

THE FIRST ELECTION OF MARCUS A. HANNA TO
THE UNITED STATES SENATE

A Thesis

Presented in Partial fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Master of Arts

by

Philip W. Warken, B.A.

The Ohio State University
1960

Approved by



Adviser
Department of History

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. THE PARTY'S CHOICE	15
III. THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE	20
IV. THE INTERREGNUM	37
V. THE ELECTION	54
VI. BRIBERY CHARGES	91
APPENDIX A	110
BIBLIOGRAPHY	112

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

In 1897 Ohio Republicans endorsed Mark Hanna for election to the United States Senate. They were acknowledging the preeminence in their party of a remarkable man whose political star had risen quickly, if late in life.¹

Marcus Alonzo Hanna was born in New Lisbon, Ohio, in 1837, one of seven children of Leonard and Samantha Converse Hanna. The family moved to Cleveland when he was fifteen. There he went to the public schools and attended Western Reserve College. School behind him, young Hanna entered a wholesale grocery concern in which his father was a partner. Gradually broadening his interests to include coal, iron, lake shipping, and street railways, he accumulated a great fortune.

Interest in street railways led him inevitably into politics. The operation of a business requiring the use of the Cleveland streets and the public authorization of fares

¹Hanna did not participate in a national campaign until 1880 when he was 43 years old and was not a delegate to a Republican national convention until 1884, William A. Taylor, Ohio in Congress, from 1803 to 1901 (Columbus, Ohio: The XX Century Publishing Co., 1900), 94.

and routes made a friendly government necessary. Securing² such a government was not especially difficult; the established method was to finance the election of friendly officials when possible and to buy unfriendly ones when necessary. Politics was thus an adjunct to business and Hanna went into politics. "It was necessary to his business that he should, and it was for the sake of his business that he did."²

In 1884, Hanna began what were probably the most frustrating years of his political life. He was supporting Senator John Sherman of Ohio for the Presidential nomination and Sherman lost the nomination to James G. Blaine. Hanna continued to support the Ohio Senator and was again a delegate to the Republican national convention in 1888 and again Sherman failed to secure the nomination. To Hanna perseverance was not its own reward and he decided that if he were to become a president-maker, he would have to switch his allegiance.

He chose to support yet another Ohioan, William McKinley Jr. Activity began at once and though Hanna supported McKinley in 1892, he was not disappointed that McKinley did not win the nomination because he was more concerned with building up his candidate for the contest in 1896. After the defeat in 1892, of the Republican

²Lincoln Steffens, The Struggle for Self-Government (New York: McClure, Phillips & Co., 1906), 165.

candidate, Benjamin Harrison, the McKinley machine, with ever increasing momentum under the skillful guidance of Mark Hanna, rolled toward the St. Louis Convention of 1896. There was one ballot.

Appointed National Chairman, Hanna prepared for a relatively quiet campaign. The merger of the Democratic Party with the Populists, the repudiation of Grover Cleveland, the nomination of William Jennings Bryan, and the acceptance of silver as the chief issue of the campaign foretold instead a colorful autumn that would seriously challenge the expectations of the Republicans and tax the ingenuity of their National Chairman. Many conservatives, seeing red where there was only silver, became frightened as the Bryan invasion swept eastward. Hanna marshalled the party against the "silver heresy," accepted the challenge, and moved into battle. The organizing genius of Hanna, the open pocket-books of the "gold bugs," and the intimidation of the fearful repulsed Bryan and his silver hordes, and carried the fight to the evangelist in his Western stronghold. Election day produced no surprises. Success again: McKinley President.³

The convention of 1888 had done more than convince Hanna of the advisability of finding a new candidate. It

³Joseph Benson Foraker, Notes of a Busy Life (2 vols; Stewart & Kidd Company: Cincinnati, 1917), II, 254.

produced a split between Hanna and Joseph Benson Foraker, the ambitious and colorful Governor of Ohio. Foraker attended the convention as a delegate pledged to Sherman but his activities both before and during the convention led Hanna to suspect him of treachery.

During 1887 Foraker had received much favorable publicity. This was the year he challenged President Cleveland on the return of the Confederate battle flags, and was frequently mentioned for the Vice Presidency. Naturally this upset Sherman who was desirous of making another attempt for the Presidential nomination. Sherman wrote that Foraker ". . . has a brilliant future before him if he will only await the natural order of events, but his mention for the office of Vice-President is not in his interest but only for the interest of others tending to divide the Republicans of Ohio."⁴ There is little evidence that Foraker was seeking to push his ambitions ahead of Ohio's elder Republican leader and Sherman seemed satisfied for he told a friend that "I note what you say about Gov. Foraker. You are doubtless entirely correct. I have no doubt it is the interest and wish of Gov. Foraker that I be nominated, . . ."⁵

⁴John Sherman to R. McMurdy, February 20, 1887, Foraker Correspondence with Senator Sherman (No editor, publisher, or date of publication), 36.

⁵John Sherman to Hon. Robert Harlan, April 15, 1887, ibid., 38.

Foraker, when he arrived in Chicago for the Republican convention of 1888, found considerable sentiment for Blaine, and he feared that if it became obvious that Sherman could not be nominated, Hanna would try to lead the Ohio delegation to McKinley.⁶ Foraker, to insure that such a move was not made, supported A. L. Conger against Hanna's choice for National Committeeman and won by a two to one margin.⁷ This aroused Hanna's suspicions concerning Foraker's loyalty to Sherman and he was soon confirmed in his doubts when on the evening of the convention's first day the Foraker Club of Columbus left a serenade of Sherman's headquarters and made a tour of the hotels shouting ". . . some for Sherman but mostly for Foraker."⁸

Sherman did not do well in the balloting. His high point came on the second ballot when he received 249 out of a necessary 416.⁹ At the same time that it became obvious that Sherman could not win the nomination a rumor started that there would soon be a stampede to Blaine. Foraker, an old Blaine man, announced that since the Sherman situation was hopeless he was switching to Blaine. Blaine sent word

⁶Everett Walters, "The Ohio Delegation at the National Republican Convention of 1888," The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly, vol. LVI, July 1947, 230-231.

⁷Ibid., 230-231.

⁸Ibid., 231.

⁹Ibid., 234.

that he did not want the nomination, however, and Foraker returned to Sherman.¹⁰

Sherman's defeat was not due to the alleged treachery of Foraker; of far more importance was the opposition of Thomas Platt and his New York delegation. Sherman himself always believed this to be the reason.¹¹ Foraker wrote Sherman that all he could say was that ". . . I know that I did for you from first to last all it was in my power to do according to the best of my judgment and ability."¹² Sherman accepted Foraker's word but Hanna and many others did not.¹³

Foraker went to the Republican convention in 1892 as a supporter of Blaine but when the McKinley managers requested him to switch to his fellow Ohioan he did so.¹⁴ The split with Hanna and his friends had not been resolved. During 1893-94, Foraker took little part in politics but he did help Charles P. Taft defeat McKinley's friend Bellamy Storer for the Republican nomination for Congressman from the first district.¹⁵

¹⁰Ibid., 235-238.

¹¹Ibid., 240.

¹²Foraker to Sherman, June 28, 1888, Foraker Correspondence, 77.

¹³See comments of C. H. Grosvenor in Grosvenor to J. P. Hopley, January 21, 1889. J. P. Hopley Correspondence, uncatalogued collection in the Library of the Ohio State Historical Society.

¹⁴Foraker to Hopley, June 20, 1892, ibid.

¹⁵Everett Walters, Joseph Benson Foraker: An Uncompromising Republican (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1948), 107.

In 1895, Foraker returned to active participation in state politics with a smashing victory over Hanna and his followers at the Republican state convention at Zanesville. Foraker saw in the convention a chance to win the party's endorsement for the Senate and to name his own man for Governor. Hanna was supporting George K. Nash for Governor and would contest Foraker on all points, but he was most concerned with ". . . securing the endorsement of McKinley as a presidential candidate for 1896."¹⁶ The endorsement for McKinley was all Hanna got; the rest went to Foraker. Breaking precedent, Foraker got the endorsement of the convention for his candidacy for the Senate.¹⁷ In addition Foraker's choice for Governor, Asa Bushnell,¹⁸ was nominated, and his secretary, Charles Kurtz, who had managed the Foraker forces at the convention, was chosen as Chairman of the State Committee.¹⁹

¹⁶Ibid., 107.

¹⁷Ibid., 109. Harvey S. Ford, "The Life and Times of Golden Rule Jones" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1955), 80-81. Available on microfilm at the Library of the Ohio State Historical Society.

¹⁸Bushnell was a prominent Springfield business man and had been Chairman of the State Committee in 1885. Robert H. Bremner, et al., The Governors of Ohio (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio Historical Society, 1954), 132-134.

¹⁹Foraker, Notes of a Busy Life, II, 211-212. "Charles Kurtz, . . . directed every move with consummate finesse. Before the convention he had predicted that he would control 508 votes; he got 509." Walters, Foraker, 108.

Foraker's endorsement by the convention was a break with established practice. Senators were still elected by state legislatures in the 1890's and the usual practice was for the legislators themselves to select the candidate of their party. This was done at the party's caucus shortly before the balloting for Senator. The legislators considered the party's various aspirants for the office and voted upon them. When one received a simple majority he was declared the choice of the caucus and entitled to the support of all his party's legislators.²⁰ Then when the legislature met, if the caucus had been faithfully attended²¹ and pledges were honored, the candidate of the majority party was elected to the Senate.

The endorsement of a single candidate for the Senate by the party convention in advance of the election of the members of the legislature supposedly pledged the legislative candidates to that man and offered the voter a clear choice in casting his ballot.

After the state convention in 1896, the factional differences between the Foraker and Hanna groups quieted down. Hanna was eager for a united delegation from Ohio, and knew that, with the party machinery in the hands of his rival, cooperation was essential to his plans. Foraker for his

²⁰Similar to a delegation to a convention voting under the unit rule.

²¹Those not attending a caucus were not considered bound by its action.

part was not eager to participate in the national convention fearing that he would be subject to charges similar to those of 1888 if McKinley was not nominated,²² but he was prevailed upon by Hanna to attend the convention as a delegate and by McKinley to place his name in nomination.²³ The rapprochement continued throughout the Presidential campaign but soon after it ended the two factions were again happily engaged in party infighting.

With McKinley elected in 1896, Hanna had fulfilled his ambitions for his friend and his interests became more personal. A seat in the Senate would give him a position of considerable influence as well as an honored title. This was the reason for the renewal of the intra-party conflict.

Shortly after the election Hanna suggested that McKinley appoint John Sherman Secretary of State,²⁴ to clear the way for Hanna's appointment to the Senate by the Governor of Ohio, Asa Bushnell. The President offered the post to Sherman and it was accepted. His advisers had informed him that he would have considerable trouble winning reelection to the Senate and this doubtless helped him make his decision.²⁵

²²Walters, Foraker, 129.

²³Margaret Leech, In the Days of McKinley (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), 81-82.

²⁴Ibid., 100-101.

²⁵Cincinnati Enquirer, January 11, 1897. Sherman accepted willingly; only later did he take the ". . . resentful view of his appointment. . . ." Leech, McKinley, 107.

Foraker learned from Hanna, shortly after the campaign, of his desire to enter the Senate. He was not pleased; Bushnell was his political ally and he knew that he would not be eager to appoint Hanna since the latter had opposed his nomination for Governor in 1895.²⁶ Foraker himself felt that he had not been properly consulted about the plan and he and the Governor both resented the rumor which had wide circulation, that they dared not refuse to appoint Hanna.²⁷ Foraker and his followers realized there was little they could do. If Bushnell appointed him, the federal patronage would be controlled by Hanna, but if he did not, they would have greatly strained relations with the national administration and with the party as Hanna was National Chairman.²⁸ The situation was further complicated for Bushnell because another of the Foraker leaders, Charles Kurtz, also desired to be appointed to the Senate vacancy.²⁹

Mr. Kurtz's presumption in aspiring to the place in the Senate intended for Hanna provoked anger from the National Chairman's supporters, and Hanna himself told

²⁶Walters, Foraker, 132-133; Herbert Croley, Marcus Alonzo Hanna His Life and Work (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923), 239.

²⁷Walters, Foraker, 136.

²⁸Ibid., 136.

²⁹Enquirer, February 18, 1897.

reporters that though he did not know who Bushnell would appoint:

. . . I am aware that there is considerable pressure being brought to bear upon the governor adverse to me, and I do not know what the result will be. I am hoping, however, that Mr. Bushnell will act for the good of the party. . . . If Mr. Kurtz is appointed, there will be a big howl.³⁰

The Foraker faction was considering the appointment of someone not so completely identified with either group. Thus in February, 1897, Bushnell asked Theodore Burton, Congressman from Cuyahoga County, to come to Columbus for a conference. At the meeting Bushnell offered the Senatorship to him but Burton refused it.³¹

Burton's refusal and the mounting pressure from McKinley and Sherman finally forced the Governor's hand.³² On February 21, 1897, Bushnell announced that ". . . when Senator Sherman resigns to enter the Cabinet of President McKinley I will appoint to succeed him Hon. Marcus A. Hanna, . . ." ³³

Municipal elections were held in Ohio the spring of Hanna's appointment to the Senate and he was interested in

³⁰Cleveland Plain Dealer, February 18, 1897.

³¹Forrest Crissey, Theodore E. Burton: American Statesman (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1956, 113.

³²Walters, Foraker, 134-137.

³³Enquirer, February 22, 1897; Cincinnati Commercial Tribune, February 22, 1897.

the results from two cities in particular. The Republican leader in Cincinnati, Boss George B. Cox, who had recently deserted his former allies, Bushnell and Foraker, to urge Hanna's appointment to the Senate, found his ticket opposed by a fusion slate of Democrats and "bolting" Independent Republicans. Hanna assisted his new friend but to no avail;³⁴ the Cox ticket was beaten.³⁵ In Cleveland, Hanna's home, all was not going well for him politically. The Republican candidate for Mayor was Robert McKisson, a Foraker supporter. There were rumors that Hanna and the Democratic candidate, John H. Farley, had had a private conference and had parted on the friendliest of terms, giving credence to a statement attributed to Hanna:

'We'll have a Mayor in Cleveland who is a Mayor in fact as well as in name, and if we can't have a Republican Mayor we will have a Democratic Mayor, if it costs me \$25,000.³⁶

The new Senator may not have been so candid in expressing his dissatisfaction with McKisson, but he left little doubt as to his position when after praising Farley as an honest and able

³⁴Plain Dealer, April 6, 1897.

³⁵Toledo Bee, April 6, 1897.

³⁶Enquirer, February 16, 1897. The validity of this statement is highly questionable, but it bears such a striking resemblance to a charge made by Frederic C. Howe that it must be considered. Howe stated that in an earlier campaign between McKisson and Farley, one of Farley's supporters told him that they had only been successful because of a contribution of \$20,000 from Mark Hanna. Frederic C. Howe, The Confessions of a Reformer (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1925), 85-86.

administrator be turned the tables on a reporter and asked if it was true that McKisson had secured his nomination by fraud and got the money for his campaign from assessments on gambling houses.³⁷

Cleveland was as big a disappointment to Hanna as Cincinnati. McKisson was elected. His vote was well below that given the rest of the Republican ticket, however, which seemed to be evidence of an organized attempt to knife him.³⁸

The results in both cities were interpreted as defeats for Hanna. Their patronage would now be in the hands of his political foes and this could only complicate his bid for endorsement by the Republican state convention.³⁹

During the years when Hanna was a participant, party activity invariably brought skillful and ambitious men into contact, often producing friction that wore at the bonds of unity. Intra-party alliances were not constant. They were often matters of convenience rather than of conviction, with opportunity and advantage the criteria of affiliation. It would require a detailed study to untangle the shifting

³⁷Plain Dealer, April 5, 1897. This story broke on election day and may have been an exaggeration on the part of a Democratic paper.

³⁸Ibid., April 6, 1897, McKisson ran about 2000 votes behind the rest of the Republican ticket.

³⁹Ibid., April 15, 1897; Walters, Foraker, 138.

alliance structures; their significance in Hanna's quest for the Senate was that they had lost their fluid character and become established, antagonistic factions.

CHAPTER II

THE PARTY'S CHOICE

Hanna desired an endorsement for his senatorial candidacy from the Republican state convention similar to the one accorded Foraker in 1895. It would be difficult to secure such an endorsement without the united support of the party in his home county of Cuyahoga, where the party machinery was in the hands of his political foe, Mayor McKisson. The situation was not without its bright side for Hanna, however, for the county convention would not be held until shortly before the state meeting in late June and there was every prospect that, with three months to prepare, his friends could recapture the party organization.

