by his eloquence and gift for phrase-making had won him many supporters through the state, and he had every reason to believe that they would win many more in such a campaign. Swanson, moreover, welcomed this type of campaign as an opportunity to meet the voters and make up some of the distance he had lost to his better known rival. As the campaign developed, Swanson also took the opportunity to try to pull Montague off the white charger that he was riding roughshod over the "machine."

The lack of any uniform primary plan in Virginia at this time made two issues prominent in the early sparring. These were, one, the question of which city was to vote first (thus influencing later voting to some extent), and, two, whether the winning candidate in local primaries should receive all the delegates or divide

them according to the vote. Each candidate wanted the first votes to be cast in an area in which he was strong. It appeared at first that the Montague forces would win this race when they set May 9 as the date for the primary in Manchester, where Montague expected victory. The Swanson forces spoke bitterly of the date as much too early and circulated a petition condemning the "snap judgment" in setting the primary date.³⁵ "Who is crying machine now?" they taunted in allusion to the Montague men's control of the mass meeting that had set this date.³⁶ But three days later the Swanson men in Alexandria were able to set May 7 as the date for their primary that they were reasonably sure of winning. The first returns were twenty delegates from Alexandria for Swanson, but the next day Fredericksburg gave its six delegates to Montague and blood had been shed by both sides.

The problem of minority representation was fought in every city and county at the committee meeting or mass meeting that was held to set a date for the primary. In every meeting the plan each faction favored was determined by its chances of victory, but when Montague was asked if he preferred minority representation, he replied, "No sir, I want either the majority plan or the precinct primary plan [winner-take-all in each precinct.]"³⁷ Either of these plans would give all the delegates to the winning candidate, and Montague evidently hoped he might receive enough delegates by this method to win on the first ballot, before the "machine" could begin its political maneuvering in the convention. Minority representation would make such a sweep by either candidate much more difficult. Swanson favored this latter plan in the hope of squeezing the greatest possible number of delegates from his support.

Richmond is a good example of the fight over these plans and, incidentally, of the use of the "machine's" influence. Montague had strong support in Richmond and favored the precinct primary plan. Swanson's supporters wanted the minority representation plan adopted. Through most of April it appeared the Montague supporters would win, and near the end of the month the *Dispatch* reported that the City Committeemen, who must make the decision, were thought to favor the precinct primary plan, eighteen-to-eight.³⁸ On May 1 with the time for the decision to be made only two weeks off, the *Dispatch* reported that either plan might win.³⁹ A day later they reported that the primary fight had become the "big thing" and that the Swanson men were "talking the committeemen to death."⁴⁰ Nine days later the committee met in a closed session and adopted the minority plan. There was a crowd outside the com-

mittee room, and one heated old gentleman threatened to cane the members when he heard their decision. It was also reported that two of the members almost exchanged punches afterwards.⁴¹ Swanson claimed he would get twenty of the sixty-two Richmond delegates by this plan.⁴²

The strength claimed by the "progressives" and amateurs in the state was shown in the selection of delegates to the constitutional convention to be held in Richmond. Among those chosen from Richmond were C. V. Meredith, who had managed Lee's campaign in 1893⁴³ and never forgiven Martin, and J. Garland Pollard, who had proposed the "spend no money" campaign pledge. The "machine" absorbed another body punch when Williams H. Boaz and John Massey were nominated from Albemarle County, the home of Senator Martin. Both ran in announced opposition to Martin and his "machine."⁴⁴ There appeared to be a firm basis for the *Time's* wishful thought that the "machine" might be "cracking on the rocks"⁴⁵ of the choice of delegates to the constitutional convention.

Near the end of April the State Central Committee of the Democratic party met in Richmond to determine the date and location for the gubernatorial convention. This Committee, which Swanson controlled⁴⁶—apparently through the "machine"—followed his wishes and selected an unusually late date, August 14, for the convention. Montague, when he learned of this late date, scornfully remarked that they (the "machine") were so far behind that they were afraid of an early one.⁴⁷

The selection of the site was a less serious matter. Richmond would probably have been their choice, but the Jefferson Hotel had burned to the ground less than a month before and accommodations for the one thousand or more delegates would be a problem. Or at least this was a sop to the consciences of the Committee as they listened to Mr. Thom's description of the sandy beaches, cool ocean breezes, and ten cent juleps that waited for them in Norfolk.⁴⁸ They selected Norfolk.

