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THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1884 IN OHIO

CHAPTER I

GENERAL POLITICAL CONDITIONS
IN THE UNITED STATES
AND OHIO

Seldom in the history of the country were party lines so indistinct, and so easily and frequently crossed as they were in the four years following the election of 1880. During those years there were but few votes taken in either the House of Representatives or the Senate in which the division was strictly on party lines.\(^1\) Party issues were certainly not sharply defined, and, in the absence of any real issues men acted with their party choice more so out of habit than for any well-defined reasons. Up to the spring of 1884 there had been nothing to indicate the vigor and bitterness which would accompany the campaign of that year.

The lack of important issues in 1884 was not due to a lack of problems in the nation or to a complete unanimity of opinion among the opposing political parties. In the years following the Civil War the nation had made tremendous progress. All phases of business and industry had expanded greatly, and all of these many and vast changes brought with them correspondingly new and great problems. The functions of government were greatly increased to provide a wider range of services and regulation. The West pressed forward with its multitude of problems needing solutions. Problems arising from the larger numbers of workers

---

employed by industry in the cities required attention, and the "labor vote" became an important element in the consideration of many politicians.

The prevailing attitude with regard to private industry was one of laissez faire.\(^2\) On questions of currency and finance the divergence was not between parties but rather between different sections of the country. Men of both parties for many years had been proclaiming their belief in the need for a civil service reform while doing all in their power to prevent its becoming a reality.

Following the Civil War the Republican party had great influence in the North due to its patriotic role as the saviour of the Union and its responsibility for the abolition of slavery. The Democratic party, on the other hand, was the party of secession, slavery, and the attempt to destroy the Union. The Republicans stayed in power by keeping alive the bitter feelings aroused by the war, and the Democrats criticized the Republicans for their shortcomings. A better course would have been for both parties to have forgotten the past hostilities and bitterness and to have worked to find solutions for the new problems confronting the nation.

That political leaders did not follow the more ideal course was perhaps due, in part, to the character of the leaders themselves. As business became more powerful, it often claimed the ablest minds, and

the men who entered politics frequently did so to further some business
aim or for their own personal aggrandizement.

A more important reason for the misgovernment that existed in the
post-Civil War period was due "to a lack of understanding of or interest
in political questions" on the part of the general populace. There were
no great emotional questions such as slavery and secession about which
to argue, times for those who shaped public opinion were generally prosper-
ous, and most voters seemed anxious to retain that party in power which
seemed responsible for the "good times."\(^3\)

The facts remain that neither of the two great political parties
had a really constructive policy which could rally enough support to
accomplish its ends. "The control of both was in the hands of men who
seemed determined to avoid all issues rather than seek them."\(^4\)

Before considering the Presidential election of 1884 in detail, a
brief survey of the important events of the four years preceding the
campaign will serve to indicate how little occurred which had any real
influence upon the result of the Presidential race.

Within the Republican party there had been dissension created as a
result of some of President Garfield's appointments, principally in New
York, which angered Senator Roscoe Conkling and led to a revival of the
two factions of the 1870's, one of which called itself the "Stalwarts"
and referred to the other group as the "Half-breeds."

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 25-6.

\(^4\)Ibid.
The assassination of Garfield, the accession of Vice President Arthur, a "Stalwart," and the scandals of the "Star Route" mail contracts in 1881 all served to arouse public opinion to a need for action in the realm of civil service reform.

When Congress reconvened in December, 1881, the Republican party had more complete control of both houses of Congress than at any time since 1875. The President's message met with general approval, but there was no definitive party program, and the Republican majority did not provide one. The only important legislation consisted of laws aimed at abolishing polygamy in Utah, regulating Chinese immigration, and the creation of a Tariff Commission in 1882. Both parties had pledged action on the civil service reform issue in their platforms of 1880, but not until the mid-term congressional elections in 1882 returned a Democratic majority to the House of Representatives was the needed law forthcoming.\(^5\) Then the Republicans in the "lame-duck" session following the election joined with the Democrats and in an overwhelming bipartisan majority enacted the long-awaited measure, which became known as the Pendleton Act, into law.\(^6\) The law provided for the creation of a Civil Service Commission and competitive examinations open to all applicants. By the close of 1883 the system was in operation in certain departments in Washington, in eleven custom districts, and in the larger post offices. Only the lowest offices were at first classified, but the law provided that the President might extend the classified lists to include other executive appointees. By the close of Arthur's


\(^6\)The bill was introduced by George H. Pendleton, Democratic Senator from Ohio.
administration, it was estimated that more than 15,000 were in the classified service.

Tariff revision was another major effort of Arthur's administration. Criticism of the unreasonably high tariff rates of the Civil War period had grown with the passing years. Practically no important revision in the high rates of the war years had occurred. Both parties favored tariff revision, but it was one thing to favor revision and quite another to put it into effect. Tariff reform, like civil service reform, cut across party lines. The report of the Tariff Commission was made in December, 1882, immediately following the congressional elections which had cost the Republicans their majority in the House of Representatives. To enable the Republicans to gain credit for revising the tariff, legislation was pushed through Congress before March 4, 1883. Meant to achieve revision downward, it only served to commit the Republican party more than ever before to the principle of tariff protection, and at the same time to force on the Democrats the responsibility for promoting tariff reform.

The selection of John G. Carlisle of Kentucky, a low tariff advocate, as Democratic Speaker of the House of Representatives indicated an unmistakable drift of the Democratic party toward a low-tariff policy. In May, 1884, Representative W. R. Morrison of Illinois tried to push through a horizontal twenty per cent reduction in tariff rates, but he was unsuccessful because forty-one Democrats led by Samuel J. Randall, a Pennsylvania protectionist, voted with the Republicans against it. The strength of the protectionist minority in the Democratic party had proved formidable.
The tariff caused sectional as well as party divisions. In drawing up the Democratic platform in 1884, the strongly low-tariff South and West compromised with the Protectionist Northeast, and a non-committal plank was the result. The Republicans also found it necessary to compromise. Thus, while a great majority of the Democrats favored a low tariff, and a great majority of the Republicans favored a high tariff, the issue was not distinctly drawn during the presidential campaign of 1884.

However, events tending to weaken the Republican party and preparing the way for its impending defeat were occurring. In elections throughout the nation other than Congressional in 1882, the Democratic party made a significant showing. In nine normally Republican states, Democratic governors were elected. In the important pivotal state of New York, a Democratic governor, Grover Cleveland, was elected chiefly because of the split in the Republican party. There was a feeling of dissatisfaction with "the machine" and the "bosses," which was reflected in the election returns. Only with candidates who reflected the sentiment of the rank and file and not the "bosses" of the Republican party could the party hope to be successful in 1884.

In Ohio in 1880 the Democratic party had suffered a schism and no hope of immediate future cooperation was evident. One faction was led by Colonel Oliver H. Payne of Cleveland and John R. McLean, editor of the influential Cincinnati Enquirer. They were popularly designated as

7Stanwood, op. cit., p. 420.
the "kid element." The other faction, referred to as the "mossbacks," was led by Allen G. Thurman and George H. Pendleton.

At the Democratic State Convention in June, 1881, the immediate need was to declare a truce and select a candidate for governor acceptable to both factions—so much of a "dark horse" it would take "two weeks to find out who he is."8 John V. Bookwalter of Springfield, a wealthy manufacturer of steam engines, was nominated. He had formerly been a Republican but "was reputed to have carried a torch in a Democratic procession," apparently his sole claim to the nomination. The "Mossbacks" failed to become enthusiastic over their candidate, and the assassination of Garfield that summer cast a gloom over the campaign.

The Republicans had nominated Governor Charles Foster. He was re-elected, but by 24,000 less votes than he polled in 1879. Bookwalter received 30,000 less than the 1879 Democratic candidate. Very significant was the Prohibitionist vote. Their candidate polled 16,000 votes out of 23,000 cast for the minor party candidates.9

Governor Foster and the Republican legislature took an aggressive attitude toward the liquor question. Liquor legislation had been considered by the legislature in 1881 but with no significant accomplishment. Agitation for some control over the liquor traffic continued, however, and two proposals were introduced in the Republican-dominated legislature. One plan proposed complete prohibition, and the other would levy a tax and place restrictions on the sale of liquor. Since the constitutionality


9Ibid., p. 354.
of both plans was doubtful, it was decided to submit the proposed constitutional amendments to the voters. Owing to a disagreement concerning the wording of the proposed amendments, no action was taken. Laws were enacted placing a tax on saloons which was almost immediately declared unconstitutional. Another law, the Scott Law, was passed the next year (1883) which, though upheld by the court in 1883, was declared unconstitutional in 1884 after a change in the makeup of the state supreme court. When the proposed constitutional amendments were submitted to the voters in 1883, they failed to receive the necessary majority of the total election vote and so were rejected. In some areas of Ohio and among certain groups, particularly the Germans, the liquor question had created considerable antagonism.\textsuperscript{10}

As the Democratic State Convention convened in June, 1883, a renewal of the factional fight and some questionable manipulations appeared with the rivalry for the gubernatorial nomination of Durbin Ward, supported by the "Mossbacks" and George Hoadly, the candidate of the Payne faction. Hoadly was nominated in one of the "noisiest, the most disorderly and altogether the most remarkable political gatherings" that Columbus had ever seen "and characterized by a few instances that led to accusations of crookedness."\textsuperscript{11}

Born in New Haven, Connecticut, and a descendant of Jonathan Edwards and Timothy Dwight, George Hoadly had studied law at Harvard and entered the law office of Salmon P. Chase in Cincinnati. Originally


\textsuperscript{11}Moore, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 353.
a Democrat, during the Civil War he had been a Republican. During the campaign of 1872, Hoadly was a prominent liberal Republican, but he shifted back to the Democratic party in 1876. As a recent Democratic recruit he particularly appealed to dissatisfied Republicans who were alarmed over their own party's prohibition tendencies.\(^\text{12}\)

The Republicans, with the consent of all factions, nominated a promising young Cincinnati lawyer and clever campaigner, Joseph B. Forsaker, to oppose Hoadly. The party attempted in vain to keep the liquor issue out of the campaign and tried unsuccessfully to turn attention to the Democratic tendency toward "free-trade."

In Ohio the Democratic party was stronger than it was nationally. In 1883, for the first time in thirty years, the Democrats carried every elective office in the state with the exception of two judgeships of the Supreme Court and one member of the Board of Public Works. Usually it was the Republican party which controlled a majority of the state elective offices.

After he had failed to secure the Democratic gubernatorial nomination, Durbin Ward announced his candidacy for the position of U. S. Senator but declared that he would not use a cent to secure his election. George H. Pendleton sought re-election. But between the election in 1883 and the Democratic caucus in January, 1884, Henry B. Payne of Cleveland, a man of vast wealth, whose name had not previously been mentioned, gained a majority of the Democratic votes in the caucus. Pendleton was considered "penurious" and had sponsored the civil service reform bill (unpopular

\(^{12}\text{Ibid.}\)
among politicians). Ward was deemed "poor", but Payne was a spoilsman. John R. McLean and powerful industrial influences chose Payne and began the establishment of a powerful Democratic machine to combat the Republican machine. It was believed that $100,000 had been expended to secure the election of the aged Payne to the Senatorship. The lower house of the Ohio Legislature (Republican) gathered evidence of fraud, but when that evidence was submitted to the United States Senate, that body refused to take the necessary action.

During this period Ohio was rapidly becoming a manufacturing center, with the natural consequence that business was becoming more and more intermingled with government and politics. Ohio's economy was allied with the more industrial East; therefore, Ohio's concerns began to center more on national issues such as the tariff, civil service reform, and financial problems rather than on state affairs.

Since the Republicans represented the party opposed to tariff reduction and paper money inflation, they did not find it very difficult to add to their strength as Ohio became steadily more industrialized following the Civil War. In fact, Ohio had remained Republican in every presidential election, including that of 1884, since 1852.

The relation between business and government is more readily indicated by a closer examination of the Republican leaders of Ohio. Among them were ex-Governor Foster, capitalist, businessman, and railroad speculator; Joseph Benson Foraker, a corporation lawyer and later

13Henry B. Payne's son, Colonel Oliver H. Payne, was the Treasurer of the Standard Oil Company.
governor and United States Senator; William McKinley, who represented the industrial northeastern area of Ohio in Congress; and Marcus A. Hanna, a Cleveland capitalist, businessman, and owner of the staunchly Republican newspaper, the Cleveland Herald. Foraker, McKinley, and Hanna were all fairly new in the political arena when they attended the Republican National Convention as delegates-at-large from Ohio in 1884.

During the presidential campaign of 1884 in Ohio there was presented a fair cross-section of the arguments advanced in the nation as a whole since Ohio politicians had to appeal to manufacturers, laborers, and farmers, and to producers as well as to consumers. Although Ohio was not seriously considered a doubtful state, since it had voted the Republican ticket in presidential years for so long, it would have a great effect on the national campaign due to the fact that Ohioans voted in October. Therefore, the best efforts of both parties were put forth to win its sizeable bloc of electoral votes. The campaign in Ohio, as in the entire nation, was not concentrated upon the seriousness of the issues upon which it was fought, but rather upon the character of the men who sought to win the prize.
CHAPTER II

THE PARTY CONVENTIONS

In the weeks preceding the Republican State convention the newspapers printed innumerable polls of local public opinion in the smaller cities and towns of Ohio. Among the Republicans, James G. Blaine and John Sherman were favored as possible presidential nominees and a great deal of sentiment existed for Benjamin Harrison of Indiana and for Robert T. Lincoln of Illinois, the son of the "Great Emancipator," for vice-president.\footnote{1} Other names frequently mentioned included General William T. Sherman, President Arthur, John A. Logan of Illinois, and Senator Edmunds of Vermont.

It was noted that the strength of the two leading candidates--Blaine and Sherman--was nearly equal in Cincinnati and in the northwestern part of the state. In the Western Reserve Blaine was considered the "legitimate political heir of Garfield," and thus had strong support.\footnote{2}

When the Republican state convention convened in Cleveland on April 23, 1884, it reflected this almost equal division of sentiment between Blaine and Sherman. Blaine's friends were reported to be "numerous and enthusiastic" but "totally without organization." The Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette remarked on the opening day of the convention:

\begin{quote}
The most striking feature ... is the acquiescence of the slight Blaine majority to the plan of sending Sherman delegates to Chicago ... State pride has come to Sherman's aid in an extraordinary degree. Ohio wants to cast her vote on the winning side at the Chicago convention ... The Ohio delegation will not force Sherman upon the Chicago convention ... The
\end{quote}

\footnote{1}{Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, April, 1884, passim.}

\footnote{2}{Cleveland Herald, April 22, 1884.}
promise is that there shall be no fight between Blaine and Sherman. Each candidate is undoubtedly the first choice of the friends of the other.3

There was some objection voiced in Ohio to Mr. Sherman's candidacy since, if he were nominated it would be necessary for him to resign his seat in the Senate. Then the Ohio legislature would chose a Democrat to replace him. Without a Republican Senate to confirm a Republican president's appointments, the president would be seriously handicapped.4

It was noted that there were more prominent Republicans present than at any of the previous state conventions. The most unpopular delegates were those who had been instrumental in bringing the convention to Cleveland since the lack of sufficient accommodations for the larger than usual number of delegates was all too apparent.5 In spite of this minor annoyance, the business of nominating the slate for state offices was carried on with ease. The most interesting contest proved to be that of choosing delegates-at-large to the Chicago convention. Although he was not even present at the convention, Foraker, known to be a Sherman partisan, won the first seat as delegate-at-large by acclamation.6 He had received some support from the Blaine men as well.7 As the nominations were made for the other three places, the proceedings were interrupted by a motion to elect the presiding chairman--William McKinley--by acclamation.