The Cuyahoga convention was a smashing victory for Hanna with McKisson and his friends completely routed. The convention endorsed Hanna for the Senate, replaced the McKisson-dominated county committee with one favorable to Hanna, and selected a solid Hanna delegation in the state convention.¹ The Hanna forces were apparently sure that they had permanently eliminated McKisson as a factor in the

¹Plain Dealer, June 20, 1897.

political scene because they forgot the wisdom of conciliating a defeated but not beaten enemy and,

. . . rode rough shod over the McKissonites with hob nailed stogas, and then having kicked the unfortunate friends of Mayor McKisson to the ground, they relentlessly tossed and punted them about as college athelets [sic] play with footballs.²

The Hanna forces arrived in Toledo for the state convention flushed with their victory in Cuyahoga and determined to repeat the performance. The meeting opened on June 22 with a prayer offered by the Rev. Dr. John Wesley Hill. His long invocation, sounded more like a stump speech than a prayer:

At the conclusion and throughout . . . at the mention of the names of prominent Americans and in reference to protection and Cuba the audience, contrary to usual custom broke into applause.³

The prayer may have lacked piety but it whipped up enthusiasm

²Ibid., June 20, 1897. The Hanna organ in Cleveland saw the convention activities in a different way. It was "with cheers and applause, without a dissenting voice or vote to mar the splendid enthusiasm. . . ." that the endorsement of Hanna was adopted. There was "not one evidence of a disposition shown conclusively, beyond the question of a doubt, that Senator Hanna is the choice of all the Republicans of Cuyahoga County as well as any part of them." This view was an obvious distortion intended to promote party harmony and later events clearly demonstrated both the dishonesty of the report and the failure of its purpose. Cleveland Leader, June 20, 1897.

³Ibid., June 23, 1897.

among the 1,052 delegates in the flag-draped Toledo Armory,⁴ and left them eager for the keynoter, Charles Grosvenor.⁵

It was felt in most quarters that the only contest at the convention would be over the choice of a state chairman.⁶ The position was customarily filled by the head of the ticket, in this case Governor Bushnell, and the Governor preferred the current chairman, Charles Kurtz. Bushnell had himself violated this custom the year before when he insisted that Kurtz be kept as chairman even though Charles Kinney, running for Secretary of State, headed the ticket.⁷ The Hanna forces did not like Kurtz in any event and did not need the excuse that precedent had already been broken to work against him, though of course they used it. Kurtz had led the fight against the Hanna forces at the 1895 convention and had sought appointment to the Senate vacancy in opposition to him, which made him unacceptable to the Hanna camp. The Hanna candidate for the post was Charles Dick, whom Kurtz had displaced as chairman in 1895.⁸

⁴Commercial Tribune, June 21, 1897.

⁵Ford, Golden Rule Jones, 198. Grosvenor was a Congressman from Athens, Ohio, and an old Hanna supporter, Taylor, Ohio in Congress, 284.

⁶Commercial Tribune, June 19, 1897; Toledo Blade, June 19 and 21, 1897.

⁷Plain Dealer, June 22, 1897.

⁸Mary Loretta Petit, OP, "Senator Charles Dick" (unpublished Master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1948), 46. Copy in Dick Papers, Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.

Bushnell realized that Hanna had the votes to elect Dick and tried one last expedient: he announced that unless Kurtz was retained he would refuse to run for governor.⁹ He hoped that the Hanna forces would feel they needed his vote-getting ability on the ticket and back down. The Hanna camp, far from giving in to the Governor, called his bluff by letting it be known that in case Bushnell should withdraw they had another candidate ready to bring forth.¹⁰ Bushnell, then decided to run. The selection of a chairman was delayed until later in the interests of party harmony.¹¹

The settlement of the fight over the chairmanship meant that the convention could proceed smoothly. Governor Bushnell was nominated, Hanna endorsed for the Senate,¹² and the rest of the state ticket selected. Hanna then came

⁹Bee, June 15, 1897; Blade, June 22, 1897; Plain Dealer, June 23, 1897.

¹⁰Commercial Tribune, June 22, 1897, Bee, June 23, 1897.

¹¹Leader, June 24, 1897.

¹²The resolution said: "Desiring to continue such representation, and appreciating his services to the party and to the people of the state and nation, and his eminent and proven fitness for the position, we endorse the candidacy of the Hon. Marcus A. Hanna for United States Senator, to succeed himself, and pledge the support of the party in the next general assembly to his election to both the short and the long terms." Printed in the Bee, June 23, 1897.

before the convention and in a plea for party unity announced his intention of taking an active role in the coming campaign.

In the opening of this campaign I want simply to say one word: That the secret of all success is unity of purpose, devotion to party, and last, but not least, organization. I don't need to give the Republicans of Ohio any advice on that statement; but I am pleased to join hands with our distinguished governor, and with him take my place in the front ranks, and from start to finish I am with the boys.¹³

¹³Plain Dealer, June 24, 1897.

CHAPTER III

THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE

In the fall of 1897 Ohio was the scene of an important political campaign. At stake were the Governorship, the state legislature and the biggest prize of all--a seat in the United States Senate. Both parties had reason to be hopeful of success. The Republicans had scored a great national victory the year before and many of the party's leaders would be prominent in the State election.¹ The Democrats had precedent on their side; of the last five state elections following a national campaign, four had been swept by the party out of power.²

Not content with the efforts of local luminaries, the G.O.P., eager to elect a Republican legislature, the necessary preliminary to electing a Senator, imported a number of

¹Hanna was Republican National Chairman, Charles Dick, Hanna's personal manager during the campaign, was Secretary of the National Committee, and President McKinley, though restrained by his office, lent a hand.

²Plain Dealer, November 2, 1897. Following the election of Rutherford B. Hayes to the Presidency in 1876, the Democrats elected Bishop Governor and sent George H. Pendleton to the Senate. Grover Cleveland's election as President in 1884 was followed by Foraker's election as Governor and Sherman's as Senator. The Democrats carried the state again in 1889, choosing Campbell for Governor and Calvin Brice for the Senate, after Harrison had won the Presidency. In 1893, McKinley was elected Governor and Sherman returned to the Senate following Cleveland's triumph in the Presidential race.

workers for the fight. The national administration, with many office holders deep in Hanna's political debt, sent several able men,³ while McKinley, owing no little part of his own success to Mr. Hanna, extended aid and comfort. Awareness of his high office limited his efforts with the exception of a leisurely trip home to vote, to writing letters and urging others to help the cause.⁴ The most useful of the outsiders were the senatorial emigres. A number of Hanna's colleagues, including William B. Allison of Iowa and William P. Frye of Maine, spent time in Ohio on his behalf.⁵ Experienced stump-speakers, they were valuable either touring alone or in conjunction with the inexperienced candidate.

Hanna, unused to facing an audience, found the rigors of the campaign hard and fatiguing, but as election day approached he gained in skill as well as experience. He won many who came to his meetings only out of curiosity. At a political rally in Cleveland during the last week of October, Hanna and his party were coldly received. Hisses and laughter repeatedly interrupted the first speaker, Iowa

³Ibid., October 12, 1897.

⁴McKinley to Hanna, October 14, 1897, Charles Dick Papers, Box 43, Ohio State Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.

⁵Leader, October 4, 5, 14, and 24, 1897. Senators John M. Thurston of Nebraska, Knute Nelson of Minnesota, J. C. Burrows of Michigan, and Charles W. Fairbanks of Indiana also participated.

Congressman W. P. Hepburn. Hanna, his normal stage fright accentuated by the hostility of the crowd, was visibly shaken by the time he was to speak. Although greeted in the same fashion as Hepburn, he continued ". . . and towards the close the hissing and laughing which marked the commencement were noticeably absent."⁶

The results were not always so rewarding, especially when Hanna was not present. In a speech at East Liverpool, Foraker, a local favorite, was himself well received, but his remarks concerning the National Chairman "met a frost."⁷ The campaign probably worked to Hanna's advantage. The shadowy figure in the background took on shape and form, the candidate's public appearances tending to break down a popular but distorted image of him. This image was largely the creation of the cartoonist Homer Davenport. Davenport had pictured Hanna during the campaign of 1896 as a ". . . brutal, obese plutocrat, the symbol of sly malice and bloated greed, covered with moneybags and dollar signs."⁸

Prosperity and the influence of the new high tariff and the safety of the currency as its causes provoked much discussion during the campaign. The Dingley Tariff had brought back prosperity, was the Republican claim. The Democrats

⁶Plain Dealer, October 26, 1897.

⁷Ibid., October 21, 1897.

⁸Leech, McKinley, 76.

challenged it with references to several recent wage cuts. The GOP orators argued that their victory in 1896 had killed the silver issue and restored confidence in the currency. The Democrats emphatically denied this and the related Republican contention that if the Democrats won control of Congress their silver agitation would undermine confidence and threaten the carefully reconstructed economy.

It was Hanna, as symbol and candidate, around whom the contest whirled. As symbol, his election would be a ringing endorsement of the administration, his defeat a repudiation that would lessen its prestige and endanger its policies. So at least the Republicans tried to convince the faithful.

The Democrats accepted Hanna as the central issue and directed their heaviest fire at him as a candidate. Columbus Congressman, John J. Lentz showed them the way. At a Democratic gathering in Cleveland he described long discourses by Senators Nelson and Thurston explaining why the silver issue was dead and pointed out that if they were right the only issue remaining was Mr. Hanna.

Among the charges leveled at the Republican candidate none caused a stronger reaction than that of "labor-crusher." Countering vigorously, Hanna branded the accusation a "lie," using statistics of his own covering employment and wages in

⁹Plain Dealer, October 22, 1897.

his companies as proof. The official entry of organized labor into the fight further confused the issue. Cleveland's Central Labor Union denounced Hanna but Lodge No. 5 of the Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders of America, many of whose members worked for Hanna's Globe Iron Works, took exception in unanimously protesting the action.¹⁰

As in all elections, local issues affected the campaign. The most significant arose in Cincinnati where the smouldering discontent with bossism that had flared into open opposition in the spring returned. The twelfth of October was the climactic day, the opening event the Hamilton County Republican Convention. Despite the selection of a "ticket [that] is the strongest in years,"¹¹ the party's chances were weakened by the loss of its reform elements. Determined to free the city from the domination of Boss Cox and his Republican machine, the dissidents held their own convention.

The Democrats meeting simultaneously sensed the opportunity. Overtures were made, agreement reached, and fusion arranged. The Independent Republicans, as the bolters called themselves, received recognition on the

¹⁰Commercial Tribune, October 4, 1897; Leader, October, 3, 1897.

¹¹Plain Dealer, October 13, 1897.

Democratic ballot, including four places on the legislative ticket.¹²

The Republican canvas was modified to offer specific appeal to various groups within the electorate. To hold the normally Republican vote of the veterans, the Republicans offered ex-soldiers memberships in Mark Hanna's Old Soldiers Club. Included among the inducements were promises that members would be ". . . entitled-free of charge--to all clerical work necessary to advance pension claims [and endorsement for] . . . their applications for political and other employment."¹³ An approach not much different from those of today, only a trifle more candid.

To win the Catholic vote the Hanna men used a different tactic--a sort of reverse whispering campaign. Letters that purported to be copies of an intercepted communication of the anti-Catholic American Protective Association were sent to Catholics. These condemned the McKinley Administration for its friendly attitude toward Catholics and declared that neither the APA nor its friends would support Mr. Hanna because of it. This document was accompanied by an appeal for support, explaining that Catholic leaders

¹²Ibid., October 13, 1897; Steffens, The Struggle for Self-Government and Croly, Hanna, contain discussions of the situation in Cincinnati.

¹³Plain Dealer, October 1, 1897. A reprint of a letter sent to the veterans signed by Charles A. Ottenat as President of the Club.

in Cleveland had met and adopted resolutions that in effect endorsed Hanna's candidacy. The campaign's effectiveness was mitigated when the latter claim was denied by J. P. Madigan, lay leader and officer in the Central Catholic Association of Cleveland.¹⁴

Of all the elements in the population none was more loyal to the Republican Party than the Negro. No special efforts were required to gain Negro support, only encouragement of their already favorable attitude. This was a simple task, and yet it was bungled--the sensibilities of the Negro were offended stupidly and avoidably. The Republican Central Committee of Cuyahoga County, known as the Committee of Fifteen, instead of handling them directly, established an auxiliary to coordinate the Negroes' contributions to the campaign. Whether the Committee acted out of prejudice or from a conviction that separate facilities would be welcomed by Negro leaders cannot be determined, nor is it important. The auxiliary, dubbed the "Jim Crow Annex," produced discontent; on October 6, a delegation representing Negro clubs from the Cleveland area called at Republican headquarters to protest. They were refused an interview because their loyalty to the entire ticket was questionable. This was basically correct as many of them had refused to

¹⁴Plain Dealer, October 25, 1897. There was no report of the affair or denial of the Plain Dealer's accuracy in the Hanna organ, the Leader.

support the reelection of Governor Bushnell,¹⁵ but the undiplomatic way in which they were treated rankled them still more. One Negro organization, the Original McKinley Club, countered with a resolution pointing to the appointment of George Myers¹⁶ to the State Executive Committee, who they claimed had bolted the party on several occasions. Not mollified yet, the club impeached its President and Vice President for serving on the "Jim Crow Annex."¹⁷ It was probably fortunate for the GOP that its blundering affected only the Negro voters. With so little to gain by joining the Democrats, it is doubtful that the Committee's ineptitude drove many from their traditional loyalties.

The factional development in the Republican Party has been mentioned. Certain incidents of the campaign itself caused friction, weakening unity and creating a climate favorable to the deterioration of party discipline that occurred when the legislature assembled early the following year.

¹⁵Bushnell had failed to pursue an investigation of the lynching of a Negro in Urbana and had lost some support.

¹⁶Myers was a Negro barber in Cleveland and one of Hanna's political agents. He has left many interesting and revealing comments about Hanna in his correspondence with the historian James Ford Rhodes referred to earlier.

¹⁷Plain Dealer, October 7, 1897.

The controversy over the appointment of a chairman of the Republican State Committee that had developed at the state convention in June was settled but Kurtz who had been displaced was bitter.¹⁸ In July, Hanna wrote Bushnell concerning a replacement for Kurtz as state chairman. He said that he had seen George Nash mentioned in the papers as a possibility and understood he was acceptable to Bushnell. Hanna assured him that ". . . before discussing it with anyone in the state I would like to hear your opinion. . . ." ¹⁹ Bushnell replied that he had no objection²⁰ and Nash was appointed.

Kurtz could not be reconciled even for the period of the campaign. He refused to assist the Hanna forces in any way. His feelings were most clearly revealed in mid-October when Hanna and Dick went to Columbus seeking an interview. Kurtz asked Foraker who served as intermediary to ". . . tell Mr. Hanna that I do not care to meet with him. He has injured me too deeply for forgiveness."²¹ Hanna offended not only Kurtz, when he forced him from the chairmanship, but the entire Foraker wing of the party as well, for Kurtz

¹⁸Ibid., October 10, 1897.

¹⁹Hanna to Bushnell, July 15, 1897, Charles Dick Papers, Ohio State Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.

²⁰Bushnell to Hanna, July 20, 1897, ibid.

²¹Plain Dealer, October 22, 1897.

was one of its principal spokesmen.²² It was an error whose seriousness would not be revealed until after election day.

Late in September Senator Foraker left Ohio because of business in New York. The Democratic press suggested that he had withdrawn from the campaign, his action prompted by a quarrel with Hanna and his advisers. The accounts continued, reporting that great pressure was being used to force Foraker to resume an active role.²³ The Republicans replied that Foraker, his business in New York completed, was in Washington preparing for his return. Foraker called reports of a disagreement between the Hanna leaders and himself "mere bosh."²⁴ Whatever the reasons, Foraker returned and worked for the election of the Republican ticket.

In Cleveland, the Hanna forces were discovering that the McKisson faction they had left for dead in the county convention was very much alive and in control of a great deal of patronage. Ill feeling was revealed in many ways. According to rumor, if the Republicans controlled the next legislature, Hanna would try to force through a bill

²²Leader, January 11, 1898. Kurtz entered state politics when he was elected to the General Assembly in 1880. He became private secretary to Foraker when the latter was elected governor.

²³Plain Dealer, October 2, 1897. This account listed threats to defeat Bushnell and to work for the defeat of Foraker when he came up for reelection among the pressures.

