

William McKinley: America as God's Instrument

[We] should reverently bow before the throne of divine grace and give devout praise to God, who holds the nations in the hollow of his hands and worketh upon them the marvels of his high will, and who has thus far vouchsafed to us the light of his face and led our brave soldiers and seamen to victory. Proclamation of Thanksgiving after the Battle of Santiago, July 6, 1898

Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness and peace to all our neighbors, and like blessings to all the peoples and Powers of the earth. Buffalo, Sept. 5, 1901

Piety and patriotism go well together. Love of flag, love of country, are not inconsistent with our religious faith. *Speeches and Addresses of William McKinley* (1900), 210

The faith of a Christian nation recognizes the hand of Almighty God in the ordeal through which we have passed. Divine favor seemed manifest everywhere. In fighting for humanity's sake, we have been signally blessed. *Speeches and Addresses of William McKinley* (1900), 105.

William McKinley Jr. had a deep and devout faith that powerfully influenced his life. After a decisive conversion experience as a youth, he participated regularly in the life and ministry of the Methodist church, prayed and read the Bible daily, often testified to his faith in private and public, and consistently practiced traditional Christian moral virtues. He strongly supported Christian missions, displayed substantial compassion for others, most notably his semi-invalid wife, and frequently voiced his conviction that God directed history and his own life. As president, he habitually sought God's guidance in making decisions and devising policies. His decisions to declare war against Spain in 1898 and to take control of the Philippines were strongly influenced by his faith and his assessment of the religious factors involved. Both actions evoked substantial support and extensive criticism from the nation's religious leaders and communions. Critics fault him for not properly distinguishing between piety and patriotism and for justifying America's actions as serving God's purposes. While making him a very popular president, these policies helped inspire future American imperialist ventures. Mortally wounded by an assassin's bullet in 1901, his forgiveness of his shooter, concern for his wife and the public interest, and demeanor while dying deeply impressed Americans. The manner of his death and the nature of his character prompted some to compare him with Christ, and a huge outpouring of grief and spirituality engulfed the nation. A man of principle, an effective orator and party leader, and an astute politician, McKinley exalted the prestige and expanded the powers of the presidency and accomplished many of his domestic and foreign policy objectives.

The Faith of William McKinley

McKinley was one of America's most deeply religious presidents. This is evident in his childhood religious training, conversion experience, deep faith in God, service to Christian organizations, regular church attendance, prayer, and reading of the Bible, frequent public and private testimony to his Christian convictions, enthusiastic support of missions, compassion for others, strong belief that God directed history and his own life, desire to be guided by God's wisdom and biblical teachings in his thinking, and personal habits. As a child McKinley formed a close relationship with his mother, Nancy Allison McKinley, which persisted until her death in 1897. His mother's example and teaching strongly shaped McKinley's view of the world and goals for life.¹ Both of his parents faithfully attended Sunday morning worship services and class

meetings, and brought their children to church and Sunday school. His mother taught the future president how to pray and took him to mid-week prayer meetings before he started elementary school.²

In 1856 McKinley had a conversion experience. At a meeting for youth at the Methodist Church in Poland, the twelve-year-old confessed, “I have not done my duty, I have sinned. I want to be a Christian. . . . I give myself to the Savior who has done so much for me.” Several nights later he proclaimed, “I have found the pearl of great price. . . . I love God.”³ Four years later McKinley joined the Methodist Church in Poland, Ohio. As a teenager, he diligently studied the Scriptures and frequently discussed its teachings with his pastor W. F. Day, his Sunday school teachers, and influential laymen.⁴ McKinley told a group of Methodists who visited him at the White House on November 21, 1899, “I am a Methodist and nothing but a Methodist—a Christian and nothing but a Christian. When I was a little child my dear old mother used to take me to the Methodist prayer meeting and class meeting. When I grew older, I . . . joined the Methodist Church and Sunday School and then became a Sunday School teacher, and afterward a Sunday School Superintendent and a member of the Epworth League.” “By the blessings of heaven,” he concluded, “I mean to live and die, please God, in the faith of my mother.”⁵ McKinley could have added that he had also served as president of the Canton YMCA, a trustee of the First Methodist Church of Canton, and, while the nation’s chief executive, on the board of management for the East Ohio Methodist Conference’s Home for the Aged.

McKinley’s faith in God and in Jesus Christ as his Lord and Savior was central to his life. As a soldier during the Civil War, the future president strictly adhered to his Methodist upbringing. He avoided drinking, swearing, smoking, and other vices and regularly participated in prayer meetings, which provided both fellowship and spiritual comfort. Our semi-weekly prayer meetings, he reassured friends and family at home, “seem to have a good effect on our brother soldiers, and are exerting a salutary influence, not only among our own company, but upon adjourning companies.”⁶ Reflecting on the possibility of dying, McKinley wrote in his diary before his first battle, “This record I want to leave behind, [is] that I fell not only as a soldier of my Country, but also as a Soldier of Jesus Christ [I]f we never meet again on earth, we will meet around God’s throne in Heaven.”⁷ Speaking at a YMCA dedication in Youngstown in 1892, McKinley, then governor of Ohio, called it “another recognition of the Master who rules over all, a worthy tribute to Him who came to earth to save fallen man”⁸ While president, McKinley told members of the Epworth League and Christian Endeavor Society in San Francisco, “He who serves the Master best serves man best”⁹ In 1899 McKinley inserted a signed paper in his letter book stating, “My belief embraces the Divinity of Christ and a recognition of Christianity as the mightiest factor in the world’s civilization.”¹⁰ The Methodist often testified to how God worked in his life and explained how faith and prayer had helped him deal with various issues.¹¹ During the 1896 presidential campaign more than a hundred prominent men came from Detroit to Canton to talk with the Republican candidate. McKinley refused to meet with them on Sunday and instead encouraged them to attend church with him, which they did.¹² Many testified that the Ohioan believed in Christianity “humbly, truly, devotedly.”¹³ A Methodist periodical declared that McKinley’s faith was as simple as a child and as firm as the Rock of Gibraltar.¹⁴ One of the leading evangelists of the era, DeWitt Talmage, called McKinley as “genial and lovable” a Christian man as he knew.¹⁵

Throughout his life McKinley faithfully attended church. While president he worshipped at the Metropolitan Methodist Church in Washington. According to eyewitnesses, he sang the hymns enthusiastically, joined in responsive readings, and listened intently to sermons.¹⁶ Abhorring special attention, McKinley wanted to worship like any other parishioner. He promised to get up and leave the service if a pastor gushed over him. “I like to hear the minister preach the plain, simple gospel—Christ and Him crucified.”¹⁷ Whenever he was in Canton, McKinley attended his home church, First Methodist. While president, he continued to support the congregation financially, serve as a trustee, and maintain a close relationship with the church’s

pastor Charles Manchester.¹⁸ Because of his own convictions and out of respect for others, McKinley rarely traveled on Sundays.¹⁹ As a Congressman, McKinley was well known for humming Methodist hymns,²⁰ and as president, he regularly held hymn sings on Sunday evenings at the White House.

While running for governor of Ohio, McKinley declared, “I pray to God every day to give me strength to do this work”²¹ A resident of Canton who accompanied McKinley on most of his congressional and gubernatorial campaigns, claimed that even after very grueling days the future president never went to bed without reading his Bible and kneeling in prayer.²² This practice, Frederick Barton concluded, demonstrated that McKinley’s faith “was woven into the very fiber of his being.”²³

Many testified that McKinley read the Bible regularly and knew its teachings well.²⁴ He declared, “The greatest discovery a man or a nation can make is to find the truth of God’s Word. More to be prized is it than the discovery of continents, than the discovery of gold mines, than the marvelous discoveries being made in the physical and scientific laboratories of the day. When a man truly gives himself to the study of the Bible he discovers it to be God’s great love story to man.” “The more profoundly we study this wonderful book, and the more clearly we observe its divine precepts,” he added, “the better citizens we will become and the higher will be our destiny as a nation.”²⁵ Prominent Chicago pastor Frank Gunsaulus argued that McKinley loved the Bible and the Constitution and wanted these two documents to provide religious and political direction for humanity.²⁶

Because McKinley wrote few letters, it is impossible to know conclusively all the factors that influenced his thinking. Nevertheless, his evangelical Christian faith clearly informed his worldview and helped direct his political philosophy. His theological commitments and regular fellowship with Methodists inspired him and guided his actions.²⁷ As demonstrated by his inaugural address, Margaret Leech claimed, McKinley came to the capitol with Micah 6:8 foremost in his mind: “What does the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?”²⁸ Testifying to his desire to be guided by God as president, McKinley had his Bible opened at his first inaugural to the prayer of Solomon in II Chronicles 1:10: “Give me now wisdom and knowledge, that I may go out and come in before this people; for who can judge this thy people, that is so great.” Similarly, at his second inaugural his Bible was opened to: “The wise in heart shall be called prudent: and the sweetness of lips increaseth learning. Understanding is a wellspring of life unto him that hath it” (Proverbs 16:21-22).

No president, argued Barton, “ever regarded himself more directly under Providential destiny as ruler of the nation than William McKinley.”²⁹ Newspaper correspondent Charles Pepper, who spent considerable time with McKinley, alleged that his “serene faith in the wisdom of Providence was manifest throughout his public career.”³⁰ McKinley told his closest friends he considered the presidency to be “a God-entrusted responsibility.”³¹ In his first inaugural address, McKinley invoked God’s guidance. “Our faith teaches that there is no safer reliance than upon the God of our fathers, who has so singularly favored the American people in every national trial, and who will not forsake us so long as we obey his commandments and walk humbly in his footsteps.” His obligation to faithfully execute his office as president was “reverently taken before the Lord Most High. To keep it will be my single purpose, my constant prayer.”³² “And may that divine Providence who has guided us in all our undertakings from the beginning of the government,” McKinley stated in 1899, “continue to us his gracious and assuring favor.”³³ In his Thanksgiving Proclamation in 1899, the president urged Americans “to the Most High for a continuation of the divine guidance without which man’s efforts are vain.”³⁴ “Man plans,” McKinley declared, “but God Almighty executes.”³⁵ The Republican frequently asserted that God had specially blessed America because of the faith of its founders and the principles upon which the nation was established. “The men who established this Government had faith in God and sublimely trusted in him. They besought his counsel and advice in every step of their progress. And so it has been ever since; American history abounds in instances of this trait of

piety, this sincere reliance on a Higher Power in our national affairs. . . . [W]e have never had a President from Washington to Harrison, who publicly avowed infidelity, or scoffed at the faith of the masses of our people.”³⁶ McKinley told the National Association of Manufacturers in 1898 that America was founded “upon the principles of virtue, morality, education, freedom, and human rights.” Using a biblical metaphor, he concluded that even if the rain descended and the floods came, the nation would stand because it was founded on a rock.³⁷ Methodist Bishop Edwin Andrews insisted that McKinley believed profoundly that the world’s course “must be ordered in accordance with everlasting righteousness.”³⁸

“No man gets on so well in this world,” McKinley told an audience in 1892, “as he whose daily walk and conversation are clean and consistent, whose heart is pure, and whose life is honorable.”³⁹ “There is nothing in this world,” the president added in a speech in 1901, “that counts for so much as godly living.”⁴⁰ Near the end of his life, McKinley wrote to a nephew, “[L]ook after your diet and living, take no intoxicants, indulge in no immoral practices. Keep your life and speech both clean”⁴¹ He practiced what he preached; his language and conduct were exemplary, and he rarely drank alcohol.⁴² McKinley did have one vice: he was addicted to cigars. Although never photographed with one, he often smoked as many as fifteen a day.

Throughout his life, McKinley was deeply interested in world missions. As president, he made bringing Christianity and democracy to underdeveloped regions part of the national mission. He insisted that the United States should play an important role in evangelizing the world. Two events near the end of his presidency illustrate this point. On April 21, 1900 McKinley spoke to the delegates of the Ecumenical Foreign Missionary Conference meeting in New York City, the world’s largest gathering and broadest representation of missionaries to that date. “The story of Christian missions,” the president declared, was “one of thrilling interest and marvelous results. The service and sacrifices of missionaries” constituted “one of the most glorious pages in the world’s history.” Missionaries served both the Master and their fellow men, “carrying the torch of truth and enlightenment.” They deserved “the gratitude, the support, and the homage of mankind.” He rejoiced that the “labors of missionaries, always difficult and trying,” were no longer as perilous as in former times. In some quarters, indifference and opposition” had given way “to aid and cooperation.” “Their contribution to the onward and upward march of humanity,” he argued, was “beyond all calculation.” McKinley hoped that the conference, attended by representatives of more than 200 missionary societies that were working throughout the world, would “rekindle the spirit of missionary ardor and enthusiasm ‘to go teach all nations’” and to proclaim Christ’s gospel “to the end of time!”⁴³

That same year McKinley met with Guy Morrison Walker, a veteran newspaper correspondent who was a leading authority on the Boxer Rebellion raging in China. As they discussed how the uprising was affecting Protestant missionaries, McKinley testified that he had long been deeply interested in missions. Missionary agencies and relatives of missionaries had been deluging him with telegrams urging him to intervene on their behalf, but McKinley was unsure of what to do. He finally decided not to directly intervene because he believed that God would protect American missionaries laboring in China to advance His kingdom. Walker, whose parents were missionaries in Peking, concluded, “I had never been so impressed with the real spirituality of any man.” He was convinced that the president “held fast to the hand of the Almighty.”⁴⁴

As will be discussed in more detail later, many testified to McKinley’s compassion, concern for the downtrodden, exemplary Christian character, and loving care of his semi-invalid wife. According to Pepper, McKinley was always moved by human suffering whether it was that of the Cuban reconcentrados, famine-stricken people in India, or the politically oppressed in China.⁴⁵ The Methodist often encouraged Americans to let their “charity abound toward the sick, the needy, and the poor.”⁴⁶ David J. Hill, Assistant Secretary of State, claimed he had never met anyone “more gracious and amiable” than McKinley.⁴⁷ McKinley’s wife Ida gave birth to two daughters, one of whom died at age three and the other at four months. Never recovering from

these crushing blows, Ida developed a nervous disorder that made her a semi-invalid for the rest of her life. McKinley loved his wife deeply and cared for her devotedly. To the end of his life, he was to her, “Your faithful husband and always your lover.”⁴⁸ So great was McKinley’s devotion to his wife that he often excused himself from conferences, cabinet meetings, and callers to attend to her needs.⁴⁹ During an interview on their trip to California in 1901, Ida declared that few could understand “what it is like to have a wife sick, complaining, always an invalid for twenty-five years, seldom a day well . . . and yet never a word of unkindness has ever passed his lips. He is just the same tender, thoughtful, kind gentleman I knew when first he came and sought my hand.”⁵⁰ After McKinley’s assassination, many paid tribute to his love for his wife. “Nothing in the President’s life had done more to endear him to the American people,” declared the *Epworth Herald*, “than his ardent devotion to his invalid wife and the rare charm of his domestic life.”⁵¹ “He was a paragon of conjugal virtue and fidelity,” asserted an Episcopal rector, who supplied “a lesson of inestimable value” in a day of increasing divorce and the desecration of marriage.⁵² Wherever Christian civilization existed, contended the governor of Iowa, wives would recount McKinley’s devotion as a husband.⁵³ His love for his wife, the *Presbyterian Banner* alleged, was “almost proverbial throughout the nation.”⁵⁴

The Elections of 1896 and 1900

Religion was a significant issue in both of McKinley’s presidential contests. Occurring at a time of economic recession and social discord, the hotly disputed election of 1896 pitted McKinley against the thirty-six year old William Jennings Bryan, a two-term Congressman from Nebraska. Although they were surprised by Bryan’s nomination, Republicans considered him a formidable challenger. Bryan had strong support in both the traditionally Democratic South and in the West, where many residents applauded his stand to base the nation’s money supply on silver instead of gold. Also nominated by the Populists, the youthful, vigorous, articulate Nebraskan was an attractive candidate. Like McKinley, Bryan was a man of fervent Christian convictions and high moral standards. Unlike the Republican, he had a charismatic speaking style and a magnetic personality. Their campaign styles contrasted sharply. While Bryan crisscrossed the country, speaking to hundreds of thousands of citizens in 27 states, McKinley conducted his entire campaign from his front porch in Canton. Recognizing he did not have Bryan’s oratorical skills and convinced that traversing the nation “in pursuit of the presidency demeaned the office,” he stayed home and gave more than 300 speeches and “well-rehearsed responses” to prearranged questions to an estimated 750,000 visitors.⁵⁵ In his famous “Cross of Gold” speech, Bryan insisted that the nation’s gold standard favored eastern financiers and businessmen and enabled them to exploit southern and western debtors, primarily farmers. The nation must base its money supply on silver to help these groups escape their debts as the prices of their products increased and prosperity returned. Despite Bryan’s energetic campaigning, winsome personality, and solid support among certain groups, he faced major obstacles in the election. Many Americans blamed the Democratic Party for their economic woes and social tribulations because of events that occurred during Grover Cleveland’s administration (1893-97). The stock market had plummeted, production had slowed, and unemployment had increased alarmingly. The march of thousands of unemployed men to Washington, bloody confrontations at the Homestead steel works near Pittsburgh and at the Pullman Palace Car Company outside Chicago, and the economic recession had created a climate of fear and despair. Moreover, the Republican campaign was better organized, spent much more money, and used the press more effectively. Republicans won votes by portraying Bryan “as a wild-eyed radical, even a revolutionary and a dangerous free trader” who opposed a protective tariff.⁵⁶ McKinley carried only one more state than his Democratic rival, but he received 51 percent of the vote to Bryan’s 46 percent and 271 electoral votes to his challenger’s 176.

