

Chapter 1 : Populist | Definition of Populist by Merriam-Webster

The People's Party (also known as the Populist Party or the Populists) was an agrarian-populist political party in the United States. For a few years, from to , it played a major role as a left-wing force in American politics.

The Growth of Populism The Grange borrowed heavily from the Freemasons, employing complex rituals and regalia. Like the oppressed laboring classes of the East, it was only a matter of time before Western farmers would attempt to use their numbers to effect positive change. Farmers Organize In , the first such national organization was formed. Led by Oliver Kelley, the Patrons of Husbandry, also known as the Grange, organized to address the social isolation of farm life. Like other secret societies, such as the Masons, Grangers had local chapters with secret passwords and rituals. The local Grange sponsored dances and gatherings to attack the doldrums of daily life. It was only natural that politics and economics were discussed in these settings, and the Grangers soon realized that their individual problems were common. Identifying the railroads as the chief villains, Grangers lobbied state legislatures for regulation of the industry. By , several states passed the Granger Laws, establishing maximum shipping rates. Grangers also pooled their resources to buy grain elevators of their own so that members could enjoy a break on grain storage. Members of these alliances won seats in state legislatures across the Great Plains to strengthen the agrarian voice in politics. Creating Inflation What did all the farmers seem to have in common? The answer was simple: As of , Congress declared that all federal money must be backed by gold. The farmers wanted to create inflation. Inflation actually helps debtors. The economics are simple. To create inflation, farmers suggested that the money supply be expanded to include dollars not backed by gold. The first strategy farmers attempted was to encourage Congress to print greenback dollars like the ones issued during the Civil War. Since the greenbacks were not backed by gold, more dollars could be printed, creating an inflationary effect. The Greenback Party and the Greenback-Labor Party each ran candidates for President in , , and under this platform. No candidate was able to muster national support for the idea, and soon farmers chose another strategy. Inflation could also be created by printing money that was backed by silver as well as gold. This idea was more popular because people were more confident in their money if they knew it was backed by something of value. Also, America had a tradition of coining silver money until Many believe that The Wizard of Oz was written as an allegory of the age of Populism. In addition to demanding the free coinage of silver, the Populists called for a host of other reforms. They demanded a graduated income tax, whereby individuals earning a higher income paid a higher percentage in taxes. They wanted political reforms as well. At this point, United States Senators were still not elected by the people directly; they were instead chosen by state legislatures. The Populists demanded a constitutional amendment allowing for the direct election of Senators. They demanded democratic reforms such as the initiative, where citizens could directly introduce debate on a topic in the legislatures. The referendum would allow citizens " rather than their representatives " to vote a bill. They also called for the secret ballot and a one-term limit for the President. In , the Populists ran James Weaver for President on this ambitious platform. He polled over a million popular votes and 22 electoral votes. Although he came far short of victory, Populist ideas were now being discussed at the national level. When the Panic of hit the following year, an increased number of unemployed and dispossessed Americans gave momentum to the Populist movement. A great showdown was in place for

Chapter 2 : Populism - Wikipedia

Populist party, in U.S. history, political party formed primarily to express the agrarian protest of the late 19th cent. In some states the party was known as the People's party. In some states the party was known as the People's party.