²⁴Leader, October 3, 1897.

reorganizing the Cleveland city government.²⁵ The city was administered under the modified federal system and the heads of the various departments were appointees of the mayor. Hanna hoped to deprive the mayor of the political power this gave him by making these positions elective.²⁶ Whether true or not, talk of this kind was not the type to introduce cordiality into the Hanna-McKisson relationship.

As a local Republican leader McKisson was used to special consideration in party affairs. After the Committee of Fifteen fell to the Hanna forces, it began relentlessly to curtail his favored treatment. He received speaking assignments at generally small, often out-of-the-way, meetings.²⁷ The mayor had always received a large personal allotment of tickets, sometimes as many as fifty, for important rallies; this was now drastically reduced. On one occasion he got only one and quipped angrily to reporters that he should probably be ". . . thankful for small favors."²⁸ These were minor irritants, but more serious assaults upon his position were under way.

²⁵Ohio cities had as yet not achieved home rule and the legislature could vary the municipal structure as it saw fit.

²⁶Plain Dealer, October 4, 1897.

²⁷The one notable exception was the selection of McKisson to introduce Hanna at the largest and most important of the rallies held in Cleveland.

²⁸Plain Dealer, October 4, 1897.

In the spring mayoralty race some Republicans had supported McKisson's Democratic opponent, John Farley. In the fall one of the Republican nominees for the legislature resigned his candidacy, and the Committee of Fifteen, in a move both suspect and absurd, appointed Thomas Roberts to fill the vacancy. Roberts had been, or at least so the McKissonites charged, one of the more active Republicans working for Farley. J. W. Holcomb, speaking for the Committee, said there had been no intention of annoying the mayor and that the selection was made with the object of securing ". . . the strongest candidate at this particular time."²⁹ The McKisson faction was furious. The Mayor suggested that Roberts' past performance gave him a decidedly Democratic appearance. Another McKisson leader with not so subtle irony cautioned the GOP that success was doubtful ". . . if the committee is going on the supposition that in order to be permitted to vote the Republican ticket this fall, one must have voted for John Farley last spring."³⁰ The committee's action, however pure of motive, was incredibly stupid: it seemed to confirm the worst suspicions of McKisson and his followers.

To be elected one must have the votes and the turning out of a favorable vote depends in large part upon loyal workers in precinct and ward. Hanna thus struck at the

²⁹Ibid., October 8, 1897.

³⁰Ibid., October 2, 1897.

heart of the McKisson organization when, again through the Committee of Fifteen, he opened a campaign to remove ward and precinct supervisors friendly to the mayor. Supervisors were elected and the legality of the committee's action in removing them for any reason except residence in a district other than the one they represented was questionable. The committee claimed it had acted only under such circumstances.³¹ The most celebrated case, involving the supervisor of the Second Ward, Little Mike Goldsmith, raised doubts as to the veracity of the claim. According to the city directory Goldsmith lived in the Second ward but the man appointed as his successor lived in another part of the city.³² Despite the committee's denial of anti-McKisson action the only supervisors removed were members of his organization.

The campaign gave evidence of Republican victory. The only real statewide issue was Hanna and after overcoming his inexperience as a campaigner he was able to win acceptance and support throughout the state.

Conditions had also been created that could bring disaster. The disregard shown for Governor Bushnell meant that every state employee was a possible enemy to Hanna. The treatment of McKisson presented the contingency of danger in the legislature: three members of the Cuyahoga delegation stood with the mayor. The ousting of Kurtz made

³¹Ibid., October 9, 1897.

³²Ibid., October 10, 1897.

available to any potential opposition a capable political general experienced in the intricacies of state politics.

The expectancy of election day was heightened by charges of corrupt practices and intra-party ticket knifing. As early as the middle of October state Democratic headquarters warned of a Republican attempt to colonize a doubtful county.³³ On the morning of election day Cuyahoga Democrats urged witnesses at polling places to be alert because "we have every reason to believe that Mark Hanna will attempt to defraud the Democratic party of victory by false counting."³⁴ In the absence of corroboration the charges appeared to be only Democratic stratagems and after a brief flurry in the press were quickly forgotten.

As had happened during the campaign, the more interesting and significant controversies surrounding the election developed between Republicans. For several weeks prior to the election the Hanna forces had been concerned over the support McKisson and his followers would give the legislative ticket. Their fears appeared justified when reports reached the public that city employees had been instructed not to vote for Republican candidates for the legislature.³⁵

³³Plain Dealer, October 14, 1897. Colonization is the movement of voters by a party from a safe district to a close one.

³⁴Excerpt from the Democratic communication appearing in ibid., November 2, 1897.

³⁵Ibid., November 2, 1897.

McKisson apparently sensing that actions would speak louder than words in denial, scurried about Cleveland on election eve rallying his supporters around the straight ticket. The relief in the Hanna camp was evidenced in its praise of the mayor's midnight ride.³⁶

One further attempt was made to defeat Hanna. On the day before election, workers in the Cleveland area received a sample ballot with instructions on how to vote the Republican ticket and against "M. A. Hanna, the labor crusher."³⁷ McKisson was not identified with the plan but it is almost certain he was behind it. He alone had the motive and organization to execute it.³⁸

When the polls closed on November 3, Ohioans settled themselves to learn the decision they had reached. Returns came in slowly, but those that did favored the Democrats. By eleven o'clock the Republicans had conceded Hamilton County with its fourteen-seat legislative delegation and the

³⁶Leader, November 2, 1897.

³⁷Ibid., November 2, 1897. The Leader reproduced the sample ballot and the instructions signed are by "A Republican Laboring man." According to the instructions, by marking an "X" at the top of the ballot and then crossing over at the legislative section and marking an "X" in front of each Democrat the desired end could be accomplished.

³⁸Ibid., November 2, 1897. This paper was highly indignant, heading its lead, "TRAITORS IN THE CAMP." It called the plan an organized effort ". . . by Republicans-- mostly office holders. . . ."

Democrats were claiming a state-wide triumph.³⁹ Amid predictions of an eight to twelve thousand plurality in the state they enthusiastically added Cuyahoga County to their column.⁴⁰ This was premature. Democratic gains which at ten o'clock had averaged sixteen per precinct over the state had been halved by midnight.⁴¹ The party, still hopeful, continued to claim victory but the tide had turned.⁴² Republican headquarters radiated renewed confidence, and though no official announcement had been made by midnight, predictions of success for the entire ticket were appearing. Shortly after twelve o'clock Chairman Nash issued the official statement: Bushnell to be reelected governor by at least 12,000 votes and the GOP to have a majority in the legislature on joint ballot.⁴³

³⁹Plain Dealer, November 3, 1897. The success in Cincinnati did not fall to a pure Democratic slate. In addition to representation on the county ticket the Independent Republicans received four places on the legislative ticket as the price for fusion.

⁴⁰Ibid., November 3, 1897. The Democrats still led in Cuyahoga with 140 of the 206 precincts reported.

⁴¹Ibid., November 3, 1897.

⁴²At midnight Democratic State Chairman, Daniel McConville, issued this statement: "I claim the legislature as Democraticly safe majorities in both branches, and the entire Democratic state ticket is elected by a good plurality." Quoted in ibid., November 3, 1897.

⁴³Ibid., November 3, 1897.

Democratic victory claims were of more than the "wish-will-make-it-so" variety. The early returns which reflected the party's gains had come largely from the cities, backbone of Republican strength. Consolidation and victory could be expected when the normally Democratic countryside reported. Unfortunately for Democratic calculations this was not what happened. The GOP scored gains in the rural areas, the Democracy's lead vanished, and the Republicans swept the election.⁴⁴ The margin of victory was reduced⁴⁵ by disgust over the rule of "Boss" Cox in Cincinnati, the activities of McKisson in Cleveland, and intra-party warfare throughout the state.⁴⁶

All that should have remained of the senatorial contest was the formality of the legislative election and Mr. Hann's return to Washington. During the interregnum, the period between the November election and the meeting of the legislature, hope that the situation would develop normally was ended. The various groups opposed to Mr. Hanna would organize, come to terms, and all but snatch the senatorial toga from him.

⁴⁴Ibid., November 3, 1897.

⁴⁵Associated Press in the Leader, November 4, 1897. The Republican plurality had been cut to less than half of what it had been the year before and its huge majority in the legislature cut to five.

⁴⁶For Republican comment see the editorial on the Cincinnati situation in ibid., November 3, 1897; statement by J. W. Holcomb of the Cuyahoga Republican Committee quoted in the Plain Dealer, November 4, 1897. See Appendix A for an analyses of the returns.

CHAPTER IV

THE INTERREGNUM

The interregnum began quietly with jubilant Republicans busily congratulating one another.¹ The quiet was quickly disturbed by an announcement from Democratic headquarters that the small legislative majority of the GOP could not be held in line and Hanna would not be elected Senator.² Most Republicans were not greatly alarmed by the announcement, feeling it was only an attempt to disrupt their ranks. The Hanna organ declared that the ". . . opposition to the election of Senator Hanna [was] . . . confined to the Democratic papers and Allen O. Myers."³ The paper confidently continued, ". . . the attempt of the defeated Democrats to cause a division in the ranks of the victors has not succeeded to the extent of inducing a single Republican . . . to bolt. . . ." ⁴ When Charles Kurtz denied having said that

¹Leader, November 5, 1897. Contains many messages including those Hanna received from Foraker and Bushnell.

²Associated Press in ibid., November 4, 1897.

³The chief Democratic spokesman after election day. He had been an exposé in Ohio politics authoring Bosses and Boodle in Ohio Politics (Cincinnati: Lyceum Publishing Co., 1895).

⁴Ibid., November 8, 1897.

there was nothing in the rumors that some Republicans would bolt Hanna, the situation changed.⁵ The suspicion and distrust current during the campaign reappeared and before the legislature met there would be foundation for both.

On November 14, the Democrats reopened their state headquarters at the Great Southern Hotel in Columbus. With the accompanying announcement that it would remain open until after the convening of the General Assembly in January, the party signaled its intention of pursuing an active role in the senatorial election.⁶ The Democrats held only a minority of the seats in the legislature; the reopening of their headquarters, though confirming their intent, posed in itself little threat to Hanna. If they were to defeat him the Democrats would need Republican votes in addition to their own, and it appeared ever more likely that they were ". . . receiving encouragement if not actual promises of assistance from Republicans."⁷

During November, stories that the Democrats and dissatisfied Republicans had arrived at an understanding gained wide circulation. Late in the month, whether because the stories were not true or the publicity was adversely

⁵Ibid., November 7, 1897.

⁶Ibid., November 15, 1897.

⁷Editorial in ibid., November 16, 1897. The writer went on to say that ". . . who those Republicans are is not known."

affecting the alliance, Myers declared that such a course would mean ". . . the disruption of the party. . . ." and that there was "absolutely no truth" in them.⁸ The stories persisted, but apparently the plans of the leaders of the Democratic-anti-Hanna Republican coalition progressed and the negotiations to bring such a coalition into being passed the critical stage. That was most probable explanation of a mid-December statement of Allen Myers the leader of the Democrats alligned with the bolting Republicans against Hanna. In what was practical contradiction of his denial of joint action only three weeks before he insisted that

. . . the Democrats are solidly in line against Mr. Hanna. . . . They will vote for any good Republican. . . . [and they] are willing to lend their assistance to the movement to defeat Mr. Hanna.⁹

A combination of anti-Hanna Republicans and Democrats might be effected, but if it was to be a successful venture the Democratic legislators would have to vote as a unit. This would not normally have been a problem in the fight

⁸Allen O. Myers quoted in the Plain Dealer, November 37, 1897. Though no agreement may have been reached at this stage the concert of later action leaves no doubt that one eventually existed. Negotiations must have been in progress at this time but it can not be definitely demonstrated.

⁹Allen O. Myers quoted in ibid., December 16, 1897. A "good Republican was, according to Myers' definition, one ". . . in accord with the silver men of both parties."

for Senator but the Democrats were being asked to vote for a Republican and this was not normal. While most members probably found this difficult to accept, for a few it was impossible. State Senator Horace Valentine announced that he would never vote for a Republican¹⁰ and by the end of December four other Democratic legislators had joined him.¹¹

Party loyalty was not the only obstacle blocking united Democratic support of a Republican. Unlike the GOP, the Democrats had not endorsed a particular candidate for the Senate. It had been expected that the way would be open for several aspirants and merger would dash their hopes. Among them were General A. J. Warner who had declared his candidacy in early October¹² and who had been joined by Congressman John J. Lentz later in the same month.¹³ More serious contenders were the defeated Democratic gubernatorial candidate, Horace L. Chapman,¹⁴ and utilities magnate John

¹⁰Senator Valentine's statement quoted in the Leader, December 16, 1897. Valentine represented Crawford County, one of the strongest Democratic centers in the state.

¹¹Ibid., December 31, 1897. Among the others were John H. Heyde of Loudonville, E. B. Stivers of Vanceburg, C. I. Goard of Loudenville, and General Aquila Wiley of Wayne.

¹²A. J. Warner, quoted in the Plain Dealer, October 1, 1897. Warner qualified his declaration by making his candidacy contingent upon Democratic victory in the legislative election.

¹³Ibid., October 28, 1897.

¹⁴Leader, December 8, 1897.

R. McLean. Both men saw in the honor recognition that would help them to realize their political ambitions. McLean had been considered the choice of the Democrats during the fall campaign until forced into the background by party strategists who felt that his business background, so similar to Hanna's, would present no contrast and attract few votes.¹⁵ After the election popular appeal was no longer paramount, so McLean's hopes revived and one of his political advisers, Lewis Bernard, announced that McLean would be the Democratic caucus nominee.¹⁶

A large majority of Democratic legislators were eager to defeat Hanna. If joining a coalition with Republicans offered the best opportunity, they were willing to do this and to vote for ". . . any Republican if it is necessary to defeat Mr. Hanna."¹⁷

On the eve of the opening of the legislative session Myers' prediction that there would ". . . be lively times [in the legislature], and we are going to help them along,"¹⁸ appeared truer than ever. The Democrats had moved from

¹⁵Plain Dealer, October 2, 1897.

¹⁶Bernard, quoted in ibid., December 29, 1897.

¹⁷John Pagh, Democratic State Senator elect, quoted in ibid., December 2, 1897. For similar statement see comments by State Senator Decker (D-Paulding) in the Leader, December 29, 1897.

¹⁸Myers quoted in ibid., November 8, 1897.

denial to actual, if not admitted, union with the anti-Hanna Republicans.

The activities of the McKisson Republicans were confused by the public attitudes assumed by the leaders of the faction. The position they would take in the senatorial contest was of considerable concern, for three Cuyahoga legislators were members of the faction. The first talk of a bolt brought requests that the three publicly declare their intentions. The ambiguity of their replies and the numerous reports of an anti-Hanna combination led to widespread speculation and demands for more definite answers. The trio, State Senator Vernon H. Burke and Representatives M. F. Bramley and Harry Mason answered early post-election questions with varying degrees of directness. All felt their positions had been made clear during the campaign and that further explanation was unnecessary. Burke explained that he had at no ". . . time or under any circumstances [said he] . . . would not vote for Hon. M. A. Hanna. . . ." Mason pointed out that though Hanna had not endorsed his nomination he had made his position clear but had ". . . ever since [his election] been unjustly accused of being hostile to Senator Hanna." Bramley, sure too much had been made of opposition to Hanna, said in the most definite statement that ". . . we know and the people know the instructions we received when nominated and every pledge . . .

will be carried out."¹⁹ The Hanna camp was temporarily satisfied, accepting the statements as ". . . guarded [but] leaving no room for doubt that they will . . . give their support. . . ." to the Senator.²⁰

Expectation of support from Mason, Bramley, and Burke was of short duration. Doubts reappeared when the three legislators, though denying opposition to Hanna, made it clear that they felt no obligation to any candidate and considered themselves ". . . pledged to no one."²¹

Hanna's lieutenants, no longer satisfied with the effect produced by their expression of confidence in the good intentions of the trio, began publicly to claim that the three had pledged themselves to Hanna. Excerpts from their speeches, comments to friends, and other documents were offered as proof of the commitment. The most convincing item was a copy of a card appearing in the Cleveland Leader which the paper claimed Burke had used during the campaign. According to the card, Burke promised, if

¹⁹Interviews with the three appearing in ibid., November 5, 1897.

²⁰Ibid., November 5, 1897.

²¹Mason quoted in the Plain Dealer, November 24, 1897. Bramley, in the same article in answer to whether he had stated he would vote for Hanna during the campaign, said, "No." Burke in the Leader, December 23, 1897, said he had ". . . entered into no agreement with anybody. . . ."

elected, to support Hanna.²² While the other items might be dismissed as being out of context or misinterpreted, the alleged card was specific and required a definite denial. Burke chose to continue general statements and neither affirmed nor denied the accuracy of the card story. This failure to respond directly to the claim of the Hanna camp created doubts about this integrity and gave foundation to the stories that the three intended to bolt Hanna.