---

3Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, April 23, 1884.
4Ibid., April 21, 1884.
5Daily Ohio State Journal (Columbus), April 24-25, 1884.
6Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, April 25, 1884. On April 26, 1884, Foraker publicly announced his support of Sherman.
Despite his modest but rather unconvincing attempts to allay the decision of the delegates, it was speedily accomplished. Since he was from a strong Blaine district, he was claimed by that faction. The Sherman men even pushed his election perhaps believing him to be friendly toward their leader. When asked later by a newspaper reporter about his preference, he replied, "I absolutely haven't any."8 M. A. Hanna won the third seat, having been introduced as his county's first choice and as "a business man and not a politician," and not "formally committed to any presidential favorite." The Blaine men realized, however, that Hanna, as the Cleveland Leader had remarked, was "alleged with some degree of plausibility[ to be] quite kindly disposed toward Senator Sherman."9 The Blaine men allowed Hanna to win the seat in return for the election of Judge William H. West to the last seat. They had decided to make an unmistakable manifestation of their power as the Arthur-Edmunds combination of the New York Republican convention, meeting at the same time became evident. Hanna, in an interview after his election said, "I am unpledged. I am for the party first, the candidate afterward; for the man who can be nominated and elected. I was elected on that platform and will stand on it."10 The split in the Ohio delegation, already very apparent, was an omen of fatal weakness for Ohio's favorite son.

The convention was honestly desirous of electing a colored delegate-at-large since the colored leaders had announced that if one of

8Daily Ohio State Journal (Columbus), April 25, 1884.
9Cleveland Leader, April 25, 1884.
10Daily Ohio State Journal (Columbus), April 25, 1884.
their number was not chosen half the colored vote would go Democratic, but the colored men could not select one of their number to support, and the convention tried in vain to settle their dispute. Four colored alternates-at-large, however, were chosen.11

The platform was declared to be "a fair and frank statement of Republican principles as they are understood and advocated in Ohio and all over the Union . . . Its declarations are tenable, practicable, and the history of our industries shows that they have not only been beneficial but necessary to our prosperity."12

Apparently all was not completely harmonious, however. Some Republicans claimed that the state convention was "a Blaine convention" and that Sherman was not receiving the proper support. A reporter observed, "Mr. Sherman is not a candidate for the Presidency in the ordinary sense of the word." The Ohio State Journal remarked that not a single man in the delegation "including Judge West" would not be "pleased and honored" to cast his vote for Sherman, and that if Blaine should be found to stand no chance of nomination and Sherman should be nominated, then the latter would "certainly get the entire Ohio vote."13

After the Democratic sweep in the state elections of 1883, the Republicans were greatly encouraged by the results of the spring elections

11Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, April 25, 1884.

12Daily Ohio State Journal (Columbus), April 26, 1884.

13Ibid., April 29, 1884.
of 1884 which showed "a sharp decline in Democratic strength." The Republicans made substantial gains over the state and carried Toledo, Cleveland, Columbus, Youngstown, and "other important towns" of which the Democrats felt certain. Even in Cincinnati the majority of the previous fall was "cut down to an insignificant figure," but the "moral reformers" mustered just sufficient strength to defeat the Republican ticket. "The Republican victory in Cleveland was won by pluck and magnificent organization against the combined influence of whisky and coal oil. The Republican majority is an expression of Cleveland's opinion of the Standard Oil senatorial sale ... There is good assurance that with good candidates and a strong platform the Republicans will carry the state in October and November by an overwhelming majority."\(^1\)

Sherman would have us believe in his Recollections that he was very disinterested in gaining the Republican nomination in 1884. On the contrary, Foraker in his memoirs gives substantial evidence that Sherman was very interested.\(^2\) Foraker had entered into correspondence with Sherman after the state convention concerning the strategy to be used at Chicago in June. Foraker advocated placing Sherman in nomination immediately instead of waiting to find out what strength Blaine and Arthur had. Sherman agreed and requested Foraker to place his name before the convention. Sherman, however, did write Foraker shortly before the convention that he would not want to accept the nomination if he could not

---

\(^1\)Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, April 9, 1884.

have the solid support of the Ohio delegation, but he did not make any move to reinforce the strength of any other candidate. 16

The eighth National Convention of the Republican party met in the Exposition Building in Chicago on Tuesday, June 3, 1884, and was called to order by Hon. Dwight M. Sabin of Minnesota, the chairman of the national committee. Foraker, as Sherman's floor manager, had arrived in Chicago early and had met, for the first time, two other Ohio politicians who were working for Sherman's nomination, Mark Hanna and Charles L. Kurtz of Columbus. The anti-Blaine groups (especially the Sherman-Edmunds bloc) were very desirous of learning Blaine's strength before the balloting began, and, therefore, determined to oppose Powell Clayton of Arkansas, a Blaine supporter and the choice of the national committee for temporary chairman. The name of John R. Lynch, a widely respected Negro of Mississippi, was substituted in a motion by Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, an Edmunds man. After a somewhat heated discussion of the motion, a vote was taken which resulted in Lynch being chosen by a majority of forty out of 808 votes cast. The plot succeeded, and it satisfied the anti-Blaine delegates that there would be more than one ballot. The Sherman-Edmunds bloc had feared that Blaine might be nominated on the first ballot. 17 In addition, however, it showed the weakness of

---


17 Foraker, Notes, I, p. 159.
Sherman since twenty-two Ohio delegates, following the example of McKinley, voted for Clayton.\textsuperscript{18} The Cincinnati \textit{Commercial-Gazette} took the following view of the defeat of Clayton:

The Republican convention put itself straight on the record by defeating the nomination of Powell Clayton \ldots The nomination was an impudent one, and the rebuke administered was well-deserved, and will have a beneficial effect. Such men as Clayton, if the party would prosper, must be kept in the background. Indeed, the proper place for him would be out of the party altogether.\textsuperscript{19}

A resolution was introduced on the second day binding all delegates to the support of the convention's nominee. As in 1880 it caused a terrific uproar, and the remarks made by George William Curtis opposing the resolution drew great cheering. The resolution was promptly withdrawn.\textsuperscript{20}

On June 5 McKinley, the chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, submitted the platform which was unanimously adopted.\textsuperscript{21} The roll of the states was then called, and the names of the candidates placed in nomination. Joseph R. Hawley of Connecticut was the first to be nominated and he was hailed as the friend of Garfield and Grant, and a candidate whom all Republicans could support with "nothing to be forgiven or forgotten,"\textsuperscript{22} a positive rebuke to Blaine. When John A. Logan of Illinois

\textsuperscript{18}Cincinnati \textit{Commercial-Gazette}, June 4, 1884.

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{20}Official Proceedings of the Convention (Chicago, 1884), p. 38. [Hereafter referred to as \textit{Official Proceedings}.]

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., p. 94.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., p. 100.
was nominated his war record and popularity with the former soldiers was particularly emphasized. When "Maine" was reached in the roll call, Judge West, the blind orator from Ohio, placed Blaine in nomination. With tremendous enthusiasm, the Judge called Blaine the "Ajax Telemon" of his party, "our Henry of Navarre," our "grand civic hero" who would "sweep onward to certain victory . . . Nominate him and the shouts of September victory in Maine will be reëchoed back by the thunder of October victory in Ohio . . . Nominate him, and the millions who are now waiting will rally to swell the column of victory that is sweeping on." He dwelt long on Blaine's public record and closed with his prediction of overwhelming success for the party with Blaine.

At the very mention of the magic name of "Blaine" pandemonium broke loose in the convention hall. All rose to their feet and the cheering echoed through the hall "like the roar of a cannon . . . like the crash of a thunderbolt." When order could be restored to the "mass meeting of maniacs," Blaine's candidacy was seconded by four speakers, one of whom was Thomas C. Platt of New York, who, three years before had resigned from the Senate in protest to Blaine. He "rose with pleasure" to second the nomination, "believing as I do that his turn has come."

23 Ibid., p. 102.
24 Ibid., pp. 104-06
26 Official Proceedings, p. 108.
President Arthur was praised for his "excellent" administration when his name was placed before the convention. But Arthur's name failed to arouse the delegates to anything at all resembling the enthusiasm of the demonstration for Blaine. "Arthur was, after all, only a 'President by accident,' who had alienated the Stalwarts without conciliating the Half-breeds." 27

Sometime around midnight the roll call reached Ohio. At the first national convention in which he took part, Joseph B. Foraker rose to nominate Sherman. Near the middle of his speech he casually mentioned his admiration "for that brilliant genius from Maine" and was immediately drowned out for almost fifteen minutes by the cheers and shouts of the Blaineites. This was very embarrassing. "Never holler until you get out of the woods," he ad-libbed when the tumult had died down. This boisterous demonstration . . . outdid all former ebullitions," he recorded in his memoirs. 28 But it was noted by reporters that there were repeated calls for Blaine throughout the remainder of his speech. 29

Foraker was perhaps justly criticized for inviting such a tumultuous ovation, but any contention that he did so purposely is difficult to believe. Foraker vehemently denied then and later that the remark was anything but "innocent," and, besides, he had everything to gain by a sincere effort as a Sherman partisan. If he did well, and Sherman was

27Muzzey, op. cit., p. 283.

28Foraker, Notes, I, p. 165. See also Official Proceedings, p. 122.

still defeated, Foraker had hope for the vice-presidential nomination for himself. 30 He could hardly expect the prize if he disgraced himself in front of his friends.

Even with consideration of the "innocent" remark, newspaper accounts were generally laudatory. Murat Halstead of the Commercial-Gazette said, "The speech of Judge Foraker nominating Sherman was a striking success, delivered with energy, yet calmly, with an impressive manner, and a voice that rang and was penetrating . . . The friends of the eloquent young leader may safely congratulate him upon his splendid effort. He made his mark upon the convention." 31

The last state to present a candidate was Vermont. George F. Edmunds was the choice of the Independent Republicans--Schurz, Lodge, Curtis, Hoar, Roosevelt, and their followers--who hoped to defeat Blaine with this very distinguished member of the Senate, who was described as having walked unscathed "through the storms and fires of public life." His "tested service" and "tried incorruptibility" would be a great asset to him as standard-bearer of the Republican party. 32

Sherman's failure to receive more than thirty votes on the first ballot was made less unpromising by the prospect of a close race between Blaine (334½) and Arthur (278). And, in addition, they had promises from the Edmunds men that they would swing their support to Sherman on the second or third ballot. 33 They mistakenly believed that Sherman's support

30Foraker, Notes, I, p. 146. See also Walters, op. cit., pp. 25-6.
31Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, June 6, 1884.
33Walters, op. cit., pp. 29-30.
would increase as the balloting continued. Sherman's supporters believed also that they would gain strength when Arthur's southern forces began to weaken. 34 But it was Blaine's victory from the start. Instead of gaining votes on the second and third ballots, both Sherman and Edmunds lost votes to Blaine. By the third ballot, Blaine had reached 375; Arthur had 274; Edmunds had fallen from his initial 93 to 69; General Logan still retained only 53 of his original 66; and Sherman had only 25, of which 21 were from his Ohio friends. 35

At the conclusion of the third ballot, Foraker hastily moved for a recess, perhaps stalling for time to decide the next move, but the motion was promptly withdrawn because of heavy opposition. Then Foraker sprang to his feet and made a surprise motion to suspend the rules of the convention and nominate Blaine by acclamation. Angry shouts greeted that motion, and it too was withdrawn. 36 On the next ballot, Logan released his Illinois supporters to vote for Blaine, and Ohio followed suit. The top half of the ticket was then decided. Blaine received 541 votes; Arthur, 207; Edmunds, 41; Hawley, 15; Logan, 7; Lincoln, 2. Blaine had received 130 votes more than the necessary 411 out of the 820 total.

After the tumult and shouting subsided, the nomination was made unanimous. Logan was named vice-presidential nominee with only seven dissenting votes. Foraker received consideration also, but he did not favor having his name presented unless he could be certain that the

34 Cleveland Herald, June 6, 1884.

35 Ibid., June 7, 1884.

nomination would be "practically unanimous." Besides, he was still a comparatively young man and could afford to wait.

There was no question that Blaine was the free choice of the delegates, and he was undoubtedly the leader most popular among those who always voted Republican. The nomination was won without the advantage of patronage or official pressure. But it was also clear that Blaine's nomination would mean the disaffection of the Independent wing of the party. If Blaine was an unworthy candidate, the rank and file of the Republican party had to bear the responsibility. Because the anti-Blaine men could not merge their support on any one candidate, they, in effect, forced Blaine's nomination. Arthur, with his great bloc of patronage-controlled delegates, was as distasteful to the Independents as Blaine, and yet, he had been the only other candidate with any chance for sufficient strength to defeat Blaine.

Newspaper speculation concerning the convention results had not been meager. Frequent support prior to the convention was found for General William T. Sherman, who, it was predicted, "would certainly make a lively and picturesque candidate, and would rouse the wildest enthusiasm among the army veterans." In spite of his declarations to the contrary, it was believed widely that he would run if nominated.

While it was observed that Blaine was "hourly gaining strength, and that it would require extraordinary strength to defeat him," it was

---

37Foraker, Notes, I, p. 169. See also Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, June 7, 1884.
38Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, June 3, 1884.
39Ibid.
frequently suggested that the names of Arthur and Foraker be coupled.\textsuperscript{40}

The Arthur men had been agreeable, but this plan had "not been countenanced by the Judge himself or the [Ohio] delegation."\textsuperscript{41}

Why the Ohio delegation, for "ill-defined and petty reasons," refused to unite and support Sherman, remained a mystery. Ohio did not have the prestige it should have had due to its split. Sherman was "most acceptable to the financial, commercial, and industrial factions of the party."\textsuperscript{42} But, because of Ohio's failure to solidly stand behind him, Sherman's chances for success were slight. He incorrectly blamed McKinley for the disunity in the Ohio delegation and the consequent loss of the nomination for himself.\textsuperscript{43}

A contemporary observer explained:

"Two Ohio men came forward... and took the position of leadership--McKinley and Foraker. Foraker made a stubborn and gallant fight for Sherman. Ohio Republicans differed widely as to the wisdom of Sherman's name being presented... There was no personal feeling against Sherman; it was simply that the people wanted Blaine... Had Blaine failed, it would perhaps be a good guess to say that the pendulum of the convention... would have pointed to Ohio's able financier... Major McKinley was in the chair long enough to demonstrate that he would have been the best choice for presiding officer of the convention. General Henderson was impartial, but not strong enough. In its closing hours he completely lost control..."\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., June 6, 1884.