Religious groups and factors played a sizable role in the election. Shortly before the Republican Convention, the American Protective Association, a nativist, anti-Catholic organization, accused McKinley of having pro-Catholic sympathies. The APA spread rumors that while McKinley was governor of Ohio the Catholic bishop of Columbus had controlled his political appointments. It also claimed that the Republican did not support nonsectarian public schools, that two of his children attended a Catholic preparatory school, and that his father was buried in a Catholic cemetery.⁵⁷ Convinced that the APA attack would do more harm than good in some areas by helping him win Catholic votes, McKinley decided to maintain a “dignified silence,” rather than refute the APA charges. But even if the false accusations had a negative impact, the Republican declared, we cannot “countenance any abridgement of the constitutional guarantees of religious freedom.”⁵⁸ Recognizing the strategic importance of Catholic voters in the nation’s cities, Republicans worked hard throughout the campaign to gain their support. Their campaign received a boost when Archbishop John Ireland of the St. Paul, Minnesota diocese denounced Bryan’s policies as “socialist” and endorsed McKinley.⁵⁹ Echoing Ireland’s criticism, the Catholic bishops of the diocese of Indiana and of Omaha, Nebraska, urged Americans to vote for candidates (implying McKinley) who would uphold the nation’s obligations and sound financial policies.⁶⁰

“At no time since 1860,” declared the *New York Times*, “have the issues of a Presidential campaign been so distinctively moral.” The editors urged religious periodicals to support the side “of honesty and right,” which meant McKinley and the gold standard.⁶¹ Bryan’s policies, the *Times* argued, sowed “envy and uncharitableness in the hearts of large classes” and threatened to inspire actions that “would imperil law and order.”⁶² Agreeing that Bryan was dangerous and considering his campaign slogans—a “crown of thorns” and a “cross of gold”—sacrilegious, some Protestant ministers endorsed McKinley. A Baptist pastor in New York City protested from his pulpit that the Democratic platform threatened “the stability of the American republic” and promised to “revive the Jacobins and Robespierre.”⁶³ As election day approached, many bankers and financiers took action to protect themselves against the financial disaster they feared would occur if Bryan were elected. Key Protestant ministers helped heighten this hysteria. In New York City, Charles Parkhurst, the pastor of Madison Square Presbyterian Church and well known for his attacks on Tammany Hall, and Thomas Dixon Jr., preaching at the Academy of Music on “The Eve of Battle,” urged listeners to vote for McKinley. Declared Dixon, “McKinley stands for all the patriotism and honor there is in this campaign, and Bryan for anarchy, repudiation, and national dishonor.”⁶⁴

The election of 1900 featured the same candidates. McKinley claimed he did not want to run again, but he capitulated to “the imperative call of duty.”⁶⁵ The incumbent yielded to the argument that only his candidacy could assure Republican electoral success. America’s alleged imperialism and the national monetary standard were the most significant issues in the campaign. The election of 1900 was “the apogee of the debate over imperialism in the United States.”⁶⁶ The Democratic platform condemned the nation’s militarism and McKinley’s policies with regard to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines.⁶⁷ Bryan especially denounced the use of force in the Philippines to subjugate people who wanted to be politically independent. “Imperialism,” the Great Commoner proclaimed in speech after speech, “finds no warrant in the Bible.” “The commandment, ‘Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature,’ has no gatling gun attachment. Love, not force, was the weapon of the Nazarene; sacrifice for others, not the exploitation of them, was His method of reaching the human heart.”⁶⁸ If elected, Bryan promised to recommend to Congress that it provide independence for the Philippines as it had for Cuba. Praising Bryan’s speech in Indianapolis in August, the Baptist *Watchman* challenged Republicans to “show why the plan of treating the Philippines as we are treating Cuba was not wise or just.”⁶⁹ In accepting the Republican nomination, McKinley countered that the American policy in the Philippines was a matter of duty, a position the *Watchman* judged superior to that of Senator Albert Beveridge who advocated retaining control of the islands because of the benefits they

brought the United States.⁷⁰ Upset that no Catholics had been named to either of the commissions the president appointed to investigate conditions in the Philippines and that McKinley was no longer consulting archbishop Ireland on religious and political matters, most Catholic journals strongly opposed the Republican's reelection. The *New York Freeman's Journal*, for example, insisted that "McKinley Must Be Beaten."⁷¹

Although McKinley had traveled fairly extensively in 1899 to support Republican candidates and remind potential voters of the accomplishments of his administration, he did not actively campaign in 1900. Believing he should focus on his duties as president, he did not receive or address visiting delegations as he had in 1896. Cleveland industrialist Mark Hanna, McKinley's campaign manager in both 1896 and 1900, made a very successful campaign swing on the president's behalf through the Midwest and West, principally arguing that McKinley was responsible for the nation's prosperity. His vice-presidential candidate, Theodore Roosevelt, made several hundred speeches in 24 states, preaching a "four-square gospel of duty, responsibility, republicanism, and Americanism." Supplying strategic, commercial, and humanitarian reasons, Roosevelt argued that American control of the Philippines was a sacred trust resulting from "the most righteous foreign war" in the last three generations; it was a duty Providence had assigned to America.⁷² Once again benefiting from a large campaign fund, chiefly supplied by businessmen, the McKinley team flooded the country with posters, pamphlets, and leaflets. Bryan again campaigned skillfully and tirelessly, gained votes in the East by condemning imperialism, and was no longer denounced as a threat to social stability. Nevertheless, McKinley's margin of victory was the largest in thirty years, as he won the electoral vote 292 to 155. The Republican interpreted the result as an endorsement of "the gold standard, industrial independence, broader markets, commercial expansion, reciprocal trade, the open door in China, . . . and the peace and beneficent government under American sovereignty in the Philippines."⁷³

McKinley's Relationship with Religious Constituencies

Throughout most of his presidency, McKinley enjoyed very cordial relations with Protestant communions, especially members of his own denomination. As he prepared to assume office, he received letters and resolutions of congratulation and commendation from numerous groups of Methodist pastors. A typical resolution, adopted by the Methodist pastors in Chicago, declared, "[W]e recognize in him a worthy follower of Jesus Christ and anticipate of him an administration thoroughly in harmony with Christian precepts."⁷⁴ McKinley hosted the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church in November 1899. Expressing their appreciation, committee members praised the president as "a Christian gentleman, . . . a devoted husband, and a God-fearing American statesman" who was "actuated by lofty motives."⁷⁵ McKinley also met occasionally with leaders of other Protestant denominations. When the General Convention of the Episcopal Church held its triennial session in Washington in October 1898, McKinley received delegates at the White House and later spoke briefly at a ceremony to mark the site where the National Cathedral would be built. Episcopalians were impressed with his hospitality and quoted his remarks in their Pastoral Letter that year.⁷⁶ The next September McKinley held a reception for delegates to the Alliance of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System who were meeting in Washington.⁷⁷ Like other presidents, McKinley regularly sent greetings to the conventions of religious bodies such as the Christian Endeavor Society and the Salvation Army.⁷⁸ In addition to giving generously to the Methodist congregations in which he worshipped in Washington and Canton, the president supported other religious causes including the YMCA.⁷⁹ Moreover, McKinley praised the revival campaigns of Dwight L. Moody.⁸⁰

One issue that caused a strain in McKinley's relations with Protestants, including Methodists, was temperance. In mid 1899, Congress passed the Anti-Canteen Bill prohibiting the army from selling liquor on its bases. Attorney General John W. Griggs decided, however, that the law did not prohibit civilians from selling alcohol on army posts. When McKinley refused to overrule his interpretation, the White House was deluged with thousands of letters of protest from ministers, college presidents and professors, and many other irate citizens.⁸¹ Resolutions passed by Protestant denominations, Woman's Christian Temperance Union chapters, Christian Endeavor Societies, groups of churches in various communities, and individual congregations as well as scores of editorials in religious papers beseeched the president to enforce the Anti-Canteen Law.⁸² While affirming their high regard for McKinley's Christian faith, character, and performance as chief executive, these groups and individuals professed disappointment that he failed to overturn Griggs's "farcical interpretation" of the law. Thousands of those who had been McKinley's "most loyal and devoted supporters, declared a Methodist bishop, were challenging the president's position as "a matter of conscience."⁸³ Charles Manchester wrote McKinley in December 1899 that East Ohio Conference of the Methodist Church was unhappy with his stance and predicted that if he abolished the canteen "an almost unparalleled wave of enthusiasm [for him] would sweep across the country."⁸⁴ Many agreed with the complaint of a Baptist pastor from Baltimore that because drinking was allowed in the army, "men are being debauched, souls are being lost, [and] families are being wrecked."⁸⁵ The president of the Florida WCTU wrote to McKinley that canteens "were responsible for the greater part of the sickness in the camps of the state and for a large part of the immorality and insubordination."⁸⁶ Speaking for the Sunday School Union of the Methodist Church, Robert Doherty lamented that he had seen "the agony of mothers and wives whose bright hopes" had been "dashed by that abomination of abominations, the army canteen."⁸⁷ A resolution of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Santa Cruz, California, declared that the canteen "has been the cause of death of more of our boys in blue than has bullets or disease."⁸⁸ Angry Protestants denounced drinking on army bases as "gross wickedness," a "criminal wrong," and "a dreadful curse."⁸⁹ The president of the University of Maine warned McKinley that if he did not overturn the attorney general's interpretation of the law, his administration might become "infamous for the spread of vice and the establishment of evil precedents."⁹⁰ McKinley, prodded by his wife, had briefly supported the temperance cause in Ohio and personally did not drink, but he refused to enforce the congressional law.⁹¹ Protestants also criticized the McKinley administration of protecting the liquor traffic in the Philippines and other newly acquired dependencies.⁹²

As noted above, various stories about McKinley's attitude toward, relationship with, and support of Catholicism circulated from time to time. McKinley rarely wrote letters, but he penned a passionate response in November 1895 to an advertising executive in Boston who had sent him a "friendly" letter about rumors making the rounds in that city. "One day I am charged in Boston with being a Catholic," McKinley complained, "and another day with being a member of the A.P.A. I am neither." He emphasized that the United States guaranteed religious freedom to every citizen and added, "I believe . . . every man has the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience." He vowed to preserve for future generations "the blessed opportunities of a free school system and the priceless privilege of political and religious freedom." "The stories about me to which you refer," he concluded, "are circulated with an unworthy purpose and are without truth or reason."⁹³

As president, McKinley had cordial relations with two of the nation's leading Catholics—James Cardinal Gibbons and John Ireland, the Archbishop of St. Paul. Ireland also enjoyed a close relationship with other Republicans throughout the 1890s.⁹⁴ Both Gibbons and Ireland praised the president's patience and restraint in dealing with Spain, especially after the explosion of the *Maine*.⁹⁵ Ireland defended most of McKinley's policies during the Cuban crisis and was frequently invited to the White House to provide advice on religious issues or to help the president solicit the support of Catholics.⁹⁶ As discussed later, Ireland secured the assistance of

Pope Leo XIII to mediate between the United States and Spain in an eleventh hour attempt to prevent war.⁹⁷ In his eulogy of the slain president, Ireland declared, "I knew him closely; I esteemed him; I loved him. He was a true man, honest, pure of morals, generous, conscientious, religious."⁹⁸ McKinley appointed Joseph McKenna, an Irish Republican, as attorney general, much to the delight of Ireland.⁹⁹ McKenna served less than a year because he became a Supreme Court justice in January 1898.¹⁰⁰ McKinley praised the work of Catholic University in Washington in a speech there on June 1, 1900. Some Protestant extremists complained that McKinley was too cordial toward Catholics and condemned his friendship with Ireland.¹⁰¹

The way their co-religionists were treated in countries the United States annexed as part of the Spanish-American War provoked the greatest Catholic protests against the McKinley administration. American Catholics were very pleased that McKinley appointed George W. Davis, a Catholic Brigadier General, as military governor of Puerto Rico, where nearly all of the 950,000 residents were Catholic, but they were very disappointed with American policies in the Philippines. About six and a half million of the archipelago's eight million inhabitants were Catholic. American Catholics were upset that the Philippine Commission, appointed by the president to investigate conditions on the islands, contained no Catholics. They were further angered when no Catholics were named to the second commission chaired by William Howard Taft. The religious issues in the Philippines were complicated. The approximately 1,000 Spanish friars living in the archipelago owned much of the best agricultural land and commercial property. Blaming the friars for many of the Philippines' civil, economic, and moral problems, Filipino insurgents, led by Emilio Aguinaldo, proposed to expel all Catholic friars and confiscate their estates. Many of the wealthier Filipinos who supported the American occupational government advocated the same course of action. The inability of the McKinley administration to stop the desecrating and looting of Catholic churches or the swarming of Protestant missionaries all over the islands also irritated American Catholics. They resented attempts to convert people who, even most American officials in the Philippines agreed, "were happy and satisfied in the practice of Catholicism."¹⁰² Catholics also denounced plans to establish a free secular public school system to replace the islands' parochial schools. This was necessary, the first commission concluded, because the current schools were too few, poor in quality, and not training Filipinos to participate in a democratic government. Catholics feared that this new education system would undermine their religious work on the islands and protested that many of the teachers were disguised Protestant missionaries who were distributing Bibles and tracts to students.¹⁰³

McKinley's Faith and Public Policies: The Spanish-American War

Prior to assuming the presidency, McKinley had almost no experience in foreign affairs, but they dominated his years in office. Although the chief executive delegated many matters, he took ultimate responsibility for foreign affairs.¹⁰⁴ For both of these reasons, analyzing why McKinley led the nation into the Spanish-American War of 1898 and how he dealt with its consequences provides the best case study for assessing how his faith influenced his policies. "Because of its expansionist consequences," writes Lewis Gould, this war has been extensively studied and highly criticized. McKinley stands at the center of the controversy, and his policies toward Spain and Cuba have been closely scrutinized and often condemned. For a long time the standard historical interpretation was that McKinley caved in to a jingoist press and public pressure and blundered into a war that could have been avoided. During the 1960s a new group of historians offered an alternative hypothesis: McKinley was "a Machiavellian and cunning executive, bent on expansion and heedless of the interests of Cubans and Filipinos," who went to war to promote "an economic imperialism that relied on overseas markets." Neither of these interpretations recognizes the complex diplomatic problems Spain and the United States

encountered or properly explains how McKinley worked to resolve their differences, end the fighting in Cuba, and improve life for the Cuban people.¹⁰⁵ The essence of the problem was that no Spanish government that publicly accepted the loss of Cuba could remain in power while no American administration that was perceived as pro-Spanish could succeed politically.¹⁰⁶

Many interwoven factors contributed to the United States' declaration of war on Spain in April 1898. The 1890s was a decade of great anxiety in America. Large-scale immigration of Jews, Eastern Orthodox, and Catholics from southern and eastern Europe made the nation much more ethnically and religiously heterogeneous. Industrialization and urbanization transformed the nation's appearance, the nature of work, and people's standard of living. The rapidly growing cities had to combat crime, political corruption, sanitation problems, and inadequate housing. At the same time the frontier disappeared as a safety valve for excess population, an economic depression rocked the country, leaving a million people without jobs. Convinced they were not receiving their fair share of the nation's wealth, many workers turned to labor unions and farmers to populism to improve their circumstances. Fears of social disorder and even revolution abounded. Reformers advocated various utopian and socialist panaceas for the nation's woes. Some businessmen and politicians thought America could best solve its economic ills by procuring new markets overseas, especially in Latin America and East Asia. Blending beliefs in social Darwinism, Anglo-Saxon superiority, and American destiny with these economic aims, many political leaders and journalists implored the nation to expand its power and influence. They argued that if the United States was to thrive, it must aggressively compete for wealth, territory, and glory. Americans were duty-bound "to spread their superior language, political institutions, and culture around the world and thereby uplift the darker, backward peoples." In two major books Admiral Alfred Mahan urged the nation to build a strong navy and an isthmian canal, to acquire bases in the Caribbean to protect the canal, to annex Hawaii, and to expand its markets in Latin America and Asia. By emphasizing American Christians' calling to redeem the world, Protestant leaders helped expand "the horizons of countless citizens and no doubt predisposed many" to accept a larger mission for their nation in the world.¹⁰⁷

Americans had been interested in Cuba since their own revolution and throughout the nineteenth century frequently denounced Spain's oppressive rule of the island. Humanitarian concern joined with recognition of Cuba's economic potential and strategic location to fuel American interest in the island. A ten-year revolution, which erupted in 1868, ended with promises by Spanish administrators to improve conditions in Cuba. From 1877 until 1895 United States companies continued to invest heavily in and trade with Cuba and took control of its sugar industry. The Spanish government failed to provide the reforms it promised, and in 1895 rebels launched another insurrection. Both sides committed atrocities. Engaging in scorched earth policies, the insurgents strove to destroy all Spanish sources of revenue on the island. The Spanish herded Cuban peasants into "reconcentration" camps to prevent them from helping the rebels. Cuba's economy collapsed, and one-eighth of the population died of disease and starvation in two years. The widespread bloodshed, devastation, and death prompted the United States government to use diplomatic and moral pressure to try to end the fighting. Grover Cleveland, cautious by nature, tried to preserve American neutrality. When Congress pushed for Cuban independence, Cleveland called for patience and restraint. While warning Spain that "time for a reasonable solution was running out," he offered Cuban rebels "only the promise of reform" and limited autonomy under Spanish rule. Although the Democrat preserved the peace, by assuming that the United States had certain rights in Cuba, he set the nation "on an increasingly escalating interventionist course."¹⁰⁸

The day before McKinley's inauguration, Cleveland invited him to dinner at the White House. In the course of their conversation about Cuba and the threat of war with Spain, the Republican told his Democratic predecessor, "[I]f I can only go out of office . . . with the knowledge I have done what lay in my power to avert this terrible calamity, with the success that has crowned your patience and persistence, I shall be the happiest man in the world."¹⁰⁹

Reinforcing this point, the new president declared in his inaugural address, “We want no wars of conquest; we must avoid the temptations of territorial expansion.”¹¹⁰ War, he added, “should never be entered upon until every agency of peace had failed; peace is preferable to war in almost every contingency.”¹¹¹ Nevertheless, a little more than a year later, McKinley signed a congressional resolution authorizing the United States to intervene to end the fighting in Cuba, and by April 25, 1898 America and Spain were at war. The Ohioan had many reasons for eventually agreeing with a bellicose Congress, the jingoist press, and much of the American public that war was necessary. The 1896 Republican platform had called for Cuban independence. McKinley had long been a strong supporter of American trade and territorial expansion. After becoming president, he worked to annex Hawaii, gain the rights to build an isthmian canal, and increase the nation’s foreign trade, which he pronounced a “positive, benevolent force.”¹¹² Deeply moved by Cuban suffering, McKinley developed a policy toward Cuba in 1897 that curiously blended “forbearance and impatience, pacific encouragement and hostile threats toward Spain, and good will and distrust toward the Cuban patriots.”¹¹³ He condemned Spain for using cruel and uncivilized methods of warfare and was reluctant to endorse a solution to the Cuban problem that the rebels rejected. However, the two sides were at loggerheads. The insurrectionists wanted complete independence, while the Spanish were not willing to relinquish all control of the island.