Recognizing the value of concerted action on legislation concerning the Cleveland area, the legislative delegation decided to organize, with the first meeting scheduled to meet in Cleveland's Society for Savings building on November 13. The meeting was the occasion for a clash of the Hanna and McKisson men on the delegation, for one of the important items on the agenda was the selection of a chairman, a position both sides desired. The test was successfully met by the McKisson forces when Bramley was elected.²³

²²Ibid., January 8, 1898. The card as printed in the paper:

No. 2 on the list of Senators
If Elected I Will Vote For M.A. Hanna For U.S. Senator
Vernon H. Burke
Candidate For
State Senator

Subject to Republican Primaries
Thursday, June 17th 4-9 P.M.

²³Ibid., November 14, 1897. Bramley won over the Hanna choice, without a vote to spare, seven to five.

Pro-Hanna State Senator Dodge was alarmed and exclaimed that according to an old saying ". . . if you scratch a Turk you'll find a Tarter [sic] underneath . . . if you scratch most members of the Cuyahoga legislature [sic] delegation you'll find McKisson men underneath."²⁴ Later events would prove him overly pessimistic but the Hanna camp had suffered a blow to its prestige.

The true significance of the vote, if any, was not clear because of the many other factors influencing it. Personal rivalries among the legislators had an effect and there were reports of a deal whereby Bramley received votes for the chairmanship in exchange for supporting C. E. Bowman in his quest for the position of secretary.²⁵ If such an arrangement did exist, and Bowman was elected with McKisson votes, there was no direct clash of the two camps for Bowman was a Hanna supporter.

Late in November the members of the State House of Representatives from Cuyahoga met and one of them, T. W. Roberts, offered a resolution binding the members to support Hanna. The McKisson and Hanna forces collided again over the resolution and again the anti-Hanna men found enough support among the rest of the delegation to defeat the

²⁴Plain Dealer, November 14, 1897.

²⁵Leader, November 14, 1897.

proposal.²⁶ The Senator's camp explained that it was an unorganized effort, that ". . . no one actively connected with Senator Hanna's campaign, no one at the Perry-Payne building headquarters [in Cleveland] nor in the State committee headquarters . . . advised or sanctioned the resolution."²⁷ This publication was probably intended to restore the prestige lost with this second setback, but as all the legislators except the three McKisson men were in line when the legislature met there was more than a little truth in it.

Hanna's chances in the legislature depended to a considerable extent on the attitude Foraker, his senior Senate colleague, would adopt. Foraker, with many supporters throughout the state, enjoyed a position of great political power. A decision to actively join a movement to prevent Hanna's return to the Senate would have materially increased its chances for success. With only a small majority in the legislature it was necessary to hold them all in line if Hanna was to realize his ambition. Foraker's prestige, if coupled with the opposition, might shift the balance.

²⁶Ibid., November 30, 1897. The defeated motion:
Resolved, That we the members to the House of Representatives from Cuyahoga county, do pledge ourselves to the Republicans of the State of Ohio that we will vote for Senator M. A. Hanna and do all in our power to elect him to succeed himself, both for the short and the long term in the United States Senate.

²⁷Ibid., November 29, 1897.

Shortly after the fall election Foraker had announced that for him the campaign was over and would remain so, even if reports of a Republican rift proved true.²⁸ The first statement was followed the next day with one that seemed to confirm his hands-off policy. It would be, he said, ". . . a species of bossism for me to tell the Legislature what it ought to do."²⁹ The Hanna camp wanted a declaration favoring their candidate, knowing that it would seriously weaken any anti-Hanna movement, and would likely insure the votes necessary for Hanna's election. Foraker preferred to maintain his neutral position and this made him increasingly suspect in the eyes of the Hanna forces; they came to feel that his neutrality was only a blind to cover behind-the-scenes support of the opposition.³⁰ The fear that Foraker was secretly in the fight was largely due to the activities of one of his lieutenants, Charles Kurtz.³¹ Kurtz, described as ". . . stealthy as an Indian," was masterminding the opposition and his long association with Foraker

²⁸Foraker quoted in ibid., November 9, 1897; Plain Dealer, November 9, 1897.

²⁹Foraker quoted in the Leader, November 10, 1897.

³⁰Telegram appearing in the Chicago Record, December 28, 1897, and reprinted in ibid., December 29, 1897. For reports of earlier dissatisfaction with Foraker's position see ibid., December 9 and 17, 1897.

³¹Ibid., December 17, 1897.

identified the latter with them also.³² Foraker did find himself in a difficult position. His political allies were leading the fight against Hanna and he had no desire to work against them, yet Hanna could bring great pressure to bear upon him. Neutrality was the only course open to him under the circumstances and he probably refrained from taking any action in the contest.

Another source of trouble for Hanna from within the GOP was Governor Asa Bushnell. The Governor had reason to dislike Hanna and to work for his defeat. In addition to his humiliation at the state convention in the spring, there was evidence, certainly enough to convince Bushnell, that Hanna, eager for his own success, had directed that the fall campaign be concentrated on the election of the legislature, even if this necessitated the neglect of the state ticket. With the resources of both the state and national committees at his disposal such neglect would appear to have been unnecessary, yet a letter sent from national headquarters in Washington over the signature of Charles Dick failed to mention the state ticket, but urged the election of the legislative slate.³³ The gubernatorial race had become secondary to the election of the legislature.³⁴

³²Ibid., January 11, 1898. See section on the fall election footnote 22 for fuller description of this relationship. For contrary view of Foraker's activities see ibid., November 17, 1897.

³³Letter from Republican National headquarters printed in the Plain Dealer, October 21, 1897.

³⁴Ibid., November 4, 1897. See Appendix A.

This would seem sufficient reason for Bushnell to join the fight to defeat Hanna. Similar provocation when Hanna usurped his prerogative to the appointment of the state chairman, however, had aroused the Governor only to a few harsh words; in any case he was not renowned for his courage. It would seem unlikely that the chance for revenge would induce Bushnell to join openly a desperate fight which, if lost, might end his career. A more likely explanation, though conjectural, was Bushnell's ambition. He was serving his second and probably last term as Governor and the only other office of comparable prestige was that of Senator. If Hanna was elected both Ohio seats would be filled by Republicans and the only place for him would be private life. Under such circumstances Bushnell would have fallen in easily with suggestions that he was, because of his large acquaintance and state wide popularity, the logical candidate of the opposition.

Bushnell's motivation may be conjectural; his participation on the side of the opposition was not. Kurtz, the leader of the anti-Hanna movement, was Oil Inspector of Ohio by appointment of the governor,³⁵ and the latter could have compelled him to stop his anti-Hanna activities or resign his state position at any time, but he did not. State employees were in fact making ". . . a more or less open fight against

³⁵Leader, December 30, 1897.

Senator Hanna in every county in the state."³⁶ This and his activities during the session of the General Assembly left little doubt concerning the Governor's position in the contest.

Until the opposition became an organized, active force there was little the Hanna camp could do but affirm the glories of party regularity and their confidence in the future. In New York for a rest because "I worked hard, for I am not used to that kind of campaigning,"³⁷ Hanna told reporters that everything was fine. When prodded about his home county, he replied, "It is all right, no matter what anybody says. The men to whom you doubtless refer [Mason, Bramley, and Burke] are good Republicans and will abide by the action of the caucus."³⁸

There were frequent newspaper reports of counter action. One such report declared that if he was defeated, patronage would not be cleared through the state's senators, but would be handled by Hanna directly.³⁹ Another announced

³⁶Plain Dealer, December 10, 1897. Among those on the state payroll thought to be working against Hanna were: W.S. Mathews, Superintendent of Insurance; O. T. Corson, School Commissioner; E. A. Archer, Chief Clerk in the Railroad Commissioner's office; and C. H. Gerrish, Deputy Oil Inspector.

³⁷Hanna quoted in the Leader, November 21, 1897.

³⁸Hanna quoted in ibid., November 21, 1897.

³⁹Plain Dealer, December 18, 1897.

that if the Democrats joined the coalition to defeat him, Hanna would urge McKinley to kill civil service reform and oust all Democrats from positions with the federal government.⁴⁰ These rumors were never denied and may have contained some grains of truth, but they would have been drastic and difficult steps to effect even for Hanna.

Cincinnatians had dealt a blow to the weakening position of Boss Cox when they elected the entire Fusion legislative ticket in the fall elections. Since the slate was not composed exclusively of Democrats, the course the men would take on the senatorial question was followed with great interest. In mid-November Hanna's Cleveland organ announced that the Republicans would have a joint ballot majority of fifteen. Its conclusion was based on the political designation claimed by each of the new legislature's members. Four of the Hamilton County fusionists, Charles F. Droste, Frank H. Kemper, Rufus W. Lane, and J. C. Otis, announced themselves as Republicans while Lewis Voight declared himself an independent Republican.⁴¹ Droste, however, earlier in the month had indicated that he was a free silver man and would vote only for a man of similar views for the Senate.⁴² The confusion surrounding the action the fusionists would take continued until their votes were finally recorded. When, late

⁴⁰Ibid., November 12, 1897.

⁴¹Leader, November 17, 1897.

⁴²Ibid., November 4, 1897.

in December, Colonel Jephtha Garrard of Cincinnati, a free silver Republican, arrived in Columbus and set up headquarters from which to seek the short senate term, the confusion was compounded, for the loyalties of the fusionists were now attracted to one of their fellow citizens and those favoring free silver had a candidate around whom to rally.⁴³

Colonel Garrard's candidacy failed to gain support and his name was not even presented to the legislature for consideration. This was perhaps the greatest blunder of the anti-Hanna coalition. If they had pushed the Colonel's candidacy they might have secured the support of the free silver men among the Cincinnati fusionists, and attracted more regular Republican support with the ideological appeal of a free silver man. They would surely have found the Democratic members of the legislature more content with an avowed advocate of free coinage.

The political breakdown of the General Assembly was seventy-nine Republicans and one Independent Republican and sixty-five Democrats.⁴⁴ A majority of 15 but a not insurmountable lead: a change of only eight votes would bring about the defeat of Hanna in his bid for election. Reports of defection were accordingly watched with great interest; there were many. They varied greatly but one of the largest

⁴³Plain Dealer, December 30, 1897.

⁴⁴Ibid., December 21, 1897.

estimates, appearing in mid-December, placed the total at twenty-seven.⁴⁵ By the end of the month more conservative but more realistic estimates placed the number of Republican legislators who had joined the Kurtz-Myers "combine"⁴⁶ at seven,⁴⁷ a far cry from the wild guesses of a few weeks before but still only one away from success. Whatever the number aligned against Hanna, it was obviously a serious threat to the National Chairman's ambitions. Hanna headquarters admitted that there was a written agreement between bolting Republicans and Democrats on the organization of the House,⁴⁸ and the opposition was asserting the further claim that after a few ballots there would be wholesale desertions from Hanna as the legislators would feel that "the declaration of the Toledo convention will have been carried out." and they were free of its obligations.⁴⁹

The Hanna forces were not yet beaten but they were in serious trouble. On the eve of the opening of the General Assembly the anti-Hanna combine was united and strong and flushed with success while Hanna's supporters were disorganized and weak and shaken by defeat.

⁴⁵Ibid., December 16, 1897.

⁴⁶"Combine" is a colloquial term for an association of persons for political purposes. It was commonly used in the newspapers of the period to describe the anti-Hanna forces and is so used in this study.

⁴⁷Plain Dealer, December 30, 1897.

⁴⁸Leader, December 31, 1897.

⁴⁹Ibid., December 24, 1897.

CHAPTER V

ELECTION

As the time approached for the opening of the Seventy-third General Assembly, Columbus became more and more the center of attention for those interested in politics around the state and nation. As in a later day the city would become known as the football capital of the world, so for this brief moment it could claim with justification to be the political capital of the United States. Most if not "every newspaper of importance upon the continent was represented at Columbus during that exciting time by its own special representative."¹ Hotels were filling rapidly as December drew to a close and Columbus merchants could look forward to an unusually busy January. Hanna badges bearing his picture and beneath it the inscription, "For Senator, the Party's Choice,"² were in evidence especially in the lobby of the Neil House, the Hanna headquarters. The combine leaders were busy on ~~New~~ Year's Eve working out last minute plans for the showdown in the legislature which would begin in a few days.³

¹J. T. Kenny, "The Legislature that Elected Mr. Hanna," Arena, March, 1899, 311-326.

²Leader, January 1, 1898.

³Ford, Golden Rule Jones, 225.

Both the Republicans and the Democrats were to hold caucuses to decide on whom they would support for officers of the Assembly.⁴ The Democrats followed the common practice of holding their caucus behind closed doors, influenced no doubt by the desire to maintain secrecy in their dealings with the Republican bolters who would also be present.⁵

Senator Hanna arrived in Columbus shortly before the caucuses began and his presence put new life into his forces, but it was too late to change the course of the first round.⁶ Alexander Boxwell, whose candidacy for Speaker of the House the Hanna forces were supporting, had been conceded the election by late November, 1897,⁷ but had since lost considerable backing. Boxwell's rapid success in gathering the votes of his colleagues had been attributed in great part to the influence of the Hanna camp;⁸ the reversal of his fortunes might be indicative of the growing strength of the anti-Hanna combination. The first of January brought news of returning fortune for Boxwell; he held a meeting with the Cincinnati fusionists and told a reporter for Toledo's Republican daily that he had gained their support. Indeed, this paper was so

⁴Leader, December 16, 1897.

⁵Ibid., January 2, 1898. The Republican caucus was open.

⁶Blade, January 1, 1898.

⁷Enquirer, November 24, 1897.

⁸Ibid., January 1, 1898.

impressed that it proclaimed poetically that the ". . . sky has cleared today. . . ." and the chances of Mr. Boxwell have brightened considerably.⁹ Boxwell was not so sure of victory and on the very day of the encouraging reports he tried to see Kurtz and Harry Mason before the caucuses were held. He was denied an interview by both men.¹⁰ There would be no compromise.

The Republican House caucus was attended by fifty-two representatives. Ten were absent. Fifty-five were needed to organize the House and elect its officers. Boxwell was beaten and Hanna had lost the first round unless three votes could be gained in the few hours remaining before the Assembly opened its session.¹¹ Hanna had additional worries; Charles Droste, Frank Kemper, and Rufus Lane, Hamilton County fusionists, had attended the caucus but refused to commit themselves on his candidacy.¹²

The Republican Senate caucus was more faithfully attended: only one, Vernon Burke of Cuyahoga, among the

⁹Blade, January 1, 1898.

¹⁰Leader, January 2, 1898.

¹¹Ibid., January 2, 1898; Commercial Tribune, January 2, 1898; the Associated Press in the Plain Dealer, January 2, 1898. The first two papers listed those not attending the caucus as John E. Griffith of Union County, James Joyce of Guernsey County, John P. Jones of Stark County, James Manuel of Montgomery County, William A. Scott, Jr. of Fulton County, A. M. Griffith of Clinton County, D. O. Rutan of Carroll County, John C. Otis of Hamilton County (fusionist), Harry C. Mason and M. F. Bramley of Cuyahoga County. The AP did not include the two Cuyahoga men but they were not present.

¹²Leader, January 2, 1898, the Associated Press in the Plain Dealer, January 2, 1898.

regular Republicans had not been present. Senator Lewis Voight, the fusionist from Hamilton County who called himself an Independent Republican, had not participated either but was expected to support the caucus choice for President pro tem, J. Park Alexander.¹³ If he did and Burke remained regular the Republicans would have eighteen votes, the same as the Democrats, and would organize the Senate with the vote of Lieutenant Governor Asa Jones. There was considerable speculation concerning Senator Burke, however, as he was a friend and political supporter of Hanna's old enemy, Mayor McKisson of Cleveland.

Before the caucuses were held the Hanna camp announced that any absentees would be looked upon as having aligned themselves with the anti-Hanna combine.¹⁴ Following the caucuses the Hanna camp, in the person of Charles Dick, claimed, in spite of its earlier declaration, that six of those absent, James Manuel, John C. Otis, James Joyce, John P. Jones, William A. Scott, Jr., and another, unnamed, would vote for Hanna when the time came.¹⁵ The validity of the claim was debatable, but the significance of the caucuses was lost on no one; Hanna was in serious, perhaps insurmountable, difficulty.

¹³Commercial Tribune, January 2, 1898.

¹⁴Blade, January 1, 1898.

¹⁵Plain Dealer, January 2, 1898.