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., June 3, 1884.

\textsuperscript{43}Sherman to Foraker, June 9, 1884 in Foraker-Sherman Correspondence, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{44}Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, June 7, 1884.
The Republican platform was declared to be "a red-hot, ringing document from the beginning to end, and it will have the full and cordial endorsement of the party. In the face of this elaborate declaration of principles, no one need ask where the Republican party stands; what its candidates represent, or what its purposes are. Its intentions are as well-defined as its record is brilliant."45

The prospects of a Democratic victory in Ohio looked brighter in 1884 than they had in many years. Their victory in the gubernatorial race in 1883, however, was somewhat beclouded by the poorer showing made by the Democracy in the municipal elections in the spring of 1884 in several normally Democratic Ohio cities.

Much sentiment existed for Samuel J. Tilden and the "old ticket," although Governor George Hoadly and Senator Allen G. Thurman also had many followers in Ohio. When Tilden announced in mid-June that "due to his declining years and failing strength" he would be unable to be his party's standard-bearer, the belief continued that he would be nominated unanimously and that he would not refuse.46 By the time the Democratic State Convention convened in Columbus on June 25, the sentiment which had existed for Senator Henry B. Payne had evaporated. Newspapers reporting on the convention said that all the apparent differences within the party had been "easily and satisfactorily adjusted." Six months seem to have

45Ibid., June 6, 1884.

46Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 12, 1884.
wiped out the blood-stains and healed the abrasions . . . since the senatorial fight last winter . . . "47 Judging from the newspaper accounts of its proceedings, the convention did not seem to have drawn nearly so large or enthusiastic a crowd as did the Republican convention in Cleveland some weeks earlier.

After the preliminary questions had been disposed of, the convention got down to the more serious and important work of selecting the delegates-at-large to the national convention. The first nomination was that of John R. McLean of Cincinnati. John G. Warwick and Thomas E. Powell were nominated next. Then came a somewhat unexpected development. To oppose those already nominated who were generally believed to be the party’s choice for delegates, another secretly organized slate now appeared, and the intention was to "rush it through on the pyrotechnic plan." The slate was composed of Durbin Ward, Thurman, Pendleton, and A. G. Warner. A motion was made to suspend the rules and nominate Ward by acclamation. At the time, it was observed, "... The convention could hardly afford to defeat Ward for such an honor after the Democrats had so frequently failed to reward him for distinguished party services." The movement, however, was not for showing the convention’s sympathy for the old veteran but for the purpose of defeating John R. McLean and those whose names had been associated with his for delegate-at-large. Following the election by acclamation of Ward, the plan was to push through Thurman "on the affection which the Democratic party regards old-time leaders" and it was expected that then in the ensuing "panic," Pendleton and Warner

47Ibid., June 26, 1884.
would be chosen by acclamation. The plan did not succeed. Following a motion made to suspend the rules in favor of McLean, Warner made a motion to substitute Thurman for McLean. As a result, "The confusion which followed paralyzed the descriptive faculties of the most patient reporters." Delegates shouted and cheered; the chairman "fruitlessly hammered on the table with a mallet large enough to maul rails..." After some minutes when order had finally been restored, an amendment was offered to Warner's motion, declaring that both McLean and Thurman be elected by acclamation. This was done forthwith. "Thus the 'Old Roman' was tacked to the motion to suspend the rules in behalf of McLean...," remarked the Enquirer. Jacob Mueller of Cleveland was selected by acclamation as the fourth delegate-at-large since he was a strong representative of the German element.

The platform presented was a reaffirmation of the 1883 platform and it included a "tariff for revenue only" plank; advocated "equitable readjustment of duties on wool"; stressed Democratic "opposition to sumptuary legislation and unequal taxation"; and advocated "a thorough reform of the civil service." A "free-trade" resolution was voted down "without consideration and amid great confusion," an action which emphasized the opposition of the Ohio Democracy to the free trade policy of the Democrats in Congress.

48 Cincinnati Enquirer, June 26, 1884.

49 Daily Ohio State Journal (Columbus), June 26, 1884. See also Cincinnati Enquirer, June 26, 1884.

50 Cincinnati Enquirer, July 11, 1884.
Though it had been frequently predicted that the Ohio delegates would be instructed to vote as a unit, the motion made at the convention to that effect was tabled. The amendment endorsing Tilden was adopted unanimously—"a thundering tribute to the unanimous choice of the Democracy of the country for the Presidency."  

General satisfaction with the work of the convention was expressed in the Democratic press. Every element and faction of the party was recognized and conciliated, as it was pointed out, "There has not been a convention in Ohio in many years so free from all attempts to dictate and control it by cliques and combinations."  

Apparently all the harmony referred to above failed as soon as the convention adjourned. The Enquirer editorially remarked the next day, "... the rejoicing of Democrats of any one clique that may believe it achieved victory ... is not conducive to the harmony necessary to succeed next fall, and it ought to cease immediately."  

When, on June 10, 1884, Samuel J. Tilden announced that he would not be a candidate for the presidency, the field was left wide open to three figures of national prominence—Thomas J. Bayard, Allen G. Thurman, and Grover Cleveland. In addition, there was a galaxy of favorite sons. The long exclusion of the Democracy from executive offices obviously limited the number of figures of national prominence who might be considered.

51 Ibid., June 25, 1884.
52 Ibid., June 26, 1884.
53 Ibid., June 27, 1884.
54 Ibid., June 28, 1884.
Among the Congressional leaders many were considered to be unavailable because of the active sympathy given to the South during the war. One such was the eminent senator from Delaware, Bayard, who had made an unfortunate speech in 1861 sympathizing with the right of the South to secede. The lack of unanimity within the party on the tariff issue necessarily precluded the nomination of any Democrat who had taken an extreme stand either way on the question. Thus, Carlisle of Kentucky and Morrison of Illinois were barred since they advocated free trade, and Randall of Pennsylvania was too much of a protectionist to satisfy the West and the South. Thurman was growing too old, and his views on money were distrusted. The West felt that it should be tried since eastern candidates had failed so consistently in the past. For that reason, Indiana, a doubtful state, had two candidates to offer, Thomas A. Hendricks and Joseph E. McDonald. Both were men of ability who had been rivals for party leadership in Indiana. In 1884, Hendricks, an old guard Democrat, nominated McDonald who was believed to be particularly strong with labor. Hendricks was spoken of frequently preceding the convention as the running mate for Tilden if the "old ticket" were revived.

Henry B. Payne was given some support in Ohio, but his lack of political experience, his advanced age, and his connection with the Standard Oil Company made him unavailable. Hoadly was unable to secure a majority of the delegates from his own state. Moreover, because the Congressional elections were held in Ohio in October, the chances of the selection of an Ohioan for the national ticket were seriously hampered since the Democrats were uncertain of carrying Ohio and feared the psychological effect of failing to carry the home state of the candidate.
Benjamin F. Butler, an errant Democrat, had received the nomination of the Greenback and Anti-Nonopoly Parties in May and believed that with this minor party support, he would receive the Democratic nomination as well. A wealthy philanthropist amusing himself in politics, Roswell P. Flower of New York was mentioned as a possible candidate but was never taken seriously.

In mid-June it became clear that Grover Cleveland, who had been elected governor of New York by an unprecedented 192,000 majority in 1882, was almost certain to receive the Democratic nomination. Tilden and Daniel Manning, the two most influential men in the national Democratic party, decided it should be so. As mayor of Buffalo and later as governor, Cleveland had been hard-working and conscientious. He had been elected to the governorship with the support of the New York Independents and because of a revolt against the corrupt Republican machine. He had gained the respect of the civil service reformers, made free use of his veto power when he felt the legislation was not in the interest of the public welfare or when appropriations were unnecessary or illegal. He had a high sense of the duties and obligations of publicly elected and appointed officials.

But there were factors which seemed to work against him. Cleveland was not a brilliant man. He was parochial-minded; his education and experience had been limited. He was a poor speaker and lacked polish and tact. In effect, he lacked many of the qualities generally associated with great leaders. But he was absolutely honest and straightforward, and he had a sincere desire to serve the people. He was too often
impulsive, but not easily swayed, and was conservative rather than progressive on most questions.

He was disliked by Tammany since he had sided with their opponents within the party and refused to give them what they felt to be their fair share of the New York spoils. Tammany also claimed that he could not carry New York since he had incurred the ill-will of the Roman Catholics, the Irish, the laborers, and the anti-monopolists because he had vetoed certain bills which they had seemed to favor. His attempts at reforming Tammany only served to make his record appear less tarnished when compared to Blaine's.

In addition, the Republicans who bolted their own party after the nomination of Blaine, added strength to Cleveland. They wished to induce the Democratic Convention to nominate a candidate whom they could support as an "honest man and genuine reformer." Their attention had already been drawn to Cleveland. These Independents, who were often called Mugwumps, greatly impressed Democratic politicians with their promises of support for Cleveland in the event of his nomination. The Mugwumps were believed to hold the balance of power in New York state which was considered to be politically doubtful.

The national convention of the Democratic party convened in Chicago on July 8, 1884. From the outset Cleveland's strength was considerable. As soon as they reached Chicago, the Tammany delegation—six-hundred strong—sought to discredit Cleveland by spreading slanderous rumors
about him among the other delegates, and exhibited openly their support for Benjamin F. Butler.\textsuperscript{55}

When the routine motion to adopt the rules of the preceding convention came up, the anti-Cleveland delegates, led by Tammany, attempted to have the convention abolish the unit rule. The state convention of New York had adopted a resolution instructing their delegates to vote as a unit as directed by the majority on all questions. Cleveland's majority was very slight and not completely certain until after the opening of the convention in Chicago. A long debate ensued, but the unit rule was retained by a vote of 463 to 332. That no state would be permitted to change its vote until the entire roll call had been completed, was added to the convention rules. The victory was a significant one since it represented a united front of basically opposing groups cooperating in the conviction that the party's only hope for victory would be to appear as Tammany's enemy, and therefore, gain Mugwump support.

Before the nominating speeches were begun, the convention passed a resolution expressing esteem for Tilden and regret that he was unable to accept the Democratic nomination. Even Tammany concurred in this resolution, inasmuch as it was certain that he would not be a candidate.\textsuperscript{56}

McDonald, Bayard, Carlisle and Randall were placed in nomination. Thurman was nominated by Breckinridge, a delegate from California, and

\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., July 10, 1884.

Governor Hoadly was nominated by T. E. Powell of Ohio. Hoadly's name did not inspire any enthusiasm contrary to what the Cincinnati Enquirer, which was pushing Hoadly, had previously predicted on frequent occasions. Powell's speech was described as "florid" and "better than many which had been made." The favorite sons and other nominees failed to arouse any real enthusiasm on the part of the convention. Everyone seemed to be awaiting the nomination of Cleveland and it was only then that the convention exhibited any real excitement. Cleveland was nominated by Lockwood, who was careful not to offend any element in the party and emphasized the belief that Grover Cleveland represented the newer element in the party.  

Many of the speeches seconding the nomination of other candidates were, in reality, attacks on Cleveland. John Grady, a Tammany delegate, speaking out-of-order, declared that he would be pleased to second Cleveland's nomination if he could carry New York which, Grady believed, was not possible since the labor vote and anti-monopoly element opposed him. Bourke Cockran, another Tammany delegate, in a speech seconding Thurman's nomination declared, "We have been told that the mantle of Tilden has fallen upon the shoulders of Cleveland. Gentlemen, when the mantle that fits the shoulders of a giant falls on those of a dwarf, the result is disastrous to the dwarf ..."  

---

57 Cincinnati Enquirer, July 11, 1884.  
58 Proceedings, p. 117.  
59 Ibid., p. 134.
The strongest and most dramatic speech of the convention and one of the many speeches seconding the nomination of Cleveland was delivered by General Edward S. Bragg of Wisconsin. Speaking for the younger men of the party he declared without hiding his animosity "... he is the choice of all those who desire for the first time as young men to cast their votes in November for the candidate nominated by this convention. They love him, gentlemen, and they respect him, not only for himself, for his character, and his integrity and judgment and iron will, but they love him most for the enemies that he has made ... I do not assume here to speak for labor."60 Instantaneously, Grady shouted from the floor, "On behalf of his enemies, I reciprocate that sentiment." A voice from the galleries shouted, "Give them a little more grape, Captain Bragg." Not at all disconcerted, Bragg retorted, "I thank the gentleman for reminding me he is still here." This, according to a reporter, won Bragg hearty plaudits for a job "mercilessly, courageously, and magnificently" done and sent Grady to his corner, his "Irish mug blood-red with passion!" 61

When the nominating speeches had been concluded, the first ballot was taken. Out of the total 820 delegates, 547 were needed to nominate. On the first ballot Cleveland received 392; Bayard, 170; Thurman, 88; Randall, 78; and McDonald, 56. An adjournment came at the close of the first ballot in spite the efforts of Cleveland's supporters to prevent it. It was noted that the Ohio delegation had voted as a unit only once up to

60Ibid., p. 176.
61Cincinnati Enquirer, July 11, 1884.
this point in the convention, and that was because they were all "tired, hungry, and thirsty" and, therefore, they had voted to adjourn.\textsuperscript{62}

A carefully arranged Hendricks boom the next morning resulted in pandemonium for a full half-hour. Indiana began it, when, during the roll call, the state cast one vote for Hendricks. The Tammany men were alone among the delegates on the floor in their efforts to arouse enthusiasm and the boom did not materialize. As the roll call continued and it was evident that Cleveland was gaining, many delegations immediately began to change their votes. The final count stood at 683 votes for Cleveland; Hendricks, 45½; Bayard, 81½; Thurman, 4; Randall, 4; and McDonald, 2.

Ohio on the first ballot cast twenty-four votes for Thurman, twenty-one for Hoadly and one for Cleveland, but before the result of the first ballot was announced officially, Chairman McLean asked to change Ohio's vote. The delegation was repolled and then cast its vote as follows: Cleveland, twenty-one; Hoadly, two; and Thurman, twenty-three.\textsuperscript{63}

The \textit{Enquirer} remarked, "If Thurman had Ohio behind him he might have been nominated. He might have had Ohio had he dropped the old machine now pretending to support him, and allied himself with the live and vigorous wing. Democrats in Ohio may as well understand that the opposition in the Ohio delegation is not aimed at Judge Thurman, but it is a protest against the scurrilous gang who have sought to drag

\textsuperscript{62}ibid.

\textsuperscript{63}ibid.
themselves into notice and importance by hanging onto the skirts of an
honest man's respectibility."64

On the second ballot, Ohio's delegation voted as follows: Cleveland,
twenty-one; Thurman, twenty-two; Tilden, two; and Hendricks, one. Before
the ballot results were announced officially, however, Ohio changed to
twenty-seven for Cleveland and nineteen for Thurman, and finally to a
unanimous vote for Cleveland.65

Hendricks, as "the representative of the grossest wrong that was ever
perpetrated upon the American people," was nominated without a dissenting
vote for the second place on the ticket. The nomination of Cleveland was,
without a doubt, the strongest that the Democrats could have made at the
time. He had the support of the younger element of the party as well as
the Independents, and because his views on many controversial issues were
unknown, it gave credibility to the belief that the Democratic party had
determined to avoid all the old issues and make the issue of reform a
most important one in this campaign.