By the late s, the Alliance had developed a political agenda that called for regulation and reform in national politics, most notably an opposition to the gold standard to counter the high deflation in agricultural prices in relation to other goods such as farm implements. However this was a labor party , and by the elections it was using the Union Labor Party label. In that meeting they decided to consolidate the two parties pending ratification. The merger eventually united white Southern Alliance and Wheel members, but it would not include African American members of agricultural organizations. Powderly, leader of the Knights of Labor. Louis in an attempt to create a single party united against the "money power. Donnelly , stating, "We meet in the midst of a nation brought to the verge of moral, political, and material ruin. Our doors are open to all points of the compass. The interests of rural and urban labor are the same; their enemies are identical. Weaver and James G. In the presidential election , Weaver received 1,, votes. Success was often obtained through electoral fusion , with the Democrats outside the South, but with alliances with the Republicans in Southern states like Alabama, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. By allowing the coining of silver coins, they hoped to make the value of the money more than what it represented, which would lead to inflation of the currency, and thus, reduce the debt of the farmers to the Eastern Elites. This idea led former Greenback Party members to join the Populist Party. The Populists followed the Prohibition Party in actively including women in their affairs. Some southern Populists, including Thomas E. Watson of Georgia, openly talked of the need for poor blacks and poor whites to set aside their racial differences in the name of shared economic self-interest. One of the great orators of the day, Bryan generated enormous excitement among Democrats with his " Cross of Gold " speech, and appeared in the middle of to have a good chance of winning the election, if the Populists voted for him. The Populists had the choice of endorsing Bryan or running their own candidate. After great infighting at their St. Louis convention they decided to endorse Bryan but with their own vice presidential nominee, Thomas E. Watson was cautiously open to cooperation, but after the election would recant any hope he had in the possibility of cooperation as a viable tool. He lost to Republican William McKinley by a margin of , votes and lost again in a rematch in by a larger margin. Historians believe this was because of the tactics Bryan used, which had not been used before; he had aggressively "run" for president, while traditional candidates would use "front porch campaigns. The most dramatic impact came in North Carolina, where the poor white farmers who comprised the Populist party formed a working coalition with the Republican Party, then largely controlled by blacks in the low country, and poor whites in the mountain districts. They took control of the state legislature in both and , and the governorship in Restrictive rules on voting were repealed. In the legislature rewarded its black allies with patronage, naming black magistrates in eastern districts, as well as deputy sheriffs and city policemen. They also received some federal patronage from the coalition congressman, and state patronage from the governor. National alliance with the Democrats sapped the ability of the Populists to fight the Democrats locally in the South. Early on, this was less of an issue in the Western states where Republicans were strong, as the Democratic-Populist alliance was a more natural fit there, but eventually ended the party. In North Carolina, the state Democratic-party orchestrated propaganda campaign in newspapers across the state, and created a brutal and violent white supremacy election campaign to defeat the North Carolina Populists and GOP, the Fusionist revolt in North Carolina collapsed in , and white Democrats returned to power. The gravity of the crisis was underscored by a major race riot in Wilmington, in , two days after the election. Knowing they had just retaken control of the state legislature, the Democrats were confident they could not be overcome. They attacked and overcame the Fusionists; mobs roamed the black neighborhoods, shooting, killing, burning buildings, and making a special target of the black newspaper. By , the gains of the populist-Republican coalition were reversed, and the Democrats ushered in disfranchisement: In , while many Populist voters supported Bryan again, the weakened party nominated a separate ticket of Wharton Barker and Ignatius L. Donnelly , and disbanded afterwards.

Populist activists either retired from politics, joined a major party, or followed Eugene Debs into his new Socialist Party. In 1892, the party was re-organized, and Thomas E. Watson was their nominee for president in 1896 and in 1904, after which the party disbanded again. Eight delegates attended the meeting, which was held in a parlor. Debate by historians over populism[edit] Since the 1960s historians have vigorously debated the nature of Populism. Some historians see a close link between the Populists of the 1890s and the progressives of the 1900s, but most of the leading progressives except Bryan himself fiercely opposed Populism. For example, Theodore Roosevelt , George W. Norris , Robert La Follette Sr. It is debated whether any Populist ideas made their way into the Democratic party during the New Deal era. The New Deal farm programs were designed by experts like Henry Wallace who had nothing to do with Populism. Watson Some historians see the populists as forward-looking liberal reformers. Others view them as reactionaries trying to recapture an idyllic and utopian past. For some they were radicals out to restructure American life, and for others they were economically hard-pressed agrarians seeking government relief. The proposals have taken increasing proportions in each region of Western Advance. Taken as a whole, Populism is a manifestation of the old pioneer ideals of the native American, with the added element of increasing readiness to utilize the national government to effect its ends. Hicks emphasized the drought that ruined so many Kansas farmers, but also pointed to financial manipulations, deflation in prices caused by the gold standard, high interest rates, mortgage foreclosures, and high railroad rates. Corruption accounted for such outrages and Populists presented popular control of government as the solution, a point that later students of republicanism emphasized. Vann Woodward stressed the southern base, seeing the possibility of a black-and-white coalition of poor against the overbearing rich. He discounted third party links to Progressivism and argued that Populists were provincial, conspiracy-minded, and had a tendency toward scapegoatism that manifested itself as nativism, anti-Semitism, anti-intellectualism , and Anglophobia. Quite the reverse, they argue, the Populists aggressively sought self-consciously progressive goals. The Populists sought diffusion of scientific and technical knowledge, formed highly centralized organizations, launched large-scale incorporated businesses, and pressed for an array of state-centered reforms. Hundreds of thousands of women committed to Populism seeking a more modern life, education, and employment in schools and offices. A large section of the labor movement looked to Populism for answers, forging a political coalition with farmers that gave impetus to the regulatory state. Progress, however, was also menacing and inhumane, Postel notes. White Populists embraced social-Darwinist notions of racial improvement, Chinese exclusion and separate-but-equal. Historian Hasia Diner says: Some Populists believed that Jews made up a class of international financiers whose policies had ruined small family farms, they asserted, owned the banks and promoted the gold standard, the chief sources of their impoverishment. Agrarian radicalism posited the city as antithetical to American values, asserting that Jews were the essence of urban corruption.