The anti-Hanna coalition of Democrats and Republican bolters agreed at the Democratic meeting to support Harry Mason of Cleveland for the Speakership,¹⁶ and if the situation did not change rapidly they could expect success.

Hanna's chief newspaper organ in the state announced that ". . . openly and aggressively, Republican opposition to Senator Hanna assumed organic factional form" at the caucuses.¹⁷ More explicitly, the Republican opposition had come out in the open to fight after several months of undercover work.

When the contending forces first began arriving in Columbus the center of activity was the Hanna headquarters in the Neil House. The lobbies were jammed and people milled about ". . . all day and far into the night."¹⁸ The Democrats and anti-Hanna Republicans were situated in the Great Southern and they were not troubled with the crowds and the noise, its lobby and halls being practically deserted.¹⁹ The difference in the atmosphere of the two headquarters remained unchanged until late on the evening of the party organizational caucuses, when the center of activity shifted from the Neil House to the Great Southern. The Hanna camp was no longer thronged with people, while at the rooms of

¹⁶Associated Press in the Leader, January 2, 1898.

¹⁷Ibid., January 2, 1898.

¹⁸Leader, December 31, 1897.

¹⁹Ibid., December 31, 1897.

the opposition the crowd overflowed into the halls and was ". . . hilarious over the result of the caucuses. . . ." ²⁰

January 3, 1898, witnessed the long-awaited opening of the seventy-third General Assembly of Ohio. Both houses convened on schedule at 10:00 A.M. In the Senate, Burke did not appear and the Democrats organized that body, electing Thaddeus E. Cromley to the office of President pro tem over Republican J. Park Alexander. The vote was eighteen to seventeen; Voight, the fusionist from Hamilton County lined up with the Republicans as predicted. ²¹ Burke finally arrived on January 2, ²² and was sworn in. The Republicans realized that Burke would bolt the party on organizational matters and made no effort to gain control of the Senate.

The opening of the House of Representatives was preceded by one of the most unusual parades Columbus had ever seen. The Democrats and the bolting Republicans marched in a body from the Great Southern to their seats in the chamber. ²³ The scene in the lower house was considerably more tumultuous

²⁰Ibid., January 3, 1898; Plain Dealer, January 3, 1898.

²¹The Journal of the Senate of the State of Ohio for the Regular Session of the Seventy-third General Assembly, Vol. XCIII, 1898, 4. A committee to make assignments to the regular committees of the Senate included Lewis Voight as one of the three Republicans. This may help explain his vote on the organization, ibid., 8.

²²Ibid., 13.

²³Leader, January 4, 1898; Blade, January 3, 1898; Commercial Tribune, January 4, 1898.

than in the Senate with the galleries filled and overflowing into the rotunda.²⁴

Soon after convening the House proceeded with the election of its officers. Philip M. Ashford of Columbiana County nominated Boxwell for Speaker for the Republicans.²⁵ For the opposition, John P. Jones of Stark County ". . . a big, tall, broad shouldered man of thirty-five years, with a heavy head of hair, a roughly cut face and the jaw of a fighter,"²⁶ nominated Mason of Cuyahoga.²⁷ It was customary for the candidates for Speaker to vote for their opponents, but when Boxwell answered to his name on the roll call he explained, "Mr. Chairman, the situation is peculiar, as I have no Democratic opponent, I vote for Boxwell,"²⁸ Mason still had enough to win; the count was fifty-six to fifty-three.²⁹ Included in the votes for Mason were those of all forty-seven Democratic members of the House and the nine Republicans who had bolted their party caucus.³⁰ A. M.

²⁴Leader, January 4, 1898.

²⁵Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio for the Regular Session of the Seventy-third General Assembly, Vol. XCIII, 1898, 4.

²⁶Leader, January 4, 1898.

²⁷House Journal, 4.

²⁸Commercial Tribune, January 4, 1898.

²⁹House Journal, 4.

³⁰Ibid., 4.

Griffith, who had been included in the list of those Republicans not at the caucus, voted for Boxwell. He had been absent due to illness, not to politics.

The anti-Hanna forces under the able leadership of Charles Kurtz had swept the round ". . . as quickly and smoothly as a Columbus hotel waiter pockets a tip."³¹ They had held their ranks intact during the caucuses and the organization of the legislature. They had only to hold the line and wait for the weak and opportunistic among the Hanna followers to jump on the band wagon. For the first time, however, the bolters were known and the Hanna camp could concentrate their efforts upon them.

The victory of the allies in the organization of the General Assembly made their superior leadership apparent to everyone. Charles Dick, who opened the Hanna headquarters on December 28, 1897, had been no match for Kurtz and his associates.³² Many Republicans were openly critical of Hanna's managers after they had lost the fight in the caucuses and the organization of the legislature,³³ and Dick who had ". . . taken too much for granted . . . [and] had declared everything was all right when everything was all wrong,"³⁴ came in for the brunt of the criticism. It is

³¹Leader, January 4, 1898.

³²Enquirer, December 31, 1897; Commercial Tribune, January 4, 1898.

³³Leader, January 4, 1898.

³⁴Blade, January 4, 1898.

true that the Hanna forces did not begin to make headway against the opposition until the Senator was himself on the field, yet it is difficult to see what could have been done until his enemies had exposed their strength.

After completing its preliminary business on Wednesday, January 5, the Assembly adjourned until the following Monday, January 10.³⁵ Many legislators, even those most distant from the capital, took the opportunity to go home for the long weekend. The Hanna forces immediately set about mobilizing the pro-Hanna elements among the "folks back home" to bring pressure to bear on the bolting Republicans.³⁶ This pressure, which continued to build up and make itself felt even after the legislators were safely back in Columbus, is one of the most significant factors of the contest.

One of the first to feel the pressure from home was John P. Jones of Stark County whose constituents had duly noted his vote for Mason for Speaker. Meetings were held in the principal towns of the county to select committees to voice the protest of the Republicans who had voted for him the preceding November.³⁷ Jones stood firm against the pressure and remained with the combine to the end.

³⁵Senate Journal, 23.

³⁶Leader, January 4, 1898.

³⁷Ibid, January 4, 1898.

Representative Henry H. Redkey (Republican) of Highland County was another to face the initial wave of protest. Redkey had attended the Republican caucus and had voted for the party's nominees for office in the House but rumor had hinted at a wavering in his convictions. When he was claimed by the coalition some of his constituents sought an interview with him and at its end, Redkey told reporters they could state ". . . that I am fully determined to vote for Senator Hanna and shall do so next Tuesday. I so announced myself today and will not reconsider the matter as it has been fully settled in my mind."³⁸

Cleveland, the home of many of the leaders of both factions, had never seen ". . . so much excitement, indignation, and wrath manifested on the streets . . . over a political affair as there was yesterday among business men and the better class of Republicans at the perfidy of the Bushnell-Kurtz-McKisson crowd of political traitors...."³⁹ The better classes, of course, included anyone supporting Hanna while those who favored the opposition, including most of the city's civil servants, were lumped together as being among the less desirable elements of the city. The protests ranged from threatening telegrams sent by that "better class" of Republicans⁴⁰ to a huge petition signed by thousands

³⁸Plain Dealer, January 7, 1898.

³⁹Leader, January 4, 1898.

⁴⁰Reprint of the telegram sent to Governor Bushnell in ibid., January 4, 1898.

of all classes. The petition stated that "Your party kept faith with you; it demands that you shall be true to all of its loyal members."⁴¹ Intended for the bolting members of the Cuyahoga legislative delegation, it proved immensely popular, and was signed by three thousand persons the first day it was circulated.⁴² One of the most important clubs in Cleveland was the Tippecanoe Club. Its members included most of the prominent Republican businessmen and politicians of the area. It took steps to expel Mason, Burke, and Bramley for their anti-Hanna activities, thus threatening them with social as well as political ostracism.⁴³

The mood of protest gained currency in the state. Speeches were made, petitions signed, mass meetings attended, and other demonstrative expressions of protest used in every county, all intended to help Hanna win election to the United States Senate. In Ashtabula three hundred people gathered to hear speeches denouncing Bushnell, Foraker, and the other members of the anti-Hanna forces and to adopt resolutions of endorsement for Hanna.⁴⁴ Citizens of Defiance telegraphed a warning to Bushnell that the Senatorship, when bought at the ". . . price of betrayal of party, surrender of

⁴¹Petition of protest from citizens of Cleveland quoted in ibid., January 5, 1898.

⁴²Plain Dealer, January 5, 1898.

⁴³Leader, January 4, 1898.

⁴⁴Ibid., January 5, 1898.

principle, and stultification of personal honor, . . . becomes a burning shame and a badge of disgrace, whose only parallel in American history is Benedict Arnold's commission in the British army.⁴⁵ The analogy may have been a little strained but the sentiments represented accurately the fury of many of the state's Republicans. In Youngstown and Piqua letters signed by hundreds were sent to Columbus protesting the action of the bolting Republicans.⁴⁶ Partisans in Caldwell, Cleveland, Columbus, and other cities adopted the peculiar practice of turning all pictures of Governor Bushnell toward the wall.⁴⁷

More spectacular and probably more effective were the groups who came to Columbus. Two hundred came from Zanesville; Canton Republicans chartered a train; businessmen in Cleveland, and Republican clubs from other cities, made arrangements to go to the capital to add their protest, in person, to those already received.⁴⁸

Republicans in Tiffin, Shelby, Napoleon, Bucyrus, Ironton and Mt. Vernon joined the growing movement. The faithful in Warren, Marietta, and Lorain added to the chorus of indignation and were joined by the day of the legislature

⁴⁵Ibid., January 4, 1898.

⁴⁶Ibid., January 4, 1898.

⁴⁷Ibid., January 4, and 5, 1898.

⁴⁸Ibid., January 5, 1898.

was to elect a senator, by delegations from most of the towns and cities of Ohio.⁴⁹

There was some favorable news from the fusionists even in the midst of the pro-Hanna outpouring. Kurtz in his headquarters in the Great Southern received a great deal of mail and one reporter who examined it claimed that it revealed the protest movement to be only a surface phenomenon. Many of the correspondents indicated that they had been forced to associate themselves with the protest because of social, business, and political pressure.⁵⁰ Generally the Democrats admitted the scope of the movement while pointing out that its size was not so great as often reported, as in Newark and Springfield.⁵¹

January 10 was inauguration day and Columbus had expected crowds but nothing like the throngs that came. Added to those attracted by the inaugural were many hundreds who had come to attend a big protest meeting called by the Republican State Executive Committee for the afternoon of the same day.⁵² They began arriving on excursion trains early in the morning and soon the city found itself with ". . .

⁴⁹Blade, January 4, 1898; Leader, January 6, 1898; Plain Dealer, January 4, 1898.

⁵⁰Franklin Hall in ibid., January 6, 1898.

⁵¹Ibid., January 4, 1898.

⁵²Leader, January 7, 1898.

crowds and . . . excitement [that] surpass any of the usual convention scenes."⁵³

The inaugural ceremonies in honor of Governor Bushnell served to highlight one of the curious aspects of the contest, the great indignation that had centered on Bushnell for his part in the combine. Many of the groups that had been scheduled to participate in the parade or some other of the festivities of the day, withdrew after his activities against Hanna became known. It took the Buckeye Republican Club of Columbus only four minutes to dismiss the committee arranging for its participation, to turn the Governor's picture to the wall, and to adjourn.⁵⁴ A Toledo firm when asked to contribute to the success of the inaugural replied, "Not a pie, not a cake, not a pickle for the honor of Bushnell."⁵⁵

The reason so much of the indignation centered on Bushnell was probably because he was the only elected official representing the the entire state, who was involved with the anti-Hanna coalition. People knew him who were not familiar with Bramley, Mason, and Kurtz. There were other reasons as well. Bushnell had appointed Hanna to the Senate, and had campaigned with him in the election of the preceding

⁵³Ibid., January 11, 1898.

⁵⁴Ibid., January 5, 1898.

⁵⁵Blade, January 1, 1898.

fall. The Governor had had ample opportunity to oppose Hanna on principle at the Republican state convention in June but had not done so, in fact, Bushnell had indorsed Hanna's candidacy at a meeting in Springfield calling for the election of a Republican legislature so that ". . . Senator Hanna might be returned to his present position."⁵⁶ It was this obvious policy of expediency that made Bushnell so unpopular.

The inaugural ceremonies began at noon on the tenth with the oath of office administered in the rotunda of the capitol which was gaily decorated for the occasion with "every recess . . . a bank of greenness and every arch . . . a bower of evergreen."⁵⁷ The crowd which had gathered for the event was limited only by the available space. It packed the main floor and was backed up on the stairs.⁵⁸ In this scene and flanked by ". . . large bouquets of American Beauties. . .,"⁵⁹ Asa Bushnell was inaugurated as Governor of Ohio for the second time.

The governor retired to the reviewing stand after taking the oath of office and watched the parade of military units and Republican clubs led by grand marshal George D.

⁵⁶Leader, October 1, 1897.

⁵⁷Plain Dealer, January 11, 1898.

⁵⁸Bee, January 10, 1898, Leader, January 11, 1898.

⁵⁹Plain Dealer, January 11, 1898.

Freeman.⁶⁰ In the evening the governor was host at the customary reception but so few attended that it took only nineteen minutes to receive the guests.⁶¹ The inaugural ceremonies had been a big disappointment. Everything had gone according to custom but much of the normal enthusiasm was lacking, and the size of the crowds was dwarfed by those participating in the Hanna mass meeting.

At three o'clock on the afternoon of inauguration day eight thousand people crowded or tried to crowd into the Columbus Auditorium for the Hanna mass meeting called only four days earlier by the Republican State Executive Committee.⁶² The Republican press was jubilant over the enthusiastic response and went back to the revolution for what it felt were suitable comparison for so significant a meeting:

The minute men who left their fields and shops to meet the red-coated enemy at Lexington and Concord were not more in earnest than were the men who, hurrying to Columbus from every direction, assembled this afternoon to uphold Republican honor, the rights of the majority, and the law of their party.

No such meeting was ever held heretofore. Excepting the Declaration of Independence it was, perhaps, the most solemn and the most mighty protest in all of our history.⁶³

⁶⁰Leader, January 11, 1898.

⁶¹Ibid., January 11, 1898, Of 250 prominent Columbus-ites invited only 25 accepted, Commercial Tribune, January 11, 1898.

⁶²Leader, January 7 and 11, 1898.

⁶³Ibid., January 11, 1898.

The meeting, opened by the State Chairman, George K. Nash, was a rousing demonstration of party regularity and confidence in Mark Hanna. Patriotic songs and a prayer by the Rev. Dr. Kelly of the Broad Street Methodist Church asking that ". . . no combination against the will of the people might succeed,"⁶⁴ set the tone that was maintained by the gathering throughout.

The rally was a success but those it was intended most to impress, the wavering among the bolting legislators, were safely sheltered from its effects. They were being ". . . closely and liberally entertained. . . ,"⁶⁵ by the Democrats and the more resolute among their own ranks.

Following their defeat in the organization of the General Assembly the Hanna forces decided not to hold a joint senatorial caucus. There had been one in 1895 when Foraker was the party's choice, and since Hanna had the endorsements of the state convention and of the Republicans in eighty-four of Ohio's eighty-eight counties, and had been the chief issue in the November election, which was carried by the Republicans, they could state with some justification that to hold one would be superfluous.⁶⁶ The decision might also have been influenced by a desire not to further weaken their hold on wavering Hanna men by disclosing their strength,

⁶⁴Ibid., January 11, 1898.

⁶⁵Associated Press in ibid., January 11, 1898.

⁶⁶Plain Dealer, January 5, 1898; Commercial Tribune, January 5, 1898.

which was certainly less than the seventy-three votes necessary to elect a senator.

Hard on the heels of the announcement not to hold the senatorial caucus came a report that Congressman Charles Grosvenor, one of Hanna's political friends, was going to Washington to confer with President McKinley on the selection of a new candidate.⁶⁷ The reasons assigned for the trip must have been wrong for McKinley indicated his intention to stand by his manager. In a letter to Hanna he stated:

I cannot tell you how much I feel for you under the great strain you are subjected to. I hope you will not lose your courage.

If ever a man won his election you did, and if ever a man deserved the support of a united party in his state you are that man. I feel more than I can write, I will not trust myself further.⁶⁸

Reports that the Democratic ranks were split were little solace to Hanna, for even with the President's sympathy he was still short of the votes needed for election. Even his most partisan supporters admitted shortly after the defeat over organization that "Mr. Hanna cannot be elected unless he can gain at least three more votes than are pledged to him at this time."⁷⁰

⁶⁷Plain Dealer, January 5, 1898.