The platform, when presented to the convention, caused great excite-
ment. Benjamin Butler, whose name had not been presented to the convention
since he had failed to gain the support of the entire Massachusetts
delegation, determined to furnish the convention some trouble, perhaps
in order that he might appear before the country as the man who had
sacrificed his chances for the nomination to his principles. When the
committee submitted the platform, Butler offered a series of resolutions

64 Ibid.

65 Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 12, 1884.
on the tariff plank as a substitute for those agreed upon by the majority. Butler defended his proposal in a colorful speech in which he claimed that if the party did not accept his ideas and avoided the tariff issue, his followers would not support the party.

After Butler's speech, Converse of Ohio and Watterson of Kentucky, who represented the two opposite extremes of the party on the tariff, spoke in defense of the platform. The essence of both speeches was that reform was the biggest issue at the moment, and the need to compromise on the tariff matter was recognized by all. The motion to substitute Butler's tariff resolutions was defeated by a vote of 96½ to 721½, and the platform as submitted by the majority was adopted. According to the Cincinnati Enquirer, "The Democratic platform is a statesmanlike paper... so plain in its terms that it cannot be misunderstood. In all this it contrasts vividly with the flimsy tissue of the Republican platform. Nothing is evaded, and it is a direct answer to those who say that the party has no principles to enunciate and defend."

The convention marked the beginning of the political decline of Thurman. It was asserted, "There is not a public man in the United States in deeper humiliation... The ambition of his tottering age led him to make a spectacle of himself unworthy of his former record. He allowed

---

66 Cincinnati Enquirer, July 11, 1884. All thirty-eight other members of the committee had signed the platform. Butler was the only dissenter.


69 Cincinnati Enquirer, July 13, 1884.
himself to be made the puppet of a disreputable gang of deadbeats... who made him a laughing stock before the country."  

An editorial commenting upon the convention results declared, "The nomination of Grover Cleveland was... the fittest thing that could have been done... He had proved to be a man on whom the Democrats could promptly and heartily unite." The writer concluded with a warning that the fight would be against a "well-equipped foe" who would leave no "scheme dormant" nor "intrigue untried" to defeat the Democratic ticket.  

In addition to the two major parties, several minor parties held conventions, nominated candidates, and published platforms in 1884. A convention of the Anti-Monopoly Party was held in Chicago on May 14. The 138 delegates present represented principally farm organizations and twenty-one states. The convention attracted little attention in the East. As a part of the platform which was adopted, "economical government" and "the enforcement of equitable laws" was demanded, as well as an interstate commerce law, the establishment of labor bureaus, a direct vote for senators, a graduated income tax, and a "fostering care of the government" for agriculture. They denounced land grants to corporations, and railroads, and demanded revision of the tariff in the interests of labor instead of capital. The platform closed with an appeal to the farmers to join together for the overthrow of monopolies. Benjamin F. Butler was nominated on the first ballot.

70Ibid., July 12, 1884.

71Ibid.

72Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, May 16, 1884.
Reformers of many different types assembled in Indianapolis on May 28 for the Greenback-Labor convention. The platform included a demand for the issue of greenbacks and the substitution of greenbacks for national bank notes. Government regulation of monopolies, especially railroads, and a graduated income tax were demanded. It favored submitting the woman suffrage and prohibition questions to a popular vote. Tariff revision was favored, but considered secondary in importance to the financial question. The Greenback-Labor Party endorsed Butler and as the vice-presidential candidate, General Alanson M. West of Mississippi.\textsuperscript{73} The joint ticket was known as the People's Party.

The question of prohibition had become an important one in many states. In 1882 it had played a part in many elections and in 1883 it was considered to have been a factor in the Democratic victory in Ohio. The state Democratic party platforms generally took the position that the control of the liquor trade was not a proper subject for legislation. The Republicans, on the other hand, had not opposed prohibition, but generally favored having the question submitted to the voters. The Republicans ignored the issue in their 1884 platform, while the Democrats included a plank declaring their opposition to "sumptuary laws which vex the citizens and interfere with personal liberty."\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{73}Francis Curtis, \textit{The Republican Party, 1854-1904}, Vol. II, (New York: 1904), p. 140. West was chosen by the national committee of the Anti-Monopoly Party.

The National Temperance Party first appeared in 1872. In 1884 the Prohibitionists held two conventions. The first was that in Chicago on June 19 of the American Prohibition National Party. It nominated Samuel C. Pomeroy of Kansas for President and John A. Conant of Connecticut for Vice-President. The platform included planks for the reduction of the tariff, the observance of Sunday, the forfeiture of charters of secret societies, prohibition, and the use of the Bible in schools.75

The second convention was that of the National Prohibition Party which nominated ex-Governor John P. St. John of Kansas for President and William Daniel of Maryland for Vice-President. St. John had been defeated in 1882 on the prohibition issue, but his record as governor had been good, and he was an enthusiastic orator. The Prohibition platform was forceful and well-stated. It demanded that the government abandon the taxes on liquor and tobacco, and that Congress prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor in the District of Columbia and the territories. In addition, it demanded that no state be admitted to the Union, unless its constitution prohibited the manufacture and sale of liquor. It condemned both parties for their attitude on the liquor question—the Republicans because they had done nothing to halt the liquor traffic in all the years they had held office and the Democrats for their declared opposition to sumptuary laws. Planks for civil service reform, woman suffrage, and the retention of the public lands for the people were included.

Selva A. Lockwood and Marietta L. Stow were nominated by the Women's Rights Convention held in San Francisco. Planks in their platform advocated, besides woman suffrage, moderate tariff reform, the encouragement of foreign trade, pensions for soldiers, education for the masses, civil service reform, and governmental control of the liquor traffic and monopolies.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{76}Ibid.
CHAPTER III

THE CAMPAIGN AND ISSUES

A. MAJOR ISSUES

1. The Tariff

The tariff had been discussed in nearly every presidential election since the Civil War. However, in most campaigns it had been merely a device for distracting public attention from scandals or other unpleasant issues which politicians were not anxious to discuss. For this purpose the tariff was effective. The vast majority of the American people were not properly equipped to understand the problem completely and could be easily convinced that protection meant prosperity while "free-trade" would mean disaster. A brief survey of the tariff during the post-Civil War era is necessary for understanding the role which the issue played in 1884.

Financial reorganization was an acute problem facing Congress at the end of the war. Taxes were extremely high during the war, but thereafter, while the internal taxes were greatly reduced, the tariff remained much the same. Manufacturers were able to convince most workingmen that protection was in their interest.

The tariff had always been more of a sectional than a party issue. Shipping and agricultural sections were often only moderate protectionists or completely opposed to it, while the manufacturing sections were strongly protectionist. In both parties there were protectionists, moderates, and "free-traders."

Reductions were made in the tariff in 1872 in response to a demand for tariff reform. However, these reductions were not permanent. When
foreign trade declined due to the panic in 1873, and import duties fell, tariff duties were restored in 1875 to many items and even in some cases increased over those in effect prior to 1872.

The tariff was a prominent part of the platform of both parties in 1876 and again in 1880, although nothing of importance was done to alter it until 1883. The Democrats declared for a tariff for revenue only although they would have been unable to unite the party in support of such a policy. The Republicans declared that the revenue should be drawn principally from import duties and should protect the interests of American labor.

After 1879 the problem was further complicated by the rapidly accumulating surplus in the Treasury.¹ This surplus was undesirable since it encouraged extravagance, withdrew money from circulation, and could result in defeat for the party in power. The Republican protectionists were faced with the problem of either reducing the tariff or finding some way to profitably spend the money. The appropriations for pensions and "pork barrel" legislation greatly increased. Thus, moderate protectionists were made more fully aware that tariff revision was a necessity if the surplus was to be reduced sensibly.

Accordingly, in 1882 the Tariff Commission was created. All of the nine members who were to investigate industries affected by the tariff were themselves protectionists. The report of the commission declared, however, that a "substantial reduction of tariff duties is demanded . . .

by the best conservative opinion of the country." Reductions averaging from twenty to twenty-five per cent were recommended. President Arthur specifically urged Congress to enlarge the free list and remove the complexities and inconsistencies on the tariff list.

Tariff revision in 1883 made very little noticeable difference in revenues since it had been engineered by the protectionists. Reductions had been made on most items, but increases were evident on articles of which there were large importations. Many discrepancies were evident also, and the bill was unsatisfactory to large elements in both parties.

The Congressional elections in 1882 resulted in a strong Democratic majority in the House, while the Senate remained in Republican control. The selection of a Speaker at the reorganization of the House in December, 1883, involved the tariff question. Randall of Pennsylvania, the protectionist, and Carlisle of Kentucky, the tariff reformer and advocate of eventual free-trade, were the contenders. Carlisle was elected and Morrison of Illinois was made chairman of the Ways and Means Committee which was divided equally among high and low tariff advocates. This committee submitted a bill, referred to as the Morrison Bill, with an average twenty per cent reduction in tariff rates. These proposed reductions along with those of the 1883 law did not equal the recommended reductions of the tariff commission, it was pointed out.

The Republicans declared that it was too early to know what effects the 1883 law would have and that no demand for further changes existed.

---

They believed that this was a beginning for free traders, and that the bill would disturb business, lower wages, and increase the surplus revenue by increasing the volume of foreign imports.

Converse, a Democrat from Ohio, attempted in a motion to have the 1867 duties on wool restored, but the motion was lost. Debate on the bill continued for more than a month, Randall making the most important speech against the bill. When the vote was finally taken it was found that of the 159 votes against it, forty-one were Democratic. Four Republicans voted with the 151 who favored the bill.  

The Democrats were thus forced to share in the responsibility for the continuance of high tariff rates and a treasury surplus. Had the Democrats passed a bill in the House reducing the tariff and allowed it to be killed by a Republican Senate, they might have taken credit for a much-needed step toward reducing the unnecessary taxation and surplus. The Democratic protectionists had forced their party to abandon one of its strongest issues. When the Republicans quite unexpectedly made the tariff question one of the principal issues of the campaign in 1884, the Democrats, placed on the defensive, were forced to show that they were not hostile to protection.

An important influence on the tariff question in 1884 was the rather severe industrial and financial depression which had engulfed the country two years previously. In 1880 the Republicans had pointed to the great...
prosperity of the country and had claimed protection was the reason for it. But, in 1884, although few real changes had been made in the tariff, the country was experiencing a severe depression. The hard times and the resulting decrease in revenue deprived the Democrats of an issue since the surplus did not seem so large as previously.

The tariff played only a small role in the selection of presidential nominees, and many of the state conventions paid little attention to it in their platforms. The Republicans spoke out for protection and the Democrats only in solidly Democratic states declared for a "tariff for revenue only." The doubtful states avoided the issue. It was noted that the Ohio Democratic convention adopted a platform that any Republican might easily endorse. 4

It was obvious that the Democrats could not nominate a man identified with either faction of the party. The assertion by the Republicans that Cleveland was chosen because his views on the tariff, as well as on other issues were unknown, was without a doubt true. The Democratic tariff plank was obviously an attempt to avoid the issue and please all factions of the party. The Republicans were rebuked for having begun and continued the tariff irregularities and for pretending to protect American interests by taxing raw materials. Many industries had been impoverished so that a few might be subsidized under the Republican policy. "Unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation," the platform declared, and the evidence for that injustice was to be found in the existing surplus. The Democrats

4Ibid., p. 125. See also Cincinnati Enquirer, June 26, 1884.
pledged tariff revision in a way that would not "injure domestic interests" or "deprive American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor."\(^5\) Little in the way of a concrete tariff reform program was indicated.

The Republicans pledged themselves in their platform to correct tariff irregularities in some way which would "relieve the taxpayer without injuring the laborer or the great productive interests of the country." Duties should be levied to "afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborers." Specifically stated was a proposal that the duty on foreign wool be raised.\(^6\)

Both platforms were equally evasive and both agreed that the tariff should be reformed and that the surplus should be reduced. Both also agreed that the inconsistencies should be removed and that it should be done so as to preserve the principle of protection. Neither party, however, had done anything concrete to bring this about.

The tariff question in Ohio was apparently more acute than in other states since Ohio farmers raised a large number of sheep and desired a high tariff to protect their industry. Ohio stood second in the number of sheep raised but produced the largest quantity of the higher grades of wool—delaine wool. With respect to quality, condition, and length of

---


fiber, Ohio wool was superior to the wool of any other state. Because of a reduction in duty by the tariff of 1883, the superior quality of Ohio wool commanded no higher prices than ordinary wool on the market. Had the Morrison Bill become law, the sheep interests would have been "utterly destroyed" since a further reduction of twenty per cent would have resulted.  

In the spring of 1884, Ohio farmers, dissatisfied because the Democratic promises of a higher tariff on wool had not materialized, held meetings in which they passed resolutions to cast their votes for the nominees of the party which promised support for higher tariff duties on wool.  

Large numbers of Republican wool-growers had voted for the Democratic ticket in 1883 on the Democratic promise to restore the tariff of 1867 which had originally been passed by a Republican Congress. On all subsequent attempts to reduce the tariff "the records show that the Republicans voted against reduction and the Democrats almost solidly for it."  

Although the Republican press in Ohio published frequent articles and editorials considering the tariff issue, the Democratic press could not be persuaded to make it an important issue. The party had shown by its candidate, its platform, and its record that it did not wish to make the tariff an issue. Cleveland never mentioned it in his letter of  

---

7 Cleveland Weekly Leader, October 29, 1884. One-hundred fifty-two Democrats voted for it.

8 Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, May 5, 1884.

9 Cleveland Herald, July 28, 1884.
acceptance and merely reiterated the Democratic platform when he briefly mentioned the tariff in one speech. The Independents also insisted that it was not an issue. The Plain Dealer steadfastly held that "the real issue of this campaign is to reform the national administration, and the way to reform it is to get the Republican party out." According to the Enquirer, Ohio voters were not willing to make the tariff question the absorbing issue.

But regardless of Democratic refusal to discuss it, the tariff became an issue and nearly every Republican speech referred to it to some extent. To the Democratic assertion that civil service reform was the major issue, the Herald retorted, "Civil Service reform conflicts with the established Democratic maxim, 'To the victors belong the spoils.'"

Although civil service reform was introduced by the Democrats, it was done more to embarrass the Republican administration than as a sincere measure of reform.

In early September a meeting of "wool-growers" was held in Columbus, and the group was addressed by representatives of each party. Converse, speaking for the Democrats, admitted that they could hope for little aid from the Democracy. Senator Sherman, speaking for the Republicans, pledged himself and his party to labor for the restoration of the former tariff on

---

10 Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 14, 1884.

11 Cincinnati Enquirer, passim.

12 Thomas, op. cit., p. 216.

13 Cleveland Herald, August 14, 1884.
wool. This was in line with the expression on the subject in the Republican platform.

During Blaine's Ohio tour the tariff question was magnified. Blaine continually compared the wealth of the state in 1884 with that of 1860 and credited the protective tariff with the progress. Professing great concern for the workingman, he predicted dire consequences if the Democrats were to gain office. He persuaded his audiences to assume that the only way to continue that progress was to continue the Republicans in office. He ignored the "hard times" which touched large numbers of Ohioans.

Commenting on Blaine's remarks on the tariff during his Ohio tour, the *Enquirer* stated, "He does not show that the Republicans have had a consistent tariff policy, nor is he able to show that the capitalist whose manufacturers are protected by a high tariff adds his excessive profits to the wages of the employees and not to his own pockets."15

Labelling all Democrats as free-traders, blaming the business depression on the fear of a Democratic victory, and claiming that all the prosperity of the country was due to the Republican tariff policy was clearly demagogical. The Democratic assertion that the Republicans seized on the tariff question to divert attention from civil service reform and Blaine's public record seems justifiable.

14Ibid., Sept., 8, 1884.

15Cincinnati *Enquirer*, Oct. 9, 1884.
2. Civil Service

Because of the multiplicity of government activities after the war and the consequent increase in the number of civil servants, and because the Republicans had been in control of the government with little effective opposition for twenty-four years, the abuses generally associated with the spoils system before the war had grown in number and seriousness. No longer could personal attention be given to making appointments, and political considerations were the dominant criterion for an appointment. Through the skillful use of his patronage, a professional politician could keep himself in power. An abuse of the spoils system which attracted even greater public attention than the inefficiency and corruption which resulted, was the practice of assessing office-holders for campaign expenses. Supposedly voluntary, in actuality contributions were often extracted under threat of dismissal. Laws passed in 1876 and 1877 attempted to correct this evil, but they were not strictly enforced, and the practice continued. The Republicans readily admitted that contributions from office holders had been sought on many occasions, but the Democrats found it nearly impossible to prove that the contributions were not entirely "voluntary" or that any office holder had been dismissed solely for his failure to contribute.

These abuses and the numerous scandals associated with the Grant administration and the "Star Route" frauds of the Arthur administration convinced many that reform in the civil service should be the dominant issue in American politics in 1884. The reformers included some prominent men of both parties and a large number of well-educated and patriotic citizens. The public, at first, showed little interest in the reform of
the civil service. The spoils system was firmly entrenched in their thinking. Politicians of both parties were initially hostile since they realized that their own influence would be reduced. The reformers gradually awakened the public interest, however, and politicians were forced to openly proclaim their support of the reform idea. When public pressure became too great to be ignored, the reform was carried into law, and both parties claimed credit for it.

A short-lived attempt at reform had come in 1871 when a commission had been established for administering a system of competitive exams for entrance into the civil service. The commission had encountered severe opposition from politicians and little support from Grant and so was allowed to lapse in 1873. The platforms and candidates of both parties in 1876 had been favorable to reform, but the actual accomplishments of the Hayes administration had not been great.

Various societies had been created to work for the adoption of civil service reform, and in 1881 a new National League of Civil Service Reform Associations had elected George William Curtis as its first president. Though the membership was small, men of ability and influence were active. Harper's Weekly and the Nation added their support to the movement.

The Independents of the Republican party had supported Garfield's nomination in 1880 since they believed that he was favorably disposed toward reform. However, his later attitude disappointed them.

16 Thomas, op. cit., pp. 103-04.
Arthur's attitude toward reform was a pleasant surprise to the reformers. Much attention was given to reform during the congressional elections of 1882 in many states, and it was believed that the Republicans were defeated because they had failed to take any action on the issue. When Congress reconvened in 1882, the Pendleton Bill was promptly passed (early in 1883) by both houses of Congress.17

The men appointed by Arthur as the first Civil Service Commission met with the approval of the reformers, and they immediately began their task of drafting rules. The first report of the Commission in February, 1884, stated that the law had already accomplished good results, that it was unanimously approved wherever it was in effect, and that the President had provided his "constant and unwavering support."18

The Pendleton Act was forced on many politicians of both parties against their will by the public pressure whipped up by a few hard-working enthusiasts. Neither party completely favored reform, but neither dared to completely oppose it. The attitude of Ohio Democrats toward the reform was readily illustrated by the failure to return strong spoilsman, Henry B. Payne, in his place. Benjamin Butler in a speech before the Democratic National Convention in 1884 claimed, "George Washington could not have passed a civil service examination in the capital named for him for a $1200 clerkship." Butler, whose career

17 Ibid., p. 98.

18 Ibid., p. 99.
had led to many charges against him, advocated "the frequent change of officers" so that they might look over the books to see who the defaulters were.19

The platforms of both parties endorsed the reform in 1884. The Republicans claimed credit for it and recommended its extension. The earnest advocates of reform realized, however, that a large majority of politicians in both parties opposed it, and therefore, if the law were to be extended in scope and properly enforced, the president elected in 1884 had to be friendly to reform. Regardless of the party platforms, the reformers believed the candidate's sincerity in his advocacy of the reform was a first consideration in their support of a presidential nominee.

Blaine, as a leader of his party in Congress had been in a position to promote reform, but he had done nothing to encourage it and, on several occasions, had used his influence against it. After the elections of 1882 he paid lip-service to the reform principle.20

On the other hand, Cleveland was fortunate in that he had gained prominence because of his devotion to reform in New York. Even though the Republicans, in all probability, contained a larger proportion of honest reformers advocates, the Independents believed that Cleveland offered greater promise of the continuation and extension of reform than did Blaine. This desire to promote reform was one of the principal reasons for the revolt of the Independents, and therefore it became an important issue in the campaign of 1884.


20Thomas, op. cit., pp. 103-04.
3. MINOR ISSUES

The slight difference in attitude between the parties on the major issues of the tariff and civil service reform was even less apparent on the more minor questions. An attempt by John Sherman to revive the southern question which was still useful to Republican politicians ended without arousing any great public interest. Sherman had introduced a resolution in Congress early in 1884 to investigate the outbreaks of violence which had accompanied elections in 1883 in Mississippi and Virginia. The Democrats did not oppose the resolution, and a committee was selected. Abundant testimony was recorded, but the majority and minority reports were distinctly partisan.

Both parties devoted portions of their platform to the "southern question." The Republicans pledged legislation which would "secure to every citizen, of whatever race and color, the full and complete recognition, possession, and exercise of all civil and political rights." Distrust of the Democrats still lingered especially among the older generation and occasional stories of southern outrages which were circulated were attempts to keep this latent prejudice alive.

The southern question received very little attention nationally or in Ohio during the campaign. Sherman touched on it and referred to the menace of the solid South in several speeches and reiterated the belief that the party which had tried to "destroy the Union should never be permitted to govern it." It was frequently stated that it would be

---

21 Proceedings, p. 94.

dangerous to return power to the Democrats who had the basis of their strength in the South with its bitterness, its narrowness, its hostility to northern interests, and its desire to restore its old glory.\textsuperscript{23}

The planks in the party platforms relating to the currency issue were practically identical, and currency was not an issue in the election campaign. The Greenbackers were silenced by the great increase of money in circulation. Both parties wished to ignore the money issue, since it, like the tariff, cut across party lines.\textsuperscript{24}

The conduct of foreign affairs was not a live issue and played practically no part in the campaign. Both parties pledged in their platforms to avoid foreign entanglements and to work for friendlier relations with the nation's hemispheric neighbors. Some minor attention was focused on Blaine's record as Secretary of State, and occasional remarks in Ohio Democratic newspapers claimed that if Blaine were elected the country would become involved in a foreign war. This, however, was not taken seriously by the voters.

Both parties posed as the friend of the laborer and the farmer. The Democrats reiterated their claim to being the traditional party of the commoners while the Republicans were designated by them as the party of the privileged groups. The Republicans claimed that their policy of protection was in the interest of the workingman and reminded the farmers that they were the originators of the Homestead Act. Neither party had any

\textsuperscript{23}Cincinnati \textit{Commercial-Gazette}, passim.

\textsuperscript{24}Thomas, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 133.
definite programs, however, and any laws passed by Congress concerning the problems of the laborer or farmer had been passed by votes from both parties.

Since both older parties had failed to take a definite stand on the newer issues, new parties formed to promote the interests of special groups. Farmers' organizations, anti-monopoly groups, and other discontented elements had tended to unite into one party in 1885. It was generally believed that the depression which had begun in 1882 and its resultant unemployment and hardships would cause the minor parties to play a more significant role in the election of 1884 than they had in 1880.

Several days prior to the November election the Democratic-controlled Supreme Court of Ohio declared unconstitutional the Scott Law providing for the licensing of saloons. Undoubtedly, the decision was handed down at that particular time for the purpose of placating the liquor interests who had voted for the Democracy in 1883 because they had been promised repeal of the law. When no action had been taken large numbers of those opposed to liquor regulation had voted for the Republican state ticket in October.

Governor Hoadly had predicted that a Republican victory in Ohio in November would result in a prohibition amendment for the state. Democrats hoped that his prediction would frighten the liquor interests into a "vigorous" support of the Democratic ticket. The Enquirer remarked,

25Daily Ohio State Journal (Columbus), Oct. 31, 1884.
"Whatever use can be made of the decision will be made by the Democratic managers in every part of Ohio." All of their efforts, however, were in vain.

It was noted in the Republican press that the financial effect of the court decision would be "disastrous in the extreme" since the local taxes in many communities had been adjusted on the basis of the Scott Law collections in 1883. The deficit would have to be made up by an increase in the 1885 levies which would devolve upon merchants, manufacturers, and laborers.

C. THE CAMPAIGN

The campaign of 1884 was officially opened with the formal notification of the candidates and the publication of their letters of acceptance. Blaine's was the first to appear. Since the Republicans had determined to make the tariff the sole issue of the campaign, he devoted half of his letter to a defense of the protective tariff. Using many statistics, Blaine attempted to prove that the great progress and prosperity of the country in the preceding twenty years had been due primarily to the Republican policy of protection.

He referred to his policy as Secretary of State of encouraging peace, friendship and closer commercial relations with the nation's South American neighbors and advocated that this policy be enlarged. In the United States Blaine believed that there was "a growing cordiality"

26 Cincinnati Enquirer, Oct. 30, 1884.
between the North and South and that what the South needed was capital. He referred briefly to his advocacy of religious liberty, sound currency, the civil service, and the free ballot. He declared that the public domain should be reserved for settlers, and that our merchant marine should be restored to prominence.

To Republicans Blaine's letter was "forcible," containing "a masterly array of facts and figures" and "just such a document as we would expect from the greatest living statesman." Similarly, Logan's letter which appeared several days later was described as "straightforward and statesmanlike," the prominent questions of the day having been discussed in a "lucid and scholarly manner."27

In the Democratic press Blaine's letter was considered to be "a disappointing document" lacking the "rhetoric, warmth, and the brilliancy, that everybody expected from the 'magnetic candidate.'" It was asserted that he had surprised "the Free Trade wing of his party by his radical commitment to the policy of protection."28 As was often the case, the Cleveland Plain Dealer was extremely vivid as it declared, "Like all public utterances of Blaine his letter of acceptance is windy, and demagogical, full of insolence, misrepresentation, and falsehoods; the production of an errant trickster and blatant demagogue endeavoring to conceal the truth in a multitude of fair words."29

In his letter of acceptance Cleveland approved the Democratic platform and devoted much space to his advocacy of civil service reform and

27Cleveland Weekly Leader, July 26, 1884.
28Cincinnati Enquirer, July 19, 1884.
29Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 19, 1884.
the need for legislation for the improvement of the condition of the
workingman. Mildly, he declared his opposition to prohibition. The
Cleveland Herald remarked that Cleveland made "a desperate attempt" to
pose as the "workingman's friend," but that friendship had not been evident
in the bills which he had vetoed as governor. On the other hand, the
Cleveland Plain Dealer declared, "His letter will stand as one of the
most important documents . . . that ever emanated from the pen . . . of a
great public man." 31

Stephen B. Elkins of West Virginia and New York was one of Blaine's
chief advisers during the campaign, but B. F. Jones of Pittsburgh, perhaps
because of his great wealth, was selected as chairman of the Republican
National Committee which actually managed the campaign from its New York
headquarters.

Cleveland's campaign was managed by ex-Senator W. H. Barnum of
Connecticut, although ex-Senator A. P. Gorman of Maryland and Daniel
Manning of New York took an active part. Barnum's selection was not
welcomed by the Independents since his name had been connected with
several scandals of earlier campaigns. The campaign set a precedent in
the number of campaign clubs, glee clubs, and bands organized in support
of the candidates in cities and smaller towns. According to the party
alignment of the paper reporting them, the many parades and mass meetings
were described as enthusiastic with an immense attendance or attended by
only a small and rather unenthusiastic crowd.

30 Cleveland Herald, Aug. 23, 1884.
31 Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 24, 1884.
One of the most important events in the first days of the campaign and one making the entire campaign of more than ordinary interest was the revolt of the Independents against the Republican ticket. Long before, as it had become clear that Blaine was the strongest candidate for the Republican nomination, groups of independents had let it be known that Blaine would not receive the support of the entire party in the event of his nomination.

On June 7 the Massachusetts Reform Club in Boston had repudiated Blaine and Logan and had organized to defeat them by the appointment of a committee of outstanding citizens. Charles Francis Adams, Jr., Josiah Quincy, Moorfield Storey, James Freeman Clarke, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Leverett Saltonstall, and Richard H. Dana were among those appointed to the committee. On June 13 a second meeting, attended by "the best brains in the city" sought to "rebuke corrupt men and corrupt methods in politics." An executive Committee of One-Hundred was appointed to conduct the independent campaign, and delegates were chosen to attend a conference in New York to be held four days later.

The New York Tribune on the morning after the adjournment of the Republican convention had asked in an editorial, "What will George William Curtis and his followers do?" The answer was soon forthcoming.

On June 17 a score or more of the Boston Independents arrived in New York for conferences with the New Yorkers. Later, in the evening a final "consultation" was held in the home of Joseph Henry Harper. Among the

---

eighty-seven persons present were Curtis, Carl Schurz, Henry Holt, E. L. Burlingame, and Thomas Nast. Curtis stated that the object of the meeting was "to get an impression of sentiment" from men elsewhere concerning the Republican ticket and what was to be done. Schurz denounced the nomination of Blaine and Logan as "in absolute disregard of the reform sentiment of the nation." There were a larger number of civil service reformers in the Republican party and the platform was definite in its pledge to reform. Therefore, to the Mugwumps, the record and leadership of Blaine was a factor of tremendous importance, but they finally decided to bolt the party.

The epithet, "Mugwump," used to designate these "holier-than-thou-Pharisees" seems to have been appropriated from Eliot's Indian Bible by the Indianapolis Sentinel at the time of Liberal Republican Movement in 1872. Charles A. Dana revived the appellation in the New York Sun in March, 1884, and provided Indian etymology translating the term as "big bug or swell head."

Local clubs of Independents were formed in many states, but Boston and New York City were the chief centers. In New York on July 22 an organizational meeting was held, attended by more than five-hundred accredited delegates, and presided over by Curtis. A motion to form a third party was rejected, but a committee was appointed to conduct the campaign, distribute literature, and send out speakers. The paramount

33 Ibid., p. 290.

issue of the campaign was declared to be moral rather than political, and
civil service reform was the most serious problem. The reasons for the
existence of the Independents were set forth; Blaine was condemned while
Cleveland was hailed as an honest and courageous reformer.

Prominent speakers sent out included Schurz, Curtis, and Henry Ward
Beecher of New York and T. W. Higginson and Josiah Quincy of Boston.
Schurz's speech in Brooklyn on August 3 in which he analyzed Blaine's
record and explained the Mugwump position was widely quoted. On a
western tour in September he spoke at Cincinnati on two separate occasions
and drew "tremendous and enthusiastic" crowds.

Not only did many prominent Republican leaders bolt their party, but
also many newspapers sympathized with the movement. The Nation and Harper's
Weekly, the New York Herald, New York Times, New York Evening Post and
Evening Telegram, as well as large influential Republican and independent
newspapers in other cities, refused to support Blaine. The editorials
published in these and other bolting papers were quoted throughout the
country.

Although bitterly opposed to Blaine's nomination, other prominent
men of the reform movement could not bring themselves to bolt the ticket.
Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, Hamilton Fish, Senator George F.
Edmunds, and Andrew D. White all held Cleveland in the highest respect but
believed there was no more hope for reform from the Democratic party than
with Blaine. Some felt dutybound to support the party nominee inasmuch
as his had been a fair nomination. None would defend Blaine.

The Mugwumps did not accept the Democratic party or its platform,
but rather they supported Cleveland. To them Blaine's defeat would mean
the salvation of the Republican party. Their view was that Cleveland was better than his party and Blaine was worse than his. They advised voters to use their own discretion in voting for members of Congress.\textsuperscript{35}

The Republican newspapers in Ohio chimed in on the chorus denouncing the Independents as "Pharisees," "goody-gooders," "soreheads," "Assistant Democrats," and "political hermaphrodites." The Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette remarked, "Our faith in reformers who change their principles to suit their purposes has vanished in thin air. Next . . . they will fall into the embrace of Tammany Hall and march with John Kelley under the banner of reform."\textsuperscript{36}

The Republican newspapers at first tried to ridicule the Mugwumps and minimize their importance. When that was no longer possible, they denounced the bolters for not supporting the ticket, revived old charges of the Independents against the Democrats, and declared that they were all free-traders anyway.

The campaign of 1884 was unique in its extremes. It was a campaign of personalities rather than principles, and the two personalities involved were antipodal in character, records, methods, and means. James Gillespie Blaine was often described as magnetic, approachable, high-strung, and possessed of a vivid imagination and a marvelous memory for facts, names, and faces. Men either devotedly admired or completely distrusted him. Grover Cleveland was almost devoid of personal charm, brusque, tactless, unimaginative, commonplace in his tastes and character,


\textsuperscript{36}Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, June 30, 1884.
but courageous, honest, and hard-working. When the campaign had reached the peak of excitement, Blaine was "lifting crowds of eager listeners to mountain peaks of enthusiasm," but Cleveland was in the Governor's Mansion in Albany phlegmatically "plodding away at business." Although Cleveland spoke very seldom, some of his words are well-remembered, yet scarcely anything that Blaine said still lives.\textsuperscript{37}

In comparison with Blaine, Cleveland was a newcomer in politics. Blaine was an adroit strategist and a diplomat in politics while Cleveland merely stated his view and was prepared to take the consequences. Blaine was very popular with professional politicians and supported by them, but Cleveland never was.

It was perhaps inevitable that Blaine's financial dealings would play a part in the campaign. In an attempt to prevent his nomination, Blaine's opponents revived all the scandal of the 1876 Mulligan Letters and his railroad dealings. Thomas Nast's cartoons in Harper's Weekly branded him as the "Tattoed Man"--tattooed with all the financial scandals in which he had been involved. On September 15 a new set of Mulligan Letters appeared which had not been in Blaine's possession at the time of his defense in 1876. The most damaging was one in which he asked a former business associate in the complicated transactions of the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad, Warren G. Fisher, to sign and make public as his own a letter composed by Blaine exonerating himself. Blaine had marked the letter "confidential" and had written at the bottom, "Burn this letter." Fisher had neither written the letter

requested nor burned Blaine's. The authenticity of the letters was
admitted by Blaine, and they did seem to make Blaine's guilt more probable.

The Cleveland Herald commented loyally, "... Whatever effect these
new letters may have will be to strengthen Mr. Blaine before the country
and tend to confirm at all points the explanations" made by him.35

Mr. Parke Goodwin, editor of the New York Commercial Advertiser made
"the most complete analysis of the Mulligan Letters." Never a Blaine
enthusiast, he had withheld his support until it was evident that Blaine
was the choice of the majority of Republicans. He admitted frankly that
he had approached the task with "a degree of suspicion" that he would find
"some grains of truth in the accusations." According to the Republican
press, his "fair and impartial findings" completely exonerated Blaine from
the accusations against him. Such papers held that this exoneration had
been reached by "the sound and honest process of reasoning, supported by
facts and indisputable evidence, and not by partisan prejudice."39

The Cincinnati Enquirer said, "Never in the entire history of
campaigns has there been a more absolute perversion of truth than in
this Mulligan matter."40

Cleveland was charged with being an enemy of the workingman. His
record as governor on questions involving labor was not entirely satis-
factory, and the Republicans were anxious to nurture that dissatisfaction.
That the Democrats realized the importance of the labor vote is obvious
from the attention devoted to labor problems in Cleveland's letter of

38 Cleveland Herald, Sept. 17, 1884.
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40 Cincinnati Enquirer, Oct. 11, 1884.
acceptance, in his two speeches of the campaign, and the extensive coverage of the question in the Democratic Campaign Textbook.

According to the Cleveland Herald, the workingmen of the country were speaking out against Cleveland for his acts as governor antagonistic to their interests. The Plain Dealer believed that there was a great deal of misunderstanding and misrepresentation about Cleveland's vetoes in the Republican press and attempted to clarify the issues in print. In reference to the five-cent fare veto, Cleveland had pointed out in his veto message that the act was in conflict with the vested rights granted to the road in its charter, and that no act of the legislature could abridge a vested right. Another bill had made twelve hours a legal day's labor for street car conductors, but did not forbid the making of contracts under which the conductors would be compelled to work as many or as few hours as the company might prescribe. Cleveland believed that the act was in the interest of the company, not the employees.

He had also vetoed a bill allowing an appropriation to a sectarian institution because he felt it would set a dangerous precedent. The reporter concluded, "In all these vetoes Grover Cleveland acted from a clear sense of duty, opposing futile and demagogical legislation ... even at the risk of unpopularity. The man with courage and intelligence to do that is the man needed for President."41 Ohio's Democratic newspapers continually referred to the Cleveland and Hendricks ticket as the "workingman's choice."

An effort by the Democrats to make Blaine appear unfriendly to the workingman was embodied in the charge that Blaine owned stock in the

41Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 16, 1884.
Hocking Valley Mine in Ohio where a wage dispute had caused a strike and where violence and property destruction had resulted when the company imported strike-breakers. The strike, lasting throughout the summer and fall of 1884, had attracted much newspaper attention. Blaine denied the frequent charges in the Democratic press that he was part-owner of the company in a letter to Hon. H. S. Bundy in which he stated, "... I beg to say that I am not and never have been the owner of any coal lands or iron lands... in the Hocking Valley or any part of Ohio..."\(^4^2\)

The charges continued, however. The *Plain Dealer* remarked that "an honest workingman" who has been at Elkins' and Blaine's mines and "knows what he is talking about" testified that the business was run on the principle that no self-respecting "workingman or intelligent mechanic need apply." Only those would be hired who would consent to work for sixty or sixty-five cents per day which Blaine had often said he regarded as "fair remuneration for a day's work." "Scandinavian and Italian pauper labor," but "no skilled Irish or Germans" are employed, the newspaper reported.\(^4^3\)

Probably the most villainous incident of the campaign was the attack on the private life and moral character of Cleveland. On July 21 the *Buffalo Evening Telegram* printed a story charging Cleveland with being a drunkard and a libertine. The details of illicit relations with a woman of Buffalo some years earlier and testified to by two ministers created a sensation. The story was garnished with all the falsehoods that were

\(^{4^2}\)Cleveland *Herald*, Aug. 1, 1884.

\(^{4^3}\)Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, July 24, 1884.
believed relevant to insure Cleveland's defeat. Ten years previously Cleveland had had a liaison with Maria Halpin, a young and comely widow who was employed in a dry goods store. Although she had received the attentions of several men, she charged Cleveland with the paternity of a son born in September, 1874, whom she named Oscar Folsom Cleveland. Even though he had not been certain that he was responsible, he had agreed to support the child since the other men involved with her were married. Possibly she hoped to force him to marry her.

After the initial charges, more false allegations were published in the *Telegram* and subsequently reprinted in Republican newspapers throughout the country. When a close friend asked Cleveland what should be done, he replied, "Tell the truth." Cleveland readily admitted the story so far as it was true.

The Republican newspapers in Ohio sought to keep the scandal alive by publishing stories bearing such titles as "Maria Halpin--The Story of the Wrongs She Suffered At The Hands of Grover Cleveland." She was frequently characterized as a "quiet, honest, humble" woman who "conducted herself with propriety" and who had experienced "years of shame, suffering, and degradation" forced on her by Grover Cleveland. She had refused to exonerate Cleveland because "on his account she was exiled from kindred and friends" and "now patiently awaiting death to end her misery."44

The Republican press abounded in stories of Cleveland's "lecheries, debaucheries," and "deeds of darkness." Ministers were unable to agree

44*Cleveland Weekly Leader*, Aug. 23, 1884.
as to the truth of the charges. Dr. James Freeman Clarke and Henry Ward Beecher of Boston discounted most of the insinuations when no substantial proof could be provided and supported Cleveland. Reverend Dr. Washington Gladden of Columbus felt called upon to make an investigation. He found Cleveland to be "a morally bad man."\textsuperscript{45}

The Democratic press ignored the charges at first and, when Cleveland admitted to the extent of his implication, they readily defended him. The Cincinnati \textit{Enquirer} published the story in its entirety while the \textit{Plain Dealer} tended to ignore the details making only an occasional mention of the scandal.

By September the scandal had abated somewhat, but when the new Mulligan Letters and the attacks on Blaine's marriage were published, it was again revived. Letters were sent by Republicans to ministers and women describing Cleveland's immorality, and Republican orators often referred to the scandal. The \textit{Leader} called Cleveland "a most unfit man for the high office he seeks," and pointed out that the Democratic party should replace him "at once."\textsuperscript{46}

To the Mugwumps supporting Cleveland, the matter was extremely serious. They had turned to him because of the lack of moral character in the Republican standard-bearer, and now it was revealed that Cleveland's indiscretions were far more serious to a religious America than the business and political accusations made against Blaine. Had the story come

\textsuperscript{45}\textit{Daily Ohio State Journal} (Columbus), Aug. 16, 1884.
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later in the campaign without allowing ample time for investigation and proper refutation of the charges, it might well have caused Cleveland's defeat.

Blaine's personal and family life was believed to be above reproach, but on August 8 the Indianapolis Sentinel published a story which was damaging to his family. The Sentinel declared that there were certain irregularities in Blaine's marriage and the birth of his first child. The child had died three years later and the birth date on the gravestone had been mysteriously obliterated. Blaine immediately instituted a libel suit against the newspaper and published a letter explaining the facts of his marriage to the satisfaction of most people. It was believed that Cleveland ordered the Democratic campaign managers to ignore the charges made against Blaine and that he destroyed documents sent to him which were supposed to support the charges.

The Leader denounced the charges as "false, slanderous, and cowardly by prominent men in the Democratic party . . . The Plain Dealer seems determined to cover Cleveland's hideous immorality by dragging Mr. Blaine's inestimable family down to the level of the great debauchee and his unfortunate victim."47

Among Blaine's special qualifications was the fact that he had many friends among the Irish who were usually Democratic voters. His mother had been an Irish Catholic and one of his sisters was a Mother Superior in a convent, and as Secretary of State he had been sufficiently anti-British

47Ibid., Sept. 27, 1884.
to gain their confidence. Democratic newspapers claimed the Irish would remain loyal, while the Republican press predicted a large Irish defection to the Republican ranks and charged Cleveland with being a "Presbyterian bigot" for his veto as governor of a bill favoring a Catholic institution. Some Catholic clergy, however, rallied to his support deploring the attempt to make religion an issue.

To counter that charge, Democratic leaders, greatly distressed over the possible loss of Irish voters, charged that thirty years previously Blaine had been a member of the Know-Nothing Party and had strongly favored its aims and principles. The charges were denied, and it was pointed out that he had used the Kennebec Journal which he then edited to discourage "Know-Nothingism." Indeed, he had encouraged his partner, John L. Stephens, to withdraw from the party's activities.

Rev. Mr. Burchard's well publicized "rum, Romanism, and rebellion" speech apparently had little influence upon the Irish vote in Ohio, since Blaine's majority far exceeded the Republican majority in the October election. It was noted in Cleveland that there were strong Republican gains in heavy Irish wards and that many Irish who voted Democratic in October voted for Blaine on November 4.48

In Ohio the Democrats attempted to identify Blaine with prohibition hoping to lure the German vote from the Republican column. The Democratic press repeatedly played upon the German fears of prohibition and reminded

48Annual Report of the Secretary of State to the Governor of the State of Ohio For the Year 1884 (Columbus: 1885), p. 313. See also the Cleveland Weekly Leader, Nov. 8, 1884.
them that Blaine's home state was the first to enact sumptuary laws. The Commercial-Gazette almost daily countered with affirmations of the enthusiastic support of Cincinnati's large German population for Blaine.

After the October election, the Enquirer commented, "It is evident that our German fellow-citizens did not vote the Democratic ticket."49

John P. St. John, the candidate of the Prohibitionists, spoke in Oberlin at a large and enthusiastic rally." The Republicans fearing that the Prohibitionist ticket would draw votes from their ranks endeavored to induce St. John to withdraw with the argument that he was merely strengthening the Democrats who were opposed to prohibitory legislation. He refused to withdraw and made speeches particularly ridiculing the Republicans. Many Prohibitionists were drawn from the ranks of the Republican party since many were the moral reformers who had joined that party in the 1860's. Now that the slavery issue was dead, they gave vent to their reforming enthusiasm by favoring prohibition. St. John predicted that the Prohibitionist vote would be large enough to affect the result in Ohio and several other states, but the Herald remarked, "There are thousands of . . . temperance advocates . . . who have not yet brought themselves to the point of engaging in prohibition politically . . ."50 Republican papers printed letters from ministers and other prominent citizens appealing to those planning to cast their ballot for St. John not "to throw their vote away," but to vote instead for Blaine and Logan.

49 Cincinnati Enquirer, Oct. 16, 1884.
50 Cleveland Herald, Sept. 22, 1884.
The Butler vote was not considered to be "great enough to work mischief on one side or the other" in Ohio, nor was the Independent secession expected to produce noticeable effect on the result of the election in Ohio.\textsuperscript{51}

The press in Ohio seemed to concur in the opinion that the 1884 campaign was one of the most exciting ever witnessed in the state. Both parties conducted thorough and well-organized campaigns. The many parades and rallies were generally well-attended and enthusiastic. The visit of the Democratic vice-presidential nominee and the two Republican candidates added greatly to the interest and enthusiasm.

Senator John Sherman opened the campaign when he spoke at Ashland on August 30, and from that time until the close of the canvass he spoke almost daily. Sherman's speech was described as "a fine and manly" discussion of the condition of politics in the South, and the tariff question during which he gave special attention to the duties on wool. The reporter concluded by remarking that Sherman was a "true Republican and statesman, and young and vigorous enough for the future."\textsuperscript{52}

Throughout the summer months Blaine had remained at home in Maine, but in September he took the stump appealing for support for the Republican ticket, a practice at that time still considered beneath the dignity of a presidential candidate. After the great Republican victory in Maine in September which "by far exceeded our most sanguine hopes,"\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{51Ibid., Aug. 12, 1884.}
\textsuperscript{52Ibid., Aug. 31, 1884.}
\textsuperscript{53Ibid., Sept. 10, 1884.}
Blaine set out on a tour which took him to Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois.

Carl Schurz had delivered "scores" of addresses before thousands of German-Americans in the mid-West and had been "enthusiastically" received by audiences in Columbus, Cleveland and Cincinnati. In an effort to counteract Schurz's influence and the new batch of Mulligan Letters which appeared in September, Blaine's "magnetic presence" was needed in the mid-West.

Coming into Ohio "triumphantly" from New York and Pennsylvania, the first Ohio town Blaine reached was Conneaut. Through some "confusion and misunderstanding" the people were "thoroughly unprepared to give Mr. Blaine the reception he would have otherwise been tendered." In Ashtabula Senator Sherman, who had joined Blaine's party along with M. A. Hanna, ex-Governor Foster, and J. B. Foraker in Buffalo, introduced Blaine who spoke "briefly but eloquently" to the "vast crowd" assembled. At both Painesville and Geneva "immense crowds of utmost enthusiasm" heard Blaine described as "Garfield's best friend." In the course of his remarks, Foraker shouted:

"Republicans of Ohio and the Western Reserve, do your duty!"
"We will do it," said a bystander.
"Yes, you said you would do it one year ago," retorted Foraker, but when the votes were counted out, it was found that somebody failed to do it."
"We voted for the ladies," said another bystander.
"Don't vote for the ladies this time!" was the Judge's reply.54

Because the entourage arrived in nearby Mentor thirty minutes ahead of schedule, they found a relatively small crowd assembled.

54Cleveland Weekly Leader, Oct. 4, 1884.
The journey of Logan from West Virginia through Ohio to Cleveland to meet Blaine was also "triumphant." Even in "Democratic-ridden Tuscarawas county" where Logan's party stopped at an early hour for breakfast there was a "vast throng clamoring for a few words from the 'Black Eagle'." At Uhrichsville and Massillon the "enthusiasm was unbounded" and "one prolonged cheer filled the atmosphere."

In Cleveland, it was noted that "the welcome given Blaine, the Statesman, and Logan, the Soldier, surpassed anything of its kind in the history of the city." The Leader remarked, "The enthusiasm of a loving and loyal people knew no bounds and the brass band no silence . . . Never were two statesmen so affectionately received. Men's hearts leaped when their straining eyes beheld either of their loved leaders. Cheers went up constantly until throats grew hoarse and refused to respond to further demands."

"Thousands" poured into the city on excursion trains and it was noted that there were nearly as many women as men in the crowd. The demand for decorations was so "unprecedented" that the supply had been exhausted. Flags and bunting, portraits of the standard-bearers, and "brightly-colored Chinese lanterns" gave the streets "a gay holiday appearance." Windows commanding a view of the reviewing stand and the parade were "for rent for reasonable rates."

The great culminating event was the mass meeting on Public Square where "the best representatives of the young, vigorous Republican party

---

55Cleveland Herald, Sept. 27, 1884.

56Cleveland Weekly Leader, Oct. 4, 1884.
discussed in words of eloquent fire the great principles that have won for it the leading position in the very van of progress and civilization." Cheers and shouts for Blaine and Logan to speak were "overwhelming" and both made brief remarks about the denseness of the crowd and expressed their gratitude for so grand a demonstration.  

The procession was described as "one continual ovation from beginning to end" for the hundreds of uniformed members of the Blaine and Logan clubs, and the torchbearers wearing white helmets and plumes. Five-thousand roman candles, sky rockets, and the continuously booming cannons encouraged "the wild and spontaneous enthusiasm for the Republican candidates and the cause they represent." One gentleman "who is used to crowds" estimated that the crowd in the Square and surrounding streets numbered 75,000. Other estimates were given varying from 65,000 to 100,000, but the Plain Dealer estimated "no more than 50,000" were present.

From Cleveland Blaine traveled to Toledo making stops along the way at Elyria, Oberlin, Sandusky, and Fremont. His speech at Toledo was one which "would not soon be forgotten." There he spoke "sublime words" when he said, "I should rather be the victim of slander than the author of it."

---

57Ibid. Among others, brief addresses were given by Forsaker, Sherman, and Hanna.

58Cleveland Herald, Sept. 27, 1884.

59Cleveland Weekly Leader, Oct. 4, 1884.

60Toledo Blade, Sept. 30, 1884.
Tiffin, Urbana, Bellefontaine, and Springfield were the next stops on his itinerary. In the latter town Blaine addressed "a vast assemblage with brief eloquence" which brought forth "deafening cheers." He was "smothered with flowers, the fragrant expression of woman's approval and admiration."\(^{61}\)

In Dayton and Hamilton where he was challenged during his remarks about the tariff by unemployed workingmen, the demonstrations were repeated. In Cincinnati "a solid mass of admirers" greeted him at the depot. The city was elaborately decorated and a "monster procession" marked Blaine's arrival and departure from the Exposition where, alone with Sherman, Butterworth, and Foraker, he delivered an address. It was noted that people were "thoroughly awakened to the tariff issue" in Cincinnati.\(^{62}\)

From Cincinnati to Columbus numerous stops were made and Blaine, seemingly always able to say just the proper thing in his lucid and persuasive manner, spoke briefly from the platform of his special train. People in Columbus turned out "en masse" to welcome him and everywhere that he appeared he was greeted with "rousing cheers." En route to West Virginia from Columbus, the "Plumed Knight" spoke to the people of Nelsonville, Logan, and other towns in the coal mining area of south-eastern Ohio. In his remarks to them, he denied the charges which linked him to the mine ownership, upheld the Republican policy of protection, and stressed his advocacy of arbitration to settle differences between employers and employees. The reception was "enthusiastic, equalling

\(^{61}\)Daily Ohio State Journal (Columbus), Oct. 1, 1884.

\(^{62}\)Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, Oct. 3, 1884.
or surpassing the demonstrations in almost any other section of the
state."63 The Ohio State Journal noted that Blaine "won many friends in
the Hocking Valley by his sensible, candid talks." Elsewhere his speech
was described as "a talk of a man of truth to men of sense and it won the
hearty approval of those who listened."64

When Blaine spoke to the citizens of Lancaster on October 11, he
digressed from his customary topic of the tariff to reminisce about his
youthful days spent in their town. He recalled his former schoolmaster,
Mr. William Lyons, whom he greatly admired. As a schoolboy, he had
resided in the home of Thomas Ewing whose own children were Blaine's
cousins. He recalled the names of Ohio young men whose names had since
become famous—Phil Sheridan, U. S. Grant, William Tecumseh Sherrill, and
his younger brother, John. After the backward glance into his boyhood
days, he pleaded for support in the coming election, and it was noted
that this speech won him more friends than many of the political speeches
that he had made.65

Mass meeting and rallies had been held almost daily over the state.
William McKinley, a Congressional candidate in the Twentieth District,
delivered his first address of the campaign on September 8 at Cuyahoga
Falls to a "large and enthusiastic" meeting. Blaine and Logan club
members came from many nearby towns to hear McKinley's speech on the
tariff which was described as "full of bright thoughts, truths, and

63 Cleveland Weekly Leader, Oct. 18, 1884.
64 Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, Oct. 13, 1884.
65 James G. Blaine, Political Discussions: Legislative, Diplomatic,
sound Republican doctrine." Blaine appreciably aided McKinley in his district with a powerful and effective speech on October 7, in which he paid McKinley the compliment of saying that "he is the ablest advocate of protection in his time" and added that "this community would be derelict in its duty if it failed to elect him to Congress."66

In a major address at Columbus, where "hundreds" had to be turned away, Sherman gave considerable attention to a discussion of the tariff and financial questions. For almost two hours he spoke and "deafening cheers" were heard when he compared the stand of the two parties on the leading questions of the campaign. He closed with an "eloquent and glowing" tribute to the Republican candidates. The meeting adjourned amid campaign singing and great cheering. Another "comprehensive and exhaustive" review of the tariff issue was delivered in a speech early in October in Bellefontaine by Judge Lawrence, First Comptroller of the Treasury.

The Plain Dealer called Blaine's tour "a shameful and degrading spectacle" and generally ignored it, but the Cincinnati Enquirer gave the event considerably more attention. The Leader reminded both papers that Democratic nominees in 1848, 1860, and 1868 had done the same thing.67

Although the Democrats made a great effort to win Ohio in 1884 and held many rallies and meetings, they seem to have been aware of the Republican precedent for victory in presidential elections. On repeated

66Canton Repository, Oct. 8, 1884.

67Cleveland Weekly Leader, Oct. 4, 1884.
occasions, however, Democratic newspapers reassured their readers that "Ohio is now more properly a Democratic state" since it had been carried by the Democrats in two consecutive elections by decisive majorities. The *Enquirer* referred frequently to the "large latent Democratic vote in Ohio" which only needed organization. The paper criticized the Democratic campaigns in Ohio of the past for being remarkable for nothing but "froth and bluster." Again on September 25 it remarked that Ohio was the "fighting ground" and the Republicans were fearful that the Democrats could and would carry the state. Both the *Plain Dealer* and the *Enquirer* frequently reiterated the fact that the Democrats could elect a president without Ohio while the Republicans could not.

The *Plain Dealer* almost daily printed an editorial or an article denouncing Blaine and the Republican party under such titles as "The League of Iniquity," "Blaine Condemned," "The Blaine Scandals--The Noble Position of Grover Cleveland," "Republican Love For the Soldier Exposed," and "What Hasn't Blaine Done?"

In September Thomas A. Hendricks visited Ohio, where in Dayton, Cincinnati, Columbus, Cleveland, and many small towns and villages he was greeted everywhere with "spontaneous enthusiasm" and "immense crowds." It was noted that he attracted a "larger crowd" in Hamilton on September 22 than Blaine did in New York the same day.

At an enthusiastic and well-attended meeting of German Independent Republicans in Cincinnati, Carl Schurz delivered an address in German on

---

68 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, July 17, 1884.

69 *Cincinnati Enquirer*, Sept. 23, 1884.
September 23 in which he stressed Blaine's corrupt record, and declared that the question of honest government was paramount in the campaign, not the tariff. The following day the German orator spoke in English to a crowd of over 5,000 people for two and one-half hours. In this speech he dwelt at length on the Mulligan Letters and other scandals to which Blaine's name had been linked. Schurz concluded his address by urging all who regarded honesty in government as essential to vote the Democratic ticket in October and to elect Grover Cleveland in November. The Enquirer remarked, "... earnest, thoughtful people were stirred more by plain, unvarnished sentences, illustrating some equally plain fact, than by the tinsel and glare of oratory ... to make prominent the convincing truths which cloud the record of the Republican nominee ... Carl Schurz has exerted an immense influence on the people of Cincinnati." A great and boisterous Democratic rally was held in Columbus, and speeches were given by Hendricks, Payne, Bayard, and Pendleton. All ignored the tariff issue, and stressed the importance of reform in government. Other Democrats who spoke frequently around the state included Thurman, Hoadly, McLean, Durbin Ward, A. G. Warner, and Jacob Mueller.

The Democratic rally in Cleveland on October 11 was attended by "vast throngs" who heard speeches by General Rosecrans, Daniel N. Lockwood, Hendricks, Bayard, and Pendleton. The Plain Dealer remarked, "... nothing in all the history of Northern Ohio ever equalled the magnificent Democratic rally ... " The streets were filled with "surging masses" of people until late at night. "Wild enthusiasm pervaded and permeated

70 Ibid.
71 Ibid., Sept. 26, 1884.
all classes in all parts of the city." The enthusiasm was "spontaneous" following the "stirring speeches" of the Democratic orators and the procession of the Cleveland and Hendricks marching clubs. 72

Although the Hendricks tour of Ohio did not receive the coverage in the Democratic press that the Blaine tour had received in the Republican press, the Democrats were no less adept at describing the reception of their standard-bearer. The Enquirer commented, "Mr. Hendricks' Ohio tour has been greeted at every station by immense crowds gathered to get a glimpse or a word from their chosen standard-bearer . . ." 73

The Democratic papers referred often to the Republican party's responsibility for the "ruin of labor and depression of business throughout the country." "Workingmen were told in 1880," remarked the Plain Dealer, "to elect Garfield and Arthur and good times would be assured. They were elected, but times were never harder than they are now . . ." 74 They frequently ridiculed the Republican attempt to make the tariff the prominent issue in the campaign, referred many times to the Independents, Germans, and Irish who "would not vote the Republican ticket," and revived the scandals surrounding Blaine whenever they seemed to fade from public attention.

On October 14 Ohio voters went to the polls to select state officials and Congressional representatives. The vote in Ohio was extremely important since it was a good indicator as to how the state would vote in November. In addition, the influence on other states was recognized

72 Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 13, 1884.

73 Cincinnati Enquirer, Oct. 13, 1884.

74 Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 2, 1884.
by both parties to be incalculable. Predictions prior to the election concerning the size of the vote and the majorities of the winning candidates varied greatly. The usual Republican estimate was at least a 10,000 vote majority and the Democrats variously estimated their victory would be "over 5,000 majority."

During the preceding weeks, the Republican papers had repeatedly admonished their Republican readers for their overconfidence and apathy during the campaign. Since the party lacked sufficient funds, "voluntary effort and thorough organization" were absolutely necessary. Warnings appeared frequently that the Democrats were making "a desperate effort" to win in October with the help of Democratic gerrymandered districts, and a "larger corruption fund than they had ever before had." Attention was called also to the Democratic practice of bringing "repeaters" into the state on election day.75 While the Republicans were hard-pressed for sufficient campaign funds, the Democrats did not seem to have that handicap.

October 14 dawned beautifully over the state. Few incidents of repeaters and illegal voting were recorded, and only in Cincinnati was any violence noted. Both the Democratic and Republican press agreed that the election riots there were the "bloodiest ever." Business suspended in many places and Cleveland recorded the heaviest vote ever cast. The 11,000 vote Republican majority carried their entire state ticket into office. One paper commented, "... so large a majority

75 Cleveland Herald, passim.
was unexpected since the Democrats had made such a desperate struggle in the state."  

The victory was extremely gratifying to the Republicans since the Democrats had carried the state in the preceding two elections by decisive majorities, and, in addition, they had more money at their disposal. According to the Republicans, their opponents had made "extensive arrangements" to defraud at the polls, but their "unscrupulous efforts to array the liquor influence solidly against the Republicans" had been unsuccessful. The Republicans further asserted that the campaign was conducted by the Democrats "solely by abusing the Republican candidates," while they "declined to discuss principles" and "persistently dodged every issue in the campaign."  

On the other hand, the Democrats consoled themselves with, "The Republican majority . . . is less than expected. Of course, we would have liked to have carried Ohio . . . but that was like hoping against hope . . . Ohio is always Republican in an election year anyhow."  

It was "really a grand triumph" since "the Republican majority was so slight," remarked the Enquirer.  

Following the Ohio election attention turned to New York which, along with Connecticut, New Jersey, and Indiana, was considered doubtful.

76Daily Ohio State Journal (Columbus), Oct. 15, 1884. It was also noted that a change of one per cent or three votes in each precinct would have given the state to the Democrats by an 800,000 majority.

77Ibid.

78Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 16, 1884.

79Cincinnati Enquirer, Oct. 17, 1884.
It was in that state on October 29 that the unfortunate implied insult to the Roman Catholic Church had been made at a gathering in Blaine's honor. At a meeting of several hundred Protestant clergymen, which was intended to demonstrate the admiration and confidence of the clergy for Blaine and their condemnation of the immoral Cleveland, the Reverend Samuel D. Burchard addressed Blaine and the group assembled. In the course of his remarks, he said:

We are your friends, Mr. Blaine, and notwithstanding all the calumnies that have been urged in the papers against you, we stand by your side (shouts of 'Amen!'). We expect to vote for you next Tuesday . . . We are Republicans, and don't propose to leave our party and identify ourselves with the party whose antecedents have been rum, Romanism and rebellion. We are loyal to our flag. We are loyal to you. 80

Several other ministers spoke after Burchard, and Blaine, tired and preoccupied with his reply, allowed the phrase to pass unnoticed in his brief address.

The Democratic headquarters immediately realized its significance, however, and handbills appeared on New York streets within hours. The following Sunday they were distributed at the doors of hundreds of Catholic churches all over the country, and the remark was even attributed to Blaine himself by some of the more unscrupulous printers. Although Blaine refuted the statement several days later in New Haven, the damage had already been done. He said, " . . . I am the last man in the United States who would make a disrespectful allusion to another man's religion . . . and though a Protestant myself, I should esteem myself

80 Muzzey, op. cit., pp. 316-17. See also Cincinnati Enquirer, Oct. 30, 1884.
most degraded if ... I could in any presence make a disrespectful allusion to that ancient faith in which my mother lived and died."\textsuperscript{81} It cannot be accurately determined how many votes Blaine lost in New York alone due to the abusive alliteration, but it may well have been enough to cost Blaine the election.

The \textit{Ohio State Journal} had substituted the phrase "ruin, rum, and rebellion" for Burchard's words on the day following the speech. Later, the paper described Burchard as "carrying the book of peace in his hands and the word of enmity on his lips."\textsuperscript{82} Calling Burchard a "narrow-minded bigot" the \textit{Herald} said, "It is not often one ... has such an opportunity to ventilate his bigotry as was afforded Dr. Burchard ... Men may have an immense influence for harm who have none whatever for good. That he made the most of it cannot be denied ... "\textsuperscript{83}

On the same day that the Burchard incident occurred, Blaine dined with about two-hundred wealthy gentlemen at Delmonico's in New York. The room was elaborately decorated, and the food was the best. In his address to the millionaires, Blaine stressed the tremendous prosperity and "marvelous progress" under Republican tried and safe policies.\textsuperscript{84} The next day cartoons appeared in the anti-Blaine press describing the event as "Belshazzar's Feast," and undoubtedly the unfavorable publicity

\textsuperscript{81}\textit{Blaine}, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 461-62.

\textsuperscript{82}\textit{Daily Ohio State Journal} (Columbus), Nov. 3, 1884.

\textsuperscript{83}\textit{Cleveland Herald}, Nov. 17, 1884.

\textsuperscript{84}\textit{Blaine}, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 455-59.
concerning the banquet alienated large numbers of workingmen who were suffering the effects of poverty and depression.

During the campaign Cleveland made only two prepared speeches. In Newark, New Jersey and Bridgeport, Connecticut he spoke to large audiences on the needs of the workingman and civil service reform. He witnessed a great Democratic torchlight parade in New York of 40,000 marchers. Heard all over the city was the repeated chant of:

Blaine, Blaine, James G. Blaine,  
The monumental liar from the State of Maine!  
Burn this letter!

On the previous night in a great torchlight parade in his honor, Blaine's supporters had marched and chanted:

Ma! Ma! Where's my pa?  
Gone to the White House,  
Ha! Ha! Ha!

As election day approached, the press of both parties claimed the victory would be theirs, although the Democrats feared they would lose New York. Both realized the election hinged on the result of the four doubtful states, and both realized that that result would be close.

The day following the election the papers of both parties claimed to be victorious. The Ohio State Journal proclaimed, "He Laughs Best Who Laughs Last! Blaine and Logan Triumphantly Elected! The Empire State Republican By 7,000 Majority!" Other Republican papers in Ohio were equally exhuberant in proclaiming Cleveland's defeat, and predicting Blaine's plurality in New York and in the nation.

It was readily apparent that the final outcome was dependent upon New York and that result was not determined until November 7, although
the official returns, so far as they were complete, seemed to favor Cleveland as early as the second day. On November 8 the Associated Press reported that Cleveland had won and by that date all of the New York City newspapers except the New York Tribune had conceded Cleveland's election. Cleveland carried the four doubtful states and Delaware in addition to the Solid South amassing 219 electoral votes to 182 for Blaine. There were charges of fraud and the corrupt use of money in certain New York precincts, but they were never formally pressed since no evidence could be found. Other charges that Butler votes had been counted for Cleveland in certain wards were made, but these charges could not be proved and were not pressed since the number of votes involved was not sufficient to alter the final result.

In the Congressional contests, the Democrats retained their control of the House although their plurality was reduced considerably. The Republicans retained their hold on the Senate. Ohio's voters returned eleven Democrats and ten Republicans to the House, among them McKinley, who defeated the incumbent, David R. Paige in the Twentieth District by a 2,029 majority. Ben Butterworth in Hamilton County defeated John F. Follet by a 1,609 majority and won a seat for Ohio's First District.

In the Twenty-first District Martin A. Foran's majority of 1,270 won a Democratic seat over Charles C. Burnett.86

CHAPTER IV

THE RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The reasons for the political upheaval in 1884 after twenty-four years of Republican control were many and varied. Foremost among the causes, which in varying degrees contributed to Blaine's defeat, was the revolt of the Mugwumps. When it is considered that Cleveland's plurality in the crucial state of New York was only 1,149 out of a total popular vote in excess of 1,150,000, the importance of the well-organized Independent campaign in that state becomes evident. If Cleveland had lost New York he would have lost the election or, had he lost Indiana or Connecticut and New Jersey, Blaine would have been elected. In all four of the doubtful states there were enough Mugwumps that their activities should be considered a potent factor in putting those states in the Democratic column. In New York the Independents claimed to have polled 60,000 votes, 20,000 in Ohio, 40,000 in Massachusetts, 5,000 in Connecticut, 15,000 in New Jersey, 10,000 in Indiana, and 20,000 in Illinois.  

These figures may have been somewhat exaggerated, but it was in these states that Blaine could ill afford to lose a single vote. At the time, the Independents claimed full credit for Blaine's defeat, but more cautious judgment and careful analysis by later historians credits other influences as well.

Another factor of great importance was the Prohibition Party vote. Although the latter did not go to Cleveland, it was drawn largely from

---

the Republican ranks. Nationally, St. John polled 150,369 votes, a remarkable increase over the 10,305 polled by Neal Dow, the Prohibitionist candidate in 1880.2

Although Butler's 5,179 vote in Ohio was not very significant in the industrial East his showing was of greater consequence. Nationally, he polled 175,370 votes.3 Butler had devoted most of his attention to the labor vote. During an active speaking campaign, he attacked Cleveland as the enemy of the workingman, and had appealed to the labor vote when he urged measures for the improvement of their condition. Charges were made and not always denied that Butler's campaign was encouraged by the Republicans in an effort to draw votes in the East from Cleveland. Some charges were made, although vigorously denied, that his campaign was financed by the Republican Party. No proof is in existence, but the probability is that Butler had an agreement of some kind with the Republicans.4 Undoubtedly, his support was drawn largely from the workingmen among whom Cleveland was unpopular.

The lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Stalwarts, especially Conkling and his followers in Conkling's home county of Oneida, New York, was especially damaging to Blaine. The ex-Senator, because of an old feud with Blaine, refused to endorse him and was purported to be secretly working for Cleveland's election. A statement was issued by a group of Oneida Stalwarts condemning Blaine and advocating Cleveland. The fact

3Ibid.
4Thomas, op. cit., pp. 210-12.
that Oneida County went Democratic by more than 2,000 votes was a significant factor in Blaine's defeat.

Burchard's unfortunate alliteration seven days before the election decided many hitherto undecided Catholic voters and placed them in the Democratic ranks. In addition, the Republican attitude and record on prohibition aided many of the Irish and the German-Americans in making their decision. The votes from these groups which Cleveland acquired may well have won him New York and the election.

The cold and rain which swept up-state New York on election day probably kept many farmers who normally voted Republican away from the polls.

Another very important circumstance which injured Blaine and would have hurt any other Republican nominee in 1884 was the depression and the unemployment and unrest which accompanied it. Such circumstances nearly always react unfavorably upon the party in power. The "prosperity dinner" at Delmonico's and its consequent unfavorable publicity for the Blaine cause undoubtedly cost him some votes of those workingmen who were victims of the depression.

The lack of great issues to distract attention from business conditions, Republican incompetence and corruption, and Blaine's personal political record might tend to justify the contention that people tended to vote for the cause of "good government". But then again, Blaine's substantial vote was indicative of the indifference on the part of many Americans even for that cause.
The Democrats pinned their hope on the support of the Mugwumps and the Prohibition Party vote, which would be drawn principally from the Republican Party ranks, to overcome an anticipated loss of some Irish votes to Blaine and a part of the labor vote to Butler. In addition, they hoped to obtain some German support because of the known Republican views on prohibition.

In New York, Tammany, with its control of a great bloc of Irish votes, lacked enthusiasm for Cleveland and, therefore, presented a great handicap to the Democrats. John Kelly, the Tammany chief, withheld his support of Cleveland until September and this open hostility caused much damage. Even more damaging was Tammany's open support of Butler for a time. Although Tammany's attitude was a handicap in New York, it was a decided advantage in many other states. The dislike of Tammany among Democrats elsewhere served only to spur them to greater support of their candidate when Tammany did not lend him its support. Furthermore, Tammany's dislike of Cleveland was, in itself, enough to recommend him to reform-conscious Independents.

In terms of the electoral vote, Cleveland's victory was decisive, but in terms of the popular vote, his victory was not impressive. On the national picture, Cleveland's popular vote was 4,874,986; Blaine received 4,851,981; St. John, 150,369; and Butler, 175,370. Blaine's majority in Ohio was greater that Cleveland's 23,005 majority in the entire United States.5

5Stanwood, op. cit., p. 410.
Blaine carried Ohio with a popular vote of 400,082 to Cleveland's vote of 368,280, a plurality of 31,802 votes. John St. John's vote was 11,069 with Benjamin F. Butler receiving 5,179. Blaine's popular vote was the largest that Ohio had ever given to any candidate for an elective office. 6

St. John's vote was a considerable gain over the Prohibitionist candidate, Neal Dow's vote in Ohio of 2,616 votes in 1880. Butler's vote of 5,179 was nearly equal to James B. Weaver's 6,456 votes in 1880 in Ohio. 7

The Western Reserve, usually a Republican stronghold, gave Blaine a 25,981 plurality, while the principal mining and manufacturing counties added a 30,149 plurality to Blaine's vote. In the agricultural counties of the state Blaine had only a 1,644 plurality while Cleveland's plurality was 5,654. 8 The campaign in Ohio, seemingly, produced no radical results since only seven counties reversed their party plurality for president from that of 1880. Montgomery, Clermont, Knox, and Perry changed from the Democratic column in 1880 to the Republican in 1884, while Franklin, Erie, and Harrison counties changed from a Republican plurality in 1880 to a Democratic plurality in 1884. 9

6 Annual Report of the Secretary of State to the Governor of the State of Ohio for the Year 1884 (Columbus: 1885), p. 248-49.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid., pp. 272-73. See also Cleveland Weekly Leader, Nov. 17, 1884.
According to the census of 1880, Ohio had 826,577 men of voting age. A revised figure of 803,633 was published in 1883. The total popular vote cast in Ohio in the October election was 785,691 and in the November election, 787,159. In the entire nation the total popular vote tallied was over ten million with an estimated voting populace of over twelve million.

So much attention was devoted during the campaign of 1884 in Ohio, as elsewhere in the nation, to the Mugwumps, to the scandals surrounding the candidates, and to casting aspersions on the character of the candidates of the opposing party that very little time remained for an intelligent, critical, and sober discussion of the more important issues facing the country. In reality, however, the campaign was barren of outstanding issues inasmuch as the only apparent disagreement between the parties was on matters of customary party policy. They differed on tariff revision, but neither party had a clear program for accomplishing its aims. On other matters, their platforms, general in nature and indefinite in scope, were almost exact duplicates. In such a campaign, devoid of

10 Ibid., pp. 244-45.
11 Ibid., p. 247.
12 Ibid., pp. 258-59. See also pp. 272-75.
13 Ibid., pp. 244-45.
outstanding issues, it was perhaps inevitable that the accent would be upon the revelation of political scandals and the defamation of personal character.

To the Republicans, the nation's rejection of their personal idol was an appalling misfortune. For the generation which had grown to maturity since 1860, it was regarded as almost an impossibility that there should be a Democratic president in the White House. Yet, if there was to be more than a reunion on paper between the North and the South, the past with all of its ugliness had to be forgotten.

As long as the South had no major role in the national government and governmental control was retained by the Republicans, whom the Southerners blamed for their disgrace, no true unity between the North and South could be achieved. Therefore, to bring about a more complete reunification, the South needed its "day in the sun," if only for four years.

But even more important among the many results of the upheaval of 1884 and the consequent return of the Democrats to power was the re-establishment of the Democratic party as a formidable rival of the Republican party.
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