Swanson had undeniably gained by the late date set for the convention, but on another front he was losing ground. Montague, in his office of attorney general, was a member of the State Board of Education that appointed the school superintendents. This Board had selected April, May, and June to accept applications and make these appointments throughout the state. During this period the Richmond papers reported that a steady stream of people came to see Montague to gain his support for themselves or their friends.⁴⁹ The possession of the appointive power to these offices

that so many men wanted was a political plum that neutralized much of the power the "machine" exerted through its organization of the county office holders. A comment that the *Richmond Times* made several years later illustrates, although it is exaggerated, the importance of this plum. The *Times* said that Montague's "greatest political asset in his campaign for the gubernatorial nomination in 1901 was his membership of the State Board of Education."⁵⁰

April passed into May and the candidates moved out of Richmond to carry their campaign personally to the people. Montague appeared in Manchester on May 3 and spoke before a packed house that rocked with the efforts of his supporters to drown out the heckling of the Swanson club that had attended *en masse*. In the moments of reasonable calm when he could be heard above the crowd, Montague fired his charge of "one man government" and stated his support of an employer's liability law. He made no special effort to conceal the fact the Martin was the "one man" he was attacking.⁵¹

Montague's attack drew quick support from Democrats through the state. The *Clark Courier* quoted with approval the comment of *The Northern Neck News* that "It is time someone expressed what thousands of democrats have long felt in this state."⁵²

Martin replied three days later from Charlottesville with a statement that he was not managing Swanson's campaign although he "will support him like any other citizen."⁵³ This was the only speech or statement that the *Richmond Dispatch* reported Martin making during the months of April, May, and June when the campaign raged hottest. Apparently he believed that connecting his name in any way with Swanson, even in denials that they were connected, would do more harm than good. This is mute testimony to the effectiveness of the campaign Montague was waging. For Montague continued these charges as long as there was any doubt of the outcome. He replied to Martin's denial with the flat statement "Martin is working for Swanson"⁵⁴ and went on to say that Martin was the force behind the scenes responsible for the decision of the Richmond City Committee for the minority plan. Martin, he charged, brought the members of the Committee around to Swanson's side in talks with them at the Westmoreland Club.⁵⁵

To all this the *Dispatch* commented that the fight was threatening to become Montague versus Martin rather than Swanson.⁵⁶

Ellyson retired from the race as the fight became hotter and the "machine," taking a terrific tongue-lashing from Montague and his supporters, realized that they were in danger of defeat. On the tenth of May Montague had spoken in Bristol and condemned

both the McKinley administration and the Martin-Swanson clique as political organizations of the "apron string" variety.⁵⁷ He went on to say that all he wanted was a "fair field and no favors,"⁵⁸ one of the many pithy phrases that colored his campaign speeches. Montague spoke in Roanoke on May 12 and attacked the "plum tree shakers."⁵⁹

There were other voices heard besides the campaigners in this race, and one of the loudest was labor. Montague was quick to hear it and answer with his advocacy of an employer's liability law. This proposed law had become an issue in the constitutional convention campaign when a questionnaire was sent to all the candidates in Richmond by the Central Trade and Labor Council asking them their position on this and other issues.⁶⁰ The replies to this questionnaire were published in the *Richmond Times* of March 20, giving the proposed law state-wide publicity.⁶¹ Swanson remained quiet on the issue for he was in an embarrassing position. The "machine" drew much of its support from state corporations, and if he should support such a bill he would alienate many of these corporations. Montague was rewarded for his support of the bill when the executive committee of the Virginia Labor Unions declared their support of Montague, who, they said, advocated the employer's liability law.⁶²

After his first swing through the state, Montague returned to Richmond and appealed to "old Virginians and Confederate heroes to rally to his support."⁶³ The Henrico County primary had been held the day before this speech and the air was full of charges of fraud and corruption from the Montague men.⁶⁴ These charges concerned mass meetings to elect delegates in the Howard's Grove and Shumaker's precincts.

At Howard's Grove the meeting was called to order by the county committeeman who then appointed J. R. Syrcle temporary chairman. Syrcle called for nominations for a permanent chairman and he, himself, was nominated by the Swanson men while W. J. Bingford was nominated by the Montague men. Then, in the words of the *Dispatch*, "Mr. Syrcle called on Mr. Parsons to take the vote. There was a show of hands. Mr. Parsons declared Mr. Syrcle the chairman." Three Montague men, the paper goes on to say, stated that they had counted the vote and it was 160 to 83 in favor of Mr. Bingford. Bitter charges and curses filled the hall and a near riot followed that took fifteen minutes to quiet.

When order was restored the Montague men asked for a second teller, and, when this was refused, they asked for a vote by ballot. This was refused, and the same procedure as before was fol-

lowed to elect a Swanson man secretary. Three Montague tellers claimed that the vote was 165 to 85 this time for their candidate. When this same procedure was followed again in electing the three convention delegates, a riot broke out in the hall. Curses and blows were exchanged. The *Dispatch* reported that "One man, excited beyond his fellows, drew his pistol and was aiming it at the chairman when a man standing by him forced down the gun." Finally the Montague men left the hall and waited outside for the meeting to adjourn. Then they went back in and elected their own slate of delegates.

The same general thing occurred in Shumaker where James Russell called the meeting to order, announced that he was the chairman, and appointed a secretary. In the uproar that followed he retreated and agreed to an election of the chairman and secretary. Montague men reported in a sworn statement (published on the front page of the *Dispatch*) that their man received three times the number of votes Russell got. Despite this, Russell declared that he was chairman and amid the turmoil that followed called for nominations for delegates to the convention. The Montague men requested that the vote be taken by hand or ballot rather than viva voce, but Russell ruled that no one had a right to speak but himself, they were out of order, and the vote would be viva voce. The Montague man stated in their sworn statement that they again received a three-to-one majority, but Russell said that he did not care "for hollering and throat splitting," that he was the chairman, and the Swanson men were elected.⁶⁵

Two days later the four delegates elected at Shumaker resigned with Swanson's approval.⁶⁶ This did not check the attack of the Montague men, however, and a week later C. V. Meredith was reported to have charged Swanson with accepting "stolen goods."⁶⁷ Meredith denied this statement the next day but said that Swanson should not accept the delegates, and no gentleman could support him if he did.⁶⁸ Swanson protested that he had no power to accept or reject delegates as though they were private property.⁶⁹

The incidents at Howard's Grove and Shumaker resounded throughout the state and were seized by Montague's supporters to substantiate their charges of "machine" corruption.

Swanson began about this time to challenge Montague to joint debates in which he apparently hoped to destroy the halo that was being built up around Montague. As long as possible Montague declined these challenges with various excuses until Swanson backed him into a corner at Boydton and received a written agreement to appear on the platform against Swanson if it did not rain.

Montague spoke first and last in the debate that followed on a platform put up facing the town square. He prefaced his remarks with an expression of regret that two Democrats should engage in joint debate and continued in a calm, forceful manner. He attacked the power that the lobbyists had in the General Assembly and the "oligarchy of office holders" in the state. The "machine" was worse than Mahone he said for "Martin tears down your house while you sleep"—a thinly veiled reference to the defeat of Fitzhugh Lee.⁷⁰

Swanson was introduced as a friend of the tobacco growers and began with a description of himself as only a "machinest" while Montague was "college bred." He charged that Montague had his own machine and was using it for "snap primaries" such as Manchester. Swanson's voice rose and fell emotionally as he went on, and his collar began to melt in the afternoon heat. He was dismissing Montague's attacks on the "machine" as those of a "cry baby" when, somewhere in the crowd, a voice bawled out, "What about Henrico?" referring to the primaries at Shumaker and Howard's Grove. Swanson ignored it and shouted the charge that Montague was using the appointment of school superintendents to his own political advantage. In conclusion, he supported the uniform primary plan, the necessity of which the people were beginning to realize as they watched the bitter fights throughout the state.

The *Dispatch* reported that Montague, sitting on the platform, remained calm throughout Swanson's speech although sometimes he paled and stiffened slightly. Montague summed up in the same dignified manner that he had first spoken.

This was the only time that Swanson was able to force Montague into a joint debate. Several times they spoke in the same place at different locations, but Montague always refused Swanson's challenge to debate, because, he said, it only served to "raise blood and becloud the issues."⁷¹ Swanson began to complain that the only way he could talk to Montague was over a long distance telephone.

A little over a week later Swanson spoke in Lynchburg where he was introduced by Senator John W. Daniel, who had taken little part in the campaign since he announced his support of Swanson. Swanson denied the charge that there was any "machine" or ring and boasted of his graduation from the University of Hard Knocks.⁷²

While Swanson spoke in Lynchburg, Montague was attacking the bosses in Danville.⁷³ His support had been rising rapidly in Danville under the energetic management of George C. Cabell, and some of Swanson's friends were beginning to wonder if Cabell

might actually live up to his cocky boast to carry Swanson's own home for Montague.

A few days later the candidates exchanged rostrums and Swanson appeared in Danville while Montague was in Lynchburg. John P. Krausse, president of the Trade and Labor Council of Richmond, introduced Swanson, and, trying to divide Montague's labor support, described him as the "laboring man's friend."⁷⁴ Swanson had now formed a general formula for his speeches that consisted of denying he was a captive candidate of the "machine," attacking Montague's role in the appointment of school superintendents, charging that Montague was afraid to face him in debate, charging Montague men with "snap primaries," and emphasizing his humble origin.⁷⁵

Carter Glass, editor of the Lynchburg *Daily Advance*, announced his support of Montague and introduced him in Lynchburg.⁷⁶ Glass defended him from the charge that he put the schools into politics with assertions that the selections was being held earlier than ever before, and Montague was choosing men despite his own interest.⁷⁷ This energetic support given by Glass was an important boost for Montague,⁷⁸ and he spoke that night to a packed hall that overflowed into the aisles.

The news that Montague had carried Danville was in headlines the next morning. Cabell had done it! Swanson had been beaten in his home territory with the aid of the labor vote.⁷⁹ In the largest vote recorded in Danville history, Montague had won by seventy-seven votes this city conceded to Swanson.

A day later the news burst that Montague had carried Lynchburg by an 800 vote majority! He had moved ahead of Swanson with 224 delegates to 159. Carrying these cities with their vote and prestige was the turning point in the campaign. Montague never lost his lead and rapidly opened it even more. The spirits of his supporters soared, and they predicted that he would get 800 and then 1000.⁸⁰

Swanson, in desperation, tried to step up his personal attack on Montague. He asked why Montague had not cleaned out the corruption since he was attorney general. He said that Montague had ridden the rail in the gold silver fight in the party, and that Montague had traded and bargained for both his offices. He renewed his charges that Montague had used the schools in politics.⁸¹ Then in a speech at Newport News he said that he would sign any employer's liability bill that was placed before him as governor, and he published a letter from Samuel Gompers saying that Swanson had always voted with labor in Congress.⁸²

Montague ignored these attacks and a crowd in the Old Market Square in Richmond roared approval when he said, "Let the heathen rage."⁸³

In the Norfolk primary that immediately followed Lynchburg, Montague took several of the delegates from Marshall, who had been expected to sweep the city, when the rumor went about that Marshall was connected with Swanson.⁸⁴

Richmond voted on June 7 and Montague won as expected, getting thirty-eight delegates. A landslide for Montague appeared imminent as headlines of statewide election results in the *Dispatch* for June 9 and 10 proclaimed, "Lion's Share to Montague" and "More For Montague." On June 13 Swanson, in a last effort, released letters from J. B. Stephenson, James Ray, and R. A. James "proving" Montague promised offices to get the attorney generalship.⁸⁵ Three days later Swanson and Echols combined their strength in an effort to beat Montague in Roanoke but this last step was futile as Montague won sixty-two of sixty-five. This victory virtually assured Montague of enough votes to win on the first ballot. Four days later, on the twentieth of June, Swanson closed his headquarters and left Richmond.

Montague was now assured of the nomination, and it was only a matter of waiting for the convention to be held. He had capitalized fully on his early lead, kept Swanson and the "machine" on the defensive most of the time and wrapped up his victory in little under a month and one-half after the first primary. If he had not won the nomination in the primaries, his chances would have been greatly reduced in the convention where the patronage and prestige of the "machine" could be thrown completely behind Swanson.

It had been a bitter fight though—one of the bitterest that had ever raged in the ranks of the Virginia Democratic party—and many party men were afraid that the scars would be slow to heal and a source of strength to the "enemy." In the midst of the campaign many voices had been raised with the *Clark Courier's* for Montague and Swanson to withdraw and allow the party to unite behind some compromise candidate.⁸⁶

So the rain that had fallen all morning in Norfolk suited the mood of many of the delegates as they came into the city for the convention. But there were many young men present who ignored the rain and thought it one of the brightest days in Virginia history. In the ranks of these young men were many new leaders who expected to take control of the party, and the *Dispatch's* correspondent noted, "Many of the old war horses are absent. It seems to be the

young man's year."⁸⁷ Delegates poured into the city all day, and every train was late.⁸⁸

The next day, August 15, Andrew J. Montague was the only name presented to the convention for the gubernatorial nomination. He made a gracious speech of acceptance, but the speech that warmed the hearts of the delegates that day was the generous and warm pledge of support that Swanson made to Montague. The *Dispatch* commented, "The manner in which the defeated gubernatorial candidate pledged his support to his victorious rival and the hand clasp in which the two united on the stage, were striking features of the day, and fitting finale to perhaps the bitterest intra-party contest the Virginia Democracy has ever known."⁸⁹

After the convention, Swanson and Martin took their families abroad for a vacation, but they returned in time for the campaign in which Swanson made more stump speeches through the state for Montague than any other single person. There was motive in all this, of course. Swanson won a great deal of popularity in the party for his gracious acceptance of defeat and efforts to heal the schism, and his speeches throughout the state gained more friends for him and made certain that he would not lose again from being unknown. All this added up to the governorship in 1905. Thus despite Montague's triumph in 1901, the "progressives" were ultimately destined for defeat by the "machine."

Montague was never in any danger of losing to the Republicans, though, as they had been weakened by internal divisions even more than the Democrats.⁹⁰ The Democratic platform, which avoided national issues, had five leading planks—a uniform primary law, improvement of the state roads, greater appropriations for the schools, an inspection system to see how state funds were spent, and a tangible property tax.

J. Hampton Hoge was the Republican nominee, and he ran behind Montague all the way. His campaign received a sharp setback when Republican President Theodore Roosevelt, had Booker T. Washington to dinner, and a wave of anger and fear swept over the state at this breach of the color line. A dispatch from Radford in the *Times* said Roosevelt cooked Hoge's goose entirely in Radford. On November 5 the Democratic ticket was swept in, and Andrew J. Montague became governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Unless otherwise noted, all newspaper citations are for the year 1901.

1. Robert Camillus Glass and Carter Glass, Jr., *Virginia Democracy: A History of the Achievements of the Party and Its Leaders in the Mother of Commonwealths, the Old Dominion*, (3 vols., Springfield, 1937), I, 293.
2. *Ibid.*, 293.
3. *Ibid.*, 293.

4. Herman L. Horn, "The Growth and Development of the Democratic Party in Virginia Since 1890," (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 1949), 361.
5. Harry E. Poindexter, "Aftermath of the Bryan Campaign in the Virginia Democracy, Silver-Plated Conservatism, (MS in possession of writer).
6. Horn, "Democratic Party in Virginia," 393.
7. The material for the sketches of Montague and Swanson given here is drawn from their biographies in Glass and Glass, *Virginia Democracy*, II, and *Men of Mark in Virginia*, edited by Lyon G. Tyler, (5 vol., Washington, 1906-09), I.
8. Horn, "Democratic Party in Virginia," 366.
9. *Ibid.*, 265.
10. Comer Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South, 1877-1913* (Baton Rouge, 1951), 371.
11. *Richmond Weekly Times*, May 29.
12. Allen Moger, *The Rebuilding of the Old Dominion: A Study in Economic, Social, and Political Transition From 1880 to 1902* (Ann Arbor, 1940), 113.
13. *Richmond Dispatch*, May 12.
14. Poindexter, *op. cit.*, 21.
15. *Ibid.*, 21.
16. Horn, "Democratic Party in Virginia," 395.
17. *Richmond Dispatch*, May 12.
18. *Richmond Weekly Times*, February 20.
19. *Ibid.*, April 5.
20. Moger, *Old Dominion*, 119, quotes a statement in the *New York Times* to this effect.
21. Horn, "Democratic Party in Virginia," 52, cites a statement in the *Richmond Times* to this effect.
22. Horn, "Democratic Party in Virginia," 46 cites a statement in the *Richmond Times* to this effect.
23. *Ibid.*, 35.
24. *Richmond Weekly Times*, March 13.
25. *Richmond Dispatch*, March 29.
26. The full dispatch sent to the *Baltimore Sun* is quoted in the *Berryville Clark Courier*, May 29.
27. *Berryville Clark Courier*, May 15.
28. *Richmond Weekly Times*, March 27.
29. Horn, "Democratic Party in Virginia," 295.
30. *Ibid.*, 294.
31. *Richmond Weekly Times*, April 3.
32. Harold G. Wheatley, "The Political Career of William Atkinson Jones" (M.A. Thesis, University of Virginia, 1953), 84.
33. *Richmond Dispatch*, April 21.
34. *Ibid.*, April 21.
35. *Richmond Dispatch*, April 28.
36. *Ibid.*, April 20.
37. *Ibid.*, April 30.
38. *Ibid.*, April 28.
39. *Ibid.*, May 1.
40. *Ibid.*, May 2.
41. *Ibid.*, May 11.
42. *Ibid.*, May 11.
43. Robert Camillus Glass and Carter Glass, Jr., *Virginia Democracy*, 263.
44. *Richmond Weekly Times*, May 1.
45. *Ibid.*, April 17.
46. *Richmond Dispatch*, April 27.
47. *Ibid.*, April 27.
48. *Ibid.*, April 26.
49. The *Dispatch* commented on the number of these visitors that Montague was receiving in their issues of May 9, April 21 and 30 to mention a few.
50. *Richmond Times*, January 11, 1903, as reported in Horn, "Democratic Party in Virginia," 161.
51. *Richmond Dispatch*, May 4.
52. *Berryville Clark Courier*, May 7.
53. *Richmond Dispatch*, May 7.
54. *Ibid.*, May 8.
55. *Ibid.*, May 8.
56. *Ibid.*, May 8.
57. *Ibid.*, May 11.
58. *Ibid.*, May 11.
59. *Richmond Dispatch*, May 12.
60. *Richmond Weekly Times*, March 20.
61. *Ibid.*, March 20.
62. *Richmond Dispatch*, May 24.
63. *Ibid.*, May 17.
64. *Ibid.*, May 16.
65. Both of these accounts are based on stories appearing in the *Richmond Dispatch*, May 17.
66. *Richmond Dispatch*, May 17.
67. *Ibid.*, May 23.
68. *Ibid.*, May 24.
69. *Ibid.*, May 24.

70. The description of the Boydton debate in this and the next paragraph is based on a report of it appearing in the *Richmond Dispatch*, May 17.
71. *Richmond Dispatch*, May 25.
72. *Ibid.*, May 26.
73. *Ibid.*, May 25.
74. *Ibid.*, May 28.
75. *Ibid.*, May 28.
76. *Ibid.*, May 28.
77. *Ibid.*, May 28.
78. *Ibid.*, May 29.
79. *Ibid.*, May 29.
80. *Ibid.*, May 30 and 31.
81. *Ibid.*, May 29 and June 2.
82. *Ibid.*, June 6.
83. *Richmond Dispatch*, June 9.
84. *Richmond Dispatch*, June 9.
85. *Richmond Weekly Times*, June 11.
86. *Berryville Clark Courier*, May 29.
87. *Richmond Dispatch*, August 15.
88. *Ibid.*, August 15.
89. *Ibid.*, August 16.
90. Horn, "Democratic Party in Virginia," 50.