⁶⁸McKinley to Hanna, January 7, 1898. Charles Dick Papers, Ohio State Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.

⁶⁹Leader, January 6, 1898.

⁷⁰Ibid., January 5, 1898.

The Hanna forces worked frantically to secure the votes they so badly needed. The pressure of public opinion that had begun in the home counties of the legislators continued, and a variety of other techniques were employed as well. The claim that a legislator was opposing Hanna in violation of his pledge served both as an appeal to the conscience of the individual so accused and as a play for the support of the people of Ohio. The validity of these charges varied but in many appears to be a matter of interpretation rather than concrete fact.

John P. Jones, who represented Stark County in the House, had been a member of the resolutions committee at the county convention and had signed the resolutions that included one endorsing Hanna.⁷¹ There would appear to be no doubt of the duplicity of Mr. Jones, but the same charges of lack of faith were hurled at W. A. Scott Jr. of Fulton County who merely made the mistake of being nominated at a county convention that endorsed Hanna.⁷² The case of the bolting legislators from Hanna's own county creates a more confusing picture. According to one of the Hanna leaders, writing several years after the event, they were not ". . . pledged to vote. . ." for the Senator. He contended that the confusion lay in the fact that the county convention that

⁷¹Ibid., January 5, 1898.

⁷²Ibid., January 2, 1898.

that chose the delegates to the state convention and instructed them to vote for Hanna met immediately following the nomination of the legislators.⁷³ A contemporary report, however, told of Burke and Mason both pledging to ". . . Mark Hanna their loyal and undivided support."⁷⁴ It would appear on the surface that the men were not involved officially but by their own voluntary statements of support. Both Burke and Mason denied ever having pledged themselves to Hanna.

Charges of bribery were hurled back and forth between the contending factions. The case of John C. Otis, one of the Cincinnati fusionists, attracted the most attention but there were other instances.⁷⁵ Representatives of the Hanna camp claimed to have a stenographic record of an attempt by two ". . . prominent members. . ." of the combine to bribe a legislator.⁷⁷ The validity of this report is doubtful for not even when the investigating committee was in session did they identify those alleged to have offered the bribe.

⁷³Myers to Rhodes, October 15, 1912, in "The Correspondence of George A. Myers and James Ford Rhodes, 1910-1923," ed. by John A. Garraty, The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly, Vol. LXIV, January, 1955, 27.

⁷⁴Plain Dealer, June 20, 1897.

⁷⁵These charges and the resulting investigation will be discussed in the following chapter.

⁷⁶Associated Press in the Leader, January 11, 1898.

⁷⁷Murat Halstead in ibid., January 17, 1898; Commercial Tribune, January 10, 1898; Plain Dealer, January 12, 1898.

The correspondence of George A. Myers, Hanna's barber and sometime political agent, and the historian James Ford Rhodes, tends to confirm charges of illicit dealings on the part of the Hanna managers and perhaps of Hanna himself. Early in the correspondence Myers explained that there was a great deal he could tell of the contest but he felt that it should not be committed to letters. Despite this he reveals a great deal of ethically questionable activity. He admits that a great deal of money was spent,⁷⁸ that he paid Representative Clifford of Cuyahoga to remain true to Hanna,⁷⁹ and that ". . . because I loved him [Hanna] I put my head in the door of the Ohio Penitentiary to make him U.S. Senator, . . ." ⁸⁰

The anti-Hanna Republicans were being subjected to great and varied pressures, and on January 7 it proved to be too great for Charles Manuel. He had voted with the opposition in the organization of the House, but he now announced at a public meeting that ". . . if alive, I will vote first, last, and all the time . . ." for Mark Hanna.⁸¹ According

⁷⁸Myers to Rhodes, April 10, 1922, in "Myers Correspondence," 395.

⁷⁹Myers to Rhodes, September 20, 1920, in "Myers Correspondence," 377.

⁸⁰Myers to Rhodes, April 30, 1920, in "Myers Correspondence," 285.

⁸¹Manuel quoted in the Leader, January 8, 1898.

to one report Manuel had been won over at a meeting with Hanna arranged by Captain Joe Dowling, a Brice Democrat.⁸² No wonder there was ". . . a noticeable gloom about the Kurtz headquarters. . . ." ⁸³ This was the first real break in the ranks of the combine and it was arranged by a faction of the Democratic party.

John E. Griffith of Union County was another of the bolters who found it impossible to long resist the blandishments of the Hanna camp. The day following Manuel's return to the fold Griffith joined him.⁸⁴ How long he would remain committed to the Senator was something no one could say with any degree of certainty. From the beginning of the contest Griffith seemed to align himself with the group that had talked to him last. Fearing he might waver, some of his constituents came to Columbus and urged him to respect the pledge of the Union County convention and vote for Hanna. He readily agreed to their wishes.⁸⁵ The Democratic press then broke a story about a meeting Griffith had had with the Hanna forces on the night of January 2. This meeting, where every effort was made to secure his vote, ran into the small

⁸²Plain Dealer, January 8, 1898. Former Senator Calvin Brice was a leader of the gold Democrats.

⁸³Ibid., January 8, 1898.

⁸⁴Ibid., January 9, 1898.

⁸⁵Ibid., January 6, 1898.

hours of the morning and, for some reason never made clear, it was decided to send for Griffith's wife. She arrived at the meeting which was being held in room 15 of the Neil House in the company of several of Hanna's managers, but Mrs. Griffith and her escorts had been followed by suspicious members of the combine and they quickly broke up the meeting.⁸⁶ The stories in the Democratic press then explained that the Hanna forces had been insulting to Mrs. Griffith, and Griffith issued a statement explaining that despite his previous pledge to Hanna, he would ". . . since learning the particulars of the indignities heaped upon my wife. . . ." not be able to vote for him without being ". . . untrue to my manhood. . . ."⁸⁷ George M. McPeck, a close friend of Griffith's who was present at the meeting denied that Mrs. Griffith had been treated in any but a courteous manner.⁸⁸ Griffith with this convenient opening changed his mind again and followed Manuel back into the Hanna camp, as earlier recorded.⁸⁹

⁸⁶Leader, January 6, 1898; Bee, January 3, 1898. For a slightly different report of the meeting see the Commercial Tribune, January 4, 1898.

⁸⁷Leader, January 6, 1898.

⁸⁸Ibid., January 6, 1898.

⁸⁹Plain Dealer, January 9, 1898. Griffith exonerated Hanna's managers of any ". . . intentional indignities. . . ." toward his wife but leveled the charges at members of the combine.

The situation was still very much in doubt during the last days before the legislature was scheduled to ballot. Both sides claimed victory but there was a greater willingness to back words with action on the part of Hanna backers. The Neil House safe contained considerable amounts of money placed there by the Senator's backers to cover bets on the outcome of the contest but there were no takers.⁹⁰

The speculation would soon end for on January 11 the legislature would begin balloting for senator. Governor Bushnell had earlier sent his message to the General Assembly announcing the vacancy:

I have the honor to inform you that there is a vacancy in the office of United States Senator for the term ending March 4, 1899, occasioned by the resignation of the Hon. John Sherman from said office on March 4, 1897.

On March 5, 1897, I made temporary appointment of the Hon. Marcus A. Hanna until the meeting of the Legislature; it now devolved on your Honorable Body to fill said vacancy.⁹¹

Rumors concerning the coalition for Senator were rife in Columbus in the weeks before the legislature voted. Most commonly mentioned was Bushnell who admitted to being ". . . a candidate . . . in the receptive sense."⁹² As early as November 9, 1897, only a few days after the election,

⁹⁰Associated Press in the Leader, January 10, 1898; Associated Press in the Plain Dealer, January 9, 1898. They offered bets of from \$500 to \$5000 on Hanna. Congressman Grosvenor was reported to be seeking a \$500 bet.

⁹¹Senate Journal, 23; House Journal, 31.

⁹²Bushnell quoted in the Leader, January 31, 1898.

C. V. Harris, the Secretary of the Democratic State Central Committee, indicated a willingness on the part of his party to vote for the Governor,⁹³ but Bushnell lost out in the days before the climax of the fight. The protest activities of the Hanna element had centered on him and destroyed any appeal he may have had for the lukewarm legislators.

The anti-Hanna allies, in a move that surprised almost everyone, selected Mayor Robert McKisson of Cleveland to oppose Hanna for the Senate.⁹⁴ McKisson had earlier denied that he was a candidate and upon his departure for Columbus late in December the Hanna organ in Cleveland had noted that he was going to ". . . fight for the election of Senator Hanna . . ." ⁹⁵ The Mayor was a last minute choice, not being offered the nomination until early in the morning of the day for the balloting.⁹⁶

In selecting a senator the procedure was for the two houses to ballot separately, and if a candidate secured a majority of the votes of each house he was declared elected. When no candidate won the support of both, it became necessary for the two to assemble in joint session and ballot

⁹³Harris quoted in the Plain Dealer, November 8, 1897.

⁹⁴Leader, January 12, 1898.

⁹⁵Ibid., December 31, 1897.

⁹⁶Ibid., January 12, 1898.

until some candidate did secure a majority of the combined membership.

At 10:00 A.M. January 11, the Senate met and listened to James Garfield announce that the Senate-House conferees charged with setting the time for the vote for United States Senator had agreed upon 11 o'clock that morning and that the short or unexpired term should be the first voted upon. It then adjourned to await the appointed time.⁹⁷

As the members reassembled Senators Burke and Voight were the most often pointed out, their votes being the only two even remotely in doubt. Both men seemed aware of the attention they commanded. Burke, sitting nervously at his desk, chewed on the end of a cigar and ". . . ever and anon in a perplexed way would pass his hand over his brow."⁹⁸ Voight, the Cincinnati fusionist who had recently decided in favor of Hanna, gave evidence of tension in a different but no less obvious way. He sat at his desk ". . . with folded arms . . ., aloof from his fellows."⁹⁹

Lieutenant Governor Asa Jones called the Senate to order a few minutes early, and exactly at eleven Senator John

⁹⁷Senate Journal, 26.

⁹⁸Plain Dealer, January 12, 1898.

⁹⁹Ibid., January 12, 1898.

J. Sullivan, as he had done for Foraker two years before, placed in nomination,¹⁰⁰

. . . the superb, the brainy, the big-hearted, great-souled . . . the greatest Napoleon of the empire of politics, the Captain of the great triumphant army of the Republicanism of 1896, Hon. Marcus A. Hanna, of Ohio.¹⁰¹

In addition to the glowing tribute to Hanna, Sullivan called the election ". . . the most significant legislative battle of the age," and urged the faithful to rally to the cause and do their duty which was simply to ". . . record and confirm the will and mandate of the Republican party. . . ." by electing their great leader.¹⁰²

Burke followed, nominating that ". . . fearless defender of the rights of the common people, that consistent and loyal Republican, Honorable Robert E. McKisson. . . ." ¹⁰³ Burke said that ". . . against his manly character and unselfish devotion to the common people from which he sprung [sic] no word of censure can be uttered, save and except that he is poor. . . ." and that if the

. . . immortal Lincoln was in this chamber he would cast his vote with the struggling

¹⁰⁰Commercial Tribune and Leader, January 12, 1898; Senate Journal, 30.

¹⁰¹Transcript of Sullivan's speech in the Appendix of the Senate Journal, A79-A80.

¹⁰²Transcript of Sullivan's speech in ibid., A78.

¹⁰³Transcript of Burke's speech in ibid., A78.

masses today. Were that peerless statesman, that lover of the common people . . . James A. Garfield . . . here, the promptings of a human heart would lead him on to duty, and he would cast his vote with the common people today.¹⁰⁴

During the speeches there had been a remarkable stillness broken only by the start of the voting for the short term.¹⁰⁵ Burke joined with the eighteen Democrats in voting for Mayor McKisson giving him a total of nineteen, two above Hanna's seventeen.¹⁰⁶ The vote for the full term followed and the result was identical: the allies had swept to victory as easily as they had when they organized the Senate eight days before.

In the House the situation was more confused. The candidacy of Jephtha Garrard had been favorably received by some of his fellow Cincinnatians and there was considerable speculation that he would get the votes of Otis and Droste, both Cincinnati fusionists.¹⁰⁷ There were also reports that Droste had decided Garrard's was a forelorn hope and had agreed to support Hanna if his vote would bring him victory.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ Transcript of Burke's speech in ibid., A77-A78.

¹⁰⁵ Leader, January 12, 1898.

¹⁰⁶ Senate Journal, 30.

¹⁰⁷ Commercial Tribune, January 2, 1898; Plain Dealer, January 11, 1898.

¹⁰⁸ Leader, January 12, 1898.

As the House was preparing for the balloting John T. Kenney, a Democrat, rose to a question of privilege and after commenting on the reported attempt to bribe Otis moved that a committee be appointed to investigate. The Democrats then moved to suspend the rules so the resolution might be considered at once but on a strict party line vote the proposal was beaten 56 to 52.¹⁰⁹ The vote revealed a change in the alignment of the House, a change favorable to Hanna.

Charles A. Leland of Noble County nominated Hanna in a ". . . dignified manner," and T. R. Smith of Delaware County followed with a seconding speech that pointed to the ". . . treachery in the party in strong terms."¹¹⁰ M. F. Bramley nominated McKisson and was greeted with hisses and calls of "traitor."¹¹¹ The vote for the short term was 56 for Hanna, 49 for McKisson, and three scattered.¹¹² The others receiving votes were Aquila Wiley, a member of the legislature; John J. Lentz, Democratic Congressman from Columbus;¹¹³

¹⁰⁹House Journal, 35.

¹¹⁰Leader, January 12, 1898; House Journal, 36. The nominating speeches were not printed in the Journal.

¹¹¹Leader, January 12, 1898; House Journal, 36.

¹¹²Ibid., 36. The three who scattered their votes were Andrew J. Hazlett, Charles R. Hess, and Aquila Wiley, all Democrats. One hundred and eight votes were cast out of a membership of 109, S. W. Cramer being because of illness.

¹¹³William Alexander Taylor, Centennial History of Columbus and Franklin County, Ohio, 2 vols. (Columbus: S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1909), II, 357-358.

and A. J. Warner, who had worked with James Baird Weaver and "Silver" Dick Bland to bring about the fusion of all the pro-silver forces in 1896.¹¹⁴

The vote for the full term produced the same results and gave Hanna a total vote in the two houses of 73, the minimum necessary for election. He had all the Republicans except Burke in the Senate, and John P. Jones, M. F. Bramley, Harry Mason, D. O. Rutan, and William A. Scott Jr. in the House, having won back James Manuel, James Joyce, and John E. Griffith of the original bolters.¹¹⁵ In addition he had the support of all the Cincinnati fusionists except Otis. If he could hold his lines intact one more day he would be elected to succeed himself to the Senate and it seemed likely that he could.

The balloting in the House had been noisy with the galleries voicing their feelings with cheers and hisses in such a fashion that the legislators could barely be heard as they cast their votes.¹¹⁶ They too felt deeply and when Hanna received a majority his supporters broke into song.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴Fred Emory Hayes, James Baird Weaver (Iowa City: The State Historical Society of Iowa), 1919, 365-366.

¹¹⁵Plain Dealer, January 10, 1898; Leader, January 12, 1898.

¹¹⁶Plain Dealer, January 12, 1898.

¹¹⁷Commercial Tribune, January 12, 1898.

The Hanna men in the Senate reacted to the news of the House vote in much the same way:

Like a spark of electricity the grave and dignified senators were on top of the desks shouting, some almost crying in happiness. Several were hugging each other. Hats and papers, books and umbrellas, everything were cast in the air and it resembled more an old fashioned camp meeting than the senate chamber of a great state.¹¹⁸

So demonstrative were the Republicans that when one yelled, "Down with the traitor!" Burke moved over to the Democratic side of the aisle.¹¹⁹

The demonstration was not limited to the legislative halls. It surged out of the State House and across High Street almost before the balloting was announced, and rolled on into the Neil House. A crowd soon filled the lobby and shouts of "'Thank God, the right will prevail; Praise God from whom all blessings flow; Glory Hallelajah,' and kindred expressions filled the air. . . ." ending in choral singing.¹²⁰

The Republican press on the eve of the joint session claimed that only kidnapping or killing of members of the legislature could prevent Hanna's election and ". . . the former is impracticable, the latter positively sinful. . . ."¹²¹

¹¹⁸Plain Dealer, January 12, 1898.

¹¹⁹Ibid., January 11, 1898.

¹²⁰Blade, January 11, 1898.

¹²¹Commercial Tribune, January 12, 1898.