Chapter 3 : Difference between Populism and Progressivism – Difference Between

Other early populist political parties in the United States included the Greenback Party, the Progressive Party of led by Theodore Roosevelt, the Progressive Party of led by Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and the Share Our Wealth movement of Huey Long in

Farmers first sought to solve their own problems through the economic cooperatives founded by the Grange. When these self-help programs proved a failure, farmers began to demand that government respond to their plight. They increasingly turned to the Farmers Alliance, a new agrarian group which sought to pressure the major political parties and the Congress into adopting their demands. When, because of the nature of the Gilded Age party system, the Republicans and Democrats as well as Congress refused to respond or responded superficially, the Farmers Alliance evolved into a third political party known as the Populists. They were intent on wresting power from the Republicans and Democrats at both the state and federal level. While they failed to take over the national government through the electoral process, they would end the Gilded Age party system and prepare America for fundamental changes in government accomplished by others after the turn of the century. This voting coalition would be difficult to create and maintain given the diversity of interests it would need to reconcile. While each group had a reason for wanting to alter the existing political system, their interests often conflicted. Rural farmers disliked urban dwellers and industrial interests. Newly-arrived immigrants were just that - urban dwellers who provided the unskilled labor to industrial manufacturers. Lower middle class farmers and mining interests and lower class urban industrial laborers who were usually newly-arrived immigrants

Occupational Backgrounds: Farmers and others associated with agriculture, mine owners and other economically dependent on western silver mine operations, industrial laborers

Geographic Distribution: The rural agrarian states of the South, Southwest, and Midwest; the mining states of the Far West; the urban areas of the Northeast

Populist Demands During its brief existence, the Populist party was dominated by its agrarian component. This becomes clear when one looks at the platform or agenda of the party during the s. The political and economic planks of the Populist platform came directly from the Ocala Demands of the Farmers Alliance - the subtreasury program, the free coinage of silver, an end to protective tariffs on manufactured goods, the abolition of national banks, a progressive federal income tax, the direct election of U. One of the most significant and distinctive actions of the Populist party was its demand that the federal government abandon its laissez faire policy and take some limited responsibility for the social well-being of American citizens. The s witnessed a financial panic in which quickly spread into the worst depression the nation had ever witnessed. As unemployment skyrocketed and fear contracted the money supply even further, Jacob S. Coxey, a Populist, organized a march upon Washington, D. They demanded that the government take active measures to ease the problem of unemployment and suffering by hiring unemployed laborers to construct roads and bridges across the country. Such a demand was unprecedented. The Populists were the first political party organization to contest national elections that demanded that the size, activity level, and, if need be, expense of government be increased to deal with the problems of a perplexing, complicated modern America. This was especially true during the Gilded Age because parties concentrated on appeals to party loyalty and solidarity to motivate their supporters rather than taking firm and public stances on currency and tariff policy. Populists had great difficulty in shaking the radical image they seemed to project to many American citizens. Right or wrong, the Populists, because of who they were and what they demanded, were viewed as extremists out of the mainstream of American politics. This made them unacceptable to many voters. Populists also had to buck the history of third party movements in the American political system. Historically, third parties have developed issue stances being ignored by the two major parties. They grow to the point where they attract enough support to threaten one or both of the major parties. Then, one or both of the major parties appropriate the issue or stance in order to win back straying voters and insure their continued viability. This kills off the third party. Populists would have great difficulty in dealing with the internal conflicts within their coalition; the groups had difficulty working together. Despite these obstacles, the Populist party enjoyed early electoral success. In the Populists drew over a million popular votes

for their candidate, James B. Weaver, and carried the farming state of Kansas and the mining states of Idaho, Nevada, and Colorado. In and the Populists enjoyed victories at the state level and in certain congressional races. They were clearly becoming an increasing threat to the status quo. In a political realignment began with Democratic voters in the South and West abandoning that party in favor of Populist candidates and, more importantly, Democratic voters in the Northeast and Midwest who turned to the Republican party. As your textbook characterizes the phenomenon: The Mainsprings of American Politics Political scientists have a method of comparing elections that rests upon the idea that at any given time there is a political system featuring a majority party and a minority party. This is not for one election cycle but for long periods of time. One party, year in and year out, will have more voters affiliated with it than the other. Given this framework, they have classified elections as either maintaining, deviating, or realigning. A maintaining election is the most common type. It maintains the political status quo. There is no great interest in the election - the outcome is simply a function of the dominant party asserting its superiority in a normal run-of-the-mill election. The minority party wins but nonetheless remains the minority party in the long haul. The election is an exception; it does not permanently alter the party system. Deviating elections can occur for a variety of reasons: Regardless, the minority party wins the election but does not permanently alter the party system. The rarest type of election is known as a realigning election, which does permanently change the party system. Realigning elections mark a rejection of the political status quo; they end one party system and usher in another. Characteristics of Realigning Elections Realigning elections occur only at forty to fifty year intervals. They represent a rejection of the party system and a demand for permanent change. It takes forty to fifty years for such dissatisfaction to emerge, build, and finally peak. Elections are accompanied by significant third party activity. Third parties reflect a dissatisfaction with the status quo and would thus be expected at a time of political realignment. Realigning elections, since they represent a desire to permanently alter the status quo, feature an abnormally high interest by the electorate in all phases of the political process and record voter turnouts occur on such election days. Realigning elections are characterized by definitive conflicting issue stances by the major political parties. Such elections offer voters a genuine choice between policy alternatives and different governmental directions for the future. Most importantly, realigning elections are characterized by a massive permanent shift in party affiliation by the electorate from one party to another. This is what realigns the party system - ending one system and creating another. All of these characteristics were present in the elections. The last realignment of the party system had occurred in the s. The Populist party represented a building rejection of the political status quo. The middles were marked by abnormally high interest in politics and the contest was decided by a record voter turnout. The political parties offered the electorate definitive policy choices with the Democrats openly supporting the free coinage of silver and free trade while the Republicans endorsed hard money and the continued use of protective tariffs. Most importantly, the Gilded Age political party system died as millions of Democratic voters in the Northeast changed their party affiliation permanently to the Republicans. Hard money and protectionist Democrats abandoned not just the William Jennings Bryan ticket in but the Democratic party for the rest of their voting lives. The Republican party which had enjoyed only a slight edge over the Democrats during the Gilded Age now became the overwhelmingly dominant party until the s. The Election In the Democratic party reacted to what it perceived as an electoral threat from the Populists by adopting the most popular of their demands - the free coinage of silver. In nominating William Jennings Bryan of Nebraska on a free silver ticket, the Democrats were trying to attract Populist support in the coming election and coopt the Populist threat. The depression of the s had strengthened the demand for free silver. Many Americans saw the inflation promised by free silver as an economic cure to the deflation of the depression. The Republican party nominated William McKinley on a platform emphasizing the continued desirability of the gold standard and protective tariffs. While Bryan polled nearly a million more popular votes than Grover Cleveland had in winning the presidency in , he was trounced by McKinley in the Electoral College. Besides being on the wrong side of the political realignment, Bryan lost the election for several specific reasons: Bryan, with Populist support, was unable to shake the "radical" image hung on him by Republican campaigners. Many Democrats and most Republican voters viewed Bryan as far too liberal and as being outside the mainstream of American politics. In accepting Populist backing, Bryan left

himself vulnerable to the charge that he was just as radical as they were. The Republicans financed their candidate in unprecedented fashion. Bryan was outspent several times over. Furthermore, the money was spent wisely, driving home the image of Bryan as a radical whose election would be a disaster for the country. Bryan failed to sweep all of the rural agricultural areas of the country. In order to meld the Populist coalition with the Democratic constituency successfully on election day, Bryan needed every single farm state. The interests of the farmers and laborers were simply too dissimilar for the coalition to work. During the campaign laborers were constantly warned that a Bryan victory would mean an industrial collapse and the loss of their jobs. While Bryan received some urban support, he failed to carry a single Northeastern state. This was crucial because the Northeastern states were the most heavily populated and therefore the states that were coming to dominate the Electoral College. The failure of Bryan in the Northeast doomed his candidacy. The Impact of Populism While the Populists failed to win national office or displace either or both of the major parties, they had a significant impact on the American political and governmental systems. Many of the Populist demands which were viewed as radical and extreme in the s were enacted shortly thereafter. While the Populists were unable to enact their platform during their existence, they prepared the way for these adjustments to a modern, more complicated American society.

Chapter 4 : The Growth of Populism [calendrierdelascience.com]

Populism "the deep public mistrust of political parties and other so-called "establishment" institutions" is disrupting traditional politics in the United States as well as abroad.

Nevertheless, the populism and progressivism campaigns were all implanted to initiate national progress. The standard conception of progressivism was leaning more on uplifting the country by means of socio-economic and political reforms while populism was more anti-capitalistic that favored agrarianism while opposing drastic modernization. In the long run, it has been discovered that the two movements were actually the same in terms of goals and objectives as both wanted change for the better. To put it simply, progressivism is academic in nature and seems to be more upper-class. As such, it was an idea supported by the rich and powerful individuals. Those who belong to the middle and upper classes were mostly dedicated to progressivism. This also includes the highly urbanized regions. Politicians also liked the idea of progressivism and highlighted charitable acts. It was a top-to-bottom approach where ideas mainly originated from the top tier and then later spread to the masses. Progressivists, as how they were called, moved for scientific advancement and societal perfection. Populism is the other side of the same coin. It is a down-up movement, which suggests more involvement of the masses with regard to the procurement of ideas and also with important decision-making. The populists also strove for the same kind of modernization as the progressivists but made sure not to compromise social justice. With regard to its time of conceptualization, the populism campaign is said to have started in the latter part of the 19th century as a result of the great economic depression. It flourished in Texas which later spread towards the Dakotas. His group strongly supported the populism agenda. The progressive movement, on the other hand, originated during the early 20th century. Those who follow or support progressivism are mostly elite, rich, and powerful politicians while those who support populism are the generally masses. Progressivism is an up-down movement whereas populism is down-up in nature. Populism is an older campaign theory than progressivism. If you like this article or our site. Please spread the word.

Chapter 5 : "Populism and Political Realignment"

new party mainly appealed to white farmers, many of whom had been impoverished by debt and low cotton prices in the s and s. Populism, which directly challenged the dominance of the Democratic Party, threatened to split the white vote in Georgia.

Popular opinion tended to place the blame for the depressed economy on Eastern financial interests. In December , representatives from a number of the alliances met in Ocala, Florida to examine the issue of united political action. This initial foray into direct involvement came to nothing; allegiances to the Democratic Party still remained strong. Racism, as well as loyalty, played a role; some feared that splitting the Democratic vote would revive the old Republican-black alliance. Two events in paved the way for a new political party. First, Congress passed the Sherman Silver Purchase Act , a totally inadequate gesture toward currency expansion. Second, Republicans in Congress chose to withhold support from a bill to enforce civil rights in the South, thus ending any hope for cooperation between the former slaves and the party of Lincoln. Into this void moved figures like Tom Watson of Georgia, who urged Southern white farmers to overcome their antipathy toward blacks because both groups were suffering at the hands of the same oppressors. Election of Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats addressed rural distress in terms sufficient to encourage the farmers of the West and South. As a result, a convention was held in Omaha, Nebraska in February The name "populist" from the Latin *populus*, meaning people was borrowed from a state political organization in Kansas. The Populist convention nominated a truly national ticket: Field of Virginia, a former Confederate general, for vice president. The Populist platform , backed by nearly religious fervor, advocated an array of progressive ideas, many of which would later be adopted by law or amendment. The Populists ran a surprisingly successful campaign in , polling more than one million popular votes and electing several of their number to Congress. Their real expectation, however, was to prepare for a serious run four years later. Election of In , the Populists gained control of the Democratic Party and engineered the nomination of William Jennings Bryan. The campaign was dominated by the silver issue. In a futile effort to assert their independence, however, the Populists refused to support the Democratic vice presidential candidate and instead nominated Thomas E. Watson of Georgia to run with Bryan. An energetic campaign failed to sway the electorate, except in the farm belt. The Republicans were returned to power and the Populists were badly split between those who wished to remain with the Democrats and those who wanted to reclaim their identity. Election of The depression of the s had subsided and much of the fervor for silver had declined. Nevertheless, many Populist Party members elected to cast their lot with Bryan and the Democrats in A small minority of Populists refused to endorse "fusion," nominating Wharton Barker and Ignatius Donnelly instead. The duo finished at the bottom of the heap, outpolled even by the Prohibition and Socialist tickets. Clearly the Populist Party had become too closely identified with free silver and that issue had vanished. Election of In , the Populist Party was reunited, but sorely lacked numbers. Thomas Watson, a former vice presidential candidate, was nominated to run with Thomas Tibbles. The Populists won fewer than , popular votes and none in the Electoral College. Election of Tom Watson was trotted for a final round in , paired with Samuel Williams. The Populist effort was probably doomed from the start. They advanced a number of stellar ideas, but fell prey to the allure of free silver, an issue that resonated poorly with urban workers whose votes were badly needed. Discontented farmers, despite their enthusiasm, simply lacked the numbers to move the nation. The Populist Vision is about how Americans responded to wrenching changes in the national and global economy. In the late nineteenth century, the tele

Populism, political program or movement that champions the common person, usually by favourable contrast with an elite. Populism usually combines elements of the left and the right, opposing large business and financial interests but also frequently being hostile to established socialist and labour parties.

One basic problem in identifying and assessing populist movements can be traced to definitional questions because their basic features are similar to those found in conventional democratic politics. Further, the causes of populist movements are quite varied and can include a wide range of both economic and cultural issues. In the United States after the Civil War, farmers protested against the impact of industrialization, particularly in regard to railroad rates for their crops, the cost of new machinery, and bank lending policies. Populists formed their own political party in 1872 and approved a platform that expanded on these initial protests. The party later merged with the Democrats and the movement declined in part as a result of the defeat of William Jennings Bryan by William McKinley in the presidential election. Populist movements in somewhat different forms, however, continue to reemerge as a factor in American politics. While populism is possibly the only example of an indigenous radical mass movement in the United States, it is a subject of controversy among democratic theorists. These groups used a variety of inventive measures to increase the price of crops. The price of cotton, for example, had declined below the cost of production. Cooperative trade agreements were made with merchants for lower prices for equipment and higher prices for produce. In some states, the alliance built its own mills for crops. Differences in strategies and tactics, however, plagued the movement. The goals of the movement began to expand in the late 1800s as the impact of these cooperative plans proved to be more limited than hoped and farmers became disenchanted with politicians who failed effectively to promote agendas that helped elect them to office. In the South, the alliance focused upon taking over the Democratic Party. After series of meetings in Ocala, Florida; Saint Louis, Missouri; and Cincinnati, Ohio, a national convention was held in Omaha, Nebraska, to form a new political party. The proposals themselves were organized into three categories: Specific endorsement of a subtreasury plan that provided for government-backed credits for farmers, which Macune had long supported, did not appear in the final document. Nor was a proposal for female suffrage included on the platform, although it had been endorsed at the Saint Louis meeting. Delegates would likely have nominated Leonidas L. Field, a former Confederate general, was nominated to give the ticket regional balance. Weaver campaigned widely and attempted to trace the ideology of the party back to Andrew Jackson. Populist candidates at the state level did quite well, although the party was unable to win control of any state government without Democratic Party support. Several decisions proved to be crucial to the course of populism after the election. The Democrats were severely weakened by the panic of 1893. Others argued for a continuation of a separate third party, and others believed that a regionally based party should be the focus of the next elections. When Democrats nominated William Jennings Bryan with Populist support at the Democratic convention in Chicago in 1896, Populists feared that two presidential candidates supporting populist proposals would assure a Republican victory. Some Populists now argued that the new party should endorse Bryan rather than nominate him as their candidate. At their convention in Saint Louis, Populist delegates nominated Bryan but refused to accept his running mate, Arthur Sewall, a conservative shipbuilder, and nominated Tom Watson instead. Populists did not anticipate that the outcome of the election would be a major national party realignment that made Republicans the dominant party for the next thirty-six years. The majority of Populists again nominated Bryan, although a faction of the party dissented and nominated their own candidates. Tom Watson ran as the presidential candidate of the Populist Party in 1904 and but received only 1, and 30, votes, respectively. Despite the collapse of the movement, the themes of the Populist Party have sporadically reemerged in American politics. Antipathy to elites, an interest in monetary plans as a fulcrum for political change, support for rural and small-town values, and acceptance of conspiratorial theories are featured in whole or in part among those who supported Senator Joe McCarthy in the 1950s and the presidential campaigns of George Wallace and Ross Perot as third-party candidates. Bush in 2001, have employed some populist themes. These movements were responses in part to the Great Depression. They grew in the context

of unstable regimes, and some were more successful than their earlier North American counterparts. Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and Evo Morales in Bolivia , among others, have rejected programs encouraging foreign investment and privatizing social services as policies of U. Both frame their policies as correctives to the power of local elites and foreign economic interests. Many scholars locate the basic features of populism in the rise of fascist regimes in Europe and thus conclude that populist appeals are a significant threat to democratic regimes. On the other hand, political leaders such as David Lloyd George in the United Kingdom and Leon Blum in France employed populist themes and programs within a democratic context. Recent populist movements reveal the same range of alternatives. Protests against immigration and economic centralization have produced populist challenges in the Netherlands , Slovakia , Austria , and France. Political Studies 47 1: The Populist Moment in America. University of Minnesota Press. The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F. The Media and Neo-Populism: A Contemporary Comparative Analysis. A Social History , â€” The Politics of Populism: Germany and the American South in the s. Comparative Studies in History and Society 31 2: Philip Abbott Pick a style below, and copy the text for your bibliography.

Chapter 7 : Populism and Party Politics: CQR

Many believe that The Wizard of Oz was written as an allegory of the age of Populism. Birth of the Populists Out of the ashes of the Greenback-Labor Party grew the Populist Party.

Agricultural areas in the West and South had been hit by economic depression years before industrial areas. In the s, as drought hit the wheat-growing areas of the Great Plains and prices for Southern cotton sunk to new lows, many tenant farmers fell into deep debt. This exacerbated long-held grievances against railroads, lenders, grain-elevator owners, and others with whom farmers did business. Peffer, with his long white beard, was a humorous figure to many Eastern journalists and politicians, who saw little evidence of Populism in their states and often treated the party as a joke. Nonetheless, Western and Southern Populists gained support rapidly. In that year the Populist presidential candidate, James B. Weaver, won over one million votes. Between and , however, the party failed to make further gains, in part because of fraud, intimidation, and violence by Southern Democrats. By the Populist organization was in even more turmoil than that of Democrats. Two main factions had appeared. The Populist organization in Kansas had already "fused"--over the bitter protest of those who considered this a sell-out. Fusionists argued that the regionally based third party could never hold national power; the best strategy was to influence a major party that could. The second faction, called "mid-roaders," suspected with good reason that Democratic leaders wanted to destroy the third-party threat; fusion, they argued, would play into this plot. These Populists advocated staying "in the middle of the road," between the two larger parties, and not merging with either. In practice, these Populists were not "in the middle," but more sweeping in their political goals than either of the major parties, while fusionists were more willing to compromise in hopes of winning powerful Democratic allies. Mid-roaders like Tom Watson warned that "fusion means the Populist party will play Jonah , and they will play the whale. They lost this fight, and fusionists selected a date after the major-party meetings, hoping that silver Democrats would win a dramatic victory in the Chicago convention. When this happened--with the nomination of William Jennings Bryan on a free-silver platform--mid-roaders found themselves in a difficult spot. The Populist Convention in St. One of the most popular and eloquent mid-roaders, Tom Watson of Georgia, stayed home--either because he sensed disaster, or more likely because hoped mid-roaders would win control of the convention and nominate him for president. The convention was a disaster for mid-roaders, as the convention endorsed the Democratic presidential nominee, making William Jennings Bryan the candidate of both the Democratic and Populist parties. When mid-roaders tried to stage a counter-rally, the lights in their meeting hall mysteriously went out--though they were burning brightly fifteen minutes after the group gave and went home. Instead, Populists chose Tom Watson of Georgia. Watson accepted the nomination only because he believed a deal had been struck with Jones , in which Bryan would renounce Sewall, making "Bryan and Watson" both the Democratic and Populist ticket. Fusionist leaders had not obtained such a promise--or, if they had, they were betrayed afterward by their erstwhile Democratic allies. Upon discovering this when the convention was over, Watson refused to campaign for Bryan, denouncing the deceit. At the same time, he refused to step down in favor of Sewall. Watson and others focused on issues rather than individuals, hoping to rescue the third party from the debacle and revive it another year. Fusionist Populists campaigned enthusiastically for Bryan; many Republicans and Gold Democrats depicted "Populists" and "Silver Democrats" as a united opposition, though this was far from the case. The Populist Platform Compared with silver Democrats, Populists advocated more sweeping federal intervention to offset the economic depression , curtail corporate abuses, and prevent poverty among farming and working-class families. They made a stronger statement than the major parties in support of Cuban independence and raised other issues--such as statehood for Territories and the District of Columbia--that Republicans and Democrats did not address. The platform was, however, less radical than the state-level platforms of Western Populist organizations, some of which had called for woman suffrage. Because the presidential campaign hinged on the currency issue, this plank which Populists had held since the early s, and now shared with the Democrats received most attention and debate. The End of Populism--or Not? In the national campaign, Populists served mostly as a symbol for

Republicans, who warned that the silver Democrats had allied themselves with ignorant "hayseeds" and "anarchists. While Populists continued to hold power in a few Western states, the party vanished from the larger electoral map. Nonetheless, Populist ideas survived into the new century. Progressive Republican Theodore Roosevelt resurrected many Populist planks and re-cast them in new forms as he tentatively expanded federal regulations of business corporations. By constitutional amendment, direct election of U. Senators became law in 1913. Other Populist planks--particularly those calling for aid to farmers and employment on public works in time of depression--became reality during the 1930s, under the New Deal administrations of Democrat Franklin Roosevelt. I say it fearlessly, and it can not be denied, that reforms for which the masses have been clamoring for years--whether it be silver or labor or income tax or popular rights or resistance to government by injunction--had never been written, and might never have been written, into a Democratic platform, until the Populist party, 1892, strong, thundered in the ears of Democratic leaders the announcement that a mighty multitude demanded these reforms. Shall all the reform elements of this country drop every other reform issue, except free coinage of gold and silver, join hands with the free silver democrats and fight the common enemy--plutocratic republicanism? If the democrats would do half of the "fusing," I for one would say yes. But do the democrats offer the reformers one single concession? I fail to see it as yet. We forced them into making free coinage the issue; shall we then drop all other reform issues and run to meet them with open arms? Shall the outraged girl, who forces her seducer to marry her at the point of a revolver, drop her mother, sisters and brothers at his command, in order to make the marriage perfect and happy? No, my brother; the democratic party can not swallow me down unless it swallows all the populist reform issues. There are too many horrors fresh in my memory--too many scenes of poverty and want, at which a democratic administration turned a deaf ear. It had not the ebullient aggressiveness of the revolutionary Democratic assembly at Chicago, nor the brilliant drivers who rode the storm there. Every one commented on the number of gray heads--heads many of them grown white in previous independent party movements. The delegates were poor men. Cases are well known of delegates who walked because too poor to pay their railroad fare. It was one day discovered that certain members of one of the most important delegations were actually suffering for food. They had no regular sleeping place, having had to save what money they had for their nickel meals at the lunch counter. They invaded our field, stole our leader, set him up on a platform they builded from materials they likewise purloined from us for the occasion. Watson for the vice presidency by the Populists complicates the situation in an unfortunate degree. It may be believed that the middle-of-the-road division, which has been opposed to Bryan, is highly pleased at the turn of affairs. At this writing it is impossible to tell what turn matters may take. I am going to stand by it till it dies, and I want no man to say that I was the man who stabbed it to the heart. No; Sewall has got to come down. He brings no votes to Bryan. He drives votes away from Bryan. Vann Woodward, Tom Watson: Watson really ought to be the first man on the ticket, with Mr. Bryan second; for he is much the superior in boldness, in thorough-going acceptance of his principles according to their logical conclusions, and in sincerity of faith. Watson belongs to that school of southern Populists who honestly believe that the respectable and commonplace people who own banks, railroads, dry goods stores, factories, and the like, are persons of mental and social attributes that unpleasantly distinguish Heliogabalus, Nero, Caligula, and other worthies of later Rome. If he got the chance he would lash the nation with a whip of scorpions, while Bryan would be content with the torture or ordinary thongs. The Populist platform is almost too absurd to merit serious discussion.

Chapter 8 : populism | History, Facts, & Examples | calendrierdelascience.com

The predominant between populism and progressivism is that the populism arose throughout the late 19 th century by the farmers about change in monetary system and the progressivism started at first of the 20 th century by the middle class regarding the altering throughout the political system.

Margaret Canovan on how the term populism was used, [2] The term populism is a vague and contested term that has been used in reference to a diverse variety of phenomena. Have people the right, in a democracy, to hold an opinion? If that is the case, then yes, I am a populist. The ideational definition of populism used by Mudde and Kaltwasser [16] A common approach to defining populism is known as the ideational approach. It thus differs from the "thick-centred" or "full" ideologies such as fascism , liberalism , and socialism , which provide more far-reaching ideas about social transformation. As a thin-centred ideology, populism is therefore attached to a thick-ideology by populist politicians. The existence of two homogeneous units of analysis: The antagonistic relationship between the people and the elite. The idea of popular sovereignty. The ideational definition of populism used by Ben Stanley [21] As a result of the various different ideologies which populism can be paired with, the forms that populism can take vary widely, [16] and populism itself cannot be positioned on the leftâ€”right political spectrum. For populists, on the other hand, the consciousness of the people, generally referred to as common sense, is the basis of all good politics. Political scientist Cas Mudde [28] In simplifying the complexities of reality, the concept of "the people" is vague and flexible, [29] with this plasticity benefitting populists who are thus able to "expand or contract" the concept "to suit the chosen criteria of inclusion or exclusion" at any given time. In such a framework, all individuals regarded as being "native" to a particular state, either by birth or by ethnicity, could be considered part of "the people". For instance, in Britain, the centre-right Conservative Party conceived of " Middle England " as its heartland, while the far-right British National Party conceived of the "native British people" as its heartland. Because of that its judgement is pure, its will is strong, and none can corrupt or even threaten it. Rather than choosing laws for themselves, these citizens are only mobilized for elections in which their only option is to select their representatives rather than taking a more direct role in legislation and governance. Responding to this critique, Mudde and Kaltwasser argued that the ideational definition did allow for a "non-populism" in the form of both elitism and pluralism. Whereas populists regard the elites as bad and the common people as good, elitists view "the people" as being vulgar, immoral, and dangerous and "the elites" as being morally, culturally, and intellectually superior. In this context, diversity is seen not as a weakness but a strength. Pluralists encourage governance through compromise and consensus in order to reflect the interests of as many of these groups as possible. In this understanding, populism is usually perceived as a positive factor in the mobilization of the populace to develop a communitarian form of democracy. He regarded it as a positive force for emancipatory change in society The Laclauan definition of populism, so called after the Argentinian political theorist Ernesto Laclau who developed it, uses the term in reference to what proponents regard as an emancipatory force that is the essence of politics. Australia is my home and the Australian people are my children. Populist leaders are sometimes also characterised as strongmen orâ€”in Latin American countriesâ€”as caudillos. Populists are not generally opposed to political representation, but merely want their own representatives, those of "the people", in power.

Chapter 9 : Populism | calendrierdelascience.com

Party systems throughout Europe have fragmented, and most have shifted toward the right. And the rise of populism has opened the door to increased Russian influence throughout Europe. Author.