In his message to Congress in December 1897 McKinley asserted the right of the United States to intervene in Cuba if a “righteous peace” were not soon attained.¹¹⁴ During the next four months, fighting continued in Cuba and “a series of diplomatic crises and disasters . . . rocked the nation and intensified the war fervor among large portions of the American public, press, and Congress.”¹¹⁵ On February 9, 1898 the *New York Journal* published a letter from Spanish ambassador Dupuy de Lome to a friend in Cuba that had fallen into the hands of Cuban revolutionaries. De Lome’s characterization of McKinley as “weak and a bidder for the admiration of the crowd” aroused the anger of many Americans. To impress Spain and protect American life and property, McKinley had sent the battleship *Maine* to Cuba in late January. On February 15 it exploded in Havana harbor, killing 266 American sailors. While much later investigations concluded that the explosion resulted when heat from one of the ship’s furnaces set off the gunpowder in an adjacent magazine, the immediate American response was to blame Spain for at least carelessness, if not conspiracy. Numerous communities hanged Spaniards in effigy, and newspapers demanded that the Spanish withdraw from Cuba as atonement. Speaking for some clergymen, Methodist Bishop Charles C. McCabe told a ministerial gathering in St. Louis, “It may be that the United States is to become the Knight Errant of the world. War with Spain may put her in a position to demand civil and religious liberty for the oppressed of every nation . . .”¹¹⁶ A sensationalist press, led by William Randolph Hearst’s *New York Journal* and Joseph Pulitzer’s *New York World*, supplied vivid accounts of Spanish atrocities, some fabricated, but most true.¹¹⁷

“As the most serious national crisis since the Civil War deepened,” wrote Lewis Gould, “McKinley became the object of intense and simultaneous feelings of confidence, hope, mistrust, and disgust.” Critics complained that he might be “too reluctant or timid” to act firmly. While refusing to give in to the yellow press that demanded vengeance or to a Congress that called for war, McKinley did not repudiate the jingoists publicly and increased the diplomatic pressure on Spain.¹¹⁸ Several factors pushed McKinley toward presenting Spain an ultimatum: Madrid seemed unable to govern the island effectively; an investigation was going to report that a submarine mine had caused the *Maine* to explode; Republican voters were threatening to desert the party if he did not deal more forcibly with Spain; and leading businessmen were beginning to support war. Moreover, clergy were increasingly calling for “a righteous crusade against Spain on behalf of humanity, ‘democracy and Christian progress’” in Cuba.¹¹⁹ In several messages to Spain in late March, McKinley issued what amounted to an ultimatum: Spain must end reconcentration, halt the fighting, and agree to make Cuba independent if he decided it was

necessary. The Spanish agreed to revoke reconcentration, arbitrate the *Maine* disaster, and declare an armistice if the rebels requested one. They refused, however, to promise independence to Cuba.

On April 11 McKinley sent a message to Congress declaring, "I have exhausted every effort to relieve the intolerable condition of affairs" in Cuba. American intervention was justified, the president argued to end "the barbarities, bloodshed, starvation, and horrible miseries" on the island; to protect the property and life of Americans who lived in Cuba; to halt the "serious injury" to United States trade and business; and to remove "a constant menace" to peace that involved "an enormous expense."¹²⁰ "In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests which give us the right and duty to speak and act, the war in Cuba must stop." McKinley hoped that the threat of American military intervention would secure this result, so that "our aspirations as a Christian, peace-loving people will be realized." Believing the rebels had not yet demonstrated their ability to govern successfully, McKinley asked Congress not to recognize Cuban independence. If the United States were to recognize any particular government in Cuba, it "would be required to submit to its direction and to assume to it the mere relation of a friendly ally." The United States should intervene in Cuba as "an impartial neutral" who could impose "a rational compromise between contestants."¹²¹ On April 19 Congress passed a joint resolution empowering the president to use military force in Cuba, and in the Teller Amendment, renounced any intention to annex the island. According to Augustus Cerillo Jr., McKinley's war message "revealed how little concerned the United States was with the desires of Cuba's fighters, ostensibly on whose behalf the nation was going to war." Nevertheless, in claiming that the United States was fighting to free oppressed people, McKinley sought to "place his decision for war within the boundaries of morally permissible intervention in the affairs" of other nations "established by international law and sanctioned by just war theory."¹²²

McKinley's Christian convictions played a major role in his decision to declare war. As a committed Christian and a patriotic American, McKinley stood upon a platform of long and fervent belief that his nation had a mission to disseminate Christianity, democracy, and civilization to the world. Biblical imagery converged with belief in manifest destiny and Anglo-Saxon superiority to convince him and millions of his fellow countrymen that the United States had a special role to play in advancing God's purposes for humanity.¹²³ As Linder and Pierard explain, McKinley had heard many ministers argue in sermons that the United States was a chosen nation, which was morally obligated to spread the gospel and uplift people around the world. The president was strongly influenced by mission spokespersons who insisted that "the time was ripe for a great, worldwide Christian advance."¹²⁴ Although American Christians preferred to promote freedom, morality, and faith by peaceful means, their spokesmen contended that oppressive regimes sometimes made this impossible. As public pressure for a war to liberate the Cuban people mounted in the early months of 1898, McKinley listened to Hugh Johnson proclaim in the pulpit of the Metropolitan Methodist Church that "the calm and firm attitude of the Chief Executive" assured Americans that neither "prejudice, passion, popular clamor, hysteria," nor ambition would cause the nation to rush to war. America's great power was "controlled by intelligence, patriotism, and Christian principle." Only "stern duty to humanity and civilization," desire for just relations with our fellowman," and national honor would compel the United States "to let loose the dogs of war. Desiring and praying for peace, let us hope that the extent and vigor of these war preparations will avert the conflict and assist the cause of peace."¹²⁵ On April 6 the New York East Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church sent a resolution to the president deploring "the sufferings of the Cuban people . . . and the methods by which Spain had attempted to keep them in subjection." Its adopters declared their "admiration and confidence" for McKinley's "calmness and . . . forbearance" in negotiating with Spain while also preparing the nation "for any emergency." The resolution expressed the mixed goals of American Protestants: they fervently prayed that the current negotiations would preserve peace,

maintain national honor, and liberate the Cuban people from Spanish oppression.¹²⁶ McKinley repeatedly stated, “I pray God that we may be able to keep peace.” He confided to Leonard Wood, “I shall never get into a war until I am sure that God and man approve. I have been through one war; I have seen the dead piled up; and I do not want to see another.”¹²⁷

Even after an explosion sunk the *Maine*, many ministers called for restraint but insisted that war may be necessary. A. J. F. Behrends, pastor of the Central Congregational Church of Brooklyn, argued that if Spain were responsible, it was the “most satanic crime of the century,” but he urged Americans not to indict Spain until its involvement had been “proved beyond all reasonable doubt.” While calling for support of the president rather than the “hotheads,” he proclaimed that if nations engaged in “policies of slow starvation and merciless extermination” and did not respond to rational arguments to stop, then it was “somebody’s solemn duty . . . to cut with the edge of the sword the sinews which wield the instruments of torture and inhuman cruelty.”¹²⁸ Fellow Congregationalist Lyman Abbott, pastor of the Plymouth Church in Brooklyn and editor of the *Outlook*, also prayed that war would be avoided, but he agreed that the United States must end “Spanish inhumanity in Cuba.”¹²⁹

Preaching on “The Church’s Duty in the Nation’s Crisis,” shortly after McKinley’s April 11 message to Congress, Robert S. MacArthur, the pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church of New York City, urged citizens “to stand by our patriotic, brave, sagacious President, who has earned for himself the admiration of all true Americans.” Although war was “a relic of barbarism” whose burdens were borne chiefly by the poor and working classes, sometimes it was “a grim necessity.” God, he maintained, might use Americans “as His instrument” to drive the Spanish butchers from the Western Hemisphere.¹³⁰ The *Christian and Missionary Alliance* editorialized in April: “We should pray not only that Cuba be free, but that these fair Eastern isles shall become scenes of gospel triumphs and the salvation of countless souls”¹³¹

Although the clergy had initially been divided over whether the United States should intervene in Cuba, after war was declared against Spain on April 25, many ministers defended it as a holy crusade. In numerous sermons, many of which were published as pamphlets, clergy supported the conflict by appealing to “higher principles, self-sacrifice, divine mandate, and altruism.”¹³² To David Gregg, pastor of the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, the war was completely altruistic, involving no revenge or mercenary elements. Renowned pulpiteer T. DeWitt Talmage, a personal friend of McKinley’s, called it “the most unselfish war of the ages,” which was “inspired by mercy.” Wayland Hoyt, the minister at the Epiphany Baptist Church in Philadelphia, declared that no nation had ever fought a war that was “more righteous” or “closer to the law of the self-sacrificing Christ that we bear one another’s burdens.”¹³³ Because Americans were fighting to free oppressed peoples, contended Francis Clay Moran, pastor of the Church of the Heavenly Rest in New York City, they had the right to ask God to grant them victory.¹³⁴ Because our war is waged to advance “genuine civilization and the equal rights of men, intoned John Peters of St. Michael’s Episcopal Church in the same city, “we can feel assured that God is on our side.”¹³⁵ Theologically liberal pastors also defended the war as necessary on moral and humanitarian grounds. Henry Van Dyke, who served Brick Presbyterian Church in New York City, argued that abandoning America’s duty to protect the weak would require a “change in National character. We have prayed for peace. The prayer has been denied. Now we must pray for victory.”¹³⁶

During the brief war, Washington Gladden, pastor of the First Congregational Church of Columbus, Ohio and well known proponent of the Social Gospel, wrote to McKinley to urge him to resubmit an arbitration treaty to the Senate. He assured the president that the American people respected his “wisdom and firmness in this crisis” and that they were earnestly praying for him every day.¹³⁷ All “decent” newspapers agreed, declared the *Christian Advocate*, that since the war began McKinley had fulfilled his responsibilities “in a manner worthy of comparison with the best traditions of his high office.”¹³⁸

On July 6, 1898 McKinley issued a proclamation urging Americans to thank God for the United States' victory. He asked people to "reverently bow before the throne of Divine Grace and give devout praise to God, who holdeth the nations in the hollow of His hands and worked upon them the marvels of His high will, and who has thus far . . . led our brave soldiers and seamen to victory." In "His inscrutable ways," Almighty God was leading American forces "to unscathed triumph" and had "brought nearer the success of the right and the attainment of just and honorable peace." He beseeched "the Dispenser of all good" to restore peace and tranquility in war-ravaged areas.¹³⁹ The *New York Times* featured excerpts of numerous sermons preached the next Sunday in New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, and Washington in response to McKinley's thanksgiving proclamation. A German-American Lutheran pastor in Brooklyn asserted, the president's proclamation showed he was "a God-fearing man, possessed of the true Christian spirit."¹⁴⁰ With McKinley in attendance, Frank Bristol, pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Church, used Psalm 98:1 as his text: "O sing unto the Lord a new song; for he has done marvelous things; his right hand, and his holy arm, hath gotten him the victory." "Were the guns of Dewey and Sampson less providential," he asked, "than the ram's horns of Joshua, the lamps and pitchers of Gideon, or the rod of Moses? Were Manila and Santiago less providential in the history of human freedom than was Jewish barbarism?" The Americans who fought against Spain "were the heirs of the Civil War, the American Revolution, the Pilgrims, the Reformers, the martyrs, and the apostles . . ." "If God ever had a peculiar people," Bristol reasoned, "He has them now."¹⁴¹ "That the yoke of Spain from the neck of Cuba has been broken with the loss of less than one thousand American soldiers," the *Christian Advocate* proclaimed in August 1898, celebrating the war's conclusion, "is an occasion for wonder, for admiration, and for unalloyed pleasure."¹⁴² McKinley echoed these themes in his 1898 Thanksgiving Proclamation. He claimed that the United States had been "compelled to take up the sword in the cause of humanity" and rejoiced that the conflict had been brief and the losses had been few considering "the great results accomplished." This should inspire Americans "with gratitude and praise to the Lord of Hosts."

In the final analysis, evaluations of McKinley's actions in dealing with Spain depend on assessing what his motives and aims were, whether he exhausted all other reasonable alternatives before pursuing war, how he directed the war effort, and what impact the war and occupation had on the Cuban people. Many historians have depicted McKinley as a "cowardly, bumbling, and politically opportunistic" man who capitulated to Congress and public opinion and blundered into an unnecessary and destructive war.¹⁴³ Supported by Theodore Roosevelt's alleged barb that the Ohioan had "no more backbone than a chocolate éclair," this interpretation dominated historical scholarship during the first half of the twentieth century.¹⁴⁴ Although McKinley had great political acumen and behind the scenes could persuade individuals to do what he wanted, Joseph Fry maintained, he was "not a dynamic, forceful public leader." Combined with his fundamental conservatism and limited view of presidential power, this "precluded dramatic or concerted attempts to alter public opinion and prevent war."¹⁴⁵

Some more recent evaluations are also highly critical of American imperialism during the late nineteenth century and McKinley's decision to declare war against Spain. In its efforts to expand overseas trade and investment, the United States, Augustus Cerillo Jr. argues, was not guided by "the biblical norms of equity, justice, and preference for the poor."¹⁴⁶ By seeking to maximize its own economic gain, "often at the expense of impoverished indigenous workers or small entrepreneurs," the nation "sowed the seeds of future anti-American violence and revolution among underdeveloped countries." The United States' economic imperialism abroad stemmed from the same sinful attitudes of superiority that guided policies at home toward Native Americans, blacks, Asians, and immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. In both spheres Anglo Americans were motivated by "economic cupidity, territorial aggrandizement, national selfishness, and idolatrous self-worship." At the same time, Protestant evangelicals, while working to evangelize the world, encased the "gospel too rigidly in Western cultural,

technological, and economic terms” and unwittingly became “advance agents for Western penetration” into the world’s least industrialized nations.¹⁴⁷ Speaking for many of them, missionary Sidney Gulick argued in 1897 that God intended the religion and civilization of Anglo-Saxons to be “the predominating influence in molding the civilizations of the world.”¹⁴⁸ Cerillo faults evangelical leaders for fusing “the gospel, racism, and nationalism,” considering the war between Catholic Spain and “Christian America” a righteous conflict, and failing to evaluate expansionists’ motives “in terms of God’s requirements for justice, righteousness, mercy, peace, honesty, [and] selflessness.”¹⁴⁹

Cerillo accuses McKinley of seeking to “remake Cuba in the American political and economic image.” This prevented “serious long-range diplomatic give-and-take with Spain” and led the president to arbitrarily demand the power to decide Cuba’s ultimate political fate and to fail to provide imaginative leadership.¹⁵⁰ Since Spain was not willing to give up a territory it had ruled for centuries and the Cuban rebels refused to accept anything less than independence, McKinley could achieve his goal—increased American influence in Cuba—only by defeating Spain militarily. Moreover, the president’s belief that the Cuban insurgents were incapable of effectively governing the island prompted him to refuse to recognize them as the legitimate authority and to authorize an American occupation that governed Cuba from 1898 to 1902 without consulting the rebels. At the beginning of the war with Spain, the *Watchman* noted in March 1900, European nations had protested it “was inspired by a desire to acquire Cuba and that the humanitarian aspect of the war was simply a cloak to cover our selfish designs.” If the United States, whose leaders had argued it waged war purely on moral and humanitarian grounds and pledged not to control Cuba, annexed the island, its action “would be both wicked and despicable.”¹⁵¹ Positively, this military government prevented further bloodshed and destruction and supplied food to thousands of hungry and impoverished Cubans. It established a free public school system, reformed the judiciary, improved municipal government, and constructed and repaired roads, hospitals, and other public facilities. American and Cuban physicians worked together to stop the spread of tropical diseases, especially yellow fever.¹⁵² Negatively, the occupational government used arbitrary methods and displayed little sensitivity for Cuban cultural mores and practices. During this paternalistic occupation, Cerillo argues, the United States strengthened its political and economic control of Cuba. In an effort to increase the political power of the island’s conservative and primarily white upper class, who had the most positive attitudes toward the United States, the military regime restricted suffrage to those who were literate and owned property. When the United States finally withdrew its military in 1902 it required the newly created Cuban Republic to accept the Platt Amendment, which gave America “the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence” and “the maintenance of a government adequate” to protect “life, property, and individual liberty.”¹⁵³ Meanwhile, American economic investment in the island doubled between 1898 and 1902, and in subsequent years American multinationals dominated all sectors of the Cuban economy. Cerillo agrees with Reinhold Niebuhr’s conclusion that the Spanish-American War provides “some of the most striking illustrations of the hypocrisy of governments.”¹⁵⁴ America’s actions in 1898, Michael Walzer adds, are an “example of benevolent imperialism,” but not of “humanitarian intervention.” Walzer maintains that the United States intervened on behalf of the Cuban people, but “against their ends.” For intervention to be moral, the liberators cannot “rightly claim any political prerogative” and must respect “local autonomy.”¹⁵⁵

Other historians conclude that McKinley “was more courageous and capable than previously portrayed and his decision for war followed logically from his own policies rather than public or congressional pressure.”¹⁵⁶ His foreign policy, Lewis Gould argues, was based on the premise that the more power and influence America had, the more other nations benefited.¹⁵⁷ Rejecting the views that McKinley was “a weak, indecisive executive who yielded at last to war hysteria” or that he “was a wily expansionist” who chose war to provide a solid foundation for building a new American commercial empire, Gould argues that McKinley worked diligently for

five months to maintain the peace in the face of Spanish obstinacy. His diplomacy in 1898 was “tenacious, coherent, and courageous.”¹⁵⁸ Behind the scenes, the president explored various alternatives to war, including buying Cuba from Spain and an arrangement by which Spain would have maintained token sovereignty over Cuba, but Madrid refused both options. He also offered to mediate personally between Spain and the Cuban revolutionaries. Through his friend Archbishop John Ireland, McKinley proposed having Pope Leo XIII serve as an arbiter in the dispute between Spain and the United States, but this also failed to resolve the crisis.¹⁵⁹ Not having the military resources to effectively fight the United States and refusing to give up Cuba, Madrid resorted to delay, obfuscation, and denial. The principal Spanish strategy was to mobilize European support against the United States. Given these obstacles, H. Wayne Morgan maintains, the president displayed “extraordinary patience,” flexibility, and “regard for Spanish sensibilities.”¹⁶⁰ Only when it became obvious that diplomacy had failed and that the intolerable situation in Cuba could be resolved no other way did McKinley support war. Gould maintains that “his conduct up to that point reveals a subtlety of action, a fortitude of will, and a simple courage”

Because of their “historic traditions, humanitarian impulses, and economic calculations,” most Americans cared deeply about what happened in Cuba. Only a revolution in the attitudes of Americans could have produced a different outcome in Cuba. Gould concludes that the United States’ other options were not likely to have resulted in success. Some scholars insist that United States should have recognized Cuban independence since the rebels had won on the battlefield, but Gould argues this would have led to war with Spain anyway. If the United States had not intervened in Cuba, governed the island for four years, and maintained a military presence, other nations, most notably Germany, may have tried to control Cuba.¹⁶¹

Other scholars insist that McKinley’s dedication to doing his duty, which in this case meant stopping the suffering of the Cuban people, served as the primary foundation for his diplomacy.¹⁶² The Republican asserted that the horrors and inhumanity occurring in Cuba was “unprecedented in the modern history of civilized peoples.” He initiated humanitarian efforts that raised several hundred thousand dollars to help Cuban victims of war.¹⁶³ McKinley eventually called for war, Robert Beisner argues, because he wanted “what only war could bring—an end to the Cuban rebellion, which outraged his humanitarian impulses, prolonged instability in the economy, destroyed American investments and trade with Cuba, created a dangerous picture of an America unable to master the affairs of the Caribbean, threatened to arouse uncontrollable outbursts of jingoism, and diverted the attention of U.S. policymakers from historic happenings in China.”¹⁶⁴ McKinley concluded that ending the bloodshed and atrocities on the island was more important than recognizing the rebels as the legitimate government. Moreover, it might put the United States in the embarrassing position of supporting a government that was unfit to rule and repressive. When the revolutionaries appeared “capable of performing the duties and discharging the functions of a separate nation,” the United States could publicly endorse them.¹⁶⁵ In the judgment of Theodore Roosevelt, McKinley “sought by every honorable means to preserve peace, to avert war. He made every effort consistent with the national honor to bring about an amicable settlement of the Cuban difficulty. Then, when it became apparent that these efforts were useless, that peace could not be honorably entertained, he devoted his strength to making the war as short and decisive as possible.”¹⁶⁶

Judged by contemporary standards that mandate respect for all cultural traditions and practices, America’s military intervention and occupation of Cuba for four years seems ethnocentric, paternalistic, and unjust. Moreover, these actions negatively affected the United States’ relationship with Cuba and other Latin American nations throughout the twentieth century. Many of its actions in Cuba violated the United States’ historic commitments to self-determinism, democracy, and basic individual freedoms. Nevertheless, given the situation he confronted and the widely accepted cultural and political assumptions of his era, McKinley’s course of action is understandable. While he did not explore every conceivable option before

committing the United States to war against Spain, the Republican tried most reasonable alternatives. Spain had made it clear it would not grant independence to Cuba, and nothing else seemed likely to end the bloodshed and horrible suffering of the Cuban people. While economic and political factors clearly played a major role in his decision, McKinley was strongly motivated by Christian compassion for the plight of the Cuban people. Had he endorsed the Cuban insurgents and allowed them to control the country after Spain's defeat, many negative consequences may have been avoided. However, the prevailing cultural attitudes, fears that the rebels were not capable of governing justly or wisely, and prudential considerations made that very difficult to do.

During the war, Commodore George Dewey decisively defeated the Spanish fleet at Manila Bay on May 1, 1898. As a result, when the war ended in August, the United States also had to decide what to do with the Philippine islands, which Spain had formerly ruled. Believing that United States control of the Philippines would provide new opportunities for missions and that God had given America victory in the conflict with Spain, many Protestant ministers and editors strongly supported acquiring the archipelago. "Hitching the cross to the flag," they "saw foreign colonization and foreign missions as practically synonymous."¹⁶⁷ A report to the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions in late May of 1898 rejoiced that the "startling providence of God" had opened the Philippines to mission work. "We cannot ignore the fact that" God had given these islands "into the hands of American Christians" who were called to "go up and possess the land." A month later, Methodist Bishop John F. Hurst praised the American military for enabling Protestants to evangelize the island.¹⁶⁸ An 1899 American Bible Society pamphlet acknowledged that some Americans saw no reason for Protestants to send missionaries to the Philippines where the Catholic Church had taken good care of the inhabitants for more than three hundred years. Its author countered that Filipinos had not been educated and only knew "the outward form of religion," not its inward and spiritual grace." Even "pious and devout Catholics would scarcely be ready to acknowledge them Catholic in more than name" and would admit they were "fit subjects for the missions of their own Church." The Spanish had not permitted Protestant Bible societies to work in the Philippines, but under American control they would be able to sell Bibles throughout the islands.¹⁶⁹ In a letter to McKinley in 1900, W. Henry Grant explained how Protestant missionaries could further America's aims in the Philippines. "Christian missions stand for everything that a Christian government desires to foster—education, local self government, commerce and industry." The "true missionary . . . upholds the Christian ideals of his fellowmen, who have gone into the same lands for other purposes." He is the "best informant" about the character and social conditions of residents of other countries. Moreover, he "demonstrates that the Asiatic, African, Islander, or Indian, has under the regenerative power of the Gospel infinite possibilities."¹⁷⁰

McKinley meanwhile pondered his options. The president initially rejected the idea of acquiring a large unknown territory on the other side of the world. When he first received the cable from Dewey announcing his defeat of the Spanish, McKinley had to look up the location of the Philippines on the map. He confessed, "I could not have told where those darn islands were within 2,000 miles." McKinley recognized that acquiring former Spanish possessions involved "political risks, administration headaches," significant financial costs, and potential problems in international relations. Moreover, the president had "denounced forced annexation as 'criminal aggression,' had disavowed 'greed of conquest,'" and had repeatedly claimed that the United States declared war on Spain only in the name of justice and humanity.¹⁷¹

Several factors, however, contributed to the Republican's decision to acquire the whole archipelago. Public opinion favored retaining the Philippines. A poll published in *Public Opinion* in August 1898 revealed that 43 percent of respondents favored keeping the island, 25 were opposed, and 32 were "wavering" but leaning toward retention. McKinley paid close attention to the telegrams and letters about the Philippines that poured into the White House.¹⁷² "The president's ear was so close to the ground," complained Joe Cannon, chairman of the House

Ways and Means Committee, “it was full of grasshoppers.”¹⁷³ Many of those who visited the White House in the late summer argued for annexation. Missionaries wanted to be able to evangelize openly there. Many businessmen wanted to use the archipelago as a source of raw materials, a market for products, and a stepping-stone to the lucrative Asian trade.¹⁷⁴ Military leaders wanted the Philippines as a base for naval operations. Second, McKinley was uneasy about the Filipino insurgents, especially their leader Emilio Aguinaldo, whom he did not trust.¹⁷⁵ Based on the reports of military leaders and civilian commissioners, he concluded that these rebels did not represent the interests of most of the 1,400 islands’ inhabitants, they could govern effectively, and they could prevent a foreign power from interfering in the affairs of or taking control of the Philippines. “The archipelago consisted of thousands of islands and hundreds of tribes of varying states of civilization, religion, and well-being.” How could Aguinaldo truly speak for all of them?¹⁷⁶ Rule by an inexperienced, arbitrary faction was likely to be both unjust and potentially dangerous.¹⁷⁷ Theodore Roosevelt later explained, “[I]t would have been both absurd and wicked to abandon the Philippine Archipelago and let the scores of different tribes—Christian, Mahometan and pagan, in every stage of semi-civilization and Asiatic barbarism—turn the islands into a welter of bloody savagery, with the absolute certainty that some strong power would have to step in and take possession.”¹⁷⁸ Third, McKinley understandably feared that the European nations or Japan, which were already carving up Southeast Asia, would also grab the Philippines. Both Germany and Japan were actively trying to build a Pacific empire. The Japanese had officially offered to administer the islands if the United States declined to do so. Fourth, Spain had demonstrated it could not govern the Philippines. The Spanish colonial government had collapsed, rebels had gained control of several islands, and Madrid could not afford to administer the country. The United States was morally obligated not to return the Philippines to its Spanish oppressors, and doing so would mean continued rebellion. Finally, McKinley briefly considered but rejected the idea of making the Philippines a self-governing republic under an American protectorate. He considered this the worst possible option because it would make the United States responsible for the archipelago without having authority over it.¹⁷⁹

For two weeks in October 1898 McKinley toured six states, speaking 57 times and giving major addresses at Omaha, St. Louis, and Chicago. While campaigning for Republican candidates and emphasizing the nation’s prosperity and rejuvenation under his leadership, McKinley frequently discussed territorial expansion. Although some historians contend that the pliable president used this tour to discern public opinion on the Philippines, Gould argues persuasively that the Republican instead used these speeches to shape public sentiment.¹⁸⁰ In his addresses McKinley accentuated his belief in God’s providential direction of history and America’s duty. “The faith of a Christian nation,” he declared at Omaha, “recognizes the hand of Almighty God in the ordeal through which we have passed. Divine favor seemed manifest everywhere. In fighting for humanity’s sake, we have been signally blessed. We did not seek war. To avoid it, if this could be done in honor and justice to the rights of our neighbors and ourselves, was our constant prayer.” America’s commitment to duty, McKinley argued, must direct its actions in Cuba and the Philippines. Because of its genius, freedoms, wisdom, courage, and justice and the blessings of divine Providence, America would choose the right course.¹⁸¹ At Glenwood, Iowa, McKinley proclaimed, “We must follow the light as God has given us the light, and he has singularly guided us, not only from the beginning of our great government, but down through every crisis to the present hour.”¹⁸² Speaking in Chicago, the president avowed, “Accepting war for humanity’s sake, we must accept all the obligations which the war in duty and honor imposed on us . . . Duty determines destiny.” Although doing our duty might bring anxiety and perils, McKinley contended, it was “always sure and safe and honorable.” God’s plans for human progress were often “shrouded for the time being in impenetrable mystery.” To illustrate his point, the president emphasized that Lincoln’s original intention was to save the union, not free the slaves, but in God’s providence both happened. The United States must use its

victory over Spain as a springboard to creating a “higher and nobler civilization” where war was no longer necessary.¹⁸³

In subsequent speeches, McKinley continued to justify his policies by appealing to the themes of destiny and duty. The territory the United States stood to gain as a result of the war, McKinley told an audience in Atlanta in December 1898, came not “as the result of a crusade or conquest, but as the reward of temperate, faithful, fearless response to the call of conscience,” which “a liberty-loving and Christian people” could not disregard.¹⁸⁴ Americans went to the Philippines to destroy the Spanish fleet and end the war, McKinley explained in October 1899, “but in the providence of God, who works in mysterious ways, this great archipelago” fell “into our lap, and the American people never shirk duty.”¹⁸⁵ “The Philippines, like Cuba and Porto Rico, were intrusted [sic] to our hands by the war,” the chief executive proclaimed to an audience of almost six thousand at the Home Market Club in Boston in February 1899, “and to [fulfilling] that great trust, under the providence of God and in the name of human progress and civilization, we are committed Congress can declare war, but a higher Power decrees its bounds and fixes its relations and responsibilities.”¹⁸⁶ There was universal agreement, McKinley claimed, that the Philippines could not be given back to Spain. Leaving them on their own would result in anarchy and chaos or their being seized by a powerful nation.

Countering anti-imperialist arguments, McKinley contended, “Our concern was not for territory or trade or empire, but for the people whose interest and destiny, without us willing it, had been put into our hands.” “Imperialist designs,” he added, were “alien to American sentiment, thought, and purpose. Our priceless principles undergo no change under a tropical sun.”¹⁸⁷ McKinley also refuted the charge that America needed the consent of the Filipino people to govern the islands. The United States did not have the permission of the Filipino people to capture Manila and destroy the Spanish navy. America was “obeying a higher moral obligation, which rested upon us and did not require anybody’s consent We were doing our duty by them, as God gave us the light to see our duty, with the consent of our own consciences and with the approval of civilization.”¹⁸⁸ God assigned the strong to bear the burdens of the weak, McKinley argued in Huron, South Dakota in October 1899, and therefore Americans should not pray that God removed their burdens but rather that He gave them to strength to carry them.¹⁸⁹ Expressing the Victorian commitment to doing one’s duty and emphasis on masculinity, McKinley announced in Madison, Wisconsin later that month that Americans must fulfill their responsibilities to their island possessions “with manly courage, respond in a manly fashion to manly duty, and do what in the sight of God and man is just and right.” He maintained that only one “small fraction” of one tribe was questioning American sovereignty in the Philippines. The great majority of Filipinos acknowledged allegiance to America and were glad to have its protection. McKinley insisted moreover that territorial acquisition had been a constant American aim, the dream of Thomas Jefferson, Stephen Douglas, and William Seward.¹⁹⁰

McKinley also insisted that American control of the archipelago would bring many benefits to their residents. It would help inhabitants become “self-respecting and self-governing.” As a result of America’s benevolent guidance, the Philippines would have a glorious future: it would soon become: “a land of plenty and of increasing possibilities; a people redeemed from savage indolence and habits, devoted to the arts of peace,” enjoying the blessings of trade and commerce, freedom and civil and religious liberty, education, and good homes.¹⁹¹ McKinley assured an audience in St. Paul on October 12, 1899 that America would govern these new possessions not “as vassals or serfs or slaves.” They would be “honestly administered,” and would have taxation without tyranny, justice without bribery, universal education, and freedom of worship, which would enable them to advance materially, intellectually, and spiritually.¹⁹²

The process by which McKinley decided what the United States should do with the Philippines is one of the most explicit examples of how a president’s faith influenced a major policy decision. On November 21, 1899 five Methodists representing their denomination’s General Missionary Committee met with McKinley at the White House. As they were ready to

leave, the president told them, “I have been criticised [sic] a good deal about the Philippines, but don’t deserve it. The truth is I didn’t want them, and when they came to us as a gift from the gods, I did not know what to do with them.” He had “sought counsel from all sides” but received “little help.” “I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went on my knees and prayed to Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night late it came to me this way—I don’t know how . . . but it came.” McKinley then described his options. Giving the archipelago back to Spain would be “cowardly and dishonorable”; turning the islands over to France or Germany, America’s commercial rivals in Asia, would be “bad business and discreditable”; leaving the Filipinos to rule themselves was not feasible because they were “unfit for self-government”; “anarchy and misrule . . . worse than Spain’s” would quickly prevail. That left only one alternative: the United States must acquire the islands in order to “educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God’s grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow-men for whom Christ also died.”¹⁹³ McKinley’s frequently quoted statement has evoked much ridicule and censure. Some are alarmed that a president made such an important policy decision primarily on the basis of an alleged revelation from God or at least his intuitive understanding of God’s intentions. Those who disagree with his choice have depicted him “as either a hypocrite” who sanctified his own desires by arguing they were God’s will or as “a bemused instrument of the Almighty.”¹⁹⁴

Lewis Gould berates McKinley’s biographers for “accepting the accuracy of this remarkable revelation without making much of an effort to verify its authenticity.”¹⁹⁵ General James F. Rusling published the chief executive’s statement more than three years after he made it. Gould questions whether Rusling could have remembered the president’s exact words so much later. Moreover, this account closely resembles a conversation Rusling reported having with Abraham Lincoln in his Civil War memoir published in 1899. These similarities lead Gould to wonder whether Rusling embellished McKinley’s statement. Although the alternatives McKinley outlined accurately describe his reflections in the fall of 1898, Gould concludes that “their famed religious context is very questionable.”¹⁹⁶ Linder and Pierard counter that the account “has the ring of truth” because McKinley’s comments were made after the Filipino revolt had begun and he was able to “reflect on the implications of his decision.” Moreover, none of the other Methodists present that day ever contradicted Rusling’s account.¹⁹⁷

In order for the United States to annex the Philippines, the Senate had to ratify the treaty negotiated with Spain, and a diverse and incongruous group of anti-expansionists worked to defeat ratification. They included Mugwump Carl Schurz, industrialist and philanthropist Andrew Carnegie, Republican Senator George Hoar of Massachusetts, a few Democratic senators, former president Grover Cleveland, prominent businessmen like Edward Atkinson, representatives of labor who feared Filipino and Asian competition, Mark Twain and other writers and artists, and some religious leaders.¹⁹⁸ Inconsistently, the anti-expansionists at times denounced McKinley as weak and a mere “weathervane for public sentiment” and at others “pilloried him as a tyrant grasping for power” who was willing to kill helpless Filipinos.¹⁹⁹ The anti-imperialists put forth a variety of arguments. They condemned imperialism as unjust, undesirable, illegal, and contrary to American history and traditions. Many protested that the United States had been pushed into war “by hysteria and unreasoning jingoism” and should not have gained control of these territories in the first place. Some insisted that the “Republic would lose its vitality and abandon its age-old promises of freedom and liberty if it ruled distant and alien people.”²⁰⁰ Other anti-imperialists objected that ruling foreign lands violated the Constitution, imposed great financial burdens, and entailed potentially explosive racial, religious, and political problems. Asians were too different to be assimilated into American practices.²⁰¹ Many insisted that imperialist ventures “would divert attention, energy, and funds” needed to solve pressing problems at home.²⁰² Imperialism contradicted America’s most important documents: the Declaration of Independence, George Washington’s Farewell Address, and the

Monroe Doctrine.²⁰³ Moreover, it was antithetical to America's commitment to liberty, equality, and self-government. Imperialism inevitably led to cruelty, militarism, and despotism. Turning a war that had been defended as a crusade to liberate oppressed peoples into "a war of conquest and aggrandizement" was hypocritical and dishonorable.²⁰⁴ Presbyterian Henry Van Dyke urged the nation's leaders not to "sell the American birthright for a mess of pottage in the Philippines." Acquiring colonies, he warned, could push America into future wars.²⁰⁵

McKinley and other supporters of annexation countered these arguments by reemphasizing the concepts of destiny and duty. They strove to spread American ideals and felt compelled to assume "the white man's burden" to bring civilization and morality to the less fortunate. Many ministers contended that acquiring an empire would facilitate the spread of the gospel. "I believe in imperialism," declared Wallace Radcliffe, the moderator of the Presbyterian Church (USA) General Assembly, "because I believe in foreign missions."²⁰⁶ "We have a right to civilize" the Filipinos, argued Washington Gladden. "To leave them to themselves and permit them to cover and curse vast regions of the earth is not a rational proposition."²⁰⁷ Proponents of annexation also insisted that the Philippines could serve as an effective base for the navy and for trade and repudiated the idea that American institutions could not be exported or that an overseas empire would undermine freedom or prosperity at home.²⁰⁸

Aided by Republican Senators Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, Nelson Aldrich of Rhode Island, and Mark Hanna of Ohio, McKinley skillfully guided the ratification process. Using convincing arguments and appeals to patriotism, accentuating public support for the measure, and promising reluctant senators patronage or better committee assignments, they convinced 57 senators to vote for the treaty, one more than necessary to ratify the agreement, even though reports reached Washington the day before the vote on February 6, 1899 that Filipino rebels had attacked American troops. Although Democrat William Jennings Bryan's support for the treaty, public opinion, and the outbreak of insurrection that prompted some wavering senators to rally behind the flag all played a role, McKinley's determined use of the powers of his office and ability to persuade was crucial to passing the treaty.²⁰⁹

For the next three years, the United States practiced what McKinley termed "benevolent assimilation." American administrators worked to establish a fair legal and judicial system, free public schools, hospitals, effectively functioning municipal and local governments, and a sanitation system. McKinley assumed that if "the United States ruled equitably and firmly, the conservative element in Filipino society would be won over" and it would become clear that the insurrection did not reflect the will of the majority. The president "underestimated the genuine support" that Aguinaldo's independence movement enjoyed.²¹⁰ This support, coupled with American paternalism, cultural coercion, and misunderstanding of Filipino thinking and customs, Filipino dislike of foreign intervention, some brutal methods the army used to battle the insurgents, and the fierce determination of Aguinaldo and the rebels, caused the fighting to drag on until 1902. The anti-expansionists, led by the Anti-Imperial League, which had 30,000 members and many notable supporters, continued to criticize American actions in the Philippines after the treaty was ratified. They worked to rally public opinion to oppose "an aggressive, unjustifiable, cruel war" against the insurgents.²¹¹ The American flag, Carl Schurz complained, had become "an emblem of that hypocrisy" that covered "a war of conquest and subjugation with a cloak of humanity and religion."²¹² McKinley ordered his military leaders to conduct the war against the insurgents in a humane way, but some war crimes and combat atrocities occurred. Provoked by the terrorist acts of the Filipino rebels, the army sometimes tortured prisoners, slaughtered animals, and destroyed farm land, civil buildings, and church property. In addition, thousands of Filipinos died as a result of battle, disease, or starvation. Ironically the United States used many of the same methods to quell the Filipino revolution that the Spanish had employed in Cuba. Even if American soldiers in the Philippines had scrupulously observed all the rules of war and civilian administrators had governed in a truly benevolent fashion, Lewis Gould concludes, it would not have mattered because the United States was violating its own

commitment to rule by the consent of the governed. American control of the Philippines “was flawed and doomed, not because bad men carried out harsh and callous policies, but because good men, such as William McKinley,” tried “to do the impossible.” Although by contemporary standards, McKinley was misguided, paternalistic, and culturally insensitive, in his own way, he “was a sincere friend of the people of the Philippines.” Any other country that ruled the islands after Spain may have done much worse.²¹³

Most historians have criticized McKinley for annexing the Philippines. The views of H. Wayne Morgan, E. Berkeley Tompkins, and Augustus Cerillo are illustrative. According to Morgan, “[m]ixed motives produced the demand for the islands: duty to the Filipinos, fear of foreign control, the glittering prospects of trade . . . in the lucrative Eastern markets, and strong feeling of destiny combined to make acquisition not merely logical but inevitable.” He faults McKinley and other expansionists for failing to realize that war was likely to occur in the Philippines, that the empire would involve enormous costs, and that few financial benefits would result from the Asian trade.²¹⁴ Tompkins labels the “splendid little war” an “inglorious, vicious conflict” and condemns American suppression of Filipino freedom. “Whether viewed from a contemporary or historical vantage point, whether considered pragmatically philosophically, or morally,” America’s annexing of the Philippines, he concludes, “was a grave mistake.”²¹⁵ Cerillo accuses McKinley of ignoring the desires of the archipelago’s eight million inhabitants. His decision was allegedly made on political, economic, and strategic grounds, but whether the Philippines were acquired as “part of a previously planned grand design or simply as a rationally calculated decision . . . the inescapable conclusion is the same.” Regardless of the specific motives—duty, destiny, evangelism, economics, strategy—the United States seized “a foreign land and controlled it “against the wishes of a fairly well-organized indigenous independence movement.”²¹⁶ While McKinley and his supporters saw the United States as an “instrument of God or Anglo-Saxon civilization chosen to bring order, justice, and peace to the Philippines,” the insurgents considered America to be “a Great Babylon or Beast, a source of persecution and injustice.” The fact that other great powers engaged in similar activities and some of them welcomed America’s annexation of the Philippines did not justify the United States violating “its own democratic traditions of self-government and the requirement of biblical morality that governments do good. In short, American policy was shaped by a “quest for national power, wealth, and security,” Cerillo concludes, “not by biblical standards of justice, righteousness, and peace.”²¹⁷ Tragically, when the Commonwealth Government was created in 1934, the United States still had not established “a viable economy, a democratic social structure, or a broad-based popular government.”²¹⁸

Was McKinley’s decision to annex the Philippines as bad as most historians maintain? Many of the long-term consequences certainly were not good. In putting down the revolt and administering the islands, the nation did contradict many of its most cherished traditions and values. Because of its actions the United States gained a reputation for imperialism that has negatively affected its relations with many nations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia ever since. Nevertheless, given McKinley’s inadequate sources of information, the political pressure he confronted, and the lack of good alternatives, his choice should not be so quickly dismissed or strongly condemned. McKinley was a product of the Victorian generation who believed in Anglo-Saxon superiority, honor, responsibility, the duty to care for and uplift the downtrodden, and the value of civilizing and Christianizing “inferior peoples.” Lacking modern sensibilities about multiculturalism and respect for differing cultural traditions, McKinley and his advisers genuinely believed they were helping the Filipino people by administering the archipelago. McKinley hoped that the United States would gain economic, military, and political benefits by ruling the Philippines, but they were far from certain and few in fact resulted. Given McKinley’s assumptions that God had chosen the United States to carry out His purposes, especially to spread the gospel and assist the poor and afflicted, his desire to create opportunities for American commerce, and his fears of what would happen to the Philippines if the United States did not

control the islands, his actions are understandable and even defensible, not malicious or malevolent. Like countless religious leaders and ordinary Americans, the president believed God had uniquely blessed and used America in the past and would continue to do so in the future.²¹⁹ He did not fight to annex the archipelago primarily for crass economic gain or self-serving political benefits, but rather because he believed God willed it, duty demanded it, and positive results would occur for both the Philippines and the United States. In May 1899 McKinley shared with Henry S. Pritchett that two factors had strongly influenced his decision to annex the Philippines: belief that it was the desire of the American people and that America's control of the islands "would be a sort of national missionary effort," which would bring great benefits to the Filipinos and have a positive impact on American politics.²²⁰ While McKinley's assumptions are debatable, they suggest his actions in dealing with Spain, Cuba, and the Philippines were not hypocritical but the result of his conviction that they were morally right and consistent with Christian teaching. American policies in both Cuba and the Philippines were certainly better than the blatantly self-serving colonization of European nations. Moreover, given the record of nations in the twentieth century, Cerillo's judgment that "the most incompetent independent Philippine government" could not have done as much damage as did the American administrators seems questionable.²²¹

McKinley's Assassination and Death

McKinley's response to being fatally wounded provided a vivid testimony to his faith, and his subsequent death evoked an outpouring of theological reflection, spiritual anguish, and praise for his Christian character and conviction. On Friday September 6, 1901 McKinley spoke at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, New York. According to the *Presbyterian Banner*, he came to the exposition "at the height of his splendid fame. The strength and purity of his character and the solidity and success of his administration" had "won him the confidence and admiration of all parties and classes." He was "personally loved as few presidents" had been loved.²²² While greeting people after the speech, McKinley was shot twice at point blank range by anarchist Leon Czolgosz. Worried about his wife who had recently suffered a life-threatening illness, the president urged his personal secretary George Cortelyou not to tell her what had happened. He then turned to the assassin who had been subdued by guards. Fearing that the crowd might beat him to death, McKinley raised his blood-stained hand and entreated, "Let no one hurt him; may God forgive him." Many Americans were later struck by the similarity with Christ's words on the cross. Like Jesus during his crucifixion and Stephen while being stoned, an Episcopal rector avowed, he prayed for his murderer.²²³ The assassin, McKinley added, was "some poor misguided fellow." Next the president apologized for having "been the cause of trouble to the exposition." As the *Presbyterian Banner* put it, after being shot, McKinley "thoughts went out in tenderness to his wife, in forgiveness to his enemy, and in unselfish regard for the public interest."²²⁴

Two bullets struck McKinley. One of them penetrated his stomach walls, shredding his kidneys. Surgeons quickly operated, but could not locate the bullet. From all quarters, the president's friends and associates flocked to Buffalo: Mark Hanna from Cleveland, Senator Charles Fairbanks from Indianapolis, Vice-President Theodore Roosevelt from Vermont, and many others. As Americans prayed and waited, the initial news was hopeful. Writing to Cortelyou, A. B. Farquhar of York, Pennsylvania, declared, "I would gladly give my life to save his, and everyone feels the same way."²²⁵ McKinley's patience, calmness, cheerfulness, and sense of peace impressed the nation. By Thursday the president seemed to be getting better. However, his condition changed dramatically the next morning. Realizing the end was near, the president called his surgeons to his bedside, prayed the Lord's Prayer, and murmured some of the words of his favorite hymn "Nearer, My God, to Thee."²²⁶ His last words, as reported by the

newspapers around the nation were, “Good-bye all, good-bye. It is God’s way. His will, not ours, be done.”²²⁷ Having regarded his whole life as under God’s direction and control,” Frederick Barton emphasized, “he even declared his dying at the hands of an assassin to be ‘God’s way.’”²²⁸ It was as though he bravely answered “the Master’s call, which others could not hear,” reported the *Washington Post*.²²⁹ The *Baltimore Sun* expressed thanks that McKinley lived long enough to experience “the outpouring of national love,” the universal goodwill and esteem of all sections of the country, and the solace of prayers offered for his recuperation. Although “the Divine Healer did not answer . . . our prayers for his recovery,” God gave him eternal life.²³⁰ Both fervent prayer and the best efforts of modern science, declared the *Charleston News and Courier*, were impotent and McKinley “surrendered to the inscrutable will of the Ruler of life and death.”²³¹

One hundred thousand sermons, contended Henry C. McCook, “could not have taught us as much as these last words: ‘It is God’s way; His will, not ours, be done.’”²³² All the sermons on the subject of Christian courage, patience, and hope in heaven for the last ten years, DeWitt Talmage argued, did “not make such an impression as [did] the magnificent demeanor of this dying chief magistrate.” The way McKinley faced death encouraged those with tuberculosis, cancer, and other life-threatening illnesses to endure their suffering patiently.²³³ “No Christian virgin seeking the martyr’s crown in Rome’s empurpled amphitheater,” declared the *Rocky Mountain News*, “faced death with courage more superb than William McKinley.”²³⁴ During his last hours, McKinley’s radiant faith in God and eternal life, maintained the *New York Herald*, eloquently reminded Americans of both Christ’s death and resurrection.²³⁵ “Christian faith and trust,” declared William Jennings Bryan, McKinley’s opponent in both 1896 and 1900, was “never better exemplified than in his death.”²³⁶ McKinley died “wonderfully as the Master died,” another added, providing a marvelous Christian example.²³⁷ “From thy Calvary of pain, whereon thou died for the weal of all mankind, we lift and lay thy body down to sleep,” wrote a man from Kansas City.²³⁸ Congressman Charles Grosvenor predicted that McKinley’s death would be remembered as the most Christ-like the world had known since Calvary.²³⁹ Many praised his submission to God’s will.²⁴⁰

Numerous commentators struggled to find meaning in McKinley’s assassination. The Presbyterian *Interior* of Chicago expressed hope that “through the flame of affliction God would lead the nation from its jaunty pride of prosperity to soberness and introspection.” Through this tragedy God was summoning America to repent of its national sins—disrespect for law and toleration of corruption, oppression, and iniquity.²⁴¹ His death challenged Americans to ask if they had been worshipping wealth and pleasure and ignoring the spiritual and eternal. This national ordeal had melted political and sectional differences and promoted unity and brotherhood. If the death of “our noble and beloved president . . . can make us more faithful to God, then indeed has he not died in vain and he is mightier and more beneficent in his death than in his life.”²⁴² Because of the way he died, argued W. B. Huntingdon, the rector of Grace Church in New York City, religion was stronger in America.²⁴³ Many Southerners praised McKinley’s efforts to restore national unity. As one of them put it, “Where he found distrust, he left faith; where he found strife, he left peace; where he found bitterness, he left love; where he found an open wound, he poured his dissolving life as a precious ointment to soothe and heal.”²⁴⁴ Some predicted that God would use McKinley’s life and death as an instrument to convert many Americans.²⁴⁵ His sudden death challenged people to examine their own spiritual state. Ministers emphasized that McKinley was with God in paradise because he trusted in Jesus Christ as his redeemer and urged Americans to give their lives to God so they would someday experience heavenly life.²⁴⁶ Preaching at Metropolitan Methodist Church in Washington the Sunday after McKinley’s death, W. H. Chapman declared, “May we all imitate his virtues and at the last be counted worthy of a place with him in the Kingdom of Heaven.”²⁴⁷

Christians took comfort in their belief that although McKinley was dead, God still ruled the world, and the republic remained strong.²⁴⁸ Numerous editors quoted the words of James

Garfield who comforted Americans after Lincoln's assassination by declaring, "God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives."²⁴⁹ While proclaiming that God still reigned and all things worked together for good to those who loved Him, the editors of the *United Presbyterian* admitted it was very difficult to "feel and express a forgiveness" like that of Christ's on the cross. As did many other mourners, they urged the nation to admit no more anarchists, smash their organizations, suppress their "incendiary publications," and silence their lecturers.²⁵⁰ Similarly, David Gregg, the pastor of the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, argued that the best weapons for combating anarchists were insane asylums, prisons, and scaffolds.²⁵¹ Striking a different note, Frank Gunsaulus insisted that "more than jails or scaffold, more than national armaments or strict legislation," McKinley's "gentle, pure, just, and loving spirit," as exemplified in his life and death, would eventually "annihilate anarchy."²⁵² McKinley's death, Gunsaulus added, should inspire all Americans to resolve to promote the common good.²⁵³ Numerous commentators bemoaned that three presidents—Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley—had been assassinated in less than forty years, a record worse than that of despotic Russia.²⁵⁴

McKinley's Funeral and National Mourning

As a special train took the slain president's body from Buffalo to Washington, large crowds lined the tracks in many towns, tears flowed, flags were lowered, and bells tolled. School children sang McKinley's favorite hymns. Thousands of mourners viewed his coffin as it lay in state at the Capitol. Two public funeral services were held: one at the Capitol and the other at the First Methodist Church in Canton. Both President Theodore Roosevelt and former President Grover Cleveland attended the service in Washington.²⁵⁵ After the service, a huge throng escorted the president's body to the train station. Everywhere along the route to Canton poles were draped in flags and people stood silently in homage. An estimated 250,000 people gathered in Pittsburgh to pay tribute to the fallen chief executive.²⁵⁶ "The outburst of tears and heartfelt grief throughout the land," an Episcopal priest concluded, was "almost unparalleled."²⁵⁷ Thousands of stores, offices, homes, and even saloons displayed portraits of the fallen president emblazoned with his last words: "It is God's way. His will, not ours, be done."²⁵⁸ President Roosevelt, 40 senators, 120 representatives, and many governors attended the funeral service in Canton. Several local ministers participated in the service, and Charles Manchester, the church's pastor, gave the eulogy. McKinley was a Christian, Manchester proclaimed, "in the broadest, noblest sense if the word. . . . He had gained in early life a personal knowledge of Jesus, which guided him in the performance of greater duties . . . than . . . any other American President." McKinley had testified that he was able to discharge his duties faithfully only because of his trust in God.²⁵⁹ At 3:30 in the afternoon on the day of his funeral the nation observed five minutes of silence as all vehicles, factory machinery, and conversation stopped. A mixed quartet sang McKinley's two favorite hymns *Lead, Kindly Light* and *Nearer, My God, to Thee*. Following a brief ceremony and the interment of McKinley's body at Westlawn Cemetery in Canton, an estimated 100,000 mourners departed for home. Roosevelt issued a proclamation making the day of McKinley's burial one of "mourning and prayer throughout the United States" and imploring Americans "to bow down in submission to the will of Almighty God." He declared that McKinley had "crowned a life of largest love for his fellowmen [and] most earnest endeavor for their welfare, by a death of Christian fortitude . . ."²⁶⁰ The principal chief of the Cherokee Nation also issued a proclamation, extolling McKinley's exemplary Christian character and urging tribe members to hold religious services to honor his memory.²⁶¹

Dying as a widely admired, highly respected, and dearly loved chief executive who had helped heal the nation's wounds and restore both national prosperity and faith in the presidency, McKinley was the subject of thousands of effusive eulogies. Many tributes focused on his virtues. McKinley was "beloved on every hand," declared the *Washington Post*, honored, trusted,

hailed as the people's friend and sympathizer."²⁶² "No American statesman," opined the *Indianapolis Journal*, had "ever grown more steadily or rapidly in public estimation at home and abroad" than had McKinley.²⁶³ Americans composed hundreds of poems to express their grief. In a widely printed one, Richard Watson Gilder, wrote, "Gentle and generous, brave-hearted, kind, and full of love and trust was he, our chief . . ."²⁶⁴ Although McKinley had led the United States into war, he was widely extolled as a man of peace and high principles. Speaking for many, the *Buffalo Courier* contended, "Providence willed that as President he should direct a successful war, but it was a war of humanity, waged on just principle. He abhorred its necessity, and was grateful to his Maker for its cessation . . ."²⁶⁵ Hundreds of commentators praised the deceased president's honesty, unselfishness, kindness, affability, and approachableness. Ministers, politicians, newspaper editors, and friends lauded his integrity, wisdom, moral purity, kindness, patriotism, fortitude, common sense, and generosity.²⁶⁶ "Honesty and courage, fraternity and justice, declared *Century Magazine*, were his "sincere watchwords."²⁶⁷ Roosevelt praised his strength, courage, courtesy, dignity, kindness, sense of justice, and concern for others.²⁶⁸ The *Rocky Mountain News* lauded McKinley as an exalted, upright, and compassionate man.²⁶⁹ Others labeled his life "stainless," "unsullied," and "spotless."²⁷⁰ His sublime faith in Him who died to save mankind, his fortitude in his final hour," declared the Cincinnati *Times-Star*, "were but the evidences of a life without flaw . . ."²⁷¹ "Blameless in his private life" and able to develop close friendships, McKinley, insisted the *Philadelphia North-American*, was "a warm-hearted, cordial, Christian gentleman . . . without personal enemies."²⁷² While "even Washington had many bitter personal enemies," the *Buffalo Courier* argued, McKinley had only a few who were inconsequential.²⁷³ Secretary of the Navy John Long insisted that McKinley never tried to accomplish "a good result by improper means." He was even tempered, patient, and very considerate.²⁷⁴ If McKinley had a fault it was that he placed too much confidence in the American people, proclaimed the Cincinnati *Times-Star*, "a confidence that cost him his life."²⁷⁵ The *United Presbyterian* claimed he was widely regarded as "a model President."²⁷⁶

Numerous eulogies compared McKinley with two of his most illustrious and revered predecessors. An Episcopal priest in Providence, Rhode Island, for example, avowed that the fallen chief executive completed a trio that would "ever shine with undiminished luster among our presidents": "Washington, the liberator of the colonies; Lincoln the emancipator of the slaves; McKinley, the deliverer of oppressed and dying Cuba."²⁷⁷ The *Ohio State Journal* predicted that history would place McKinley beside "Lincoln and Washington in high ability, . . . lofty character, and . . . far-sighted statesmanship."²⁷⁸ Among America's presidents, judged the *Topeka Daily Capital*, only Washington and Lincoln were as close to the American people during their public life as was McKinley.²⁷⁹ Neither Washington nor Lincoln, the *Springfield Union* claimed, surpassed McKinley's commitment to duty.²⁸⁰

"Duty and destiny," declared the *Baltimore Sun*, "were favorite words of Mr. McKinley . . ."²⁸¹ His pastor in Washington, Frank Bristol, insisted that McKinley, like Robert E. Lee, regarded duty as the most sublime word in the English language.²⁸² Few could match his "singleness of purpose," moral purity, or commitment to public duty, argued the *Buffalo Express*.²⁸³ Cardinal James Gibbons praised McKinley's civic virtues and the high moral standards of his administration.²⁸⁴

Dozens of eulogies and editorials emphasized the depth of McKinley's faith. All of McKinley's other virtues, the *Presbyterian Banner* asserted, rested upon the foundation of his Christian faith. From the day of his conversion until he died, McKinley "lived his faith in thought, word, and deed." Neither parading nor concealing his faith, "he walked as a humble and faithful follower of the Lord Jesus."²⁸⁵ An Episcopal rector described the stricken president as "an avowed lover, and worshipper, and servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ" who was "not ashamed of the Gospel." He prayed, read the Bible, and attended church regularly. Believing that God was establishing his kingdom on earth "to be an institution as real as any earthy . . . government," the Civil War major was a faithful and fervent soldier of the cross.²⁸⁶

The rector of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York emphasized his deep faith in God and lack of religious bigotry and judged him to be one of the nation's most beloved presidents.²⁸⁷

Many considered McKinley a martyr. He offered his life for the American people, stated the Cincinnati *Times-Star*, "on the altar of his country." His sacrifice could help complete the unification of the nation to which he had devoted "his best thought and energy."²⁸⁸ He had done much, declared the Atlanta *Constitution*, to bind domestic wounds and heal sectional estrangement.²⁸⁹ His death, predicted the *Baltimore Sun*, would "strengthen the foundations of the Republic by bringing closer together all who love free institutions and giving fresh power to old ideals and aspirations."²⁹⁰ McKinley had surrendered "selfish and personal considerations to promote the welfare of the Republic."²⁹¹

A Final Assessment

Thousands of his contemporaries showered McKinley with praise. He was a "shining example," asserted the *Milwaukee Sentinel*, of the success that could be achieved by those who, although "born in humble circumstances," worked earnestly, conscientiously, and industriously.²⁹² By treating the South justly, the Birmingham *Age-Herald* argued, he had helped restore national unity.²⁹³ Praising his handling of relations with the Philippines and China, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* predicted that McKinley would go down in history as one of the nation's greatest presidents.²⁹⁴ A highly skilled politician, McKinley had an excellent relationship with the opposition party and a more complete mastery over Congress than any other president, declared the *Buffalo Express*.²⁹⁵ Charles S. Olcott insisted that "McKinley's private life was so pure, his personal integrity so well known, and his political conduct so far above suspicion that not a word of reproach in any of these directions was uttered."²⁹⁶

The evaluations of later historians have not been so laudable. Despite the effusive outpouring of genuine affection expressed for McKinley after his assassination, the memory of his character and contributions faded quickly, and by the 1920s his "administration was dismissed as little more than a mediocre prelude to the energy and vigor" of Roosevelt's seven and a half years in office.²⁹⁷ During the 1890s numerous cartoons implied that Mark Hanna made McKinley president and controlled his policies. Later critics depicted McKinley as a puppet dancing at the end of strings pulled by Hanna.²⁹⁸ Lewis Gould argues that McKinley let little stand in the way of his own advancement, had no charisma, and rarely inspired the American people. Lacking speechwriters or dramatic flair, McKinley, H. Wayne Morgan explains, failed to explain his philosophy of governing in a very compelling way.²⁹⁹

Despite such criticisms, Gould, Morgan, and other recent biographers, have provided a generally positive assessment of McKinley. Claims that McKinley was a "hidebound Republican conservative," "the spokesman for untamed business in the Gilded Age, the compliant agent" of Hanna, and an irresolute executive who could not prevent a needless war with Spain, Gould maintains, are "erroneous stereotypes."³⁰⁰ In reality, McKinley shrewdly used the industrialist's "organizational skills and fund-raising ability" to help him reach the White House. The Republican successfully directed the military during the Spanish-American War and the diplomatic process that brought peace and territorial acquisitions.³⁰¹

In numerous ways, these scholars argue, McKinley was a transitional president. He was the nation's last chief executive to fight in the Civil War. The Ohio native did much to restore the prestige and authority of the presidency and expanded its powers, helping to pave the way for his more activist successors in the twentieth century. When McKinley came to office, the presidency was modest in both size and aspirations. He used his power as commander in chief "broadly and creatively" and laid the foundation for the emergence of the modern presidency.³⁰² He brought experts and academicians into the government through his appointment of commissions. McKinley established good relations with Congress by making it an equal partner in government

and regularly consulting with leaders of both parties in crafting programs. An effective orator, he used tours of the country and the press to attain a high level of personal popularity that “gave him a powerful lever in public controversies.”³⁰³ Although McKinley believed deeply in democracy and sought to discern the will of the people, he resisted public opinion when his principles or circumstance dictated. While he insisted that the voice of the people was “commanding and conclusive,” he knew how to interpret and shape that voice to achieve his own ends.³⁰⁴ Because of his patience, political skills and experience, temperament, tact, and facility for telling people things they did not want to hear, McKinley helped heal the divisions of his party caused by the controversial issues of the Gilded Age and create the Republican unity necessary to carry out his domestic and foreign policy goals. These same traits enabled him to help heal a nation torn asunder by a bloody civil war and subsequent hostile feelings.³⁰⁵ While McKinley was not a great chief executive, Gould concludes, by strengthening the Republican Party, expanding the size and scope of the presidency, and engineering “important departures in foreign policy,” he left a significant legacy. Shrewd, masterful, and astute, McKinley during his tenure in office was as dominant a political leader as Franklin Roosevelt was during his twelve years as president.³⁰⁶

McKinley’s mother frequently said she was sorry her son “had only become president when he could have had such a useful and brilliant career in the church.”³⁰⁷ Although he never became a Methodist bishop as his mother hoped, Frederick Barton argued, McKinley was a priest whose “services were performed at the head of a nation.” He extended God’s Kingdom by ending oppression and giving religious freedom to thousands.³⁰⁸ “McKinley’s life and work,” Pierard and Linder conclude, epitomize the powerful Protestant civil religion consensus of the last decade of the nineteenth century, “which provided the spiritual underpinning for the nation to become a world power.”³⁰⁹ McKinley told fellow Methodists in August 1899 that “piety and patriotism go well together.” “Love of flag, love of country, are not inconsistent with our religious faith.”³¹⁰ Sometimes failing to properly distinguish between piety and patriotism, between Christian teachings and the United States’ aims, McKinley frequently justified America’s actions as fulfilling God’s will and accomplishing His purposes. Like most other presidents, he used civil religion much more in a priestly than a prophetic way. While endearing him to many of his contemporaries, this led him to questionable courses of action that set some dangerous precedents for the nation in foreign relations. Nevertheless, McKinley safely piloted the ship of state through many perilous waters. Dignified, devout, decorous, determined, duty-bound, and diplomatic, in life and death he was an impressive role model. “[A]ll a man can hope for during his lifetime,” McKinley declared, was “to set an example, and when he is dead, to be an inspiration for history.”³¹¹ Judged by this standard, McKinley succeeded admirably in many ways.

¹ Bishop Edwin Andrews, eulogy at the funeral service in Washington, in Murat Halstead, *The Illustrious Life of William McKinley, Our Martyred President* (Chicago, n. p., 1901), 284.

² See “The Mother’s Story,” as told to Julius Chambers, in Charles Grosvenor, *William McKinley: His Life and Work* (Washington, D.C.: The Continental Assembly, 1901), 175-79.

³ Frederick Barton, “A Christian Gentleman: William McKinley,” *The Chautauquan* 34 (Nov. 1901), 134. Historians and contemporaries disagree about when McKinley had his conversion experience. Richard Pierard and Robert Linder, *Civil Religion and the Presidency* (Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1988), 115 and Margaret Leech, *In the Days of William McKinley* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), 5, claim he was ten; Halstead (*Illustrious Life*, 422) maintained he was about fourteen; and Frank Gunsaulus, “The Religious Life of William McKinley,” *Interior*, Sept. 26, 1901, 1205, alleged he was fifteen.

⁴ Charles S. Olcott, *The Life of William McKinley*, 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916), 1: 18-19; Robert Porter, *Life of William McKinley, Soldier, Lawyer, Statesman* (Cleveland: N. G. Hamilton Pub. Co., 1896), 53ff.

⁵ James F. Rusling, “Interview with President McKinley,” *CA* 78 (Jan. 22, 1903), 137.

⁶ Quoted in Joseph Butler, Jr., *Recollection of Men and Events* (Youngstown, OH: n.p., 1925), 26.

⁷ H. Wayne Morgan, ed., “A Civil War Diary of William McKinley,” *Ohio History* 69 (July 1960), 283.

- ⁸ *Speeches and Addresses of William McKinley From His Election to Congress to the Present Time* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1893), 606.
- ⁹ Quoted in "Notable Public Utterances of President McKinley; Outspoken and Eloquent Championship of the Christian Religion," *PB*, Oct. 3, 1901, 13.
- ¹⁰ William McKinley Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress (hereafter WMP), reel 18, vol. 90, p. 425.
- ¹¹ Pepper as cited in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 387.
- ¹² Barton, "Christian Gentleman," 135.
- ¹³ Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 370.
- ¹⁴ *Epworth Herald*, Sept. 24, 1901, quoted in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 395.
- ¹⁵ T. DeWitt Talmage, *T. DeWitt Talmage As I Knew Him* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1912), 307.
- ¹⁶ Vernon B. Hampton, *Religious Background of the White House* (Boston: Christopher Pub. House, 1932), 356-58.
- ¹⁷ Quoted in Barton, "Christian Gentleman," 135. McKinley did not always get his wish to be treated like other worshippers. For example, the Sunday after Republicans nominated McKinley for the presidency, Charles Manchester sought to encourage the candidate with a sermon based on II Peter 1:10: "Therefore, brethren, be even more diligent to make your call and election sure, for if you do these things you will never stumble." See Edward Thornton Heald, *The William McKinley Story* (Canton, OH: Stark County Historical Society, 1964), 84.
- ¹⁸ Manchester wrote McKinley frequently about a variety of church, political, and personal matters. He attended the inauguration as the president's guest. See Manchester to WM, WMP, Mar. 11, 1897, reel 2. See especially Manchester to WM, Apr. 7, 1897, reel 58; Oct. 8, 1897, reel 2; Dec. 21, 1899, reel 8; July 9, 1898, reel 61; Jan. 20, 1899, reel 5; John Addison Porter to Manchester, Oct. 12, 1897, reel 22; Porter to Manchester, Mar. 7, 1898, reel 26; and WM to Manchester, Apr. 14, 1899, reel 39, all in WMP.
- ¹⁹ John D. Long, "Some Personal Characteristics of President McKinley," *Century Magazine* 63 (1901), 145.
- ²⁰ Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 423.
- ²¹ Quoted in Barton, "Christian Gentleman," 136.
- ²² W. K. Miller as told to Charles Manchester as told to Barton, "Christian Gentleman," 135.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, 135.
- ²⁴ E.g. Bliss Isely, *The Presidents, Men of Faith* (Boston: W. A. Wilde, 1953), 191.
- ²⁵ Quoted in an American Bible Society tract.
- ²⁶ Gunsaulus, "Religious Life," 1206.
- ²⁷ Leech, *McKinley*, 462.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, 132.
- ²⁹ Barton, "Christian Gentleman," 134. Cf. A. Ellwood Corning, *William McKinley: A Biological Study* (New York: Broadway Pub. Co., 1907), 170-71.
- ³⁰ Quoted in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 386.
- ³¹ Barton, "Christian Gentleman," 135.
- ³² *Speeches and Addresses of William McKinley from March 1, 1897 to May 30, 1900* (New York: Doubleday and McClure Co., 1900); the first quotation is from 2, the second from 15. Cf. his second inaugural address, Richardson, ed., James Richardson, ed., *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1917), 13: 6466.
- ³³ William McKinley, Speech at Canton, IL, Oct. 6, 1899, *Speeches and Addresses* (1900), 229.
- ³⁴ Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers* (1917), 13: 6519. Cf. "First Annual Message," *ibid.*, 13: 6251; "Thanksgiving Proclamation," 1897, *ibid.*, 13: 6470.
- ³⁵ *Speeches and Addresses* (1900), 319.
- ³⁶ *Speeches and Addresses* (1893), 607.
- ³⁷ *Speeches and Addresses* (1900), 66-67; quotation from 66.
- ³⁸ Andrews, eulogy, in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 285.
- ³⁹ *Speeches and Addresses*, 1893, 607.
- ⁴⁰ May 22, 1901 speech in San Francisco, as cited in "The First Anniversary!," *CA* 77 (Sept. 18, 1902), 1483.
- ⁴¹ Quoted by Leech, *McKinley*, 10.
- ⁴² See *UP*, Sept. 19, 1901, 4.
- ⁴³ *Speeches and Addresses* (1900), 367-68. See also "The Ecumenical Missionary Conference," *Watchman*, Apr. 26, 1900, 12; "The Ecumenical Missionary Conference," *UP*, May 3, 1900, 8-9; and "Annual Cosmopolitan Survey," *CA* 74 (Nov. 14, 1901), 1-2.
- ⁴⁴ "Faith During the Crisis in Peking," *The Chautauquan* 34 (Nov. 1901), 137-38, quotation from 138.
- ⁴⁵ Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 388.
- ⁴⁶ E.g. Thanksgiving Proclamation, 1899 in Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers* (1917), 13: 6519.
- ⁴⁷ Quoted in Corning, *McKinley*, 170.
- ⁴⁸ Quoted in Leech, *McKinley*, 28. On Ida as First Lady and the McKinleys' relationship, see 28-30, 432-61.
- ⁴⁹ Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 425.
- ⁵⁰ Quoted in Barton, "Christian Gentleman," 136.
- ⁵¹ *Epworth Herald*, Sept. 24, 1901, quoted in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 395.

- ⁵² George McClellan Fiske, *William McKinley: President, Patriot, and Martyr* (Providence, RI: Snow and Farnham, 1901), 11.
- ⁵³ Leslie M. Shaw, cited in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 127.
- ⁵⁴ *PB*, Sept. 19, 1901, 4.
- ⁵⁵ Edward Ransom, "Electing the President, 1896," *Annual Editions, American History*, Vol. 2: *Reconstruction through the Present* (Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw Hill, 1999), 51.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁷ Stanley L. Jones, *The Presidential Election of 1896* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964), 143; Leech, *McKinley*, 76-77. Leech faulted McKinley for not condemning the APA, which "would have won him the applause of Catholics and decent Protestants alike," but noted that except for his indictment of Democrats, "he never placed himself in opposition to any group of Americans" (77).
- ⁵⁸ WM to William Osborne, Apr. 17, 1896, WMP, as cited by Jones, *Presidential Election*, 143. The McKinley organization chose a Jewish rabbi from St. Louis to give the opening prayer at the Republican Convention in an effort to avoid antagonizing either the APA or Catholics who would have been upset if a priest or minister respectively offered the prayer. After McKinley secured the nomination, the APA decided that his qualification and record were satisfactory and endorsed him (*ibid.* 169-70, 144).
- ⁵⁹ See "Archbishop Ireland Opposes the Chicago Platform," *Literary Digest*, Oct. 24, 1896, 806-7; *New York Journal*, Oct. 12, 1896, 1; James H. Moynihan, *The Life of Archbishop John Ireland* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), 261-62. Moynihan maintained that Ireland "spared no effort to aid in the election of McKinley" (262). Some political pundits thought Ireland's support of McKinley would increase the Republican vote in Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois by 50,000 or more. See *NYT*, Oct. 13, 1896.
- ⁶⁰ *New York Herald*, Oct. 17, 1896; *NYT*, Oct. 9, 1896, as cited by Robert F. Durden, *The Climax of Populism: The Election of 1896* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1965), 149-50.
- ⁶¹ *NYT*, Aug. 17, 1896. Cf. "Strong Pulpit Attack on the Silver Delusion," *ibid.*, Oct. 5, 1896; "Silver and Common Sense," "A Drift Toward Anarchy," "Mr. Bryan's Classes, and "Sixteen to One Denounced," all in *ibid.* These are excerpts of sermons by some of the nation's leading ministers: Congregationalist John Scudder of Jersey City; Baptist Thomas Dixon of New York City; Methodist A. B. Kendig of New York City; and Baptist Cortland Myers of Brooklyn.
- ⁶² *NYT*, Aug. 23, 1896.
- ⁶³ "Crisis in History; Dr. MacArthur Denounces the Chicago Platform," *NYT*, Aug. 3, 1896.
- ⁶⁴ *New York Tribune*, Nov. 2, 1896, 2, as quoted by Jones, *Presidential Election*, 340. See also "Mr. Dixon Talks of Mr. Bryan," *NYT*, Oct. 12, 1896.
- ⁶⁵ Leech, *McKinley*, 463.
- ⁶⁶ E. Berkeley Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States: The Great Debate, 1890-1920* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), 236.
- ⁶⁷ It demanded that the United States provide Filipinos with first a stable government, second, independence, and third, protection from outside interference.
- ⁶⁸ Quoted in William Harbaugh, *Power and Responsibility: The Life and Times of Theodore Roosevelt* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1961), 139.
- ⁶⁹ "My Bryan's Indianapolis Speech," *Watchman*, Aug. 16, 1900, 6. The editors added that there was "something absurd in having 'the consent of the governed' extolled by a candidate who represents a party that is disenfranchising hundreds of thousands of negro voters in our own country."
- ⁷⁰ "President McKinley's Letter," *Watchman* 81 (Sept. 13, 1900), 1.
- ⁷¹ *New York Freeman's Journal*, Oct. 12, 1900, 2, as cited by Frank T. Reuter, *Catholic Influence on American Colonial Policies, 1898-1904* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967), 71. For the larger context, see Reuter, *Catholic Influence*, 70-72.
- ⁷² Harbaugh, *Power and Responsibility*, 140.
- ⁷³ Speech to the Union League of Philadelphia, quoted in "Victory and Its Meaning," *Boston Journal*, Nov. 26, 1900. See also *Watchman*, Nov. 15, 1900, 8.
- ⁷⁴ "A Resolution adopted by the Chicago Preachers' Meeting of the MEC," Mar. 8, 1897, WMP, reel 2. The Baltimore and Kansas conferences of the MEC sent similar statements, which are also in reel 2.
- ⁷⁵ "Thanks to President McKinley," *CA* 74 (Nov. 30, 1899), 1928.
- ⁷⁶ Fiske, *McKinley*, 12-13
- ⁷⁷ See "Programme of the Seventh Council," WMP, reel 68.
- ⁷⁸ See Frontispiece, *The Christian Endeavor World*, July 1899; Francis E. Clark to WM, MWP, reel 67; WM to William J. Cozens, Nov. 27, 1898, WMP, reel 17; Frederick Booth Tucker to WM, Jan. 25, 1898, reel 60; Frederick Booth Tucker to WM, Dec. 9, 1898, WMP, reel 64.
- ⁷⁹ See James Norr to WM, June 26, 1899, WMP, reel 2. The McKinley Papers contain numerous letters thanking the president for his contributions to the YMCA and various congregations.
- ⁸⁰ See J. Wilbur Chapman to WM, Aug. 13, 1899, WMP, reel 73.

⁸¹ The McKinley Papers include a document entitled “Letters to the President . . . from Sixty-Two Clergymen” that contains individual letters by pastors from throughout the country (reel 71); another entitled “Letters to the President . . . from Presidents of Thirteen Universities” that contains letters from the presidents of Miami University, the University of Denver, the University of Kentucky, and West Virginia University (reel 70); a third entitled “Letters to the President . . . from Twenty-Seven Instructors,” which contains individuals letters from college and seminary professors and high school principals and teachers (reel 70); a fourth entitled “Letters to the President . . . from Thirty-One College Presidents” (reel 70).

⁸² The United Presbyterian Church of North America and the Presbyterian Church (USA), both adopted resolutions in May 1899 (see William Reid to WM, Jan. 24, 1900, WMP, reel 71; and William Henry Roberts to WM, Jan. 20, 1900, WMP, reel 71). See also the churches of Ft. Collins, Colorado (S. P. Telford and others to WM, Jan. 30, 1900, WMP, reel 71); and the Orthodox Friends Church of Chicago to WM, n.d., WMP, reel 71. There are dozens of letters from local WCTUs and individual congregations in reel 70.

⁸³ Bishop Fitzgerald, “Thanks for President McKinley,” *CA 74* (Dec. 21, 1899), 2073.

⁸⁴ Manchester to WM, Dec. 21, 1899, WMP, reel 8.

⁸⁵ O. F. Gregory to WM, Jan. 31, 1900, WMP, reel 71.

⁸⁶ Alice Brown to WM, Jan. 30, 1900, WMP, reel 71. She reminded McKinley that like him she had worked for prohibition in Ohio in 1874, “but unlike you, I have no boss except my Lord and Master Jesus Christ. I would that you, a Christian and a Methodist, would take your orders straight from Him.”

⁸⁷ Doherty to WM, Jan. 31, 1900, WMP, reel 71.

⁸⁸ Milton Buck to WM, Jan. 16, 1900, WMP, reel 71.

⁸⁹ H. H. Bowen to WM, Jan. 30, 1900, WMP, reel 71; A. Baker to WM, Jan. 22, 1900; WMP, reel 71; Vaughan S. Colins to WM, Jan. 5, 1900, WMP, reel 70.

⁹⁰ Karl P. Harrington to WM, Jan. 16, 1900, WMP, reel 70.

⁹¹ On his temperance activities in Ohio, see H. Wayne Morgan, *William McKinley and His America* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1963), 46. The reasons McKinley failed to support the prohibitionists are unclear, but he may have been persuaded by arguments that the law violated the personal freedom of soldiers and might cause many of them to leave their bases to drink. On this episode, see Gaines M. Foster, *Moral Reconstruction: Christian Lobbyists and the Federal Legislation of Morality, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 168-70.

⁹² *Watchman*, May 10, 1900, 5. The editors especially noted the protests of the Ecumenical Missionary Conference. See also *Watchman*, May 17, 1900, 5.

⁹³ WM to T. C. Evans, Nov. 30, 1895, WMP, reel 17, p. 174.

⁹⁴ Moynihan, *John Ireland*, 261-63. There are 31 pieces of correspondence in the McKinley Papers between Ireland and various members of the administration. On Gibbons, see especially John Addison Porter to Gibbons, Apr. 13, 1899, WMP, reel 18; Gibbons to WM, Mar. 14, 1900, WMP, reel 9.

⁹⁵ See *NYT*, Mar. 1, 1898, 1; *New York Freeman’s Journal*, Mar. 5, 1898, 1; as cited by Reuter, *Catholic Influence*, 7.

⁹⁶ Reuter, *Catholic Influence*, 8.

⁹⁷ See Moynihan, *John Ireland*, 162-76.

⁹⁸ John Ireland, “His Memory Will Live,” in Alexander K. McClure, *The Authentic Life of William McKinley, Our Third Martyr President* (Philadelphia?, c 1901), 403. See also Gibbons’ eulogy, “His Characteristic Virtues,” in *ibid.*, 401-2.

⁹⁹ See Ireland to WM, Nov. 9, 1900, WMP, reel 14; John Addison Porter to Ireland, Feb. 19, 1898, WMP, reel 26.

¹⁰⁰ Richard J. Purcell, “Catholics in the President’s Cabinet,” *America* 48 (Dec. 17, 1932), 253.

¹⁰¹ E.g. “Evils of Romanism,” a newspaper account of a speech by J. C. Hardenbergh, Supreme Grand Master of the Loyal Orange Institution of the United States, WMP, reel 70. Neither the name of the newspaper nor the date is evident.

¹⁰² Reuter, *Catholic Influence*, 68-79, quotation from 79.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 84-86.

¹⁰⁴ Morgan, *McKinley*, 335.

¹⁰⁵ Lewis L. Gould, *The Spanish-American War and President McKinley* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1982), 19.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁰⁷ Augustus Cerillo, Jr., “The Spanish-America War” in Ronald A. Wells, ed., *The Wars of America: Christian Views* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981), 92-94, quotations from 94. Also see Robert Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967); David Healy, *U.S. Expansionism: The Imperialist Urge in the 1890s* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970); Ernest R. May, *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay* (New York: Atheneum, 1968); Robert L. Beisner, *From the Old Diplomacy to the New, 1865-1900* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1975); and Richard W. Leopold, *The Growth of American Foreign Policy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962).

¹⁰⁸ Cerillo., “Spanish-America War,” 98-105, quotations from 105.

- ¹⁰⁹ Charles G. Dawes, *A Journal of the McKinley Years*, Bascom N. Timmons, ed. (Chicago: Lakeside Press, 1950), 115; George F. Parker, *Recollections of Grover Cleveland* (New York: Century Co., 1909), 249-50, as cited by Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 1.
- ¹¹⁰ James D. Richardson, ed., *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1908* (Bureau of National Literature and Art, 1909), 10: 16.
- ¹¹¹ In his inaugural address, McKinley also lauded George Washington's policy of "non-interference with the affairs of foreign governments" and added that the United States had been content to allow both friends and enemies to settle "their own domestic concerns."
- ¹¹² Lewis L. Gould, *The Presidency of William McKinley* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1980), 33.
- ¹¹³ Cerillo, "Spanish-American War," 107-8.
- ¹¹⁴ Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers* (1909), 10: 37-38.
- ¹¹⁵ Cerillo, "Spanish-American War," 109.
- ¹¹⁶ Quoted in Ernest R. May, *Imperial Democracy: The Emergence of America as a Great Power* (New York: Harper Torch-books, 1961), 141.
- ¹¹⁷ The press neither created the differences between Spain and the United States nor strongly shaped public opinion. It primarily expressed what Americans already believed about Cuba.
- ¹¹⁸ Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 40.
- ¹¹⁹ Cerillo, "Spanish-American War," 112.
- ¹²⁰ Richardson, ed., the *Messages and Papers* (1917), 13: 6289-90, 92; first quotation from 6292, the rest from 6289.
- ¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 13: 6289, 6292: first two quotations from 6292, the last two from 6289.
- ¹²² Cerillo, "Spanish-American War," 113-14, quotations in that order.
- ¹²³ See James H. Moorhead, "The American Israel: Protestant Tribalism and Universal Mission," in William R. Hutchison and Hartmut Lehmann, eds., *Many Are Chosen: Divine Election and Western Nationalism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 145-53; Russel B. Nye, *This Almost Chosen People: Essays in the History of American Ideas* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1966); Winthrop Hudson, ed., *Nationalism and Religion in America: Concepts of American Identity and Mission* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970); and Conrad Cherry, ed., *God's New Israel: Religious Interpretations of American Destiny* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).
- ¹²⁴ Pierard and Linder, *Civil Religion*, 132.
- ¹²⁵ "Sermon to the President," *NYT*, Mar. 14, 1898, 2.
- ¹²⁶ Resolution sent to McKinley, Apr. 6, 1898, WMP, reel 60.
- ¹²⁷ See Diary, Mar. 26, 1898, Cortelyou Papers, box 52; *New York Tribune*, Apr. 1, 1898; Hermann Hagedorn, *Leonard Woods*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931), 1:141, as cited by Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 41.
- ¹²⁸ "He Trusts the President," *NYT*, April 18, 1898, 12. Cf. "Dr. Storrs Urges Calmness," *ibid.*
- ¹²⁹ "Dr. Lyman Abbott Says the Time to Stop Spanish Inhumanity in Cuba Has Come," *NYT*, Mar. 14, 1898, 2. See also Abbott to WM, Mar. 6, 1898, WMP, reel 60, in which he praises the president's "wise moderation" and "courageous patience" in dealing with the crisis and maintains that "the great body of the religious people are with you in this course."
- ¹³⁰ "A Plea for United Action," *NYT*, April 18, 1898, 12. Cf. "A War for Civilization," *ibid.*; "Father Malone for Action," *ibid.*; and "Reasons for Intervention."
- ¹³¹ "Quoted in John Lukacs, "The Meaning of '98" in *Annals Editions: American History*, 2:55.
- ¹³² Pierard and Linder, *Civil Religion*, 127.
- ¹³³ These three clergymen are quoted in John E. Smylie, "Protestant Clergymen and America's World Role, 1865-1900: A Study of Christianity, Nationality, and International Relations," Th.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1959, 431-32, as cited by Pierard and Linder, *Civil Religion*, 125-26. See David Gregg, "The National Crisis, or God's Purposes Worked Out Through International Relations" (Brooklyn, NY: Brooklyn Citizen Job Print, 1898), esp. 2, 5, 13. See also Charles Eaton, "Stay-at-Home Patriots," *NYT*, May 2, 1898, 12; and "Rev. Dr. J. O. Wilson's Sermon," *ibid.*; "Silverman on Patriotism," *ibid.*
- ¹³⁴ "Services of Thanksgiving," *NYT*, July 11, 1898, 10.
- ¹³⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹³⁶ "The Sacrifices of War; The Rev. Henry Van Dyke Justifies the Position Taken by the United States," *NYT*, May 2, 1898, 12.
- ¹³⁷ Gladden to WM, June 1, 1898, WMP, reel 3. McKinley replied that he did not think "submission of the arbitration treaty would be timely now." Instead the United States had almost concluded arranging a commission to settle all differences with Spain (WM to Gladden, June 3, 1898, reel 18, Vol. 90, 186). While acknowledging that "the clamor for war . . . was fierce and brutal," Gladden later wrote in his memoirs, "one sometimes wonders whether a little stiffer fibre [sic] in McKinley's will might not have averted the Spanish War." See Washington Gladden, *Recollections* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909), 385.
- ¹³⁸ "Sundry War Notes," *CA* 74 (June 9, 1898), 918.
- ¹³⁹ "A Day of Thanksgiving," *NYT*, July 7, 1898, 1.
- ¹⁴⁰ "German-American Attitude: A Hearty Response to the President's Proclamation at the Lutheran Churches in Brooklyn," *NYT*, July 11, 1898, 10.

- ¹⁴¹ “Thanksgiving for Victory: Sermons in Washington Churches in Compliance with the President’s Proclamation,” *NYT*, July 11, 1898, 10. While McKinley’s response to this sermon is unknown, he highly respected Bristol and gave him personal gifts. Bristol wrote McKinley and other administration officials many letters between July 1898 and June 1901. E.g. Bristol to WM, Dec. 27, 1898, WMP, reel 64; Bristol to WM, May 26, 1899, WMP, reel 67.
- ¹⁴² “Peace!” *CA* 73 (Aug. 18, 1898), 1322.
- ¹⁴³ Joseph A. Fry, “William McKinley and the Coming of the Spanish-American War: A Study of the Besmirching and Redemption of an Historical Image,” *Diplomatic History* 3 (1979), 77.
- ¹⁴⁴ Quoted in *ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 96.
- ¹⁴⁶ Cerillo, “Spanish-American War,” 95.
- ¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 95-96; first three quotations from 95; last two from 96.
- ¹⁴⁸ Quoted in Robert T. Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 123. See also Paul A. Varg, “Motives in Protestant Missions, 1890-1917,” *CH* 23 (1954), 68-82.
- ¹⁴⁹ Cerillo, “Spanish-American War,” 97.
- ¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 114-15; quotations from 114.
- ¹⁵¹ “Richard Olney on Cuba,” *Watchman*, Mar. 1, 1900, 8.
- ¹⁵² Cerillo, “Spanish-American War,” 117.
- ¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 118; the quotations are from the Platt Amendment of 1902.
- ¹⁵⁴ Reinhold Neibuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1932), 99; Cerillo, “Spanish-American War,” 119.
- ¹⁵⁵ Michael Wazer, *Just and Unjust Wars* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), 104. Cerillo, “Spanish-American War,” 119, called my attention to this source.
- ¹⁵⁶ Fry, “Spanish-American War,” 77.
- ¹⁵⁷ Gould, *Presidency*, 34.
- ¹⁵⁸ Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 136.
- ¹⁵⁹ See *ibid.*, 44-45.
- ¹⁶⁰ Morgan, *McKinley*, 335.
- ¹⁶¹ Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 52-53; all quotations from 52.
- ¹⁶² John A. S. Grenville and George B. Young, *Politics, Strategy, and American Diplomacy: Studies in Foreign Policy, 1873-1917* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966), 242-43, 265-66.
- ¹⁶³ Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers* (1917), 13: 6283-85, quotation from 6283.
- ¹⁶⁴ Beisner, *Diplomacy*, 114.
- ¹⁶⁵ Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers* (1917), 13: 6288-89, quotation from 6289.
- ¹⁶⁶ Theodore Roosevelt, “Introductory Address” in Corning, *McKinley*, v. See also Theodore Roosevelt, *An Autobiography* (New York: Macmillan, 1913), 275.
- ¹⁶⁷ Cerillo, “Spanish-American War,” 120.
- ¹⁶⁸ Quoted in Smylie, “Protestant Clergymen,” 490.
- ¹⁶⁹ “Bible Work in the Philippine Islands,” WMP, reel 68, 18-22, quotations from 20.
- ¹⁷⁰ W. Henry Grant to WM, Apr. 18, 1900, WMP, reel 71.
- ¹⁷¹ Leech, *McKinley*, 326; Ivan Musicant, *Empire by Default: The Spanish-American War and the Dawn of the American Century* (New York: Henry Holt Co., 1998), 600.
- ¹⁷² As cited by Musicant, *Empire*, 614, 591.
- ¹⁷³ Quoted in Musicant, *Empire*, 614.
- ¹⁷⁴ Some businessmen opposed annexation, but the majority supported it. See Julius Pratt, *Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1936), 265-70.
- ¹⁷⁵ Musicant, *Empire*, 591.
- ¹⁷⁶ H. Wayne Morgan, *America’s Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), 89. According to Reuter, the Philippines contained eighty different tribes that spoke more than sixty different languages (*Catholic Influences*, 61-62). In his second inaugural address (Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers* [1917], 13: 6489), McKinley argued that the great majority of Filipinos recognized American sovereignty and welcomed “it as a guarantee of order and of security for life, property, liberty, freedom of conscience, and the pursuit of happiness We will not leave the destiny of the loyal millions on the islands to the disloyal thousands who are in rebellion against the United States.”
- ¹⁷⁷ In a memo to McKinley on August 30, 1898 General Francis Vinton Greene argued that only annexation “would provide peace and prosperity to the Philippines.” He labeled Aguinaldo’s insurgent regime a “pure despotism, a dictatorship of the South American type.” The “intelligent classes” of Filipinos preferred a republic under American protection over a government ruled by Aguinaldo. See “Memoranda Concerning the Situation in the Philippines” Treaty of the Peace Between the United States and Spain, 422-25, as cited by Musicant, *Empire*, 613-14.
- ¹⁷⁸ Roosevelt, “Introduction,” vi.
- ¹⁷⁹ Musicant, *Empire*, 601.

- ¹⁸⁰ Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 104.
- ¹⁸¹ *Speeches and Addresses*, (1900) 105.
- ¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 118.
- ¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 134.
- ¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 161.
- ¹⁸⁵ Speech at Redfield, South Dakota, Oct. 14, 1899, *ibid.*, 288.
- ¹⁸⁶ *Speeches and Addresses* (1900), *ibid.*, 186-87. The *Christian Advocate* printed McKinley's entire address. See "President McKinley's Address on the Present Situation," 74 (Feb. 23, 1899), 306-7.
- ¹⁸⁷ *Speeches and Addresses* (1900), 192.
- ¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 187-89
- ¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 289.
- ¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 318-19; quotations from 318.
- ¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 318-19; quotations from 318.
- ¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 193.
- ¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 269.
- ¹⁹³ Rusling, "Interview with President McKinley," 137.
- ¹⁹⁴ Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 108. Cf. Morgan, *McKinley*, 412.
- ¹⁹⁵ Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 109.
- ¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 109-10. Lincoln allegedly told Rusling after the battle of Gettysburg, "I went to my room one day and got down on my knees and prayed [to] Almighty God for victory at Gettysburg." "After thus wrestling with the Almighty in prayer," Lincoln confessed, "I don't know how it was, and it is not for me to explain but, somehow or other, a sweet comfort crept into my soul" that the Union would win the battle. See James F. Rusling, *Men and Things I Saw in Civil War Days* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1899), 15. McKinley told a variant of this Lincoln story in 1892. After the Battle of Gettysburg, Lincoln told General Sickles: "Before that battle I went into my room at the White House, I knelt on my knees, and I prayed to God as I had never prayed to Him before, and I told Him if He would stand by us at Gettysburg I would stand by Him; and He did, and I shall" (*Speeches and Addresses*, 1893, 608).
- ¹⁹⁷ Pierard and Linder, *Civil Religion*, 130.
- ¹⁹⁸ Schurz, Carnegie, Cleveland, and Atkinson all served as vice presidents of the Anti-Imperial League, which was founded in November 1898, along with Charles Francis Adams Jr., Detroit mayor Hazen Pingree, labor leader Samuel Gompers, Presbyterian pastor Theodore Cuyler, and Episcopal rector Henry Codman Potter. Congregationalist Leonard W. Bacon and Presbyterian Charles H. Parkhurst later served as officers. These well known clergymen all condemned imperialism as immoral in "numerous incisive sermons and essays" (Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the U.S.*, 142). See also Robert L. Beisner, *Twelve Against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968).
- ¹⁹⁹ Morgan, *America's Road*, 103.
- ²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 104.
- ²⁰¹ E.g. F. H. Agnew, "The President's Pittsburg Address, and His Responsibility," *CA* 74 (Nov. 30, 1899), 1921-22; W. H. Larrabee, "Some Thoughts of an Anti-Imperialist," *ibid.* (Dec. 28, 1899), 2105-6.
- ²⁰² Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism*, 125.
- ²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 146. See, for example, Anti-Imperialist League, *Arguments Against a So-Called Imperial Policy* (Washington, 1898); Charles Francis Adams Jr. *Imperialism and the Tracks of Our Forefathers* (Boston, 1899); and Andrew Carnegie, "Distant Possessions—The Parting of the Ways," *North American Review* 167 (Aug. 1898), 239-48.
- ²⁰⁴ Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism*, 205. He concludes that anti-imperialists were unsuccessful because their "arguments tended to be too academic and their speeches too erudite for widespread popular consumption." Moreover, their "position was negative, restrictive, and self-denying" (250). On the other hand, "the need and desire for new and wider markets for the burgeoning output of the nation's farms and factories, the example of European imperialism, the influence of social Darwinism, the theoretical closing of the frontier, the missionary impulses of Protestant churches, and the resurgence of Manifest Destiny" coalesced to support the policy of expansion (291).
- ²⁰⁵ Henry Van Dyke, "The American Birthright and the Philippine Pottage" (New York: Scribner's, 1898), esp. 4, 11, 14, 16.
- ²⁰⁶ Wallace Radcliffe, "Presbyterian Imperialism," *Assembly Herald* 1 (1899), 6.
- ²⁰⁷ Quoted in Smylie, "Protestant Clergymen," 520.
- ²⁰⁸ E.g., J. B. Van Petten, "The President's Pittsburg Address and His Responsibility," *CA* 74 (Dec. 28, 1899), 2106-7. Van Petten countered the charge that the United States was being inconsistent in subduing and subjugating the Filipinos by armed force. "Was not that the way Washington subdued the Whiskey Rebellion, and Lincoln the Rebellion of 1861? . . . We are not fighting the Filipinos, but the insurgent Tagalogs. We are defending the Filipinos from the plundering and murderous Tagalogs and the Tagalogs from themselves" (2107).
- ²⁰⁹ Morgan, *America's Road*, 109. Although Bryan was an anti-imperialist who opposed annexing the Philippines, he supported the treaty as the fastest way to stop the bloody fighting. On the debate over ratification, see Brian P. Damiani, *Advocates of Empire: William McKinley, the Senate, and American Expansion, 1898-99* (New York: Garland, 1987), especially 183-215.

- ²¹⁰ Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers* (1917), 13: 6582; Gould, *Presidency*, 180.
- ²¹¹ Gould, *Presidency*, 182.
- ²¹² Carl Schurz, *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, ed. Frederick Bancroft, 6 vols. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913), 6:115.
- ²¹³ Gould, *Presidency*, 189, 237, quotations in that order.
- ²¹⁴ Morgan, *America's Road*, 97.
- ²¹⁵ Thompkins, *Anti-Imperialism*, 293.
- ²¹⁶ Cerillo, "Spanish-American War," 123.
- ²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 124-25; first three quotations from 124, fourth from 125.
- ²¹⁸ Cerillo quotes the conclusion of Richard E. Welch, Jr., *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-America War, 1899-1902* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 155.
- ²¹⁹ See Pierard and Linder, *Civil Religion*, 134. Many ministers discussed this theme in their sermons, and Robert Ellis Thompson's *The Hand of God in National History: A Study of American Politics* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1902) was quite popular.
- ²²⁰ Henry S. Pritchett, "Some Recollections of President McKinley and the Cuban Intervention," *North American Review* 189 (1909), 401.
- ²²¹ Cerillo, "Spanish-American War," 125.
- ²²² "The Attempted Assassination of the President," *PB*, Sept. 12, 1901, 5.
- ²²³ Fiske, *McKinley*, 10.
- ²²⁴ *PB*, Sept. 12, 1901, 5.
- ²²⁵ Farquhar to Cortelyou, Sept. 7, 1901, WMP, reel 16.
- ²²⁶ See Allan Sutherland, "Our Martyred President's Favorite Hymns," *PB*, Oct. 3, 1901, 12.
- ²²⁷ E.g. "Last Words of President McKinley," *CA* 77 (Sept. 18, 1902), 1493-4, which based its account on James Creelman's *On the Great Highway* (Boston: Lothrop, 1901).
- ²²⁸ Barton, "Christian Gentleman," 137.
- ²²⁹ "The President is Dead," *WP*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 26.
- ²³⁰ "The Death of the President," *Baltimore Sun*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 29.
- ²³¹ "The Dead President," *News and Courier*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 57.
- ²³² Quoted in Hampton, *Religious Background*, 257.
- ²³³ DeWitt Talmage, "Our Dead President," *Christian Herald*, quoted in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 388-89.
- ²³⁴ "God's Will, Not Ours, Be Done," *Rocky Mountain News* in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 66.
- ²³⁵ "The Man and His Faith," *New York Herald*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 72.
- ²³⁶ W. J. Bryan, "Address," in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 266.
- ²³⁷ Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 370.
- ²³⁸ Printed in *ibid.*, 375.
- ²³⁹ Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 272.
- ²⁴⁰ E.g. Morgan Dix as quoted in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 279.
- ²⁴¹ "The Nation's Sorrow," *Interior*, Sept. 19, 1901, 1175.
- ²⁴² "The Meaning of the Tragedy," *PB*, Sept. 19, 1901, 6.
- ²⁴³ Cited in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 280.
- ²⁴⁴ Harry S. Edwards of Macon, Georgia, quoted in Edward L. Parks, "The Progress of Sentiment in the South," *CA* 76 (Nov. 28, 1901), 1898.
- ²⁴⁵ Fiske, *McKinley*, 13.
- ²⁴⁶ E.g., Andrews, "Eulogy," in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 284.
- ²⁴⁷ Quoted in *ibid.*, 287.
- ²⁴⁸ *Providence Journal*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 59.
- ²⁴⁹ E.g. "A Nation Mourns," *Milwaukee Sentinel*, in *ibid.*, 82.
- ²⁵⁰ "The Death of President McKinley," *UP*, Sept. 19, 1901, 4.
- ²⁵¹ Cited in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 288.
- ²⁵² Quoted in *ibid.*, 259.
- ²⁵³ Gunsaulus, "Religious Life," 1206.
- ²⁵⁴ E.g. "The President is Dead," *Ohio State Journal*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 124; A. B. White, as quoted in *ibid.*, 133.
- ²⁵⁵ Edwin Andrews of Ohio, the Methodist Church's oldest bishop and a close friend of McKinley, did the eulogy.
- ²⁵⁶ *Daily Inter Ocean*, Sept. 19, 1901, 1.
- ²⁵⁷ Fiske, *McKinley*, 9.
- ²⁵⁸ "Secularization Far Overdone," *Interior*, Sept. 26, 1901.
- ²⁵⁹ Quoted in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 251-52.
- ²⁶⁰ Theodore Roosevelt, "Proclamation," Sept. 17, 1901.
- ²⁶¹ T. M. Buffington, "Proclamation," in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 146-47.
- ²⁶² "The President is Dead," *WP*, 26.

- ²⁶³ “Our Dead President,” *Indianapolis Journal*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 35.
- ²⁶⁴ *CA* 77 (May 1, 1902), 691.
- ²⁶⁵ “President McKinley’s Death,” *Buffalo Courier*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 52.
- ²⁶⁶ Fiske, *McKinley*, 5, 7-9; “The Death of the President,” *Baltimore Sun*, 30; “President McKinley,” *Springfield Union*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 49; Aaron T. Bliss, quoted in *ibid.*, 155; Cardinal James Gibbons, “Eulogy,” in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 264; McClure, *Authentic Life*, 204; Corning, *McKinley*, 162.
- ²⁶⁷ “McKinley—Roosevelt,” *Century Magazine* 63 (1901), 148.
- ²⁶⁸ Roosevelt, “Introduction,” viii. Cf. Roosevelt, “At the Banquet at Canton, Ohio, Jan. 27, 1903, in Honor of . . . President McKinley,” *Presidential Addresses and State Papers* (New York: P. F. Collier and Son, 1905?), Part One, 241.
- ²⁶⁹ “God’s Will,” 66.
- ²⁷⁰ The first quotation of from Senator Jonathan Dolliver of Iowa in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 271; the second is from Locke in Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 276; the third is from Leech, *McKinley*, 10. According to the *Illinois State Journal*, many maintained that his personal life approached the ideal (“Assassin Struck at the People Through Their President,” in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 84).
- ²⁷¹ “William McKinley,” *Times-Star*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 54.
- ²⁷² “Death of the President,” *Philadelphia North-American* in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 38.
- ²⁷³ “President McKinley’s Death,” 52.
- ²⁷⁴ Long, “Some Personal Characteristics,” 144-45.
- ²⁷⁵ “William McKinley,” 55.
- ²⁷⁶ “A Trying Position,” *UP*, Sept. 19, 1901, 4.
- ²⁷⁷ Fiske, *McKinley*, 6.
- ²⁷⁸ “The President is Dead,” *Ohio State Journal*, 124.
- ²⁷⁹ “The President is Dead,” *Topeka Daily Capital*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 68.
- ²⁸⁰ “President McKinley,” *Springfield Union*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 50.
- ²⁸¹ “The Death of the President,” *Baltimore Sun*, 29.
- ²⁸² Cited in Corning, *McKinley*, 167.
- ²⁸³ “Our President,” *Buffalo Express*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 106.
- ²⁸⁴ Gibbons, “Eulogy,” 263.
- ²⁸⁵ “President William McKinley,” *PB*, Sept. 19, 1901, 5.
- ²⁸⁶ Fiske, *McKinley*, 10-13; first two quotations from 10, third from 12.
- ²⁸⁷ Halstead, *Illustrious Life*, 281.
- ²⁸⁸ “William McKinley,” 55-56, quotations in that order.
- ²⁸⁹ “The Nation’s Grief,” *Atlanta Constitution*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 97.
- ²⁹⁰ “Death of the President,” *Baltimore Sun*, 30.
- ²⁹¹ “Death of the President,” *Chicago Tribune*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 61.
- ²⁹² “Nation Mourns,” 82.
- ²⁹³ “Death of President McKinley,” *Age-Herald*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 69. Cf. W. E. Stanley, Governor of Virginia, in *ibid.*, 155.
- ²⁹⁴ “President McKinley Dead,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, in Grosvenor, *William McKinley*, 80-81. Cf. “The President is Dead,” 125.
- ²⁹⁵ “Our President,” 109-10.
- ²⁹⁶ Olcott, *William McKinley*, 2: 336.
- ²⁹⁷ Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 136.
- ²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 5.
- ²⁹⁹ Morgan, *McKinley*, 528. See also John L. Offner, *An Unwanted War: The Diplomacy of the United States and Spain over Cuba, 1895-1898* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).
- ³⁰⁰ Gould, *Presidency*, vii.
- ³⁰¹ Gould, *Spanish-American War*, 5, 137, quotation from 5.
- ³⁰² *Ibid.*, 17, 1, 137-38; quotation from 137.
- ³⁰³ Gould, *Presidency*, vii, 56, quotation from 56. See also Robert C. Hilderbrand, *Power and the People: Executive Management of Public Opinion and Foreign Affairs, 1877-1921* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981).
- ³⁰⁴ *Speeches and Addresses* (1900), 129; Morgan, *McKinley*, 527-28.
- ³⁰⁵ Morgan, *McKinley*, 529.
- ³⁰⁶ Gould, *Presidency*, 253, 5-6; quotation from 253. See also Lewis L. Gould, “William McKinley and the Expansion of Presidential Power,” *Ohio History* 87 (1978), 5-20.
- ³⁰⁷ Morgan, *McKinley*, 12.
- ³⁰⁸ Barton, “Christian Gentleman,” 134.
- ³⁰⁹ Pierard and Linder, *Civil Religion*, 135.
- ³¹⁰ *Speeches and Addresses* (1900), 210.

³¹¹ Leech, *McKinley*, vi, frontispiece.