The next day when Lieutenant Governor Jones called the joint session to order all thirty-six Senators and 108 of the 109 Representatives were present. Only Cramer, who was still ill, was absent.¹²²

Hanna was placed in nomination by Senator Garfield who confidently proclaimed that it ". . . now remains for us but record the verdict of our constituents."¹²³ Vernon Burke again presented the name of Mayor McKisson and then the vote was taken. Hanna received 73 of the 144 votes cast, McKisson 70, and Lentz one. The vote for the long term was the same and Jones declared Hanna to be elected.¹²⁴

The announcement of Hanna's election was the signal for ". . . hats, handkerchiefs, umbrellas, and newspapers. . . ." to be thrown in the air and for the crowd to burst into prolonged applause.¹²⁵ The Tippecanoe Club of Cleveland broke into its yell:

'Hi-Hi-Hi-O-Hi-Ø, Tippecanoe
and Hanna, too, Cleveland, O-H-I-O.¹²⁶

¹²²Senate Journal, 33.

¹²³Transcript of Garfield's speech in ibid., A82.

¹²⁴Ibid., 34; House Journal, 40-41. Wiley was still voting for Lentz but Haslett who had voted for Wiley and Hess who had voted for Warner cast their votes for McKisson. Commercial Tribune, January 13, 1898. When Foraker was elected in 1896 he received 116 votes to 27 for Calvin S. Brice with five votes scattered. Taylor, Ohio in Congress, 117.

¹²⁵Leader, January 13, 1898; Blade, January 12, 1898. It is doubtful if many of the Senators remembered, in the excitement, that they had accepted the invitation of Ohio State University President, James H. Canfield, to attend the dedication ceremonies for the new Townshend Hall on this afternoon, Senate Journal, 29.

¹²⁶Myers to Rhodes, October 15, 1912, Myers Correspondence," 16.

Shortly after the results of the election were known W. J. Crawford waved a white handkerchief from the steps of the State House. For Hanna, waiting in a room in the Neil House overlooking those steps, it was a signal of triumph and relief. The handkerchief indicated the long fight had ended successfully.

A committee was appointed to notify Hanna formally of his victory and to escort him to the House Chamber.¹²⁷ He was greeted with great enthusiasm and introduced by the Lieutenant Governor as a ". . . man that comes from the people and I trust belongs to the people . . . and like the Republican party stands by the common people."¹²⁸ The newly elected Senator acknowledged the applause and told the legislators:

I thank you with a grateful heart for the distinguished honor which you have just conferred upon me. . . . I come to accept this high honor, recognizing that when I assume my duties in the United States Senate that I am the Senator for the whole people of Ohio.¹²⁹

Later in the day Hanna in a less expansive mood spoke out against "traitors." "I have," he said, "no desire to put any indignity upon any man, but I have a desire to visit upon every man the fruits of his own sins when he

¹²⁷Leader, January 13, 1898.

¹²⁸Blade, January 13, 1898.

¹²⁹House Journal, 42.

sins against our party."¹³⁰ Bushnell, perhaps cowed by Hanna's vigorous statement, announced that though it was true he had been asked to be a candidate he had declined, even going so far as to tell those urging him to that if he was elected he would not accept.¹³¹ It is doubtful whether many believed the Governor but he had little political courage and probably hoped that this would appease his victorious foes. McKisson who had recognized that to lose the fight meant political death maintained his defiance.¹³² He told reporters that ". . . we gave Uncle Mark the fight of his life . . . we had him on the rack for two weeks. I'll bet, he didn't sleep for ten days."¹³³

In Cleveland, Hanna's supporters were hurriedly planning for his triumphant return. One of them unable to control himself any longer, pasted several pictures of McKisson on a football and kicked it up Superior Street until he reached the public park where it was promptly utilized for a hectic game.¹³⁴

Hanna got a warm and enthusiastic welcome when he arrived in his home town. His train pulled into the Erie

¹³⁰Bee, January 13, 1898.

¹³¹Bushnell quoted in the Leader, January 14, 1898.

¹³²McKisson quoted in ibid., January 6, 1898.

¹³³Ibid., January 14, 1898.

¹³⁴Leader, January 13, 1898.

station at 12:45 P.M. on January 13, and large crowds were there to meet him. They formed a parade led by the Great Western Band and including well over a thousand men from various clubs in the area. When they arrived at the Hollenden Hotel, Hanna made a short speech and received the crowd of well wishers with an estimated six thousand handshakes.¹³⁵ He caught the spirit of the crowd and in his speech told them that "this home-coming is sweeter to me than any honors that have ever been conferred upon me."¹³⁶

The election had been a hard fought, exciting affair and Columbus had witnessed some spectacular maneuvering. The participants had furnished the press with fresh stories every day.

The trouble and expense the press was put to in presenting fresh and first-hand to its readers and story of that remarkable fight was very profitably invested. Nothing like it, speaking conservatively, had ever before been accomplished in this country. The charm of novelty was upon it for even the oldest and most hardened political 'sensation springer' of them all. For once it was unnecessary to draw upon the imagination. The facts had to be toned down, rather than colored up, in order to be made more acceptable for publication.¹³⁷

When the Republicans won a majority of the seats in the legislature in November 1897, the election of their

¹³⁵Ibid., January 14, 1898.

¹³⁶Hanna quoted in the Blade, January 13, 1898.

¹³⁷Kenny, "The Legislature that Elected Mr. Hanna," 311-326.

senatorial candidate, Mark Hanna, appeared certain. Formidable opposition developed among some of the dissatisfied elements of the party during the six weeks before the opening of the legislature but it was not until they effected an alliance with the Democrats that Hanna was faced with a very serious challenge. Just how serious this was may be seen clearly in the ease with which the coalition organized both houses of the legislature. On January 3, they had a total vote of 73 or enough to elect the candidate of their choice. This was the high point in the fortunes of the opposition struggling to bring about Hanna's defeat. Hanna, who had arrived on the scene too late to have an effect on the legislative organization, took over the direction of his forces and they immediately began to gain strength. The force of public opinion, mobilized by Hanna headquarters, had a great effect on the irresolute among the Senator's supporters and those who had strayed to the ranks of the enemy. That money was spent freely by Hanna's managers is certain, and that some of it was used to buy votes is a possibility, but even if it was used only in the most ethical manner it had an effect on the outcome favorable to Hanna.

The cabal was, however, not free from error. At least two of its moves were mistakes and they were perhaps serious enough in themselves to cost it the election. By contesting the organization of the legislature they disclosed

not only their total strength but also, by exposing the identities of the bolters, allowed the Hanna forces to concentrate their efforts upon them. Even more serious was the failure to make Garrard the opposition candidate for the short senate term. His bimetallic views would have served as an ideological attraction for silver Republicans, made him a much more attractive candidate to the Democrats than any regular Republican, and appealed to the Cincinnati fusionists who were sympathetic to his candidacy.¹³⁸ Without him all the fusionists but one were lost and without them the election was lost.

¹³⁸McKission stated after his defeat that such a plan had been impossible because none of the Republican members of the combine would vote for a silver man. Quoted in the Leader, January 14, 1898.

CHAPTER VI

BRIBERY CHARGES

Hanna's election to the Senate did not end the contest so far as the coalition opposing him was concerned. Even before the legislature had reached its decision about the new Senator, Representative Otis revealed that an attempt had been made to buy his vote. Quickly Hanna's opponents seized the opportunity to initiate an investigation of the conduct of his senatorial canvass. Hanna had won the contest and was in the Senate, but the genuineness of his title was not certain and he had to consider the prospect that the prize might be lost through disqualification.

The reports of the bribery incident indicated that Henry H. Boyce, a New Yorker, had offered Otis \$10,000 to vote for Hanna for the Senate.¹ The Republican press, fearful of the effect the charge might have on the outcome of the election, had declared the story a ". . . wretched fake . . . [and] a grotesque lie from first to last."² The story persisted and Otis made a formal statement confirming it, but

¹Bee, January 11, 1898; Commercial Tribune, January 11, 1898; Association Press in the Leader, January 11, 1898. The AP story is almost totally wrong.

²Leader, January 11, 1898.

again the Republican press attempted to discredit the charge and the accuser, calling it a ". . . bungling story prepared for him, . . ." ³ It was enough for Hanna's opponents, however, and they prepared to capitalize on the opportunity.

On the morning of January 12, before the Senate moved to the House chamber for the joint vote for senator, Vernon Burke introduced a resolution calling for the investigation of the Otis bribery charges. ⁴ The Republican presiding officer ruled the first attempts to discuss the resolution out of order but an appeal to the Senate by George S. Long was sustained by a vote of nineteen to seventeen, Burke as usual joining with the eighteen Democrats. ⁵ Debate continued but only long enough for the Republicans to secure the elimination from the resolution of what was to them a particularly offensive section. This section stated that ". . . this charge is sustained by documentary evidence of such a character as to be convincing to every unbiased mind and honest man." ⁶ Further debate was then postponed until after the election of a senator.

In the afternoon, following Hanna's election, the Senate returned to the consideration of the resolution. An

³Ibid., January 13, 1898.

⁴Senate Journal, 31-32.

⁵Ibid., 32-33.

⁶Ibid., 33.

amendment to extend the investigation to consider any attempts to influence the votes of members of the Senate was agreed to and the resolution as amended was adopted, twenty to six.⁷

The special committee set up by the Burke resolution to conduct an investigation into the charges of bribery surrounding the election of Mark Hanna was composed of three Democrats, C. D. Robertson, George S. Long, and W. E. Finck Jr.; anti-Hanna Republican and chairman, Vernon Burke; and regular Republican, James Garfield.⁸

A similar resolution had been introduced in the House, but as in the Senate, action was delayed until after the election of a senator and it was not until then that it passed.⁹ This committee sought to act in conjunction with the Senate committee but was told that, though its members could attend the meetings, they would be allowed to question witnesses only through the Senators. The House group accepted but this procedure prevented any effective action on its part.¹⁰

⁷Ibid., 35.

⁸Leader, January 13, 1898.

⁹House Journal, 35, 43-44.

¹⁰Senate Report No. 1859, 55th Congress, 3d Session, 15. This report included not only the majority and minority reports of the United States Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections but also the majority and minority reports of the special committee of the Ohio Senate that investigated the charges and a transcript of the testimony taken by that committee.

Testimony before the committee may be divided into three main divisions: the testimony about the alleged bribe itself, about the telephonic and telegraphic communications between the briber and Hanna headquarters in Columbus, and about the meeting between the briber and one of the Hanna leaders.

The alleged briber, Henry Harrison Boyce, had left the country and so the committee was dependent upon the statement of Otis and his lawyer, Charles T. Campbell, for information about the actual bribe attempt.

Otis testified that Boyce first contacted him on Friday, January 7, 1898, calling him at his drugstore in Cincinnati from the Great Southern Hotel in Columbus. An interview was arranged for six o'clock that evening at the Gibson House in Cincinnati. According to Otis, Boyce told him, at their first meeting, that he represented J. P. Morgan, and was a friend of C. C. Shane, who was very close to the President, and that all of them were interested in seeing Hanna returned to the Senate.¹¹ The two men met twice the next day, January 8, and Boyce continued in much the same vein. Otis testified that Boyce told him that if he would vote for Hanna it would be profitable to him. At their second meeting on the eighth Otis informed Boyce that he ". . . didn't care to talk further about it, [his

¹¹Ibid., 136.

vote] but that if he would go with him to the Hotel Emery he would introduce him to Col. T.C. Campbell [his lawyer], and let him discuss the matter with him, . . ."12

They went to the Emery and met Campbell. Otis then left and all further negotiations were between Boyce and Campbell.

Campbell testified that Boyce represented himself as an agent of McKinley and C. C. Shane just as he had to Otis. Campbell told the committee that Boyce first offered \$2500 and that he refused the offer as being beneath the dignity of a member of the General Assembly. Campbell stated that Boyce then told him that it was a very good price since they had secured four other votes at an average of less than \$1500 apiece and a fifth for only \$600. At a later meeting, according to Campbell, Boyce raised the offer to \$1750 to be paid in Cincinnati, \$1750 to be paid when they went to Columbus, and \$6500 more to be paid if Hanna was elected.¹³

Campbell stated that he asked Boyce if he came from Hanna and that Boyce told him he did not.¹⁴ At the same

¹²Summary of testimony in the majority report of the Ohio Senate committee in the Senate Journal, A83-A84; Leader, January 29, 1898; Senate Report 1859, 136ff.

¹³Testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in ibid., 146-148; Leader, January 29, 1898.

¹⁴Ibid., January 29, 1898; testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in Senate Report 1859, 146.

time, Shane, in New York, denied having an interest in the Ohio senatorial contest and knowing Boyce other than as a customer in his store.¹⁵ Boyce was finally located in Canada and in response to the questions of a reporter stated that he was ". . . not protecting Mark Hanna, I am protecting someone in Washington. It is McKinley."¹⁶ Shane's statement was undoubtedly made in an effort to keep himself from becoming involved in the investigation, but if it was true, then Boyce's grandiose claims about the people he represented would have even less validity than they appeared to have.

The committee in its attempt to determine Boyce's connection with the Hanna headquarters, if any, felt that it must check on telephone and telegraph messages between Hanna headquarters in Columbus and Boyce's hotel in Cincinnati, the Gibson House. The first witness the committee called in this respect was Samuel Pentland, the manager of the Neil House, where Hanna's Columbus headquarters was located. Pentland refused to produce any of his records but did tell the committee that there was a long distance phone in room twenty-four and that Alexander Boxwell occupied it during the period of the senatorial fight.¹⁷ A more cooperative

¹⁵Leader, January 30, 1898.

¹⁶Report in the Chicago Chronicle Democrat reprinted in ibid., February 7, 1898.

¹⁷Commercial Tribune, January 19, 1898; Leader, January 19, 1898.

witness was F. P. Ross, the manager of the Central Union Telephone Company in Columbus. He told the committee that his company had installed a phone in room twenty-four on or about December 27, 1897, and that its number was 1092. Ross further told the committee that records were kept of calls at the company's central station showing the name of persons called and either the name or number of the phone on incoming calls, but that he would not produce these records without the authorization of his superiors.¹⁸

Ross could not get the permission of his company to produce the records and this was typical of the response the committee got from the various communications utilities. Shepherd M. Dunlap of Western Union's Columbus office, W. T. Truesdell of the Postal Telegraph's Columbus office, and Governor Calhoun, the District Superintendent AT&T all refused to produce records for the committee.¹⁹ Dunlap's reason was standard. He claimed that the committee's request for all the telegrams from or to Hanna, Dick, Harry Daugherty, and E. G. Rathbone for the period December 27 to January 12 was too indefinite a request. Senator Robertson asked him if it would be sufficient to call for a telegram

¹⁸Ibid., January 19, 1898; Commercial Tribune, January 19, 1898.

¹⁹Ibid., January 19, 1898; Leader, January 19, 1898; testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in Senate Report 1859, 26-27, 134.

on a specific date addressed to Hanna or one of the others. Dunlap replied that it was not, that ". . . you should say who the message is from and [state] the contents of the message" as well.²⁰ The committee thought that this was asking for a little too much and Robertson told him that ". . . if we had that information we would not be asking it from you."²¹ Dunlap remained firm in his intention not to turn over company records subpoenaed in such a general way.

C. E. Page, the head of Western Union's Cincinnati office, was asked to produce records of telegrams for January 9 and he agreed to do so, but the records were missing. Page had no idea what had happened to them. They had just disappeared.²² It was a different approach but it still had the same effect of denying records to the committee.

The only records the committee was able to secure were those given them by Horace Dunbar, the manager of the Gibson House. He had a bill for the use of the long distance phone at the hotel itemized for him by the phone company giving

²⁰Ibid., 24.

²¹Ibid., 24.

²²Ibid., 130-131. Page did finally produce some records showing several calls from 1092 to the Gibson and two from 1092 to Cincinnati's Union Savings Bank and Trust Company which, it was alleged, furnished the money used for the attempted bribe. Page also testified that Charles Dick paid all bills charged to 1092 beginning shortly after Boxwell who had been paying them was defeated in his race for the Speakership. Ibid., 168-173.

the users names.²³ Included in the bill were several calls from Boyce to Columbus.²⁴ Volney Elstin, Assistant Secretary of the City and Suburban Telephone Association, testified in regard to the bill Dunbar had turned over to the committee. He told the committee that his company kept records, and that the bill which included the name of the caller and the name of the person being called was typical of those his company sent out because it was the type of information normally recorded. He also testified as to the accuracy of the bill saying that it was correct as he had sent it.²⁵

It was not enough to establish that there had been calls between Boyce and Hanna's Columbus headquarters. As suggestive of association as they might be, something of the nature of the calls would have to be determined to give any real significance to them. There were, of course, no electronic recording devices, the best the committee could hope for was that part or all of the conversations had been overheard or listened to by a third party who would be willing to testify.

²³Leader, January 23, 1898, summary of testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in the majority report of that committee in Senate Journal, A86-A87.

²⁴Ibid., A86-A87.

²⁵Testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in Senate Report 1859, 77-78. Q. E. Elwell the clerk who made out the bill also testified to its accuracy. Ibid., 79.

The principal witness testifying about the content of the Boyce calls was Allen O. Myers Jr., the son of Allen O. Myers, the Democratic leader of the anti-Hanna coalition and a clerk at the Gibson.²⁶ Myers told the committee there were two phones for long distance calling in the Gibson: one in the lobby and another in the manager's private office. These phones were so connected that anyone listening on the lobby extension could hear the conversations of those using the phone in the office.²⁷ Myers further testified that he had heard parts of several calls between Boyce and Columbus, and in at least one instance had heard Boyce address a person in Columbus as "Major Dick."²⁸ Others at the hotel backed up Myers' statements. Most convincing among these was Hattie Jacobs, a stenographer whose office was in the Gibson. She told the committee that she had been employed by Dunbar, the hotel manager, to transcribe Boyce's conversations and she gave the committee her transcriptions which were based upon the notes she took during the calls.²⁹

²⁶Leader, January 23, 1898; Summary of the testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in the majority report of that committee in the Senate Journal, A84, A86-A87.

²⁷Ibid., A86-A87

²⁸Ibid., A84.

²⁹Leader, January 23, 1898; Testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in Senate Report 1859, 80.

The notes themselves had been destroyed ". . . in the regular course of business. . . ." however.³⁰

From those who heard the calls came the story of a discussion of \$10,000 for a Mr. O. to be brought to Cincinnati in some form by H.H. Hollenbeck of the Hanna headquarters.³¹

From the reconstruction of the phone calls given in the testimony of those who overheard the conversations and from the bills which gave the time of the calls and the person called, it appeared that there was some communication between the Hanna headquarters and Boyce. The validity of the statements made by those who listened to the conversations was in some instances doubtful but it would be difficult to maintain that all of those who testified were interested, self-seeking parties.³²

The other significant area of testimony concerned the activities of H. H. Hollenbeck. It was reported that in one of the calls between Boyce and Hanna headquarters in Columbus, Hollenbeck had been designated as the messenger to

³⁰Ibid., 80.

³¹Summary of testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in the majority report of that committee in the Senate Journal, A86-A87.

³²Leader, January 23, 1898. Among the others who testified concerning the phone calls were George Seeger, John Ryland, and Russell S. Pryor, all clerks at the Gibson, and T. H. Miller of the Miller Detective Agency.

deliver to Boyce the money necessary to bribe Otis. Whether for that reason or for one completely unrelated Hollenbeck did arrive in Cincinnati the day following the alleged conversation.³³ Two points about his trip were of interest to the case: did he make contact with Boyce and did he arrange for the money to be used in the bribery attempt?

Hollenbeck was followed during his stay in Cincinnati by operatives of the Miller Detective Agency. The agency had been retained by Jerry Bliss, one of the leaders of the anti-Hanna forces and the manager of Columbus' Great Southern Hotel.³⁴ One of the operatives, Charles Armstrong, testified that he followed Hollenbeck to the Union Savings Bank and Trust Company where he met Rudolph A. Koehler, the cashier, and the two proceeded to Vorheis, Miller & Company.³⁵ Albert B. Vorheis was the first vice president of the bank. Hollenbeck returned to his hotel, and then went again to the Union Savings Bank and was admitted through the back door, where he remained for about five minutes.³⁶

The meetings between Hollenbeck and the officials of the Union Savings Bank could be established by Armstrong's

³³Ibid., January 25, 1898.

³⁴Ibid., January 23, 1898.

³⁵Testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in Senate Report 1859, 121.

³⁶Ibid., 121-122; summary of the testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in the Senate Journal, A90.

testimony but the purpose of the conversations could be explained only by those who had participated. Hollenbeck had left the state, however, and the others refused to discuss the matter.³⁷ Vorheis, who was alleged to have had a meeting with Hollenbeck during the latter's visit to Cincinnati, would not be sworn, claiming that the committee had no jurisdiction in the matter. He did, however, answer the committee's questions on all other points. It was curious that he was willing to tell the committee of his acquaintance with all the others involved in the case, including Hanna and Dick, whom he knew, and Boyce whom he did not know.³⁸ Certainly if the committee's jurisdiction did not cover Hollenbeck it did not cover Hanna, Dick, or Boyce. Vorheis' willingness to talk of them cast doubt on his reason for refusing to talk of Hollenbeck.

The other officers of the bank also refused to be sworn but were willing to answer the committee's questions on all subjects other than Hollenbeck and his business with them. All of the bankers were emphatic that it was because of their belief that the committee did not have jurisdiction and not a fear of incriminating themselves that caused them not to testify under oath.³⁹ As in the case of Vorheis,

³⁷Ibid., A91; Leader, January 25, 1898; testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in Senate Report 1859, 108, 112.

³⁸Ibid., 108-111.

³⁹Ibid., 112-114; Leader, January 25, 1898.

however, their willingness to talk about anything but Hollenbeck cast doubt on their stated reason.

It mattered little what Hollenbeck was doing in Cincinnati if he did not try to contact Boyce. J. H. Miller and E. Schlesinger, two of the detectives shadowing Boyce and Hollenbeck, agreed that

. . . while about the hotel lobby, these two men never connected or spoke to one another. They passed one another as strangers.⁴⁰

Both detectives testified, however, that Boyce and Hollenbeck went up together in the elevator of the Gibson.⁴¹ Neither of the operatives followed and there was obviously time while in the elevator for Hollenbeck to have given money to Boyce. Boyce shortly afterwards left a package for safekeeping at the hotel desk, and even if money was not passed, there were strong reasons to believe that it had been. There was another reason to believe that Hollenbeck contacted Boyce. The head porter at the Gibson testified that Hollenbeck had asked him to point out Boyce. The porter hastened to add that he had been out of the lobby a great deal after that and had not done so, but if the porter told the truth Hollenbeck was at least interested in meeting the alleged briber.⁴²

⁴⁰Testimony before the committee of the Ohio Senate in Senate Report 1859, 115.

⁴¹Ibid., 115-117, 81.

⁴²Ibid., 79-80.

Some of the witnesses called by the committee refused to testify because they claimed the committee did not have jurisdiction in the case. The arguments for those who held this view were presented by Emmett Tompkins, the counsel for the Western Union Telegraph Company. Tompkins maintained that investigation was a judicial proceeding and that, except in a case where one of its members was involved, the Senate could not exercise such a power. No Senator was involved and therefore the matter rightly belonged in the courts.⁴³ The anti-Hanna forces pointed to the Dalton Case in which the courts had ruled that Daniel Dalton had to turn over election records to the Ohio House of Representatives for an investigation it was conducting.⁴⁴ Tompkins pointed out that in that case members of the House had been involved and that was not true in this investigation.⁴⁵ Tompkins was right in his particulars, there were no members of the body conducting the investigation involved in the case, but legislative bodies had long been conducting investigations. Even Tompkins' claim that this was only because ". . .

⁴³Commercial Tribune, January 22, 1898. Tompkins had been the unsuccessful Republican candidate for mayor of Columbus the preceding spring and may have felt more than a professional interest in the affair. Bee., April 6, 1897.

⁴⁴Leader, January 20, 1898.

⁴⁵Commercial Tribune, January 22, 1898.

nobody has seen fit to object" could not change the fact that the right was firmly established.⁴⁶ On this basis it would seem likely that the Ohio Senate had the right to look into so serious a charge to determine the advisability of sending a protest to the United States Senate. It is a curious fact, however, that though the committee threatened, it never brought contempt proceedings.⁴⁷

The committee wanted Hanna and Charles Dick and E. Rathbone, the two leading Hanna managers most deeply implicated, to appear and sent ". . . subpoenas and respectful invitations. . . ." to them by registered letter. Though they were received, the three did not return from Washington to testify.⁴⁸ Hanna told reporters that there were ". . . several more important matters which demand my attention in Washington. . . ." ⁴⁹

The special committee investigating the bribery charges reported to the Ohio Senate on April 23, 1898, the majority report being presented by Vernon Burke. Senator Garfield moved that his minority report be substituted for

⁴⁶ Ibid., January 22, 1898.

⁴⁷ Leader, January 19, 1898.

⁴⁸ Majority report of the committee of the Ohio Senate in the Senate Journal, A93.

⁴⁹ Leader, February 16, 1898.

it, but his motion was beaten and the report of the majority adopted.⁵⁰

The majority report, signed by Burke, C. D. Robertson, George S. Long, and W. E. Finck Jr., concluded that an attempt had been made to buy the vote of John C. Otis for Hanna, that Boyce was the agent who made the bribe offer, and that Dick, Rathbone, and Hollenbeck had aided Boyce. They maintained that the evidence of Otis and Campbell established the truth of the bribery charge, that the telephone bill and the testimony of those who had listened in on Boyce's conversations tied Dick and Rathbone of the Hanna headquarters to Boyce, and that the sworn statements of the detectives concerning the movements of Hollenbeck tied him to Boyce and the bribery attempt.⁵¹

Senator Garfield, the lone Hanna man on the committee, submitted a minority report to the effect that the evidence failed to connect Boyce with any of the Hanna managers because there had been no identification of the people on the Columbus end of Boyce's phone calls, the original notes of those who listened to the calls had been destroyed, and no connection between Hollenbeck and Boyce was developed.⁵² Garfield even charged that the whole affair was a plot

⁵⁰Senate Journal, 857-858.

⁵¹Majority report of the Ohio Senate Committee in ibid., A94, A83.

⁵²Senate Report 1859, 191.

manufactured to injure Hanna. His charge was based on the fact that Boyce first entered the scene at the Great Southern Hotel where the coalition had its headquarters and stayed at the Gibson in Cincinnati, one of whose clerks was the son of the Democratic leader of that coalition.⁵³

The reports and the testimony were sent to the United States Senate for whatever action that body felt necessary. The Senate referred the matter to its Committee on Privileges and Elections which on February 28, 1899, finally brought in its reports.⁵⁴ The committee, though reporting a year after the event, had taken no testimony but had spent its time considering the communication of the Ohio Senate. The reasoning of the majority was strange. They would recommend further action only if additional testimony was taken, but they advised against taking any, even though in their own report they stated that the Ohio committee had raised doubts about the conduct of Hanna's representatives that could only be answered by the taking of further testimony.⁵⁵

The Democrats on the committee filed a minority report that stated their belief that, because many witnesses had refused to testify before the Ohio committee including Hanna who had not responded to a subpoena, there was still

⁵³Ibid., 188.

⁵⁴Congressional Record, 55th Congress 3d Session, 2558.

⁵⁵Senate Report, 1859, III-IV.

evidence outstanding into which the Senate should inquire.⁵⁶ The two reports were similar in other respects; however, the Democrats pointed to the probable guilt of some of Hanna's managers but like the majority failed to level any charge at Hanna directly.⁵⁷ In the absence of a charge against Hanna the Senate was not obliged to pursue the investigation and the matter was dropped.

The evidence indicated that an attempt was made to bribe John C. Otis and that the man who made the attempt was in contact with important members of Hanna's political family. There was no direct evidence implicating Hanna but it is interesting to note that before Hanna arrived in Columbus, in early January, his forces suffered one defeat after another. It was when Hanna arrived and assumed command himself that the situation changed and success was attained. This would seem to indicate that Hanna was in control of everything in his headquarters and would certainly have been aware of an agent, engaged in illicit activity, who was in frequent touch with his staff.

It must be remembered that politics was a much rougher game in Hanna's day. If he used money freely it perhaps is more revealing of the ethics of the period than of the corruption of an individual. The significance is not that Hanna's methods were different from his rivals but rather that he applied them with more success.

⁵⁶Ibid., X

⁵⁷Ibid., X, II.

APPENDIX A

The vote for Governor in 1895.¹

Asa S. Bushnell	Republican	427,141
James E. Campbell	Democrat	334,519
Jacob S. Coxey	Peoples	52,675
Seth H. Ellis	Prohibition	31,264
Others		<u>1,870</u>
Total		837,469

The vote for Governor in 1897.²

Asa S. Bushnell	Republican	429,915
Horace L. Chapman	Democrat	401,750
Jacob S. Coxey	Peoples	6,276
John C. Holliday	Prohibition	7,555
Others		<u>18,526</u>
Total		864,022

It is obvious from the above tables that though both the major parties increased their vote, the Democrats gained far more than the Republicans. With the total vote increasing about 27,000 votes and the vote of the minor parties dropping about 43,000 the Democrats gained about 67,000

¹Annual Report of the Secretary of State to the Governor of the State of Ohio for the Year Ending November 15, 1898, 286.

²Ibid., 286.

votes to under 3,000 for the GOP. Many of those who had voted for third parties in 1895 were probably nominal Democratic voters returning to the fold but the great increase in the total vote which went largely for the Democrats indicates that the Republican factional fights hurt the ticket.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

Charles Dick Papers, Library of the Ohio State Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.

J. P. Hopley Correspondence. Uncatalogued collection, Library of the Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.

Government Publications

Congressional Record, 55th Congress, 3rd Session, December 6, 1898 - March 4, 1899.

Senate Report No. 1859, 55th Congress, 3d Session, December 6, 1898 - March 4, 1899.

Annual Report of the Secretary of State to the Governor of the State of Ohio for the Year Ending November 15, 1897. Norwalk: Laning Printing Co. Press, 1898.

Annual Report of the Secretary of State to the Governor of the State of Ohio for the Year Ending November 15, 1898. Columbus: Fred J. Heer, State Printer, 1898.

Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio for the Regular Session of the Seventy-third General Assembly, January 3, 1898 - April 26, 1898.

Journal of the Senate of the State of Ohio for the Regular Session of the Seventy-third General Assembly, January 3, 1898 - April 26, 1898.

Newspapers (1897-1898)

Cleveland Leader.

Cleveland Plain Dealer

Cincinnati Commercial Tribune

Newspapers (1897-1898) (continued)Cincinnati Enquirer.Toledo Bee.Toledo Blade.Biographies, Memoirs, and Writings of Public MenBeer, Thomas. Hanna. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1929.Crissey, Forrest. Theodore E. Burton American Statesman.
Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1956.Croly, Herbert. Marcus Alonzo Hanna His Life and Work.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.Foraker Correspondence with Senator Sherman. N/A, N/P, N/D.Foraker, Joseph Benson. Notes of a Busy Life. 6 vols.
Cincinnati: Stewart & Kidd Company, 1917.Haynes, Fred Emory. James Baird Weaver. Iowa City: The
State Historical Society of Iowa, 1919.Howe, Frederic C. The Confessions of a Reformer. New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.Leech, Margaret. In the Days of McKinley. New York:
Harper & Brothers, 1959.Sherman, John. John Sherman's Recollections of Forty Years
in the House, Senate and Cabinet. New York: The
Werner Company, 1896.Walters, Everett. Joseph Benson Foraker an Uncompromising
Republican. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State Archaeolog-
ical and Historical Society, 1948.General HistoriesBremner, Robert H., et al. The Governors of Ohio. Columbus,
Ohio: The Ohio Historical Society, 1954.Dibble, R. F. Strenuous Americans. London: George
Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1925.

- Flynn, John T. Men of Wealth: The Story of Twelve Significant Fortunes from the Renaissance to the Present Day. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1941.
- Roseboom, Eugene H. and Weisenburger, Francis P. A History of Ohio. In the Prentice-Hall History Series. Carl Wittke, ed. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934.
- Steffens, Lincoln. The Struggle for Self-Government. New York: McClure, Phillips & Co., 1906.
- Taylor, William Alexander. Centennial History of Columbus and Franklin County, Ohio. 2 vols. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1909.
- Taylor, William A. Ohio in Congress, from 1803 to 1901. Columbus: The XX Century Publishing Co., 1900.
- Thompson, Charles Willis. Party Leaders of the Time. New York: G. W. Dillingham Company, 1906.
- Thompson, Charles Willis. Presidents I've Known and Two Near Presidents. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merill Company, 1929.

Special Monographs

- Ford, Harvey S. "The Life and Times of Golden Rule Jones." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953. On microfilm in the Library of the Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.
- Petit, Mary Loretta, O.P. "Senator Charles Dick." Unpublished Master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1948. Copy in the Charles Dick Papers, Library of the Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.

Articles and Essays in Periodicals and Publications of Learned Societies

The Arena.

The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly.