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INTRODUCTION

By the early 1840's, the United States was well on the road to its irrepressible conflict. The slavery controversy had split the nation into two separate and distinct camps. One advocated that slavery should no longer be allowed to spread its ugly venom into the emerging West, while the other strongly championed the right of private property, racial superiority, and constitution legality. Thus, an age of anxiety and frustration was enveloping the nation. The future was faced with an intense awareness that no land could exist with such an open fissure; or, as the Great Emancipator would vividly state, "half slave and half free".

Anxious parents could justifiably be concerned about what type of world their young children had entered. They could ponder whether such a setting would permit their offspring to grow and develop with the intense optimism and enthusiasm so typically characteristic of the expanding nation. How would the children of the time be able to adjust to the fomenting crisis? With the advantage of hindsight, we know that the crisis reached a climax during the 1860's. Because of these strife torn years, a young man born in those earlier years of the debate, would grow up with a distinct set of traits and beliefs which would leave indelible marks on his character. As the war ended, America was on
the threshold of an economic and industrial growth unparalleled in its history. Could a young man, nurtured with an intense belief in individualism, equality, and freedom, adapt himself to the ensuing business consolidations, trust combinations, and labor organizations? After having lived during such intensely emotional times and having developed and held a set of beliefs with a firmness and steadfastness that so often marks and holds captive an advocate of a moral cause, could one ever completely lose such an experience?

It is the purpose of this study to look at one such man and to examine how he was able to adapt himself to this situation. It would be far too presumptuous to state that James Edwin Campbell was typical of all men born under similar circumstances. Yet, it can be stated that he was representative of a certain group of men who early in life faced the slavery controversy and were filled with a deep love of individual liberty, freedom, and equality. They tenaciously held to these early values and never felt that they could or should compromise, alter, or change such basic principles. As the world changed about them, they talked, wrote, and acted as if the nation were still predominantly the simple agrarian land they experienced in their early years. Possibly they recognized the changing political, social, and economic philosophies which they unknowingly helped bring about. However, they also recalled vividly their earlier lives which so strongly affected their values.
President William Henry Harrison's sudden death within a month of his inauguration in 1841 had amply demonstrated to the nation the sometimes strange workings of the American political system. His successor, John Tyler of Virginia, true to his Southern tradition, failed to represent the views of the majority of the Whig Party as its titular leader. The party was at best a loose coalition, and Tyler championed a states' rights philosophy of a low tariff, slavery, and expansion held by a minority in the party. Additionally, he was opposed to internal improvements at federal expense, free lands, and a national bank. Other Whigs, and particularly Henry Clay, were sadly disillusioned with these views and his actions and looked forward to the next presidential election with hopes of victory and a change in fundamental policies.

In Ohio, the home of the late president, the jubilation of victory had been quickly dimmed by the actions of the Virginia. Thomas Ewing of Lancaster, Ohio, who had proudly accepted the position of Secretary of the Treasury, and who thus became the first cabinet officer from the state, was equally disillusioned. Ewing joined his cabinet colleagues,
with the exception of Daniel Webster, the Secretary of State, in submitting their protesting resignations. Shortly thereafter, another Buckeye, John McLean received a proffered appointment as Secretary of War by Tyler but refused, deciding to remain as Justice of the Supreme Court.\(^1\)

On the state level, the Whigs in Ohio generally represented the propertied interests. Thomas Corwin had gained the governorship for them at the time of the Harrison victory. Because of the rupture within the Whig ranks on the national scene, the Democrats were able to win back the top executive post of the state in 1842. The new victor, Wilson Shannon, who many believed was supported by the Tyler Whigs, declared a belief in a "well-guarded and well-restricted system of local banks," a material concession to the Whig program.\(^2\) Later, the state legislature, with a Democratic majority, enacted a law granting special banking privileges to the Bank of Wooster. Thereafter, the local Democrats were faced with an internal split similar to that of their rivals. Each of the political parties failed to represent all its members; rather, they usually were the vehicle of expression for an interest group which by no means was indicative of the policies or beliefs of all their

\(^1\)Eugene H. Roseboom and Francis P. Weisenburger, A History of Ohio (Columbus, The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1958), p. 158.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 161.
During these years of political division, James Edwin Campbell was born in Middletown, Ohio, July 7, 1843, to Laura Reynolds Campbell and Andrew Campbell, a successful surgeon. He was to be the only son of these proud parents, both of whom came from a sturdy, pioneer stock that gave to the Miami Valley at an early date a characteristic distinction that its children have ever cherished and enjoyed.

Later, when Campbell was Governor of Ohio he boasted that his parents were also born in the Buckeye state. In a conversation with Governor Loundsbury of Connecticut, Campbell related that his father and mother were born in Ohio and "that the proudest thing in my life was that I was the first Governor whose parents were born in Ohio . . . ." In a more poetic vein upon numerous occasions he would aver that

---


5 James E. Campbell, ms., notes for speeches, n.d., in James Edwin Campbell Papers (Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society Library, Columbus, Ohio).
he was "the first specimen of the second growth of timber."\(^6\)

The future statesman's father, Andrew Campbell, was a descendant of Alexander Campbell who was born in Argyllshire, Scotland, about 1745, and who eight years later journeyed to Virginia and prepared to build a new home in the colony. His son Samuel, the grandfather of James Edwin, was born in 1781 and subsequently moved to Ohio in 1795. He was a soldier in the War of 1812. Samuel's wife, Mary Small, born in 1786, was the daughter of Andrew Small, who had moved to Ohio in 1796 after having completed three and a half years of service and attained the rank of ensign in the Revolutionary War.\(^7\) Thus, Andrew Campbell was the product of two fairly well established and honorable families which had aided the young nation in gaining and preserving its independence.

Andrew Campbell spent his entire life in Butler County, Ohio. For twenty-two years after he became a country doctor, he ministered to the sick and afflicted with a sincere dedication and a spirit of sacrifice that eventually won for him as much respect among his fellow practitioners as among his patients. He died, a comparatively young man,

---


\(^7\)Ibid., p. 314.
on September 5, 1851, at his home in Hamilton, Ohio.

On his mother's side, James Campbell was also endowed with ancestors who possessed the pioneer spirit of adventure and bravery which contributed to the early years of the nation's growth. His mother was a descendant of one of the earliest families in Massachusetts dating back to 1645 when Jonathan Reynolds emigrated to America from Plymouth Earl in the county of Devonshire, England. On his arrival he settled near Plymouth in New Plymouth colony, which came to be a part of Massachusetts. His descendants eventually spread to such neighboring states as Rhode Island and New York where some of them have filled important positions in state and national councils.

Laura Reynolds Campbell presented a quiet dignity and cheerfulness of manner, soundness and stability of judgment, and a ready wit that were reflected to their fullest after the untimely death of her husband. She helped to guide and direct her son as long as she lived, and she was privileged to witness his success for which she so diligently had hoped and prayed.

From his parents Campbell inherited a strong admiration for the Whig Party and especially its leader, Henry

---

8Sater, op. cit., pp. 18-19.
10Sater, op. cit., p. 19.
Clay. During the presidential election of 1844, the Great Compromiser was a candidate for the nation's highest office for the third time. It was later claimed that during this time James Edwin, an infant of fifteen months, was heard to hum the tune of a popular Whig song although he was unable to articulate the words, the refrain of which was:

Ha! Ha! Ha! Such a nominee
As little Jimmie Polk of Tennessee! 11

In the same campaign he discovered running the whole length of the third floor of his home the inscription painted in huge black letters, "The Lone Star--Let Her Be Alone." Later he learned that his home had been used to paint banners for the Whig Party during the campaign. The slogan referred to the point that the Whigs would not vote to accept the annexation of Texas because that would mean war with Mexico and the expansion of slavery. In this particular case, the paint had filtered through the canvas and had become permanently situated upon the floor. 12

The eventual defeat of the Whig candidate was received with a great sadness by the Campbell family. However, it did not affect the loyalty and warm admiration which they continued to feel toward him. As late as 1860, during the turbulent election of that year, Campbell's maternal uncle

was to express the devotion the Whigs still held for their former, then deceased, hero. He announced that even though he was a personal friend of Abraham Lincoln, as well as an active supporter of him in that campaign, he would rather vote for Clay's old boots than for any living statesman.  

The lad's next encounter with politics and the Whig Party came in February, 1849. His father took him to Cincinnati, Ohio, to see General Zachary Taylor who had been recently elected President of the United States and was then on his way from Louisiana to Washington D.C. in order to be inaugurated. Campbell later recalled Taylor as a "gray-haired, bare-headed man dressed in black." In addition, the procession with which the President-elect was honored, was to remain a vivid memory to the impressionable youth.  

The next couple of years of the young boy's life were to follow a similar pattern. His father, very interested in politics, would continue to take his son to view or listen to political personalities. Usually they were Whigs. This close father-son relationship was to end suddenly in September, 1851, when Doctor Campbell was to die literally at his work and at the height of his career. It then was discovered painfully that although Andrew had been a good physician, he had been a poor bill collector. Thus, Laura

\[13\] Campbell, "Politics of Other Days," p. 49.  
\[14\] Ibid., pp. 50-51; Sater, op. cit., p. 21.
Campbell and her seven-year-old son fell heir to little beyond a huge bundle of newspapers and magazines which commemorated the political deeds and utterances of Henry Clay. In the ensuing weeks the lad read these but with no vast personal advantage. He reported that he was "much more muddled than refreshed."\textsuperscript{15}

A paternal uncle, Lewis D. Campbell, directly entered into the boy's life at this time and attempted to provide the need for masculine tutelage. This older relative imprinted an indelible mark upon the lad who in many ways would pattern his beliefs and principles after him.

Lewis had previously published a Clay Whig newspaper in Hamilton, Ohio, from 1831 to 1835, when he was admitted to the bar. He had been an unsuccessful candidate for the national House of Representatives in the three succeeding elections of 1840, 1842, and 1844, on the Whig ticket. In the election of 1848 he abandoned his party because its nominee, Zachary Taylor, was a slaveholder. He then ran successfully as a Free Soil Party candidate. In the following two Congressional elections in 1850 and 1852 he was returned to the national legislature after again having re-entered to the Whig fold. His aversion to slavery and his realization that the Whig party was dying prompted him

again to switch parties in 1854. Campbell ran as an anti-Nebraska candidate although he was secretly a know-nothing. He felt that he could not join the Democrats who tolerated slavery among its members. Again he was elected. Finally, with the birth of the Republican Party and its entrance into the national arena, and with its distaste for the "peculiar institution," Campbell was prompted once again to switch parties in 1855. Subsequently he lost a contested election in 1856 and was defeated in 1858. Thus, Lewis Campbell exhibited marked individualism and confirmed principles. (To his nephew, although many political contemporaries regarded him as an opportunist.) He was willing to leave his party when he felt it violated the doctrine of freedom and equality for all.

During the post-Civil War period the Republican Party noticeably lost its liberalism and appeal to the common man and became associated with big business and special interests. Lewis Campbell, who was no longer politically active, was then nominated by the Democratic Party to run for Congress against Robert C. Schenck, who was then the Republican floor leader in the national House of Representatives. Campbell at first hesitated and then replied by submitting to the Democrats a letter challenging Schenck to a series of debates. After turning the letter over to the nominating committee, Campbell commented, "Here is my letter of
Prior to this campaign Campbell and Schenck had been neighbors, both having been born in the same block in the little village of Franklin, Ohio. They had been casual and friendly acquaintances, but now all friendship was secondary to the contest. In his previous thirty years of politics, Campbell was noted as a master of vituperation and had stated and written many biting and caustic things. Schenck also possessed a long and similar record. In the first debate, the latter spent his entire allotted time quoting his opponent's past remarks against his newly adopted party. When Campbell rose to speak, he commented that Schenck was correct in all that he had said and at that moment he himself, "couldn't think of anything meaner to say." This remark brought a tremendously favorable response from the audience which prompted Schenck never to refer to the past again. By that time, however, the damage had been done to Schenck, and for the fifth time Campbell returned to Washington as a member of the House of Representatives and the fourth time as a representative of a different party. ¹⁷

It was within the political shadow of his uncle that


James Campbell was to grow to manhood. The young impressionable youth would exhibit what he considered to be his uncle's force of character, positive individualism, and unswerving dedication to moral tenets. He would never compromise on principles regardless of how they affected his political future. For him, politics was to be judged by truth and honesty, not by success at the polls.

At the tender age of nine James first learned that he was a Whig. He recalled later in life that this information was unhappily obtained "suddenly and violently from certain rude Democratic boys" in his home neighborhood in Hamilton, Ohio. In the presidential campaign of 1852, the voters of Ohio showed their political preference by placing tall flag poles in front of their homes in the form of trees. Young hickory trees were used by the Democrats to display their loyalty to the party of Andrew Jackson, known as "Old Hickory." The Whigs responded with ash trees in honor of "Ashland," the home of Henry Clay.

Campbell's home at that time was located on the corner of Third and Broadway. He observed that upon the other three corners Democratic flags were flying from the hickory poles. Whig party officials asked and received permission to erect an ash pole with a Whig flag upon it, as had been Andrew Campbell's custom in the past. After the pole had been set up, a group of young Democrats attempted to destroy it by tearing it down. Campbell, accompanied by
several Whig champions, tried to defend his banner against the invading enemy. Finally, after a vigorous fist fight, both parties retired from the field of battle with a few injuries but with much feeling of glory. The ash tree, although slightly marred, remained standing throughout the campaign.

During the same political struggle, Campbell heard his party's candidate, General Winfield Scott, speak from a flatcar. Of the oratory of Scott, he remembered nothing, "but, his appearance was so impressive that even a boy of nine could not forget it." Scott was "six feet eight inches tall, perfectly proportioned, and . . . so well dressed that he aptly fitted the term, "Old Fuss and Feathers." Personal appearance, however, was not able to put him into the White House. The Whig Party managed to win only four states to its cause. Thus, the Democratic darkhorse candidate, Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire, was elected.

Lewis Campbell played a major role in bringing his nephew into the political debates and circles of his day. In 1856, serving as Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee of the national House of Representatives, he held a position which opened many important doors. He brought his young relative along on many trips to attend

---

18Ibid., pp. 50-51.
19Ibid., pp. 52-53.
meetings or to listen to speeches by important members of his party, as well as its opponents.

Having reached the age of thirteen, the youngster had been impregnated with the northern Whig political values. He had become an ardent politician, anti-slavery agitator, and assiduous attendant at political meetings. At the age to be stirred by emotional and eloquent addresses, he especially fell prey to the utterances of Thomas Corwin, a strong anti-Mexican war zealot and Whig representative from the Buckeye state. Corwin possessed the ability not only to dramatize and passionately phrase his words, but to exercise an amazing power on an audience swaying them to tears or laughter, without uttering a single syllable, by means of a phenomenal mobility of his face.

Upon one such occasion in Germantown, Ohio, Corwin impressed the youth with his emotional assets. He, along with Lewis Campbell, had delivered political speeches. At the conclusion of the meeting a pretty girl went upon the stage with two immense wreaths, which, in a most awkward fashion, she proceeded to place around the necks of the embarrassed orators. The scene was ludicrous and the crowd tittered. The elder Campbell, reputed to be the quickest man in Congress at repartee, fell back in his chair utterly speechless. Corwin, after receiving his wreath, turned to the snickering audience with a look that seemed to express some marvelous uplifting of his soul.
Instantly the crowd became silent. Then, Corwin turned to the girl and spoke in glowing and florid terms, concluding by saying, "My dear young lady, we may never meet again in this world below, but let me express the hope that we may meet in that garden where the flowers that bloom are immortal." Reversing the usual direction, Corwin had gone from the ridiculous to the sublime.

Another important Ohio statesman whom the neophyte politician encountered was Salmon P. Chase, United States Senator, Ohio Governor, Secretary of the Treasury, and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This successful government official impressed the admiring boy with his polished manners, intellectual ability, dignified bearing, and majestic mien. Chase was one of the few men Campbell had ever met who seemed to him to be the ideal statesman.

John C. Breckinridge, the Democratic Vice-Presidential candidate in 1856 presented an even more aristocratic and patrician countenance. After listening to the Kentuckian speak, the lad was almost ready to admit that actually there was something worthy of consideration in the doctrine of pedigree. As he listened, he recalled that Breckinridge was a descendant of a long established family noted for its culture and good breeding. Breckinridge's handsome,

\(^{20}\)Ibid., pp. 55-56; Sater, op. cit., 21.

exquisitely formed face, and keen flashing eyes stirred the boy to admiration, and he came to feel that apparently the Democrats possessed a few good men, even if the party as a whole was misguided and misled.

A second important member of the opposition party with whom he conversed in 1856 was Stephen A. Douglas, Senator from Illinois. Although an implacable political foe, the "Little Giant" and Lewis Campbell were warm personal friends. At that time the younger Campbell opposed Douglas and his political policies; however, for a time after 1860 and the attempted secession of the southern states, he became a staunch Douglas defender. Douglas's strong and unswerving defense of the Union aptly demonstrated that although political differences may seem insurmountable, they may be forgotten in the time of crisis and danger. Rather than let the opposition Republican party handle the problem itself, the Illinoisan worked diligently to uphold the nation and help the new administration, until his sudden death in June, 1861.22

Thus from these few incidents one can readily perceive that James Campbell, although only a lad in his early teens, was directly acquainted with the political squabbles of his time. He had the opportunity to consider many of the issues with some of the major participants of the

---

22Campbell, ibid.; Sater, op. cit., pp. 21-22.
turbulent period. Many times a man's personal appearance and use of emotional appeal had a greater and more lasting effect than did the actual content of his argument. In later years many of these same traits would be emulated by Campbell in an effort to make his appeal strong and lasting. Indeed, he learned early that in the political arena quite often it is not what one says that counts, but how one says it.

Campbell's interest in politics was not his only concern in early life, for he had some of the same aims as other boys of his age. Experiences and associations of his early years molded in him a respect for the man who earned his bread by honest toil, and this he never outgrew. He attended the public schools of his hometown and studied under a private tutor, Reverend John B. Morton, pastor of the Middletown Presbyterian Church. When he graduated, he taught school for a few months during which time he studied law. His education was interrupted by the consequences of the outbreak of hostilities between the North and the South in 1861. Later, he abandoned his studies and entered the Union Army as a member of the Mississippi and Red Rivers flotilla squadron on November 29, 1863. True to his inheritance he felt that the war proved that the public

\[23\] Sater, op. cit., p. 23.

\[24\] Galbreath, op. cit., p. 15; Smith, op. cit., p. 124.
conscience could not be smothered nor compromised any further in regard to the moral question of slavery.

His military career was spent aboard the two gunboats, Elk and Naiad. Essentially a northern landlubber, he experienced suddenly and tragically the brutality of war, the hot, humid climate of the South, and the difficulty of living aboard a ship. Upon his "awkward and ignorant advent on the scene" his future commander, Commander Breese, embarrassed him by appointing him master's mate. Campbell recalled that at that time he could not have described wherein a "half-hitch" varied from a "Turk's head," nor the difference between "a needle and a marlons-spike."25 Nevertheless, he was young and earnest and willing to learn.

His craft was subject to a tremendous fire and barrage by the Confederate batteries. To Campbell, however, an even greater nuisance and danger was the nefarious mosquito. Several of his comrades became quite ill because of their stings and were subsequently sent back to the safety of the Union lines. The young master's mate felt that it would have been better to have been wounded by the Confederate guns than to fall prey to the wicked insect because a gun wound left a visible scar which could be shown as a hero's medal, while the disability of the mosquito would have to be suffered alone and with no proof of military service or

bravery in action.

The floating battlefields were a constant threat because of the limited area to which one could safely hide from the constant and enormous barrage. The young man, already a battle-weary veteran, expressed this view plainly when he wrote: "I decided, on several occasions, that if I ever went to war again, I would select the army instead of the navy upon the solid, bed-rock, upper fastened principle that I could run, or hide, when fighting ceased to be a virtue."\(^{26}\)

After approximately one year of service, Campbell was felled by backbone fever and invalided home on September 24, 1864. Shortly thereafter, he was given a complete discharge by the medical board of surgeons, being described as "a complete wreck and almost a human skeleton."\(^{27}\)

Thus, prior to reaching the age of maturity, Campbell was an honorably discharged war veteran suffering from disabilities received in the line of duty. Although he suffered for years as a result of this, as soon as he was able, he resumed his study of law in the office of Doty and

\(^{26}\)Ibid.

Gunekel of Middletown. He was able to pay for his upkeep with the help of a small government disability pension, an item which he voluntarily surrendered after he first started to make a living from his lawyer's practice. Campbell here was showing in his own forthright way that for him the role of the government was to help people when they could not help themselves and not to help when someone was able to care for himself. Hence, even though he legally could have continued to receive the pension, he felt that ethically he was no longer entitled to it.

He was admitted to the Ohio bar in 1865 but did not immediately go into private practice. Needing a sufficient cash fund to get started, he worked as a bookkeeper in the First National Bank of Middletown and subsequently served eight months as Deputy Collector in the Internal Revenue service in Hamilton, under General Ferdinand Van Derver, the Collector of the district. In early 1867 he was appointed Commissioner of the United States and performed the duties of the office for two years. This latter appointment proved to be a stepping stone to his personal professional career. Not only did it introduce him to many


30 Reed, op. cit., pp. 277-278.
local prominent leaders, a basic necessity for all would-be politicians, but it also paid enough to permit him to leave his position as Commissioner to devote the next fifteen years unreservedly to fulfilling the tasks of his profession.\textsuperscript{31}

As a lawyer, Campbell impressed his peers in the southern portion of the state with his ability, readiness, and skill to grasp the essential points in the cases he handled. He was a clear, logical, and forceful speaker, as well as one well-informed on the questions of law. It was said that no man in Hamilton had a more honorable record during the same period. Finally, to attest that he had been accepted as a mature, capable attorney, he was given charge of many important receiverships and other trusts usually reserved for only the truly noteworthy and influential lawyers.\textsuperscript{32}

His early success as a lawyer permitted him to enter into the state of matrimony. He delayed taking this important step until he was fairly sure that he would be able to support a wife and eventually a family in a reasonably comfortable manner. Thus, on January 4, 1870, he married Miss Maude Elizabeth Owens, a girl with whom he had been acquainted since his early boyhood in Hamilton. The new

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{31}Galbreath, \textit{Campbell}, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{32}Reed, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 278.
\end{footnotes}
bride possessed a family background in a general way similar to that of her husband. Her father, Job E. Owens, was a native of Wales, and her mother, Mary A. Price, was of Welsh descent.\textsuperscript{33}

The marriage proved to be the start of a long and devoted relationship between the two. Their four children would be raised with the same care and attention that the parents had received in their youth. Governor James Cox of Ohio (1913-1915, 1917-1921) described the love between the couple when he commented at the eightieth birthday party of the then elder statesman:

No knight of old ever gave finer chivalry than Mr. Campbell rendered to his wife. No other interest ever interfered with his devotion to, and attendance upon her. In her view, he remained the gallant lover of her youth. Her life and her character were his inspiration, and her grave was his shrine.\textsuperscript{34}

Governor Cox forgot to mention that for the couple years together after their marriage had been constantly interrupted by calls from the public and the Ohio voters. In being forced to share her husband's time with political office, Mrs. Campbell resolutely, yet proudly, had been willing to forego some of the usual marital bliss in return for the devotion of such a man and the knowledge of his public service.

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Ibid.}; Smith, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 125.

\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Sater, op. cit.}, p. 54.
CHAPTER II

THE START OF A CAREER

As the young lawyer and his wife settled down to live a normal married life, storm clouds were developing over Washington. The first administration of the Northern Civil War General, Ulysses S. Grant, proved to be corrupt and fraudulent. Never had the nation witnessed such an appalling degree of mismanagement, open acceptance of bribery, and general decline of public morality. The inexperienced president was surrounded by a vast array of advisors concerned only with selfish ends. Indeed, the Republican Party, the party that Lincoln had led as the champion of abolitionism, free land, and free education, was now shackled by the bonds of special interests, the philosophy of "the bloody shirt", and favoritism.

A few short years prior to this upheaval, Grant easily defeated the Democratic candidate, Horatio Seymour, Governor of New York, by a fairly large margin in 1868. The General's accession to the nation's highest office was viewed as a stepping stone to the ending of internal troubles of the nation and to the beginning of an optimistic period of national growth and unity. Many hopeful reformers felt that the abolition of slavery was just the first of many such
deeds. They expected Grant to purge the government of inefficiency and corruption and to drive the horde of lobbyists and favor seekers from the Capital.

The cabinet selections were generally disappointing except for two choices, Attorney General E. Rockwood Hoar, and, Secretary of the Interior Jacob Dolson Cox. The former had spent over sixteen years in the state and federal courts of the nation and had earned a reputation as a honest and capable man. Disregarding Republican Senatorial patronage requests, President Grant accepted Hoar's recommendations in filling nine new judgeships in the Federal circuit courts. This, combined with the belief that Grant and Hoar had packed the Supreme Court Bench in order to obtain reform decisions, resulted in the Senate's refusal to confirm Grant's appointment of Hoar to the Supreme Court bench in 1870. Subsequently, in trying to get Senate approval on his favorite project, the annexation of Santo Domingo, Grant was successfully induced to request Hoar's resignation.¹

Jacob D. Cox, a native Ohioan, had compiled an outstanding Civil War military record. At its conclusion he returned to Ohio and was promptly elected Governor. Upon Grant's election Cox accepted a cabinet post in the new administration hoping to encourage the naive Grant to inaugurate a broad program of Civil Service reform. Failing in

¹Allan Nevins, *Hamilton Fish: The Inner History of The Grant Administration*, pp. 365-368.
this area and because of his opposition to the Santo Domingo scheme, he, too, felt obliged to resign in 1870. Thereupon he returned to Ohio to denounce the President and the motley coterie of advisors who surrounded him.  

By the spring of 1871, Cox joined Stanley Matthews, George Hoadly, and Frederick Hassaurek—a distinguished leader of the German element in Ohio—and a number of other Cincinnati Republicans, in forming a Reunion and Reform Association. A liberal policy toward the South, civil service reform, sound currency, and revenue reform were the main objects of the group. As the association was organizing, Cox was in touch with the great German-born leader, Carl Schurz, who was successfully leading a similar movement in Missouri.  

The immediate aim of the new reformers was to gain control of the office of the presidency by forming a political party and winning the election of 1872. They called for a national Liberal Republican convention and eventually assembled in Cincinnati, Ohio, on May 1 of the same year. With an optimistic hope for victory, the delegates' first hurdle was to draft a platform. Opinions were so strongly divergent on several key planks that the delegates found it

---

2The matter is discussed in Nevins, Hamilton Fish, pp. 465-467.

difficult to agree. "Honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion" with regard to protection and free trade existed, and the only position that could be adopted on these matters was a demand for a fair system of taxation. The Liberal Republican solution proposed that the decision be referred to the voters in the Congressional districts. Thereafter, the platform attacked the Grant administration as unfit to govern, proposed equality for all citizens, accepted the three Reconstruction constitutional amendments, demanded amnesty for all ex-Confederates, and concluded by advocating sweeping civil service reforms for the federal government.

The second item on the agenda was that of selecting a presidential candidate. The former minister to Great Britain, Charles Francis Adams of Massachusetts, and Justice David Davis of Illinois, possessed strong credentials as proven reformers, but they were by-passed for the erratic newspaper editor of the New York Tribune, Horace Greeley. Mentioned originally as a possible vice-presidential candidate, Greeley capitalized upon the various disagreements amongst his opponents to get the nomination on the sixth ballot. Governor B. Gratz Brown of Missouri was selected

---

to be his running mate. 5

The Ohio delegates who attended the convention supported Charles Francis Adams. Several had expressed a willingness to swing to their favorite son candidate, Jacob D. Cox, if it appeared their original choice should falter. This latter alternative never materialized, and at the conclusion of the meeting, the Ohioans held a stormy post-convention caucus on May 4 to determine whether they could conscientiously support Greeley and the platform. A few, such as, George Hoadly and Stanley Matthews, denounced the ticket and refused to accept Greeley, but the majority accepted the ticket as a lesser evil than Grant. 6

Approximately one month later, June 5, 1872, the regular Republican members assembled for their convention in the "city of Brotherly Love," Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. On the outer surface, it appeared that they had selected the appropriate place. President Grant was renominated for another term following a complete endorsement for his administration. The only real excitement at the convention occurred during the selection of a vice-presidential nominee. Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts was chosen over the incumbent, Schuyler Colfax, apparently because of hostility toward the latter by administration leaders and Washington

5Ibid., p. 227.

Their platform, while rather vague, defended the Grant administration, and included a plank favoring big business by calling for a revenue which would "promote the industries, prosperity, and growth of the whole country."

Making a weak attempt to woo some of their misguided brethren or to steal some of their thunder, they adopted a plank calling for civil service reform. Actually, few liberals were enticed back into the Grant camp. His past performance indicated that promised reforms would never occur under him.

The Democrats were scheduled to hold their convention in Baltimore, Maryland, starting on July 9, 1872. Many anticipated that they would join forces with the Liberal Republicans and support Greeley against Grant. Such a step did not appear to be impossible because of the precedent started by Clement L. Vallandigham and his New Departure policy of 1871. This program called for the Democrats to recognize the Civil War and Reconstruction acts as a finality. Hence, it was time to look forward to new issues and champion reform measures similar to those adopted by the

---


9 Vallandigham prior to the Civil War had held a states' rights position. He personified the Copperhead feeling but failed during the conflict to be elected Governor of Ohio in 1863.
Liberals.

The surprising nomination of Greeley was unfortunate for those who had hoped for an easy alignment of the reform elements of both parties. Many recalled Greeley as the vituperative editor who had sadistically maligned the Democratic Party and its members for years. Such hate-filled utterances could not be easily forgotten or forgiven.

Prior to the national convention the Ohio members of the Party assembled in Cincinnati on June 2, 1872, to discuss their plan of action. There in miniature form was an indication of the feelings held by Democrats throughout the nation. They disliked and openly castigated Greeley, but he always emerged as a better choice than Grant. Very few of the delegates felt their party could win if it selected its own candidate. They realized that Grant would benefit because the Liberals and the Democrats would divide their votes leaving the field to their rival. Thus, as the Liberals Republicans from Ohio had done, the Ohio Democrats accepted Greeley as the lesser evil than Grant.

Concurrently, while these questions of Greeley vs. Grant, Liberal Republicans vs. Regular Republicans, and Democrats vs. Grant were debated, James Edwin Campbell had to make a decision for himself. When he reached maturity,

11 Roseboom, The Civil War Era, p. 482.
he had imitated his uncle and had voted Republican, believing that party best represented his views. Its leader, Abraham Lincoln, personified the courage and moral responsibility that Campbell believed were needed to bind once again the strife torn nation. In 1868, accepting literally Grant's statement, "Let us have peace," he had continued to defend and support the party. Now, in 1872, he was faced with a dilemma. Should he follow his party and its questionable candidate, or should he recant his past actions and support the Liberal Republicans? On the surface it was a rather easy decision for a man like Campbell whose uncle had successfully switched parties whenever he felt they no longer represented his ideas. Underneath, however, he was faced with the problem of having to support Greeley, a man he abhorred. It was the large initial support given by many other traditional Republicans that proved to be the determining factor.

Ironically, the early support of Murat Halstead, the editor of the Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, for Greeley played a prominent role in influencing Campbell's decision at that time. Later, Halstead not only recanted but resumed his former Republican allegiance, and to the end of his editorial career, reproached the Liberal Republicans in general, and Campbell in particular, for their apostasy.

As the campaign swung into high gear, the presence and direct prestige coming from the support of James Campbell did not play a significant role. He was still in his political apprenticeship and, accordingly, was relatively unknown. He would, however, benefit from the association with many influential people. The results of the election, which saw Grant carry Ohio by 37,531 votes, meant the end of an era for some of the more important Ohio Republicans who had defected. Some returned to the regular Republican fold but had to be content with very minor positions. Others, who preferred to align themselves permanently with the Democrats, admittedly entered a difficult alliance. Many of the defectors discovered that they had committed political suicide by their losing gamble. Campbell, on the other hand, discovered that his act could and would prove to be beneficial. He was too young and unimportant to have engaged seriously in any of the vituperative and caustic party squabbles. He would be able to enter the Democratic fold much easier and without the suspicious feelings rendered toward his Republican comrades. Furthermore, it can be assumed that many of the former Republicans later would be more willing to support one of their own within their new party than one of their former enemies. Thus, this switch in parties proved

---

to be a positive maneuver, the effect of which would not be evident until the following years.  

The Grant administration from 1873 displayed an even greater ineptness than it had done earlier. A period of economic depression, beginning with the panic of 1873, continued to engulf the laboring man, to make difficult the expansion of business, and to render the farmer timid. The Republicans were on the defensive while their main rivals, the Democrats, grouped for an equitable solution which could appease their new adherents. Furthermore, a third party appeared in Ohio to add to the confusion. The formation of the People's Party was an attempt to maintain the union of Liberal Republican and Democrats. They declared "both major parties had outlived their usefulness" and demanded "in the interests of public welfare" that they be cast aside.

Events continued along these lines for the next two years. Ohio was a battleground between the two major parties and the neophyte third group. The older leaders were leaving the scene, and younger men were coming forward to place their ideas before the electorate. James Edwin Campbell

---

16 Ibid., pp. 21-22; Roseboom and Weisenburger. History of Ohio, p. 232.
announced on June 1, 1875, that he was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Prosecuting Attorney of Butler County, Ohio. His local colleagues responded four days later by electing him temporary Secretary of the Democratic Central Committee of Butler County, and then postponed any further action until after the State Convention which was held in Columbus, Ohio.

The major issue facing the Democratic Party was its reaction to the Resumption Act of 1875 which was passed by a Republican controlled Congress. This act stated that after January 1, 1879, the federal government would give gold dollars in exchange for greenbacks and directed the government to acquire a gold reserve for redemption purposes. The Democrats were divided on the money question, but they renominated for the governorship, William Allen of Chillicothe, Ohio, an ardent champion of inflation, thus seemingly endorsing the greenbacks. Subsequently as they were composing the party plank on this issue, a floor fight developed. The platform committee dominated by United States Senator Allen G. Thurman, a nephew of Allen but a hard-money advocate, presented two reports. The majority report favored hard-money while the minority report called for a national currency, or soft money. On the floor of

17Cincinnati Enquirer, June 2, 1875.
18Ibid., June 6, 1875.
the convention a vote was taken, and the minority report was adopted by a count of 386-266. Thus the soft money people had not only nominated a candidate, but had also written the platform. Thurman and others, however, refused to concede the decision as final, and, later, in a speech at Mansfield, Ohio, the Senator pointed out that the platform did not specifically endorse inflation or oppose resumption.

As the delegates returned to their local districts, they prepared to nominate a slate of candidates who would reflect the ideas of the state platform and would campaign on those issues. In Butler County, after George W. Jackson and James Neilan announced their candidacy for the Prosecuting Attorney post, the Democratic Central Committee met in Campbell's law office to evaluate the state convention and prepare for the local conclave.

Since there was a large primary election turnout which selected delegates to attend the convention in Hamilton, Ohio, on July 17, 1875, the committee was successful in arousing considerable interest. More delegates and interested spectators attended than normally appeared at such

---


21 Cincinnati *Enquirer*, June 13, 1875.
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meetings. It was apparent that more people, official and unofficial, were interested in learning which candidates would be selected from the forty county office seekers. Mother nature had given the committee a helping hand by providing a heavy rain the preceding day which gave the farming element a day off from their usual chores.

Official proceedings were started at 11:00 o'clock. Committees were established for rules, regulations, credentials, and resolutions. Thereafter, a lunch recess followed. By 1:00 A.M. the delegates had reconvened and prepared to undertake the main business of the convention--nominating candidates.

Three names were presented for the post of prosecuting attorney: James E. Campbell, John F. Neilan, and James L. Vallandingham, the incumbent. After both Campbell and Neilan pledged themselves to support the state platform and the entire ticket, Vallandingham, as previously announced, withdrew from the contest because of ill health. Thereafter, the first ballot was taken, and Campbell emerged victorious in his first political attempt by a vote of 48-43.23

His Republican opponent was William R. Smith from Oxford, Ohio, who was selected by a committee of his party's leaders. The Republican convention had no choice but to

23Ibid., July 18, 1875.
nominate him. Running against a man with the well known name of Campbell, Smith was hardly expected to win in the predominately Democratic county.\(^{24}\) On the other hand, the selection of an unusually popular man as Republican nominee for Governor, Rutherford B. Hayes, might pull enough Democratic votes to the Republican standard to enable Smith to win. Officially, the Republican platform fully championed the Resumption Act of 1875 and advocated a hard money solution to the nation's ills.\(^{25}\)

The Democrats during the campaign were not inactive, and mottoes declaring, "We prefer the rag-baby to the Golden Calf" and "Greenbacks saved the Union and let them avert starvation," were much in evidence. The money issue was complicated by the appearance of the element of religious prejudice. It was charged that the Democrats were unduly favorable to the Catholics in passing a proposal known as the "Geghan Bill" which permitted "ample and equal facilities" for religious worship and instruction for persons of all denominations in public jails and asylums.

Campbell, although a heavy favorite in his contest, refused to sit back and wait for his victory. He displayed a vigor such as would be manifested in all his other

\(^{24}\)Ibid., August 15, 1875.

\(^{25}\)Jordan, Ohio Comes of Age, pp. 39-49.

\(^{26}\)Roseboom and Weisenburger, History of Ohio, p. 234.
elections. The month of September was filled with constant speaking engagements at such places within the county as Collinsville, Trenton, Symmes Corner in Fairfield Township, Madison House in Madison Township, and Okeana. At these sites, he was greeted by large gatherings which warmly received his utterances. He laid the basis for his pseudonym, the "Butler Mascot," just as his uncle, Lewis Campbell, years before, had been hailed as the "Butler Pony."

When the results of the contest were tallied on October 13, 1875, Campbell emerged as an easy victor over Smith by a count of 5328-2707. He ran ahead of all other Democrats on the local ticket including Governor Allen who carried Butler County by 2265 votes but lost in the statewide election by 5644 votes.

Thus, Campbell had conquered his first political foe. He was now on the threshold of a long and active political career which would be mixed with moments of great joy and great frustrations, but never with resignation. As he eagerly looked forward to his new governmental post, with

---
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the added joys of Christmas and its holiday cheer, he was inflicted with erysipelas which necessitated a stay in bed.\textsuperscript{30} The infliction was attributed to his Civil War injury and was one of several occasions when such outbreaks would occur.

By the following week he had sufficiently recovered to be able to deposit a bond of $1000.00 as an insurance for his honesty in his capacity as Prosecuting Attorney of Butler County. On the same day, January 2, 1876, he took possession of his new office preparing for the subsequent two years.\textsuperscript{31} The next day he was administered the oath of office by the local Probate Judge and began the discharge of his duties.\textsuperscript{32} Within two days, January 5, 1876, he had called over 100 people and prepared them to serve as witnesses for the grand jury.\textsuperscript{33}

His vigor for quick and prompt completion of his duties did not remain unnoticed. His acts were constantly noted in local newspapers in laudatory fashion. Fellow Democrats asked his opinion on numerous political and partisan questions and habitually held policy creating meetings in his law office.\textsuperscript{34} The Board of County Commissioners noticed his
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reliability and complimented him in September of his first year in office. Stating that the Board required all county officials to submit an annual report of their actions, the Board members remarked that Campbell was the only official to submit his report on time and had done it in a most effective manner. The report, which recorded all cases prosecuted for final conviction and their sentences from January 3, 1876 - August 3, 1876, was as follows:

- Number convicted and sent to Penitentiary: 15
- Number sent to county jail and fined: 7
- Amount of total fines for above: $90.
- Number fined: 21
- Amount of total fines for above: $344.
- Number sentenced to jail to pay costs: 3

These months were not occupied entirely with work. Campbell managed to find time to spend with his family and friends. Furthermore, he entered into the world of the theater appearing as Major Rutledge in a home talent production of *The Drummer Boy of Shiloh*. This diversion was performed with other members of the Civil War organization known as the Hamilton Light Infantry in order to raise funds for parade suits. It was performed in the local opera house and ran from May 22 through May 27, 1876. Local critics stated that the play was well attended and well received and that Campbell admirably handled his role.

---

On the national scene, the year of 1876 was important for two features. Once again, a presidential election was held, and secondly, the nation was celebrating the anniversary of its first hundred years. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, was the logical site to hold such a gala occasion. There, a Centennial Exposition and World's Fair was held from May to the end of October. More important than the actual event was the significant role played by the federal government. The Centennial marked the beginning of the United States government's aid to worthy endeavors of national interest. "Expediency" had replaced "constitutionality" as the criterion. This new switch would find repercussions in the following national, state and local elections.

The end of the two administrations of President Grant was at hand. The Republicans realized that only a candidate who possessed some of the reputation of a reformer would be a winner. Thus, Governor Rutherford B. Hayes of Ohio was the eventual choice. Thrice elected to the gubernatorial position in his pivotal state, he possessed the credentials of a moderate and the reputation of disassociation from the scandals in Washington, D. C. Finally, he was the type of man who could serve as an inducement to bring back the Liberal wing which had left the Party in 1872.

---
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Hayes, fresh from his recent victory over Governor William Allen, represented the successful conservative sound money man. He was able to accept the Republican platform which endorsed the Resumption Act and protective tariff, and pointed with pride at the past, but, nevertheless, promised reform in the future. 39

The Democrats, sensing the possibility of their first presidential victory in twenty years, championed the cause of reform. A possible split on the money question was averted by compromising general planks calling for reform in the currency, in the tariff, and civil service. A candidate to fit the platform was available, Samuel J. Tilden. As governor of New York, and the successful opponent of the corrupt Tweed ring, he aptly met their qualifications. 40

During the rather heated campaign, James Campbell worked diligently for his party's candidate. Believing Tilden to be the best possible selection, the Ohioan spoke to several large audiences calling for Democratic votes. Generally the assemblages cheered his utterances because most of the talks were given to Democratic groups in the traditionally strong Democratic County of Butler. 41


40 Ibid., pp. 240-241.

41 Cincinnati Enquirer, September 25, October 6, 1876. Tilden eventually did carry Butler County by 3351 votes. Cincinnati Enquirer, November 9, 1876.
After this effort, the young politico and his wife journeyed to Philadelphia to attend the Centennial on the Ohio day celebration. From there the couple continued to take a well-earned vacation touring the eastern coast after a busy and exhausting first year of officeholding. \(^{42}\)

Following the questionable defeat of Tilden in the national election, Democrats turned to their own state elections using the dubious victory of Hayes as the major issue. The Democrats of Ohio met in their state convention on July 25, 1877. There they nominated Richard M. Bishop of Hamilton County for the office of Governor. \(^{43}\) He had been a conservative mayor of Cincinnati, a member of Ohio's third constitutional convention, a wholesale grocer, and a trustee of the Southern Railroad. \(^{44}\) Bishop felt that the start of the recent panic had been caused by the Federal Act of 1869, which altered the procedure of payment of federal bonds from greenbacks to gold, and the demonetization of silver, as well as the Resumption Act of 1875. Therefore, he accepted the Democratic platform, which denounced the election of Hayes as a fraud, stated that the poor labor conditions were caused by the Republicans, called

\(^{42}\)Ibid., October 29, 1876.


for the end of the Resumption Act by bringing back silver and greenbacks, and demanded the adoption of a revenue tariff in place of the business oriented tariff.

Sensing the possible adverse reaction to the circumstances of Hayes' victory in 1877, the Republicans felt the need of an exceptional candidate. Lieutenant Governor Thomas L. Young had served as Governor of Ohio following Hayes' ascendancy to the presidency. While he was somewhat appealing as a native of Ireland, a Civil War veteran, and an exceptional legislator, he lacked the appeal needed in a strong contest. Instead Judge William H. West, popularly known as "the blind man eloquent," made a definite appeal to the discontented laboring classes. He demanded a just compensation, minimum wage, and profit sharing by the workers. 45

The two national parties did not represent all the people in Ohio. A Prohibition Party, which met in Columbus in February of 1877, had concerned itself primarily with matters of drink and morals and did not touch financial affairs in its platform. They believed that the immediate monetary problems were only symptoms of a far more disturbing problem in the nation and state—a loosening of the

45Roseboom and Weisenburger, History of Ohio, pp. 235-236; Powell. The Democratic Party of Ohio, p. 236.
moral fibre of the American people.

Added to them was a group of the discontented who despaired of any hope of relief from the Democratic party. Meeting in June, 1877, in Columbus, they organized the Greenback Party and nominated Stephen Johnson, Miami, Ohio, a retired lawyer and farmer, for the governorship. They demanded that the government repeal the resumption act and pay off its bonds according to law at the time of issuance, control corporate bodies, establish a graduated income tax, and restore legal tender, or greenback currency.

The ensuing election campaigns were considerably affected by national politics. The general hard times, the money question, and the election of the president had put the Republicans on the defensive. Added to these problems, the outbreak of a railway strike and eventual disturbances along the lines of the Baltimore and Ohio and the Pennsylvania railroads during the summer necessitated the calling of the Ohio Militia to prevent violence. As usual, the administration in power was blamed for the problems. When West offered his liberal program to the workers, he discovered that the conservative wing of his party opposed

46Jordan, Ohio Comes of Age, p. 155.
Thus, the Democrats and Bishop looked forward to election night.

James Campbell during this period was busily engaged in performing his duties as Prosecuting Attorney. He continued to display an amazing ability to cut through red tape and complete his assignments in a minimum of time. He was described as, "the man to push his work through without any foolishness," by his fellow colleagues on the Butler County Grand Jury.  

Fellow Democratic Party members bestowed their growing confidence in his ability, and as an indication of his growing political stature, they appointed him as a delegate to the state Democratic convention which nominated Richard Bishop for the governorship. At the same time he was appointed a member of the Butler County Democratic Central Committee to help determine the times, places, and procedures for administering the party for the ensuing year.  

After returning from Columbus and recovering from a mild illness caused by some overzealous endeavors at the convention, Campbell turned his attention to securing reelection to his post as Prosecuting Attorney.  

---
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received no opposition in the Democratic primary and waited to see who would be his Republican adversary. 52

Aaron Wesco, a locally prominent lawyer, was selected by the Republicans to battle Campbell for the office. Speaking at their party convention on July 29, 1877, he avowed his lifelong adherence to the Republican Party and dedicated himself to a vigorous contest with his Democratic opponent. 53 A third party, The Workingman's Party of Butler County, assembled and selected candidates for state and county offices, but decided not to nominate anyone for Prosecuting Attorney. They resolved that because of the candidates already selected for the position, they "did not think it advisable" to enter a hopeless candidate. 54

The ensuing campaign proved a rather interesting contest. After vacationing for three weeks in the East, James Campbell returned to Hamilton and started on his usually arduous task of attempting to talk to as many people as possible. 55 His opponent, Aaron Wesco, realizing the difficulties of trying to defeat Campbell in the routine manner of trying to woo votes, issued a challenge for a
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formal debate on the various planks in the Democratic and Republican platforms. The Republican chairman, Henry L. Morey, gave it his full endorsement. He also believed that a more direct attack on Campbell was necessary if his party's choice hoped to be successful. Coincidentally, the reporter of the column "Hamilton" in the Cincinnati Enquirer recalled the debates of Lewis Campbell and Robert C. Schenck, "in which the former still wore the scalp of the latter." The reporter concluded by cautioning Wesco that "he had better look to his cranium."\(^{56}\)

Campbell accepted Wesco's challenge terming it a "discussion" rather than a debate. He whimsically added that, "Wesco, having failed to specify in what part of the state he wishes the discussion to be held, I would suggest that the 'venue' for same be 'laid' in Butler County, Ohio."\(^{57}\)

The plan of the discussion called for four encounters arranged as impartially as possible. At two sites, Hamilton and New London, Campbell spoke first for forty minutes, Wesco for one hour, and, then, Campbell again for twenty minutes. The procedure was reversed at Oxford and Middletown where Wesco was given the opportunity for the

\(^{56}\)Ibid., September 21, 1877.

\(^{57}\)Ibid., September 22, 1877.
opening and closing remarks. 58

The challenger, while courageous in giving the challenge, proved no match for Campbell, who, recalling all that he had learned in the past, constantly and consciously copied those qualities of early speakers which had won votes. He remained calm, confident, and cheerful. From the first encounter, at the heavily Democratic city of Hamilton, to the end, Campbell spoke to generally favorable audiences. He rose to speak "smiling and loudly applauded," while "Wesco looked worried." 59 As his uncle has beaten Schenck, James Campbell handled Wesco.

Perhaps, feeling that little could be done against the strong Democratic ticket, a light turnout appeared on election day. Campbell garnered victory by a count of 5352 votes to 2490 votes for Wesco, as he received the largest plurality secured by anyone else on the ticket. His local ward, the third, strongly supported him by more than a two-to-one majority, 302 votes to 144 votes. 60 Thus, after such a smashing victory, the future loomed bright for the young politico.

Realizing that no successful politician could expect
higher positions without a proportional growth of popularity, Campbell prepared almost immediately to continue to meet as many people as possible and to woo them to his support. With this in mind and also with a compassion for mistreated animals, he actively aided in the organization of a chapter of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Using his office as a meeting place, November 10, 1877, the interested persons adopted a basis for a chapter constitution, and he and two others served on the committee which drew it up. Campbell, acting as attorney for the group, also drew up the articles of incorporation and filed them with the Secretary of the State of Ohio. Five days later at a second meeting, the group elected him as a member of their Board of Directors. During succeeding months Campbell continued to play a prominent role in the organization, i.e., drafting legal papers, and preparing warnings and formal charges against people guilty of cruelty to animals. He regretted later that his own political duties necessitated a lessening of his contact with the group.

Campbell's first major indication of his legal ability and his attitude toward the monied interests came in December, 1877. The Cincinnati, Hamilton, and Dayton Railroad, after receiving their tax notice assessment,

---
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protested that their rates were too high. They, as well as other railroads, had been accustomed to doing this and had been successful in getting their taxes lowered. It was questionable whether their successful reassessments were due to the fear of taking legal action against the railroads or due to the fact that their high salaried lawyers were vastly superior to local county prosecutors, especially those who had any further political ambitions.

On this occasion, the railroad was in for a surprise. Campbell decided to fight their claims. Accompanied by an amazed Board of Commissioners, he went to Columbus to plead before the State Supreme Court that the tax rates of Butler County levied upon the railroad were just and reasonable. On December 22, 1877, he presented his brief before the court. After examining it, his opponents decided to conclude the appeal, admitting that Campbell "had them cold." 62

Thus a reputation for ability and fearlessness before seemingly overwhelming odds was established. Shortly thereafter, in a similar case against Montgomery County tax levies, the same railroad was successful in having its tax rate reduced. Accordingly, Campbell's victory then loomed larger, and his political status took a definite upswing.

After the Christmas holiday interlude, Campbell

62Ibid., December 21, 23, 1877.
accompanied Jervis Hargitt, chairman of the Butler County Democratic organization, to Columbus to attend the inauguration ceremonies of Governor Bishop and the opening of the new session of the state legislature. While there he worked for the selection of State Representative James E. Neal of Butler County for the post of Speaker of the House. In this capacity he gained firsthand knowledge and experience in how the legislature worked. Neal after some minor skirmishing was selected. 63

Campbell returned to Hamilton and settled down to the business of completing his duties as Prosecuting Attorney and advising local Democrats in their forthcoming spring elections and subsequent Congressional elections.

The Democrats of Butler County were confronted with issues created on the national scene. The passing of the Bland-Allison Act by Congress provided for the remonetization of silver. The Secretary of the Treasury was instructed to purchase two to four million dollars worth of silver bullion per month to be coined into silver dollars at the existing legal ration with gold. Stating that the commercial value of silver was eight to ten percent below its nominal value, President Hayes had unsuccessfully vetoed the measure. He had also removed the troops from the South which further splintered his party. Radicals

63Ibid., January 3, 6, 1878.
had hoped to continue military occupation, which implied continual political control of the region. Finally, his proposed civil service reform measure startled many of his spoilsman colleagues who protested the possible patronage loss.

Though the elections of 1878 merely concerned the choice of Congressmen and certain state officials, the contest was an important one in Ohio because it marked the crest of the greenback movement. Meeting in Toledo in February of 1878, delegates from the Workingmen's Party, the Greenbackers, Nationalists, and Labor Reformers, united under the name of the National Party of the United States. Featuring representatives from twenty-eight states, this party adopted a platform and set forth its aims. Basically, they favored an inflationist policy of fiat money, that is, money not directly backed by gold.

The Ohio Democrats felt this was a direct challenge to their appeal to the more liberal elements of the state. Attempting to remain moderates and at the same time trying not to lose vital support to their neophyte radical opponents, they countered with a state platform demanding the gradual substitution of greenbacks for national bank notes and the complete remonetization of silver.

---

Their major opponents, the Republicans, anticipated victory because of the emerging split of left-wing advocates. Meeting in a rather dull fashion, they approved a platform which opposed further agitation of the financial question, made friendly overtures to the South, stood squarely behind Hayes' election, approved a tariff for revenue, and asked for economy in State spending. The Democrats, however, charged that some of the Republicans secretly attacked specific acts of the President, namely his silver veto, his removal of federal troops from the South, and his advocacy of civil service reform. It was alleged that some regarded him as a traitor to his party as John Tyler and Andrew Johnson were said to have been to theirs. As a result of the Republican complacency and the Democratic charges some elements of disharmony were reported. Consequently eleven Democratic Congressmen were elected and mine 65 Republicans.

Campbell, whose political stature was ascending outside of his own county, was appointed a delegate to the district convention to nominate a candidate for the national congress. After assembling at Middletown, Ohio, members of the convention selected him as first permanent vice-president of the body. Agreeing with the majority, he

supported John McMahon against Henry L. Clough who later blamed his defeat upon Campbell. This personal feeling would be returned later against Campbell in his unsuccessful attempt at the state senatorship in 1879.

During the ensuing McMahon campaign, Campbell took to the stump in behalf of his party colleagues. His speeches were so favorably received that he soon joined James E. Neal, the chief local politico, in speaking at party rallies. Together, they helped secure McMahon's election by an approximate majority of 1200 votes. This was behind the average Democrat majority in 1876, but still it represented a strong victory.

Hoping for victory throughout the state, the Democrats were weakened by the appearance of the National Party which polled over 38,000 votes. Nevertheless, they garnered eleven Congressional seats to nine for the Republicans, one of whom was William McKinley.

As a consequence of his role in the election, Campbell's political star became brighter. By associating and working directly with leaders of his party, he was preparing the groundwork on which to build a political future.

66 Cincinnati Enquirer, July 29, August 7, 1878.  
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Truly, the question was no longer whether he would remain in politics, but was one of deciding where he would direct his attention.

Not by any means did Campbell limit his time to politics. He continued to seek the laughter and the warmth of associating with friends on worthwhile community projects. For two years, he had been a member of the Hamilton Assembly, an organization which attempted to promote local cultural activities in the city. Although, he personally was not able to attend and take part in many of their functions, his wife was a regular member and a reliable source from whom he learned of impending events. Nevertheless, he was elected President of the Assembly in 1879, and he had the task of presenting silver tea sets in "his happiest and neatest speeches" and promoting a "Calico Party" which proved to be a successful and gala affair.69

Additionally, his name became a regular feature in the local Hamilton newspaper and in the Cincinnati Enquirer. It was not uncommon to read items such as that he and James Braley, an insurance associate, had gone to Dayton, Ohio, to attend the annual reception of Mr. Samuel Craighead, President of the Fireman's Insurance Company. Further reports disclosed that up to the time the article was written "the Hamilton boys were having a jolly good time" and were

69Cincinnati Enquirer, April 5, 13, 25, 1879.
expected home shortly. 70

The first clue that Campbell was contemplating a change in his political status came on February 20, 1879. In compiling a list of possible candidates for the position of Prosecuting Attorney in Butler County the Cincinnati Enquirer omitted his name. Nothing was mentioned about him or why he would not be a candidate for the post for a third time. 71 He continued with his customary duties and throughout the various committee meetings and conventions during the spring elections, he neither offered his name as a candidate for any city office nor did he give any indication that he would be seeking other possible county, state, or national openings.

By midsummer the final time for selecting candidates for the state senate to represent the Second Senatorial District of Ohio which was composed of Butler and Warren Counties was approaching. The nominee was to be chosen by a Democratic convention to be held at Middletown, Ohio, August 5, 1879.

Jacob Kemp of Madison Township as early as February 14, 1879, had been the first candidate to submit his name for consideration. 72 Thereafter, he failed to generate any

70 Ibid., May 22, June 1, 27, 1879.
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significant following so that by the summer he had virtually no chance whatsoever.

Henry L. Clough, Campbell's foe from the time of his support of McMahon nomination, was mentioned as a possible choice. When asked if he was a candidate, Clough stated that several prominent men in the district had spoken to him, and that others, especially from Warren County, had written letters requesting permission to set his name before the convention. He replied along traditional lines that while he was not seeking the office, if the Democracy of the district should nominate him, he would, as a matter of duty, accept.  

When asked the same question, the former Democratic chairman of Butler County, soon to be executive clerk of the party, Jarvis Hargitt, replied that he was not a candidate for the post but deemed that, if nominated, he would regard such recognition as an honor. He mentioned other men of integrity and ability who could do the work, including Colonel Lewis D. Campbell, James' uncle who was still active on the local level; Jacob Kemp, the only official person seeking the nomination; and Henry L. Clough. He added that among others James E. Campbell would also be a strong candidate. Hargitt went on to aver that the final decision would not be determined by a realization as to

---

73Ibid., June 2, 1879.
which man had the most funds or ambition, but by a concern as to which could secure the most votes. Thus, he concluded that no man who in the opinion of the party could command the most votes ought to refuse the nomination. 74

State Senator Peter Murphy, the Democratic incumbent, had removed his name from consideration for renomination on the grounds of party harmony. He believed that other men could draw more votes to the Democratic slate than he, and he thus felt obliged to step aside. 75

With several good choices developing, it became apparent that no one of the candidates would be a first ballot victor. In such cases a dark horse has eventually emerged as the winner. Campbell, on July 31, 1879, took the first step by announcing that several Democrats had urged him to become a candidate for the state senatorship post. Briefly and to the point, he commented that "in the case the Democracy of the District should tender" him the nomination, he would accept. 76

By the beginning of August the question of who would be the party's choice had begun to engender a deep feeling of excitement and interest. Fear began to develop that Liebeer's Hall, the site of the convention in Middletown, would not be large enough to hold all of the delegates and

75Ibid., July 23, 1879.
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other party men. Because of the vast array of potential candidates each planning to arrive with a crowd of workers and supporters to help in their quest, the assemblage promised to be one of the largest meetings in years.

Prior to the opening of the convention the candidates started to arrive in Middletown. Appearing confident that he would be the choice, Henry L. Clough arrived with "a placid and satisfied air." In one sense he did possess a valid optimism. The local experts predicted that the winner would have to be a resident of Butler County because of its traditional Democratic strength and because of the sheer number of its delegates attending the convention. His major opponents, taking a more cautious approach, entered the city with less fanfare and quickly went to their headquarters and prepared for the contest.

At 11:45 A.M., August 5, 1879, Judge McKemy, chairman of the Democratic Central Committee, called the meeting to order and stated that A. B. Deem of Butler County was the temporary chairman of the convention. In his acceptance address Deem called for party unity and a victory in the forthcoming election. Thereafter, the various committees of rules, resolutions, credentials, etc., were appointed. This was followed by an adjournment so that the committees could complete their assignments and report back to the assemblage after the noon recess.

The convention reconvened at 2:00 P.M. and formally
recognized seventy-six official delegates, fifty-one from Butler County and twenty-five from Warren County. Edward Warwick of Lebanon, Warren County, was made permanent chairman, and a platform calling for free elections formulated because of the dispute of 1876 was adopted. Thereafter, the main business of the meeting, the selection of a state senatorial candidate, began.

Clough was the first to be nominated with the appeal that he traditionally had run ahead of the Democratic ticket. As a type of honorific reward for his past party loyalty, Jacob Trautman, "a life-long Democrat of the area," had his name placed before the group by J. D. Miller. Thirdly, James Campbell, described as "a high-minded, conscientious man, notable in all his dealings, public and private," was placed in nomination by W. D. Stokes. To counteract the earlier Clough appeal, Stokes pointed out that Campbell had "defeated the most popular Republican candidate by thirty-one hundred votes, more than any other Democrat on the ticket." Then, to give a bandwagon type of approach, a telegram from Peter Murphy was read stating: "If it will harmonize the Democracy or strengthen it, I am at the service of the Party and James E. Campbell." Thus, the stage was set for a head on clash between Clough and Campbell. To conclude the nominations, Wilson Warwick nominated Jacob Kemp.

The first ballot was then taken and showed Clough as
the leader with thirty-four votes to Campbell's thirty-three, Trautman's five and Kemp's two. Two ballots were left blank. Thirty-nine votes were necessary for victory. Thereafter, in the interval between ballots, Trautman had his name withdrawn.

The second ballot found little change with Campbell going to the forefront with thirty-six votes to Clough's thirty-four and Kemp's three. Prior to the third vote, a new name was placed before the convention, A. J. Runyon of Warren County. The latter hoped that the two candidates from Hamilton would split their strength and would in time be forced to turn elsewhere for a compromise choice. In essence he was hoping for a potential dark-horse victory.

This new strategy proved to hurt Clough much more than Campbell. When the third ballot was taken, Campbell's total fell only two votes to thirty-four while Clough lost twenty and dropped down to fourteen votes. Runyon, meanwhile, had garnered twenty-four votes to take over second place. Finishing with two votes, Kemp remained a distant fourth.

With the end in sight the fourth ballot proved decisive as Campbell's total grew to thirty-nine, the minimum necessary for victory. Runyon's total had risen to twenty-seven, while Clough, a very disappointed man, finished with only nine. As was customary, the vote was made unanimous, and Campbell emerged from this contest as a
happy, if not, an entirely popular victor.

Following this triumph Campbell left Hamilton to journey to Oakland, Maryland, to join his family for a well earned rest. Local papers had mentioned that Oakland was much cooler than the hot summer of Ohio, and that hats and shawls were in use there. Campbell took advantage of this more congenial and refreshing atmosphere and prepared to lay the groundwork for his fall struggle. He and his family did not return to Hamilton until August 31.

His Republican opponent was Dr. John L. Mounte of Warren County. He was forty-five years of age, a surgeon in the Civil War and had practiced medicine in Morrow, Ohio, for twenty-three years. He was additionally noted for his avid interest in intellectual pursuits and was regarded as a scholar. Finally, he was a very popular choice of a united party which heartily and warmly endorsed his nomination.

Both candidates were affected by the state gubernatorial contests which were held at the same time. The Democrats, who met in Columbus, called attention to the "stolen" election of Hayes and adopted a platform advocating a greenback plank in hopes of recapturing support lost to
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the National Party in 1877. Thomas Ewing, Jr. of Lancaster, Ohio, was nominated over the incumbent, Governor Richard Bishop, who had sought renomination but had failed because he lacked the political acumen necessary for appointments and had been unduly influenced by his son.

Leaders of the National Party responded favorably to the Democrats' actions and proceeded to align themselves with the major party. While the exodus of these leaders was felt by the Greenbackers, the party did survive as a separate entity for another five years, but increasingly became an insignificant political force in the state.

"Calico" Charles Foster was nominated by the Republicans in opposition to Ewing. Foster, displaying modern organized campaign methods, had an active organization working throughout the state. He represented a conservative monetary position and disapproved of the inflationary tendencies of his adversary. Using "calico" neckties as a campaign symbol, he turned a Democratic charge that he had remained out of the Civil War and stayed home selling "calico" by a vibrant appeal to the common man.  

On his arrival home in Hamilton, Campbell proceeded in his usual campaign style to talk to as many people as possible and to woo them to the party banner. His talks

---

were well attended, and much interest was manifested in his favor. The largest and most enthusiastic meeting took place on September 30 in Hamilton when he led a local Democratic speakers in conducting the raising of a large hickory pole, the traditional Democratic symbol of honor of Andrew Jackson. Campbell, recalling his early allegiance to Henry Clay, had some personal problems in honoring the symbol he had disliked as a boy. However, Clay had long been dead, and the Republican Party did not represent the older Whigs. Times had changed, although he felt that the principles he had defended as a boy were still the same. The following two weeks were filled with more travel and talks throughout the district. He was generally successful but was forced to fight against problems created beyond his control or defense.

On September 2, 1879, the Cincinnati Enquirer reported that David Yeakle, a Democratic Clerk to the Treasurer of Butler County, had embezzled approximately $6,000.00 from the Butler County Treasury. The County Treasurer, James Jones, had replaced the funds taken and hoped that it would end the clamor over the misdeed. The Republicans, however, knowing the value of scandal or misconduct in office as an election appeal, refused to let the issue die. The

---

81 Cincinnati Enquirer, September 18, 21, 30, October 4, 5, 7, 11, 1879.
82 Ibid., September 2, 1879.
Democrats tried to atone by replacing Yeakle on their ticket with James Curtis, who some described as more honest than capable, and argued they had cleaned out the culprits themselves.\(^{83}\) This maneuver was weakened when subsequent investigation disclosed that the embezzlement developed, not by stealing funds from the county treasury directly, but through overcharging tax assessments and taking the excess. This meant private citizens were the people who lost and not the county as a whole.\(^{84}\) Unfortunately for the Democrats, taxpayers protest more when they are individually cheated than when the whole county is robbed. Hence, the entire Democratic slate was on the defensive by this poorly timed act.

In an effort to counteract this latest discovery the Democrats tried other means to garner votes. They encouraged Ewing, their gubernatorial candidate, to visit not only in Middletown, where he was originally scheduled to deliver an address, but also Hamilton in a last minute effort. On the former occasion the Democrats went all out to generate excitement and were successful. They previously had arranged for a delegation to go from Hamilton to Middletown via train to represent them on the day of the

\(^{83}\)Ibid., September 3, 1879. The Democrats had indicated that Yeakle would have remained as Clerk if Jones had been reelected.

\(^{84}\)Ibid., September 19, 1879.
speech. On the day of the address eight train coaches were not enough to carry all the people. A great deal of publicity was used by the Democrats to show that Ewing was attracting overflowing crowds which could not be handled by normal means. Later, when Ewing arrived in Hamilton to speak, a crowd of over 3,000 people assembled around the Court House Park to witness the occasion. At the time it was reported to be the largest crowd ever gathered in Hamilton. 85

Five days prior to the election, the Democratic Central Committee announced that it had discovered a false ballot being circulated by the Republicans. The Democrats charged that it was a deliberate attempt to mislead potential Democratic voters, hoping they would vote Republican or vote wrong in order that their ballots be invalidated. Democrats were warned to be careful on election day and to make sure they voted correctly. 86

Finally, Campbell faced an even more imposing obstacle, the opposition of Henry L. Clough, who angrily declared that Campbell was responsible for his failure to gain the nomination. He not only refused to endorse his party's nominee, but he openly threw his support to Mounte. Thus, added to the aforementioned problems,

85 Ibid., October 2, 3, 1879.
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Campbell had to contend with a local party split.

Even so, on the day following the election, October 15, Campbell claimed victory. He was leading in local returns in Hamilton by 1,059 votes. This margin, he figured, was enough to offset the expected opposition majorities elsewhere, although it was not the normally high majority needed to win. Returns on the following day showed that Campbell's lead had been reduced to twenty-seven votes with more returns yet to arrive outside of Hamilton. Finally, on October 17, two days after the election, the first set of official returns were counted and showed that Mounte had won by the bare majority of two votes. Campbell decided to call for a recount and was saddened to discover that a mistake of ten votes in his favor had been made in the tallies from Riley Township. Thus, he lost officially by twelve votes.

The Democrats from Ewing on down had fallen before the Republican landslide.

In a post election interview, Henry L. Clough, "for the first time in ten years, showed signs of satisfaction". Even though he had been strongly censured by fellow Democrats for his actions against Campbell, he commented bluntly that he had "supported Republicans by influence

---
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and money." Furthermore he concluded emphatically, "Yes, I did help defeat him (Campbell) and would rather see him defeated than be President of the United States."  

Justifiably, Campbell maintained that his narrow defeat was caused by any of three factors: the local Democratic scandal, the state Democratic ouster of Governor Bishop, and Clough's defection. Oftentimes, such developments can frustrate and drive men of less fortitude away from the political arena. Campbell, however, was not to sit by the wayside and watch the others pass by. Rather, he accepted his defeat as only a temporary setback, something which he could reverse when circumstances were more opportune.

---
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CHAPTER III

CONGRESSIONAL YEARS

As the 1870's became history, the opening years of the following decade witnessed not only the advance of modern industrial and economic triumphs, but also a quickening of the higher sentiment which regarded public service as a public trust and civil duty as akin to religious obligation. James Edwin Campbell conformed to this new attitude with little difficulty. He had always manifested these principles even though he did not formally philosophize them.

Within the Buckeye State the elections of 1879 had left the Republicans in control of the governorship and both houses of the legislature. One of the Ohio General Assembly's first assignments was the selection of Republican James A. Garfield as United States Senator over the incumbent, Allen G. Thurman. Thereafter the administration of Governor Foster concerned itself with the goal of maintaining Republican ascendancy.

---

1 Edwin Erle Sparks, National Development, 1877-1885, p. XIV.

Secretary of the Treasury John Sherman of Ohio was endorsed as a favorite son candidate for the Presidential nomination the following April by the Ohio Republicans, although nine districts delegates were committed to Senator James G. Blaine of Maine. Meeting early they wanted to display unity and to show as much strength as possible for their choices against the growing threat of a return of General Grant as their party's standard bearer. Their state opponents meeting in Columbus in May decided to support Thurman for the presidential nomination but to wait until after the national convention to frame a platform. Campbell was a delegate to the Columbus meeting but was by-passed as a delegate to the national conclave. Generally such honorific and important selections are not bestowed upon losing candidates of local elections.

Campbell was concerned with another problem, the need of earning a living. Described as a man "who had served with great credit to himself and to the satisfaction of the people for two terms," Campbell was replaced by James F. Neilan on January 5, 1880, as Prosecuting Attorney of Butler County. Hence, Campbell was without a steady job. He returned to his law practice which had been minimized during the preceding four years and also showed interest in

---
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speculative business ventures.

During the early months of 1880 he was constantly taking business trips throughout Ohio and adjoining states. On one such trip to New York City in late March, he learned a somewhat expensive lesson. He anticipated that the climate was similar to Ohio's in early spring. "Jimmie found by sad experience" that his light weight clothing was no match for the colder elements. He was forced to purchase a new overcoat and indicated that the next time he went East in March he would leave his spring coat at home and take his winter one regardless of existing Ohio weather. Furthermore, after he did return home, because of the rigors of travel, business, and the cold, he became quite sick and was confined to bed for several days. 5

The Democratic national convention met at Cincinnati and in a somewhat dull gathering nominated General Winfield S. Hancock of Pennsylvania for the presidency and former Congressman William H. English of Indiana as his running mate. Their platform was brief and advocated home rule, sound money, civil service reform, and subordination of the military to civil power. 6 Their Republican opponents convening in Chicago produced a more interesting platform. Hayes ruled

5Ibid., March 23, April 2, 12, 24, 1880.

himself out as a candidate because of his assertion that he was only a one-term president. Hence, the choice fell between two blocs, the old guard leaders or Stalwarts, and the Hayes supporters or "Halfbreeds." The Stalwarts, yearning for a return to the good days of the past, supported General Grant for a third term, and their rivals championed James G. Blaine with John Sherman of Ohio as a possible compromise. Because there was a major fissure within the party no one candidate could garner enough votes for the nomination until the thirty-sixth ballot when Senator-elect James A. Garfield of Ohio, a Halfbreed, was selected. As a concession to the Stalwarts Chester A. Arthur of New York was chosen as the vice-presidential nominee.

Within the Buckeye State, despite the belief that there was "treachery" among the Ohio delegates, and the charge that both Governor Foster and Garfield gave Sherman "sickly" support at the convention, solid support was rendered to the nominee. 7 State Democrats realized that, once again, it would be a difficult task to defeat a favorite son candidate of a national party. Almost immediately after the Cincinnati meeting, they assembled and accepted Hancock and the Democratic platform. Thereafter, local Democratic organizations were sponsored with the notion of bringing the campaign to the people.

The city of Hamilton immediately issued a call to local party workers and supporters to meet at the court house to plan strategy and to erect the traditional hickory pole. At the meeting James Campbell was chosen president of the local Hancock for President Club because of his loyalty to the party and, more important, because of the full vigor he traditionally infused into a campaign.

Democrats recalled the "stolen" election of 1876 and attacked Garfield as a member of the Credit Mobilier by the number "329", referring to the amount of dollars received by him as a dividend from promoters of the scandal. Republicans ridiculed Hancock's tariff position which proposed tariff as a local issue. They claimed further that, after Tilden refused consideration as a candidate in 1880, "only scrubs were left."  

In his role as local campaign president, Campbell displayed his usual approach. He declined to accompany his family in early September on a vacation to Mackinaw, Michigan, and stayed at his duties during the remainder of the season. Speaking at Beckett's Hall, Hamilton, before a
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large Democratic group, he vividly pointed out that Ohio had
gone heavily for Hayes in 1876, and that the Buckeye state
had been continually returning Republicans to office in re-
cent elections. Campbell admitted that 1880 was going to be
a difficult year because of the presence of Garfield on the
national ticket. Perhaps more idealistically than realist-
ically, he urged that a strong effort by Democrats would
produce positive results in the end for the Hancock-English
ticket.

He repeated this theme in other speeches and continued
to draw approving crowds. Interesting also was the contin-
ued presence of sizable groups of ladies who attentively
listened to his talks from the front seats and applauded
vigorously. 12

He, however, did reserve time for a very special occa-
sion, the seventy-fifth birthday of his mother. Campbell
and his wife prepared a luncheon party which purposely in-
cluded seventy-five guests. At the party, described as
elegant, each guest wore a boutonniere. The elder Mrs.
Campbell was given a warm reception, remaining in Hamilton
at the residence of her son, until October 29, at which
time she journed back to her home in Middletown. 13

Concurrent with the national election was the contest

12Ibid., October 31, 1880.
13Ibid., October 23-24, 29, 1880.
for the seat in the recently created Third Congressional dis-

trict. The Republicans selected Henry L. Morey, an able

lawyer and eloquent speaker, as their candidate. As early

as January 29, 1880 Morey had been proposed by his fellow

colleagues as their candidate. This action was prompted by

the news that members of the Ohio legislature, controlled

by the Republicans, were gerrymandering the area to ensure

continued Republican victories. Later, by mid-summer,

this news leak proved correct, and the local members of the

G.O.P. did fulfill the early request.

Morey's opponent was General Durbin Ward who was easily

nominated after Thomas Milligan, his only serious rival,

withdrew from consideration. The General, realizing the
difficulty of the race, challenged his Republican adversary
to a joint discussion of the issues. Morey, however, sens-
ing an easy victory, decided not to risk the loss of poss-
able votes in a direct encounter and quickly refused the

offer. 15

Unfortunately for Campbell and Ward, 1880 was not a
Democratic year. The Republicans under Garfield continued
their hold on the White House and kept Ohio in the Republi-
can electoral column. Because of the general prosperity in
Ohio and the fact that Garfield was a Buckeye he won by a

14 Ibid., January 29, 1880; Lowry Sater, James Edwin
Campbell, p. 25.

15 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 6, 1880.
count of 375,048 to 340,821 votes for Hancock. Morey, running a safe race, emerged victorious by a majority of 871 votes.

Although Campbell's extended efforts for his Democratic colleagues proved unsuccessful, they did demonstrate that he was still a loyal party supporter willing to work in its behalf. In the future fellow party men would be more than willing to return their efforts when they were called.

In the months following these elections, Campbell returned to his law practice and continued to play a prominent advisory role in shaping local politics. His office continued to be the central meeting place of party officials to discuss plans for future contests. One of the causes of this phenomena was the selection of Job E. Owens, Campbell's father-in-law, as chairman of the local Democratic Central Committee. This action proved to be a type of final tribute. After suffering a severe attack of rheumatism, Owens died within a couple of months. Only a few days prior to this sad event Campbell himself had been confined to bed and his condition diagnosed as quite "sick and threatened with an attack of typhoid fever."
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After his recovery he was selected to serve on the Hamilton Board of Trade as a member of the Standing Committee of Law with other locally prominent lawyers. He constantly devoted many hours to this duty and proved to be a wise choice. On one occasion he was selected to head a special Committee on Finance to celebrate the annual Fourth of July holiday. Under his aggressive leadership the committee solicited over $110 a level never before attained.

He also continued to remain in the public eye by constantly giving speeches in one capacity or another. Commemorative speeches for the ex-Soldiers and Sailors Association and after-dinner roles such as toastmaster for the Royal Arcanum Order were typical. Campbell knew that potential politicians have to keep their names and faces before the public. For this reason he regularly notified local reporters of any of his actions out of the ordinary, such as business or pleasure trips outside the city, guardianships, and trusteeships. Rather than drifting into the shade as a losing politico, he remained as a possible candidate for office.

During the summer of 1881, prior to the local Democratic meeting to nominate a state senatorial candidate, a letter embodying a proposal appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer.

20Ibid., April 2, June 7, 1881.
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The author, who anonymously signed it, "A Democrat", recalled that Campbell had been the victim of an intra-party battle during the previous contest. He suggested that, as "a fitting tribute" to the new party harmony, Campbell be renominated because of his past loyalty, sacrifices on behalf of the party, and his basic native competence. Furthermore, he asked the other potential candidates "to jointly step aside and unite with fellow Democrats in politically vindicating this young man." 22

In reply to this public request, a second letter signed "Another Democrat," stated that, "Mr. Campbell has repeatedly avowed himself as not a candidate and that he could only become one by identifying himself as such." The author went on to aver that since Peter Murphy, former Democratic State Senator from the district, had previously withdrawn from the race, the only candidate left was Colonel George F. Elliott. 23

Campbell, perhaps, had hesitated to move at this time because of the tragic assassination of President Garfield. Realizing that public sympathy would lie with the slain President's party, it appeared safer to wait for a more opportune time. 24 A second defeat directly following his

22Ibid., July 9, 1881.
23Ibid., July 10, 1881.
24Eugene Roseboom and Francis Weisenburger, A History of Ohio, p. 266.
first possibly would have proven catastrophic for Campbell's political future.

As it happened, Colonel Elliott did get the nomination rather easily. Later, during the fall elections, he, along with many other Democrats, fell before the Republican victors who carried both the executive and legislative branches of the state government. Actually, Elliott lost by only twenty-seven votes and subsequently claimed that he was "defeated by fraud." He appealed the decision, and he stated publicly that he would not win because the Republican controlled legislature would not objectively listen to his appeal. Henry L. Morey was labeled by Elliott as one of the perpetrators of the fraud, and the Democrat hoped that if this did nothing more it would arouse the docile public enough to alert them for future elections.

The first Republican administration under the leadership of Governor Foster enjoyed general prosperity but faced a basic problem involving the difficult temperance question. Politically, if they either withheld necessary control of the liquor traffic, or instituted some type of reform, they would be met by strong opposition. Foster eventually decided to give his support to some type of regulation. The problem was complicated by a specific provision in the Ohio Constitution of 1851 prohibiting any licensing of the liquor

\[25\text{Cincinnati Enquirer, October 13-16, 1881.}\]
traffic. After a long and hotly debated session over the control problem, a mild measure which restricted dramatic musical entertainments on Sundays when associated with liquor sales was adopted.\textsuperscript{26} Interpreting the heavy election returns of 1881 as a sign that something more stringent had to be done, Foster proposed constitutional amendments which would provide for either total prohibition of alcoholic beverages, or for taxation upon the liquor traffic coupled with close regulation. Although neither of these two regulations was accepted by the legislature, two laws were adopted. The first, known as the Pond Law, provided for a graduated tax on saloons based upon local population and the submission of a thousand dollar bond ensuring payment of the assessments. The second, the Smith Law, prohibited the sale of liquor on Sundays under heavy penalties.\textsuperscript{27} Both laws immediately infuriated the liquor interests which raised over twenty thousand dollars to fight them. Agents who were sent to Columbus to work against them became notorious for their pressures. The Cincinnati \textit{Commercial} asked, "What are those pot-bellied lobbyists doing in Columbus, with jugs of whiskey, boxes of cigars, and the best rooms at the hotels?"\textsuperscript{28}

\begin{itemize}
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\item \textsuperscript{28} Cincinnati \textit{Commercial}, March 28, 1882.
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Within two months of passage, the Pond Law was declared unconstitutional by the Ohio Supreme Court as a violation of the Constitution of 1851. The presence of the Smith Law continued to be a major issue. Residents of some areas, especially in German-settled regions, often spent Sundays at their neighborhood "beer-gardens", and they were openly defiant of the restrictions on their personal freedoms. Understandably, the liquor question became a major issue in politics. While the Democrats were attracting the liquor groups because of their natural position as the opposition party, the Republicans were now placed on the defensive. Actually by remaining silent and following an ambiguous policy the Democrats also appealed to the prohibition groups which felt the Republican controlled legislature had failed to go far enough.

Within the city of Hamilton Democratic meetings and conventions became "high old times." Oldsters were heard saying "Be jabbers. It does the heart good, for it looks like a return to the good-old days." Local saloon-keepers openly fought the short lived Pond Law, but they were more compliant with the Smith Act, although some proprietors defied that law and remained open. Soon druggists and barbers joined them in denouncing this abridgement of their Sunday freedom and prepared petitions to appeal to the legislature for an

29Cincinnati Enquirer, March 22, 1882.
Immediate change. At all times the Republicans were labeled as the culprits.\textsuperscript{30}

Additionally, internal problems began to arise within the local G.O.P. ranks. While it appeared that Henry L. Morey would be renominated for a Congressional seat, elements within his party were dissatisfied. This was especially true in the city of Hamilton where party chieftains were angered by the removal of Captain John McKee as postmaster. It appeared that McKee, an old party faithful and protege of Hamilton Republicans, was removed in favor of Charles E. Giffen, described as a member of the emerging young wing of the party. Furthermore, Morey, who owed his initial success in politics to the Hamiltonians, had turned against them in this matter. This was partly explainable by the Republican gerrymandering of the newly created Seventh Congressional district, including Butler, Clermont, Green, and Warren Counties. It was expected that Butler, traditionally a Democratic stronghold, would be controlled politically by the other three counties. Hence, Morey felt a feeling of independence from the Hamilton group which traditionally proved to be the weakest link in the Republican chain. It was natural that he should turn to his greatest strength in terms of appointments.

Evidence of the rift appeared when a small delegation

\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Ibid.}, April 20, 25, 26, 1882.
of Republicans from Hamilton went to Lebanon for the purpose of seeing if they could break the solid vote of the forty delegates in Warren County from being cast for Morey. On their return from the trip, their looks "indicated that they had not been as successful as they might have desired." Two days later, July 14, 1882, the Warren Republicans, meeting in a County convention, cast all forty votes for Morey. Hence, at the Congressional nominating convention, while disharmony reigned, Morey was chosen. Indicative of the displeasure of Butler chieftains was the absence of the traditional bosses, Beckett and Milligan. Rumors appeared shortly after the Republican conclave that if the Democrats would make "a judicious choice," some Republican support could be expected.

The Democrats, now tasting victory, decided to reward past party loyalty by organizing a delegate system of representation. Each town and city ward was allowed one delegate for every fifty votes cast for Bookwalter for governor in 1881. Consequently, Butler County's approval was necessary for any ultimate decisions at the convention, and it was assumed that a Butler native would be the nominee.

Initially, Lewis D. Campbell was mentioned as the possible choice. The old campaigner, described as the "strongest
timber in the district, and a man of the old school of politicians and statesmen, who were noted for their ability, economy, and patriotism . . . ," was viewed as an easy victor. Unfortunately, he was not in the best of health and would die within the year.

Judge Alexander F. Hume, a resident of Hamilton, was proposed as a second nominee. His supporters pointed to his excellent showing in the 1881 election for the State Supreme Court. Although he had lost that race, he had managed to carry the counties composing the Seventh Congressional District by eight hundred votes. Thus, it was argued that not only would he be a sure winner, but also he would prove to be a man of "ability and strength" beyond any other resident of the district. His candidacy did engender some support, but after one week of consideration Judge Hume positively refused to be a candidate.

Finally, James Campbell was mentioned for consideration. He lacked the enthusiastic acclaim and complete endorsement given to his uncle, and yet, he was described as the strongest man in the district after Hume, and he did produce a feeling of inspiration and satisfaction. Democrats could rally around his banner and be proud that they had a capable candidate.

---

34 Ibid., July 9, 1882.
Prior to the local conclave Campbell journeyed to Columbus as a delegate to the state convention. There he had little to say and was not appointed to any of the numerous state committees. On the important liquor issue he was not recorded as having taken a position or as having urged action in either direction. Other Democrats generally stated that some control was necessary, but they did not approach the degree of regulation their major rivals sponsored. They agreed that some suspension of Sunday sales would be acceptable, but they failed to present a precise plank. 36

In the interim between the state meeting and the local gathering, Campbell's nomination was continually proposed by local newspapers. Described as a good speaker, organizer, and campaigner, and known by all the residents of the district, Campbell would have little difficulty in defeating Morey, according to their predictions. The young lawyer replied that if he were offered the nomination, he would not refuse it. He added that if there were any other capable men who felt that they could more successfully cope with Morey, he was prepared to step aside and follow them to victory. He concluded by observing that if he were selected, he would carry the fight to Morey and would wage his usual aggressive campaign.

After this cautious but affirmative statement Campbell's strength grew daily. No other serious candidate appeared, hence the following days became virtual waiting periods for official confirmation.  

Most Democrats were elated with the prospects of victory. Many of the various clubs and associations in the region canceled their regular meetings, so their members could attend what was affectionately termed the beginning of the big revival. In reality they had no choice but to cancel their affairs because numerous individuals had asserted their intent to attend the convention regardless of any other commitments.  

The harmonious gathering in Lebanon, Ohio, began on August 14 in the morning with an array of speeches, all predicting victory and castigating their Republican opponents for various failures. By the time the afternoon session opened and the main duty of the delegates began, it was a foregone conclusion that Campbell would be nominated. It took only part of the first ballot to confirm this, and ultimately the vote was made unanimous. At that point Campbell appeared to speak to the assemblage. In humble tones he thanked the delegates for the honor bestowed upon him and promised to equal the enthusiasm of the group in

---
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in his own efforts in the ensuing campaign. He attacked the Republicans for magnifying the liquor question beyond proportion, but he did not offer a solution himself. Following the political rule of not taking a position when it was not necessary, he adroitly avoided a positive statement. He ridiculed instead the recent gerrymandering efforts of the Republicans as a direct effort "to uphold and perpetrate the profligacy and corruption" existing in Ohio. He expanded on this theme and accused the G.O.P. of openly embracing these principles on the national scene. Lincoln and Garfield were described as two men who tried to fight this growth, but both were cruelly assassinated and left the nation in the hands of unscrupulous bosses. 39

This, then, became Campbell's central theme in his campaign. Continually, he offered the voters a noble choice of "bossism or freedom." Specifically he included Morey as a proponent of fraudulent dupings of the American people. Indeed, he presented a true "time for a change" appeal.

Immediately after the convention Hamiltonian Democrats arranged a meeting to be held in the city on Saturday night, August 20, 1882. That night Mrs. Campbell was not present. Though she was vacationing in Columbus and Marion, it was suggested that she was still able to hear the shouts and applause. In what was considered one of the largest and

39Ibid., August 17, 1882.
most enthusiastic political meetings ever held in Hamilton, jubilant Democrats gathered to honor Campbell and prepare for the following campaign. Numerous speakers took the platform and uttered thankful and optimistic statements that the party was fully reunited and working together. Lewis Campbell, in what was regarded as the most heartfelt emotional moment of the occasion took the platform and expressed his complete satisfaction with the existing state of affairs. He concluded with reference to his pseudonym, "the Butler Pony," that he was laying down his political harness and passing it on to another Campbell. To the tune "the Campbells are Coming," he stepped aside and ushered his nephew forward.

Thanking the delegates for their support and especially lauding the young people in attendance, Campbell spoke for only fifteen minutes. Referring to the lateness of the hour because of the large number of speeches and the continuous applause, he suggested that everyone go home and prepare for the campaign to begin shortly.\textsuperscript{40}

In the ensuing weeks a steadily growing following appeared for the Democratic nominee. Campbell continued to meet large and receptive audiences and generated an electrifying feeling of optimism. Throughout the district regular reports attested to this new style of candidate.

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., August 18, 20, 1882.
Not only did he represent the usual party appeal, but he also began to build a personal following. Usually Republican or independent voters continued to aver their allegiance to Campbell, the man, and not the party. This theme was especially evident at the Butler County Fair where both Morey and Campbell staged rival speeches in the hope of winning votes. It appeared to veteran onlookers that the Democrat constantly bested his opponent in gathering crowds and in getting endorsing shouts of approval.\textsuperscript{41}

During the first week of October, Campbell sent a letter to Murat Halstead, editor of the Republican controlled Cincinnati \textit{Commercial}. He complained of injurious attacks on his character. Noting that Halstead had not replied to short notes sent previously, Campbell asserted that he was not a regular complaining card-writer and that he did not consider attacks by such local Republican newspapers as the Lebanon \textit{Gazette}, Hamilton \textit{Telegraph}, and Xenia \textit{Gazette}, to be worthy of his notice. He did feel, however, that when such allegations were included in a paper of such importance as the \textit{Commercial}, that he was obliged to deny them.

Specifically, he referred to three charges: that he irrevocably opposed soldier's claims and pensions; that he was currently receiving a large pension; and that he was responsible for the removal of Postmaster McKee. In his

\textsuperscript{41}\textit{Ibid.}, August 24 - October 7, 1882.
reply he asserted that he was not opposed to assistance or pensions for deserving soldiers or their widows and children. He, however, did object to indiscriminate granting of such pensions simply because someone spent time in the service and had no other valid reason for such assistance.

On the second charge he admitted that he had received a pension as a consequence of his Civil War affliction. When he was not able to help himself in this type of situation, he felt that it was permissible and commendable for the government to provide such aid at that time. Later when he was able to care for himself, then such help was no longer necessary. Consequently, he voluntarily sent a letter asking that his name be removed from the pension rolls and that he be sent no further compensation.

Reversing the third allegation, that he was responsible for the dismissal of the local postmaster, he charged Morey was the real culprit. Campbell asserted that the postoffice position was a federal appointment subject to the usual rules of patronage. Hence, because the Republicans were in control of the national government and because Morey was the Congressional Representative at the time, it was unthinkable that a Democrat could have influenced such action. Campbell did admit that prior to the actual removal he had suggested that McKee be replaced temporarily because of poor health. He believed that the postoffice was not being run properly because the postmaster was
physically unable to perform his duties. Furthermore, in lamentable tones, he added weight to his argument by commenting that McKee died shortly after his removal. He even implied that if the dismissal had been performed earlier, McKee might have been alive then.

Halstead did not bother to answer Campbell's publicly delivered letter. Feeling, perhaps, that Campbell's letter was a sign of weakness and apprehension, he avoided any direct refutation with his party's opponent.

Meanwhile, Henry Morey was experiencing a new problem. Hubbellizing Parker, a prominent Negro leader in Xenia, Ohio, had charged that the Republicans were not doing enough for his race. He believed that if the Negroes were to have any appreciable gains, then, they would have to assert their political independence. He viewed it as foolishness to follow blindly one party which ignored Negroes but counted their votes. Parker even stated that he was going to offer his support to the Democrats in the hope of receiving some consideration for his people.

Morey was deeply alarmed by news of this break in his party immediately before the election. He canceled his prescheduled speaking engagements and hurriedly sped to Xenia to try to regain the Negro vote. Failing to convince Parker of his party's intentions, he attempted a door-to-

42Ibid., October 3, 1882.
door campaign in the Negro areas of the city. He was not appreciably successful in getting promised votes and was noticeably "irritated and disgusted" over the situation.

Added to this Negro problem, Morey was deeply concerned about the liquor issue. Such a general assertion as, "There is no such thing as a German Republican this year," emphasized the repercussions of the state liquor traffic problem. This was especially important because of the large number of Germans residing in the area. Morey's ultimate hope for victory rested on the gerrymandering scheme. Without it he had little chance for re-election.

On election night, October 10, 1882, the city of Hamilton was in a festive mood. "Old men and boys were intoxicated with joy if by nothing stronger." Early returns had indicated an above average number of Democratic votes. By 1:00 A.M. with a deficit of 2,483 votes, the Republicans prematurely conceded defeat and recognized Campbell as the winner. Partisan Democrats offered bets of one thousand dollars against five hundred dollars that the returns of the three other Republican counties would not override the heavy vote from Hamilton. When early returns from these counties indicated a growth of Democratic votes, they were further encouraged.

---
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Unfortunately for the Democrats, when they awoke on October 11, they discovered that they had rejoiced too soon. The city of Middletown and the rest of Clermont County had voted more heavily Republican than at any time in the past. Democratic losses were significant, and Morey claimed the victory as his. Campbell refused to make any statements and adopted a wait and see policy. Regardless of the final results, he indicated that a challenge and demand for a complete investigation of the election returns would be issued.\textsuperscript{45}

Within a few days after the election, Campbell went to Middletown to visit his mother and some friends. While he was there he spent several hours discussing the local voting situation, and he left the city feeling much happier than when he arrived.

On October 22, 1882, the Butler Democrats held a jubilation celebration to honor the victorious party members. Numerous speakers questioned how Campbell could carry Butler County by approximately 2,500 votes and still lose. Countless orators referred to "Our Jimmy," and they avowed their respect and admiration for his campaign regardless of the results. Campbell delivered a brief speech thanking those who had aided him in the campaign. Then, amidst

\textsuperscript{45}Sater, Campbell, p. 25. The official returns stood: Morey, 14,451; Campbell, 14,410.
wild shouts from the audience, he stated that it was not over and that he intended to carry on the fight from the state to Washington, if necessary.

As Campbell began to prepare the basis of his appeal, a sorrowful event occurred to disturb his life. His uncle, Lewis D. Campbell, having been confined to bed for several weeks, died on November 27, 1882. The young politico and the veteran campaigner had shared a great many experiences together. Only recently they had waged the tough battle for the Congressional seat and were, at the time of the illness, again sharing the older man's wisdom and the younger man's vitality. Now, James Campbell would no longer have the friendly and knowledgeable advice of his uncle. The contest for Morey's seat would have to be waged without the personal support of such a helpful advisor.

Closely watching the proceedings of the State Canvassing Board to discover how it would officially tabulate the votes of the Seventh Congressional District, Campbell spent the early weeks of December in Columbus. In an interview relative to the count, he commented that some basic technical errors had been made which could reverse the final decision. In an attempt to display a moral overtone to his close scrutiny, he stated that he was not picking legal

\[46\] Cincinnati Enquirer, October 16, 22, 23, 1882.

\[47\] Ibid., November 28, 1882.
technicalities in order to be elected. Rather, he was interested in trying to obtain a decision which would insure closer observance of the rules in all future elections and avoid future troubles.\(^{48}\)

Specifically, Campbell contended that Greene County had erred in bestowing several hundred votes upon Henry L. Morey when the name written on the ballots was that of H. L. Morey. Campbell argued that the votes for both names should not be combined and that they should be tabulated separately. If this interpretation was accepted, then the Democrat would easily be declared the victor. The State Canvassing Board, which was composed of a Republican Governor, the Secretary of State, and other Republicans, refused to accept the appeal and declared Morey the winner.

After this reversal Campbell appealed to the State Supreme Court on January 3, 1883, and requested that it order the Canvassing Board to rehear his case and reconsider the Henry Lee vs. H. L. Morey plea. Additionally, he claimed to have new information which would nullify the original decision. This appeal also failed to engender any support because the Court ruled that since the Governor and the Secretary of State had already rendered a decision, it would be foolish to have them reconsider the claim.\(^{49}\)

\(^{48}\)Ibid., December 11, 1882.

\(^{49}\)Ibid., January 3, 9-10, 1883.
Hence, they refused the appeal.

Immediately after the decision was given, Campbell boarded a train to Washington D.C. Feeling that his cause was just and, perhaps, that a Democratically controlled Congress would be less partial to a Republican, he prepared to carry his appeal to the national legislature.

By January 22, 1883, Campbell had sufficiently prepared the basic argument for the contest. As required by law he submitted a copy to Morey in order to allow his opponent ample time to prepare a defense. The Hamilton Telegraph printed a copy of Campbell's plea and stated that Campbell had given it to the newspaper. Campbell indignantly retorted that the only person to see a copy of his appeal was Morey, and if any copies were being publically circulated, Morey must be the one sending them.

During the following months the long and arduous task of investigating voter qualifications, residencies, minors, marked ballots, and other questionable acts was undertaken. In the city of Xenia alone nearly three hundred witnesses were questioned and over three thousand pages of testimony were compiled. Such investigations could not be rushed quickly when only a few votes separated victory from defeat.

Although the major part of Campbell's time was limited

\[^{50}\text{Ibid.}, \text{January 22, 1883.}\]

\[^{51}\text{Ibid.}, \text{June 25, 1883.}\]
to working on the contest, he did take part in various local political conclaves and campaigned in behalf of George Hoadly, the Democratic nominee for governor in 1883. Attesting to Campbell's importance in the gubernatorial campaign was the visit to Hamilton by Hoadly and his wife shortly after his successful election. While there he was a guest in the Campbell household and conferred with its master on the challenges of the new office. Indeed this was a thankful gesture for a job well done. 52

When Congress reconvened in December, 1883, Campbell proceeded to Washington to contest officially the election and to be present when the specific case appeared before the House Committee on Elections. The partisan Cincinnati Enquirer wrote that despite the voluminous record of over 10,000 pages, the committee would quickly rule in Campbell's behalf and permit him "to put a derrick under Mr. Morey." Unfortunately for Campbell, the committee proved to be a slow moving body that also had the duty of judging several other contested elections, one of which was a contest between William McKinley and Jonathan Wallace from Ohio. 53

Between the months of January and June, 1884, Campbell was constantly traveling from Hamilton to the nation's capital and back again. He was forced to be present when his

52 Ibid., October 12-13, 1883.
53 Ibid., December 10, 1883.
case was brought before the committee only to have it tabled on several occasions. It was not until March 20 that Campbell was able to present his brief. Containing eighty-five pages of specific attacks on alleged voting irregularities, it included, among other things, charges of illegal student voting, voting by idiots, marked ballots, double ballots, and intimidations of voters as follows:

**Campbell**

original recorded vote Add  
so-called marked ballots in Ohio Township 2  
vote for Morey by mistake in Ross Township 1  
**Total** 14413

Deduct  
illegal student vote 11  
other non-residents 4  
aliens 3  
**Total Votes** 14395

**Morey**

original recorded vote Add  
gain on recount 8  
balloons not counted East Fairfield 2  
**Total** 14461

Deduct:  
illegal student vote 80  
 non-residents 37  
 idiots 3  
mistaken vote Ross Township 1  
loss on excessive ballots 3  
illegal ballots, Sugar Creek Township 49  
oversize ticket 1  
**Grand Total** 14287

Campbell's majority 108.54

---

Morey was given two weeks to reply to Campbell's brief, but he delayed submitting his summation until April 16, 1864. He argued that the Ohio State Canvassing Board and Supreme Court had previously ruled in his favor after they had conducted careful investigations. He felt that their decision should be upheld as valid and that the committee should dismiss the contest immediately. This initial plea was overruled by the committee; hence, Morey submitted his brief which stated:

Morey:
Original recorded vote
Add:
net gain on recount 10
ballots for Morey and H. R. Morey not counted 2
Persons unlawfully prevented from voting 11
Total 23

Deduct:
votes by non-residents 7
Total 7
Grand Total 14467

Campbell:
Original recorded vote 14410
Deduct:
votes by non-residents 48
idiots and insane 13
convicts 2
minors 6
aliens 6
persons intimidated 2
aliens having void naturalization papers 9
net loss of excessive ballots above names on book 3
double ballots 1
ballots with another name written and counted 3
Infirmary vote 27
Total 120
Grand Total 14290
Morey's majority

After both briefs had been submitted and recorded, Campbell delivered an argument lasting one and one half hours in support of his position and reserved one half hour to reply to whatever Morey presented. The latter was supposed to appear before the committee on May 1, but he failed to appear. Additionally, the Republican members of the committee also failed to appear. It became apparent by May 13 that the Democratically dominated committee would favor Campbell. Hence, on May 15 the committee's report, which advocated the unseating of the Republican in favor of the Democrat, surprised very few people.

Meanwhile local Democrats in Butler County were championing the renomination of Campbell for the Congressional seat. They charged that the Republicans had fraudulently delayed Campbell from rightfully taking his seat and promised a complete victory for the Hamiltonian in the fall. Consequently, there was virtually no opposition when the Democrats of the newly created Third Congressional District comprising Butler, Warren, Clermont and Preble Counties

---


56Cincinnati Enquirer, May 2, 3, 15, June 11, 1884. The vote was strictly partisan as all eight Democrats voted for Campbell while the remaining four Republicans voted for Morey.
renominated him for the office. Campbell had returned to Ohio to accept the nomination and promised that within a few weeks the contest would be over and victory would be his. On June 16 the report of the Committee on Elections was presented to the House of Representatives. Because of the lateness of the hour it was decided to postpone any action until June 18. At that time the case was brought forward, but it was delayed by a strong vocal Republican opposition and a vote could not be taken. Consequently, it was not until June 20, 1884, that the final decision was made. The vote was taken to accept the minority report, the report favoring Morey. It was defeated by a more than two to one count of 62 yeas and 139 nays, with 102 not voting. Again the vote was strictly a partisan one with the Democratically dominated House supporting Campbell and the minority Republicans voting for Morey. Thus, at long last, Campbell was declared the victor of the Congressional election and was allowed to take his long denied seat.

After the vote was concluded, Campbell was ushered forward to the bar of the House and qualified for active membership by taking the prescribed oath. The battle

---
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had taken approximately seventeen months of his hard and constant attention. Lesser men could have easily dropped the contest and allowed the original decision to stand. Throughout the contest Campbell displayed the determination and perseverance so typical of his character.

Campbell was virtually a non-participating member of Congress during this first term. After his acceptance he returned to Ohio to conclude some business duties, traveled to Washington to ascertain his committee assignments (Committee on Public Lands), and followed this with a rapid trip to Columbus to take part in the State Democratic Convention to select delegates to the national nominating convention of 1884. At its conclusion he returned to Washington to witness the ending of the session in which he never really had taken part. His main attention was now directed to Ohio in preparation for the upcoming Congressional election and a chance to be an active member of Congress.

Events within Ohio had originally helped the Democratic party; however, after initial successes it, too, was unable to cope with the complex developments within the Buckeye State. The liquor traffic problem had continued to plague the Republican administration of Governor Foster. In 1883 the governor successfully proposed that the legislature submit two constitutional amendments to the voters by the time of the fall elections. The first proposition
provided that the General Assembly should both regulate and levy taxes or assessments upon the liquor traffic. The second stipulated that the manufacture and traffic of intoxicating liquors be forever prohibited. Concurrently the legislature passed the Scott Law, which provided for an annual tax of two hundred dollars on all places where liquor was sold at retail and, in addition, prohibited the opening of such places on Sundays. The Supreme Court in 1883 upheld this law; however, after the election of 1884 and a change in the composition of the court, it declared the Scott Law unconstitutional. 60

In his last annual message Foster emphatically endorsed the Scott Law on the basis of the receipt of approximately two million dollars in taxes and the closing of over one thousand saloons. 61 By this action he placed the Republicans on the defensive. Consequently, in June, 1883, when the Republicans assembled in Columbus to nominate a candidate for the governorship, the liquor issue was important. Because the Republicans feared the loss of the strong German vote in Cincinnati, they nominated Joseph Benson Foraker, a lawyer in his late thirties, who possessed a notable Civil War Record. He warmly approved the platform which called for a high protective tariff, favored the tax

---
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and regulation of liquor, and applauded the Republican General Assembly for submitting the two constitutional amendments to the voters. 62

In a more optimistic air the Democrats convened in Columbus and found two strong candidates to compete for the nomination, George Hoadly and Durbin Ward. The former, like Foraker, was a Cincinnati lawyer. He had grown to manhood in Cleveland. Serving as a judge and as an attorney for Samuel Tilden before the Electoral Commission of 1877, Hoadly possessed a strong background of judicial experience. His one fault was that he was originally a Republican, and he had left that party in the 1872 liberal split. Thereafter, he joined the Democratic Party and had been one of its staunchest supporters. On the other hand Ward, who was supported by former Senator Allen G. Thurman, was a Civil War veteran, and a prominent Lebanon, Ohio, attorney.

After much maneuvering and compromising Hoadly won the nomination. Owing to the fact that United States Senators were elected by state legislatures at that time, Ward maintained that he was a candidate for the United States Senate in the event of a Democratic victory. A platform, calling for a revenue tariff, civil service reform, and for the regulation of the liquor traffic by a

licensing system, was adopted.63

The Prohibition Party opposed the Democratic licensing system and the Republican proposal of constitutional regulation. The Prohibitionists strongly urged adoption of the amendment which provided for complete and total prohibition of the liquor traffic within Ohio. Consequently, in political terms, they hurt the Republicans more than the Democrats.

After a strong and active campaign Hoadly and his party soundly defeated the G.O.P. They got control of the House by a sixty to forty-five margin, and the Senate by a twenty-two to eleven majority. The liquor issue had brought forth a large percentage of the electorate. Failing to secure a majority of the 721,310 votes cast as required for passage, both proposed amendments went down to defeat.64 Foraker, commenting after the election, stated that he had been defeated but not damaged by the results. He attributed his defeat to the liquor issue and not to his own failure to win votes.65

During the ensuing year of 1884 several developments


64Roseboom and Weisenburger, History of Ohio, p. 240; Jordan, Ohio Comes of Age, pp. 182-183. The Prohibition amendment received 320,000 votes while the regulation proposal received 241,000.

occurred which hurt the Democratic Party's image within Ohio. When the legislature met in January, one of their first duties was the selection of a United States Senator. The incumbent, George Pendleton, author of the Civil Service or Pendleton Act of 1883, desired to be reelected. Local Democrats, especially those from the Cincinnati area, disapproved of the merit reform and lamented that they lost valuable patronage appointments. They refused to support Pendleton and were able to prevent him from getting the endorsement of the party caucus. After much internal party haggling the office went to Henry B. Payne. At that time he was a seventy-three year old Cleveland millionaire. It was asserted that his son, Treasurer of the Standard Oil Company, spent over 100,000 dollars to elect his father. The elder Payne had been trained in the law, had served as a State Senator, had been an unsuccessful Democratic gubernatorial candidate in 1857, and had served a term in Congress in 1875-1877. Ostensibly, however, he had retired from politics and his selection caused a great deal of surprise and controversy. It appeared that money, favoritism, and party patronage had defeated the reforming, civil service-minded elements within the party.

66Roseboom and Weisenburger, History of Ohio, p. 241; Jordan, Ohio Comes of Age, pp. 185-187. In 1886, after the Republicans returned to power, they conducted an investigation of the election but failed to come to any positive conclusions.
Payne's selection was only the first of a number of distressing incidents. In February the rampaging Ohio River flooded and destroyed many homes and other valuable pieces of property. Cincinnati was hardest hit by the deluge of melting ice and heavy rains. Thousands were left homeless and found themselves with no place to turn for help. Relief did appear from other parts of the State but the suffering continued to be great.

With tensions high riots started to occur. In March, because of a heavy crime wave, mobs descended upon the jail in Cincinnati in an attempt to hang a murderer who had been convicted only of manslaughter. They felt that justice had been subverted by the verdict. Eventually, Hoadly ordered a part of the state militia to quell the disturbances.

The following month of April witnessed similar riots when fighting occurred in the Hocking Valley mines between workers and company guards, later reinforced by state troops. Again the Democratic administration was faced with dilemmas. It was forced to make decisions which would bring hatred and a loss of political support regardless of its action.67

Finally, a noticeable split within the party occurred

at the Democratic Presidential convention in Chicago. Both Governor Hoadly and former Senator Allen G. Thurman hoped for the nomination. Each claimed that Ohio would be a pivotal state and promised to carry it if nominated. Unfortunately both men split their home strength and eventually lost to the Governor of New York, Grover Cleveland. The Governor of Indiana, Thomas Hendricks, was selected as his running mate.

Ohio Republicans felt that since 1868 the Buckeye State had been instrumental in garnering victory for the G.O.P. They believed that without the inclusion of the successful Ohio presidential candidates, the party would not have fared as well as it had done. The Republicans concluded that another Ohioan, Senator John Sherman, should be nominated in order to continue the winning trend. Foraker presented Sherman's name to the national conclave with optimistic hopes of victory. The convention, however, selected James G. Blaine to be the standard bearer.

Because of the events within Ohio, the Democrats, and especially, James Campbell, anticipated a difficult campaign for reelection. His hopes had been stimulated in February when the Democratic General Assembly gerrymandered the districts of Ohio. The Seventh Congressional District

---

was changed to the Third District which included Butler, Warren, Clermont, and Preble Counties. When their past votes were combined, these counties generally returned Democratic majorities. Thus, Campbell because of redistricting compared his favored position to that of Morey's in 1882.69

Campbell's opponent was Henry L. Morey again. Morey's Republican colleagues felt that he should be allowed to vindicate his recent ouster by another chance for a complete victory. Although this was the general sentiment of his party, some individuals wanted the nomination for themselves and wished Morey to be dropped. When the Republicans gathered in Loveland, Ohio, in July, several maneuvers were made to stop Morey. The major one was to have local favorite sons come forward and garner enough votes between them to prevent Morey from getting the necessary majority. They failed in this plan because they could not hold to this strategy. Since they feared political retaliation if they lost, they yielded, and Morey got the nomination on the first ballot.

Amid "howls of delight" Morey accepted the nomination; after he denounced the Democratic gerrymandering, he promised that he would sit in Congress for the entire term. He stated that if any major Republicans opposed his nomination,

69 Cincinnati Enquirer, January 11, February 7, 1884.
he wished they would come forward and openly express their feeling. He did not want to head a divided party and vowed that he would step aside if any appeared. Later Democrats attacked this statement and argued that there was opposition and that Morey refused to abide by his vow.  

The Republicans attempted to cast doubt on Democratic harmony when they stated that the thrice elected Democratic Prosecuting Attorney of Butler County, James F. Neilan, was opposed to Campbell's reelection. Neilan denied this and replied that he was doing everything in his power to help Campbell. He concluded by asserting, "There is not a Democrat of my acquaintance, Irish, German, or American, who voted for Mr. Campbell two years ago but will not do so again . . . ." J. B. Hughes, Democratic County Auditor, could only aver that such a charge was one of the biggest campaign jokes he had ever heard, and the only question which should be asked was how great the Campbell majority would be. 

Morey attempted in another way to carry the battle against Campbell. Figuring that Preble County held the balance of victory and defeat, he claimed that Preble County was his birthplace. Prior to this all local histories or biographies of Morey had said that his birthplace

70Ibid., July 16, 24, 27, 1884.
71Ibid., August 3, 7, 1884.
was Butler County.  

Morey was responsible for a circus-type maneuver which completely backfired. He had purchased a cord of wood from a man known as Jim Williams of Millville, Ohio. The ordinary delivery route of the wood was through the City of Hamilton. Williams, on the pretext of delivering the wood, rented twenty wagons with mules to haul it. Additionally, he hired a brass band and prepared with his load to enter the city riding a white Jackamule. When the entourage approached Morey's office it stopped, and the band started to play. Morey, neatly dressed, climbed out upon his windowsill and began to wave to the group. At that point Williams began to give his famous "cat-fish calls" only to discover that few of the other drivers were cheering. It appeared that most of them were Democrats and refused to cheer although the Republicans later claimed that they did not cheer because they feared that they would scare the mule which had already thrown Williams outside of town.

As the parade began to leave the city, the drivers started to cheer for Campbell but were forced to stop under the threat of non-payment for their toil. Later, after the wood was unloaded, the group returned to Hamilton and was treated to a large dinner and beverages by Morey. When they left the restaurant, they proceeded to go to Campbell's
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office and to play songs honoring the Democrats and to cheer for the Party's candidate. A disgruntled and unsmiling Morey was reported peeking through the blinds of his office wondering what went wrong.  

Meanwhile Campbell's campaign was progressing quite well. Speaking throughout the district, he delivered "eloquent speeches" which were "met with enthusiastic and well deserved applause." He did make a move to continue to receive the Negro support that he had received in 1882. He discovered that the local School Board in Hamilton had refused to grant a two-dollar-a-month salary increase to a Negro janitor. The two Democrats on the board had voted for the increase while the lone Republican had opposed the measure. Thereafter, the latter then proposed a salary increase of four dollars a month for a white janitor at another school. Campbell pointed out that each school was approximately the same size, entailed the same work, and that both men had similar qualifications. He concluded by stating, "This is the party which boasts of its love and friendship for the poor colored man."

Entirely on the defensive, Morey retorted that Campbell was anti-Irish. He quoted Campbell as saying, "the
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Democratic Party could get along very well without the Irish and that he was glad they were gone." Local Democrats refused to believe this charge and replied that "James Campbell, who knows the value of a vote better than any man would be a d--d fool to make an expression of that kind just now." 76

Evidence of Republican concern over Morey's chances of victory became apparent through two events. The first was a charge, never denied, that Morey had received approximately 30,000 dollars to conduct his campaign. The main donor was reputed to be a large eastern sugar concern. Because of the importance of the tariff issue and the Democratic plank promising to lower it, such a charge could have validity. The composition of Congress was such that a few votes either way could affect any national legislation. 77 The second was the appearance of James G. Blaine in the Ohio Congressional District. Blaine delivered five speeches in the area and encouraged the voters to elect Morey. 78 On October 2, 1884, Blaine arrived in Hamilton to personally conduct "Blaine Day". With numerous bands playing he alighted from the train only to have a boy wildly swinging a broom strike him in the eye and cause pain. While the crowd stood in

76 Ibid., September 11, 1884.
77 Ibid., September 8, 1884.
78 Sater, Campbell, p. 25.
apprehension, Blaine smiled and proceeded to his open
carriage and paraded throughout the city. Finally, he ar-
ived at the park. Flanked by Morey and Foraker on the
platform, he delivered an address which supported a high
tariff. He pointed out that since 1864 when the first mod-
er piece of protective legislation had been enacted, the
nation had prospered with a tremendous growth. This in-
cluded not only the factory owners, but also the laborers
and farmers. He admitted that such a system allowed tem-
porary economic setbacks, and he pointed out that it was only
part of the working of natural law. He drew an analogy for
the Ohions that stated an insufficient rainfall was no rea-
son to abandon farming or forsake rain. Then amidst thun-
derous applause, reputed to be purchased at three dollars
per person, he turned the podium over to Morey who contin-
ued to champion a high tariff.

After the presidential candidate left, Republicans
claimed it was the largest gathering ever. The Democrats
were forced to agree but pointed out that a large percent-
age of the crowd were paid cheerers. Finally, at what some
regarded as the acid test, they noted that there was more
drinking in the local saloons after Democratic meetings
than those of the Republicans. The Democrats maintained
that success was measured by consumption and celebration
rather than passive onlookers.79
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On the other hand the Democrats did show some concern over the large audience which applauded. In an attempt to discredit Morey they started a charge that the Republican was anti-immigrant and anti-Catholic. In Butler County Morey had joined an organization whose major goal was never to vote or lend support to anyone connected with these two groups; therefore, the Democrats' attempt at discrediting was warranted. Morey never answered this accusation. Instead, he replied that he was in favor of granting full pensions to all men who had one hundred days of service in the Civil War.

In essence the charges levied by both sides and the positions adopted were, in miniature form, reminiscent of those associated with the national election. The "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion" label used against Cleveland referred to his party's reliance upon the Irish, Catholic, and Southern votes. Blaine, meanwhile, was the arch prototype of Republicans who waved the proverbial "bloody shirt" in constant reference to their party's role in the Civil War. Hence, by appealing for larger pensions Morey was pushing his party's reliance upon the Grand Army of the Republic's voting strength.

Ohio cast its votes for its Congressional representatives on October 14, 1884. After the first day's returns
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were counted, Morey was the leader in the Third Congressional District. The city of Hamilton surprised all the experts by giving Morey a lead in the first eleven of the twenty-five voting precincts. While Republicans claimed victory was theirs, the Democrats only shook their heads in disbelief. On October 16, 1884, a complete reversal of the first day's results occurred. Campbell forged ahead in Hamilton by approximately 2,500 votes and in the entire district by about 450 votes. This margin proved to be the approximate result, for on the following day Campbell was declared the winner by 412 votes. The County breakdown was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Campbell</th>
<th>Morey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>6,835</td>
<td>4,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>4,187</td>
<td>4,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preble</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>3,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>4,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,398</td>
<td>15,986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campbell's victory took on special significance when it became apparent that the Republicans were regaining the majority of congressional seats in Ohio. Consequently, on November 2, 1884, at a large Democratic presidential election rally at Seven Mile, Ohio, Campbell's presence was eagerly demanded. After he delivered an address supporting Cleveland, an event occurred which was similar to one which had happened to his uncle and Tom Corwin many years earlier.
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A bevy of young ladies stepped upon the platform and one of the ladies, Miss Maude Salvely, then formally presented him with a magnificent floral horseshoe bearing the words "Good-Luck." She concluded by stating that, "as these flowers represent purity, we also claim them as the emblem of Democracy . . . knowing you will prove worthy as our next representative in Congress." Campbell, completely surprised by the act, thanked the young ladies in a few short remarks and stepped back as if he were in a dream. The scene was greeted by the large audience with thunders of applause.

When the presidential election was concluded, Cleveland similarly carried the Third District, but he lost the state to Blaine by approximately twenty thousand votes. The Republicans also carried the state offices in Ohio. Thus, Campbell's victory was regarded as a major triumph because most Democrats had gone down to defeat at that time. His importance as a national figure had soared, and this was evident upon his arrival for the lame duck session of the 48th Congress in December, 1884. He was among the favored representatives whose desks were adorned with flowers. As a Democratic Congressman from a
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state that had given a large Republican majority, the emerg-
ing Campbell received added prestige.  

The 49th Congress proved of greatly significance for Campbell. He met and conversed with the leading men of both parties from both the House and the Senate. He easily accepted the leadership of President-elect Cleveland and the basic philosophy of the Bourbon Democrats. He believed as they that the Democratic function was to prevent control of the government by special interest groups such as farmers, wage earners, and inefficient, irresponsible, corrupt office-holders. Accordingly, he opposed any interference with the natural laws of economics and any governmental aid or regulation other than the barest necessity. Taxes and the operational costs of the government were to be reduced to the minimum. Specifically, the protective tariff, which was held to interfere with natural law and acted as a subsidy to special interests, violated their principles. Much of their strength came from the railroad operators, bankers, and merchant classes of the nation.

No one in Cleveland's cabinet specifically championed the cause of the farmers. This policy trend continued down
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through the lesser important appointments. Cleveland looked to conservatives in Congress for suggestions and followed the Bourbon criteria of overlooking the agricultural elements. Vice President Hendricks, useful only during the campaign, was overlooked at the patronage banquet. Yet, it was ironical that the Democratic majority in the House was essentially representative of agricultural districts.

Campbell accepted Cleveland's leadership and proved to be a sound and loyal party man. "Although he spoke but a few times," said Representative Amos J. Cummins, "he commanded on each occasion the undivided attention of the House . . ." He voted each time for the Democratic leader, John G. Carlisle for Speaker, for the Administration's sponsored tariff bills, and Cleveland's pension proposals.

Following the Christmas holidays Campbell's return to Washington was delayed by a lingering illness, but he was finally able to return to the nation's capital on January 18, 1885. Shortly thereafter he was forced to go back to Hamilton to conclude personal business arrangements. On his subsequent return to Washington he was among the few Democrats who voted to bestow a full pension upon
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ex-President Grant. Although, commenting that Grant was not an outstanding national administrator, Campbell, concluded that the General as a military genius had helped end the Civil War. Noting that he was a veteran himself, Campbell believed Grant fully merited the pension even though he suffered no physical limitations or injuries in the struggle. 91

Campbell's role in the inauguration ceremonies for President Cleveland was minor. He was a member of the Butler County contingent which proudly labeled itself the "Democratic Gibraltar of Ohio." 92 Following this pleasant interlude Campbell returned to his Congressional duties assuming a passive role. He neither introduced any significant legislation, nor did he deliver any outstanding addresses. Justifiably, although theoretically he was a veteran member of Congress, he was still learning its basic operations. He was not ready to assume a leadership at that time.

After the Congressional session, Campbell returned to Hamilton to resume his legal duties. Although he was never considered a poor man who had to struggle, he was forced to be active in his profession. Yet, as in the past he continued to enjoy good companionship and joys
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apart from his work. He joined his wife, James Neal, and others in performing an amateur play, "The Elevator", in Hamilton. Assuming the role of Mr. Miller, his acting was described as pleasant, if not professional. 93

Along with Democrats throughout the nation, he looked to the task of helping President Cleveland distribute patronage. For the first time since before the Civil War, a Democrat had this duty. Cleveland, however, was forced to deal directly with the Civil Service system and could not dismiss all the Republican officeholders at will. Consequently, he worked slowly in making new appointments. Campbell had decided initially to follow the President's leadership in this matter, but occasionally he was forced to disagree with some of the appointments. On one such occasion he strongly disapproved of the selection of Henry C. Urner of Cincinnati for the post of United States Marshall. When asked what he thought of the appointment, Campbell stated, "If the President asks me as to the popularity of the appointment . . . , I will tell him the truth . . . , that Urner never has been a Democrat." Furthermore, if such acts by the President were to be continued, he feared that "if an election were held in his district", or in the entire state, "tomorrow, it would probably go Republican . . . ." He concluded by
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cautioning, "Unless there is a change in the method of administration, there is no use of the Democrats holding an election in Ohio this fall."  

Throughout the summer months Campbell remained in Ohio, and, surprisingly, he did not attend the state Democratic convention which renominated George Hoadly for the governorship. Perhaps this was prompted by the realization that he would not take an active role in the fall elections. Because of a concern that there should be no interruption in his daughter's education, he left Hamilton on September 30 to accompany her to Washington to enroll her in school. He then remained in the nation's capital throughout the concluding month of the campaign which saw the Republican Joseph Benson Foraker elected as governor.

In an interview prior to the election, Campbell accused the Republicans of refusing to face the Issues. He denounced the waving of the bloody shirt, as so consistently practiced by Senator John Sherman and Foraker. He applauded what he deemed his party's straightforward stand on current state issues, especially the liquor question. He felt that the licensing system adequately regulated the traffic without depriving anyone of his rights as the prohibitionists wished to do and that the Republicans only

\[94\] Ibid., June 17, 1885. Despite this announcement Urner received the appointment.
straddled the fence and refused to take a definite stand. He concluded by predicting a Hoadly victory by approximately 10,000 votes.

Thereafter, he commented that on the national level Cleveland's appointments were generally good although his constituents "have occasionally grown impatient under his necessary delays." Campbell regretted that the Civil Service Act prohibited a complete rotation of office. Finally he attacked the Republican pension position and charged that the Republicans not only promised too much to win votes, but also lied about the Democratic position. Repeating a familiar theme, he stated that the Democrats would grant pensions whenever applicable and would reduce the tariff if given the opportunity.

When Foraker eventually was elected Governor, Campbell's state prediction proved erroneous. Perhaps Campbell really believed that the Republicans would win because his 10,000 vote majority did not appear so large as confident politicians like to pronounce. Furthermore, his absence from the campaign could be interpreted as a refusal to be part of a losing effort at a time when his own career was beginning to possess important credentials.
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Nevertheless, in Butler County Hoadly was given a majority of approximately 5,000 votes, a figure below normal for Democratic candidates of the past. Hence, while the Democrats were floundering in Ohio, Campbell removed himself from the scene and watched his own prestige grow as a result of his party's failure.

When the next session of Congress convened in December, 1885, Campbell was present for the opening day ceremonies. He was eventually appointed to the Committee on Public Lands and was given a rank several grades higher than normally bestowed upon new members. This type of recognition implied that he was not a neophyte delegate, but a veteran Congressman.

Following the Christmas holidays Campbell publicly called for the appointment of General Ferdinand Van Derveer for the position of Postmaster in the city of Hamilton. He described the General as a capable man who had served the nation in the Mexican and Civil Wars and was a "sterling Democrat" always loyal to his party. Two days later January 13, 1886, the appointment was approved.

The Ohioan was also appointed to the Select Committee
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on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic. Serving in the capacity of chairman, Campbell displayed a vigorous aggressiveness. He submitted a resolution asking that a full time clerk be assigned to the committee. This resolution was originally referred to the Committee on Accounts which failed to act favorably upon the request. Not to be denied this goal, Campbell persevered in its behalf. In a notable outburst he argued the need for a clerk on two grounds. First, he believed that it was entirely inconsistent to believe that the House would create a committee and then "refuse it the ordinary means of transacting business." He strongly averred that "if the committee is abolished, I will make no objection whatever; but if it is allowed to stand, I insist upon its being treated with the dignity that is worthy of this house."

Secondly, Campbell observed that the committee was the focal point of a great number of pressure groups. Letters by the thousands were received, and they had to be answered. Moreover, such diverse visitors as Neal Dow and representatives of the brewing industry demanded that they be allowed to have their say before the forum. Campbell predicted that his committee would spend more time simply answering mail or listening to witnesses than many other committees would utilize for all their deliberations during the entire congressional session.

Arguing that he was told that his committee had access
to two House stenographers, he vividly showed that, in reality, they had to be shared with other committees and were not always available for the Liquor Traffic Committee. He ended his appeal with the charge that there was "an attempt to give this committee as little machinery as possible, for fear that it will take some action in the interest of the temperance element of the country." Because of the stern position taken by Campbell, the House by a vote of 92-31 granted the committee the individual clerk. It is interesting to note that though Campbell himself was not a prohibitionist, he believed that they should be given the right to express their opinions. This was a manifestation of his basic democratic belief that no majority group has the right to indiscriminately ignore minority protests.

In a notable clash with Thomas B. Reed, Republican Representative from Maine, on one phase of the political history of the Civil War, Campbell convinced both the House and his opponent of the correctness of his position. The debate centered on the Republican's contention that the northern soldiers were heavy supporters of his party during the conflict. Campbell claimed that this position was not valid, because there was not a Republican Party during the struggle, but instead, there was the Union Party which
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comprised both Republicans and Democrats. Furthermore, Campbell said, if one wished to align oneself entirely with party labels, one would have to accept the notion that the Union Party during the conflict was a continuation of John Bell's party of 1860. Realizing that this latter contention was false, Campbell explained that partisan differences were minimized during the war, and that the major goal of the soldiers was to preserve the union.

Campbell quoted from an article in the Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette which stated that Reed consistently "put young men of the opposition down." He insisted that he was "one of those young members," and if the article was correct, he "ought to be dreadfully alarmed." The Democrat continued by stating, "I know that the gentleman from Maine has a trick of shrugging his shoulders and winking his eyes, and making everybody laugh on that side of the house," but he was afraid to defend himself and his party when challenged. At this point many Republicans asked for recognition from Speaker Carlisle to answer the young, seemingly arrogant Democrat. Campbell, who still had the floor, stated that he would yield to William McKinley of Ohio and then to the remaining Republicans. He promised that "if you come one at a time, I will take care of all of you." This utterance engendered a great deal of laughter and completely centered the entire attention of the House on Campbell.
Meanwhile McKinley argued that there continued to be a Democratic Party during the war, but many of its traditional members had forsaken that party to join the Union group. He, consequently, contended that neither Campbell nor his party had any claim to the Union Party. Amidst shouts, McKinley asked Campbell if he had voted for the Union ticket or the Democratic slate. Campbell replied that he was not a Democrat at that time and that he "voted for the Union ticket, because I believed in prosecuting the war under the existing administration, and I did not like to 'swap horses in midstream'". Thereafter Campbell attempted to reply to each and every Republican who wanted to debate the issue, but the Speaker ruled that he would have to yield to others. When Campbell asked for more time, he was told that he had made three speeches already and that he should give others a chance. In a final statement the Ohioan stated that he would not permit those Democrats who had died in the conflict to be slandered and that he would defend their acts whenever he felt it was necessary.

Aside from these two debates Campbell did little of any significance or notoriety. He performed many of the routine duties of a congressman, such as submitting petitions, requesting pensions, or other similar acts by the federal government. Some of these included requests for
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the erection of municipal buildings in Hamilton and the granting of a condemned cannon for the Soldier's Cemetery at Eaton, Ohio.

During this session Campbell, as in the past, was forced to request leaves of absence to journey to Hamilton in order to conclude business deals. When he requested a leave in March, 1886, he was delighted to state that the leave was strictly a pleasant and personal departure. He was going to Franklin, Ohio to participate in the family celebration honoring the hundredth birthday anniversary of his grandmother. This proved to be a very satisfying event and a final tribute since the elderly woman died on April 23, 1886.\(^{103}\)

By July, 1886, the Congressional session was over, and the often raised question pertaining to Campbell's political plans for the future arose. As previously mentioned the Democrats had not fared well in the preceding election. Joseph Benson Foraker, a Republican, was Governor, and the legislature was also in the hands of the G.O.P. The liquor question was still alive even though many believed it solved when Foraker, running on a platform of regulation by taxation, had defeated Hoadly who
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had advocated regulation by license. The election of 1885 had also witnessed the passage of a constitutional amendment which established a three-year term of office for township officials, and a rule which stated that the incumbents would remain in office until their successors were duly elected and qualified. Finally the election changed the date of state elections from October to November to formally align Ohio with the rest of the nation and to remove the costs of conducting dual elections.

As early as February 9, 1886, Campbell was questioned about his plans concerning a possible third term. At that time the Ohioan ambiguously answered that:

So far as my attempting to return is concerned, that depends upon whether the Republicans get hold of the Ohio Senate and redistrict the State. If they do, I would not accept a renomination.

Later, when asked if he would accept a nomination if his district was not disturbed, he indirectly answered, "I would, if it were offered to me, yes."¹⁰⁵

Events in the Ohio legislature confirmed Campbell's fears. On May 17, 1886, the dominant Republican General Assembly redistricted Ohio's congressional districts. Butler County again joined Clermont and Warren Counties in forming the Seventh Ohio Congressional District with

¹⁰⁴ Jordan, Ohio Comes of Age, p. 187.
¹⁰⁵ Cincinnati Enquirer, March 16, April 23, 1886.
Greene County. This realignment normally produced a 2,500 Republican majority. Consequently, taken literally, Campbell would not be a candidate for reelection. Democrats, however, optimistically stated that in 1882 they had captured fifteen of the twenty-one contests when the districts were the same as the presently enacted ones. Unfortunately, this was the exception rather than the rule. The Republicans anticipated victory despite the exceptional defeat.

Within Butler County local Democrats championed the renomination of Campbell and proudly stated that there would be no opposition at all if he would indicate that he would accept the honor. Republicans insisted that Campbell was not a candidate and would not accept the nomination even if it were offered. This position was interpreted by the Democrats as an open avowal of fear by their opponents. They charged that the Republicans were trying to divide the Democrats and remove the possibility of the candidacy of Campbell, the strongest in the area. They believed confidently that if Campbell were offered the post, he would not disobey the command of his party.

Events continued along this line after the state
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convention in August. F. J. Sorg of Hamilton stated that he was ready to come forward as a candidate for the Democratic nomination if Campbell refused to openly state his position. Trying to quiet Sorg, fellow Democrats insisted that they would be badly mistaken if they should even consider bypassing Campbell, and they urged that any contrary ideas be dropped until the time of the district convention. 109

The local Republicans were also having internal problems. John Little, former Attorney General of the State of Ohio, and, at that time, a Congressman from the district to which Greene County had formerly assigned was the leading candidate for their nomination. At the Greene County convention an open fissure appeared against his candidacy. Little, popularly called "Boodie" or "Boodle" Little by his opponents, had constructed a tight organization which refused to allow outsiders to question his acts. Typical of this procedure was the selection of a committee to present nominations at the convention. The latter body took only three minutes to assemble and announce their choice—John Little. This brought forth a storm of protest from other delegates who demanded that each district be allowed to present candidates for consideration, but the Little men, having full control over the convention, refused to consider such a request and proceeded to endorse their
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leader. Once he had surpassed this hurdle, Little had virtually no opposition in gathering the nomination.

Despite Campbell's refusal to openly take a position regarding his own nomination, he, nevertheless, continued to act like a candidate. He journeyed to Covington, Kentucky, and asked John Carlisle, Democratic Speaker of the House, if he would attend the forthcoming convention in Batavia, Ohio. Carlisle agreed, commenting that he and Campbell had always been able to work together amiably in Congress.

On Campbell's return to Hamilton, at which time he gave the announcement of Carlisle's impending visit, a conclave of the Knights of Labor was being held in the city park. A delegation of Cincinnati broom makers presented him with one of their products and directed him to "sweep the district in November." Smiling warmly, Campbell hesitated by affirming that he was not the nominee, but he would be honored if he were. Up to the date of the convention, September 8, 1886, Campbell had refused to state openly whether he was a candidate, or if he would accept the nomination if it were offered to him.

Assembling in Batavia, the Democratic delegates were called to order by the chairman. Thereafter, John Follett
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of Cincinnati, delivered the key-note address. In what was regarded as the first party speech of the campaign, Follett attacked the Republican administration of Foraker in Ohio and the actions of his party members in the national Congress. Repeating the general aims of the Democratic Party, he promised a significant lowering of the tariff, the establishment of a sound veteran pension system, a strict adherence to civil service, and a definite austerity program on the national level.

After this stirring speech James G. Neal placed Campbell's name before the convention and requested that he be renominated by acclamation. Demonstrating that Campbell had won in the past against terrific odds and that he was the only logical choice in 1886, Neal approvingly affirmed that, "He [Campbell] does not seek the position, and he would much prefer that someone else would undertake the hard and difficult struggle, but ... we have the right to demand of his services and ask him to lead in the battle now about to come off." In a direct reference to the quest for the Negro vote, Neal bluntly commented that Campbell would "carry the war into Africa--Greene County, I mean--and lead us to victory."

The nomination was made by acclamation and a committee was selected to inform the awaiting Campbell of the convention's decision. Obviously expecting it, Campbell was visiting Batavia that day. Going to the convention hall
he delivered an acceptance speech in which he expressed his humblest thanks for the honor bestowed upon him. Promising to wage a diligent fight against the Republican gerrymandering, he cautioned his hearers that victory could be obtained only "by the wide dissemination of truth and the untiring efforts of many willing workers." He outlined the basis for his appeal to the people he felt would be most influential in the campaign. He described the Negro as a man who sought "freedom for thought as well as for limb." Campbell charged that the Republicans only offered the former and refused to allow Negroes to make their own choices. To the crescendo, "Tramp, tramp, tramp, the boys are marching into the Democratic camp", the thrice nominated Ohioan claimed that only his party adequately and honestly faced the issue of federal pensions. Rather than offering broad indiscriminate grants, he espoused his party's position that only disabled soldiers or their widows and children should receive such aid. To Campbell the Republican position was simply a plot to buy votes.

Turning to the laboring man, he continued his attack upon the G.O.P. by stating that the Republicans were only interested in a favored few, while the Democrats, as proven by their creation of labor bureaus and committees, had devised legislation which would help those men who survived by their honest toil. He boasted that "the reformer, the economist, the man of thought, who is seeking the party
who governs best at the lowest cost, has studied the figures too", and has selected the Democratic standard. Finally, he turned to the farm element and promised that a Democratic victory would mean an opening of vast tracts of fertile land in the West which could be homesteaded freely. He proudly described his party's action in the last Congressional session in attempting to force the railroads to return vast arable acres which were given them by the G.O.P. Campbell specifically called attention to the railroad's failure to fulfill their obligations and questioned why the Republicans had refused to foreclose on the defaulting "railroad barons." Summoning forth all his emotions, he directed the delegates to be prepared for a long, hard campaign, as he exclaimed, "Let us anew consecrate ourselves to the cause of reform, economy, and constitutional government."

In a jubilant and enthusiastic mood the delegates applauded Campbell's speech. After the remaining scheduled orators had concluded, the crowd once again shouted for Campbell. Approaching the podium, the nominee made brief and informal comments. He read a letter from Speaker Carlisle apologizing for his inability to attend the meeting because of a last minute legal conflict. Supporting the entire Democratic ticket, Campbell specifically singled out John McBride, a candidate for office in Greene County. Commending McBride's interest in the laboring man and his own past work, the congressman concluded by stating,
"... McBride ... never had on a pair of kid gloves, like Follett and I when we go to Congress, but [is one] who has the experience and ability to fill any position in the country."^112 Thus, Campbell sounded the theme of his campaign. He would wage the battle on the national issues and in defense of his party. His opponent, John Little, attempted to dodge specifics and to fight the battle in terms of the Civil War or of past issues no longer relevant.

The Democratic Cincinnati Enquirer noted that the Republican hope of not having to face Campbell in the congressional race had been shattered as well as the hope that they would not contend with a harmoniously united party. The newspaper predicted that the G.O.P. would probably put large amounts of "boodle" into the race and attempt to buy Little's entrance into Congress.^113

One of Little's main efforts was to retain the large Negro vote in Greene County. Constantly arguing that his party had given the colored man his freedom, he counseled that any further gains would have to come from the same party. While he was in Clermont County, he attempted to force traditionally prominent Negro leaders into publicly endorsing his candidacy. When four of these men refused, Little demanded that the "four black crows" be driven from
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the party. Although he obtained his immediate goal, he antagonized Negroes and drove large numbers of them into the willing and waiting arms of Campbell. Little also attacked the questionable election of Senator Henry Payne in 1884. On this charge he failed to garner votes, because Campbell retaliated by showing that a Republican controlled Senate had investigated the circumstances of the election and had not discovered any proof of duplicity. Little dropped this charge and looked for more positive issues to develop.

Attempting to carry the campaign directly against Campbell, he called for a series of joint debates on the "points of the day." Campbell immediately accepted the requests and canceled all his speaking engagements scheduled for the last week of October. He proposed that the talks be held in Xenia, Lebanon, Batavia, Hamilton, and Middle-town, because they were centers of the most populated areas. Using the opportunity to ridicule Little, he cynically suggested that they even discuss the Payne election and subsequent investigation. Little, realizing the danger of such clash with a man of Campbell's oratorical successes, suddenly avoided any further mention of the debate. Campbell, however, proceeded to visit each of the towns and delivered rousing speeches which were greeted by

\[114\] Ibid., July 16, October 18, 22, 1886.
enthusiastic audiences.

In a last minute deal with members of the Knights of Labor, Republicans offered to trade votes. They would vote for McBride, the pro-Labor Democrat seeking office in Greene County, for votes for Little. Local Democrats shouted their opposition and stated that both McBride and Campbell would win without any deals. Repeatedly, Little was described as a "boodler" supreme. It was no secret that Little's past history was clouded with charges of the buying of votes and of using money to accomplish his nefarious schemes.

Little's forces tried to label Campbell as a Bourbon Democrat who had no interest in the laboring man. Several Republicans joined the Knights of Labor and subsequently proposed that they draw a list of their goals and submit them to both candidates. Hence, the workers would be given a public view of each candidate's policies. Little, having been informed of this impending action, managed successfully to elude the committee when it arrived to deliver the questions. His campaign headquarters promised to arrange a meeting but always failed because of alleged last minute conflicts. Campbell, on the other hand, was directly confronted by the Knights and was asked to state his positions. It was believed that if Campbell adopted a

115Ibid., October 21-25, 1886.
policy to placate the workers, he would surely lose support among the more conservative elements of the district. On the other hand, if he disapproved of the labor demands, he would lose their votes. Consequently, Little's constant unavailability to meet the committee was expected to keep both conservatives and liberals happy.

Campbell proved more than a match for this maneuver. When confronted by the Knights, he decided to take a stand. He approved some of the demands, amended others, and disapproved of the remainder. Turning the plan in reverse, he won the respect of the Knights and their opponents, and he caused Little and his party to be ridiculed as sneaky political cowards. 116

The election results proved quite breathtaking. Campbell forged into an early lead in Butler County and surprised local experts by capturing the normally Republican County of Clermont. In the district originally Campbell obtained a majority of three, but in the final count he won the slim margin of two votes. 117

Little did not contest the election, nor did he ask for a recount. Democrats claimed this was because Little feared any type of investigation. The Republican's only

116 Ibid., October 27-28, 1886.

117 O. D. Smith, "James Edwin Campbell," Governors of Ohio, p. 125. The final official count was: Campbell, 15303, and Little, 15301.
comments suggested that the defeat was caused by outsiders who mismanaged his campaign. To this, the Cincinnati Enquirer, which took a great delight in announcing Little's defeat, punningly suggested, "The Republican candidate of the Seventh District is trying to sneak out of his defeat. This is just about as LITTLE as he usually is." Then, with reference to Scripture, it stated, "It is easier for Campbell to go through a needle's eye than for Little to enter Congress." 118

Campbell's reputation soared to new heights. The caustic Murat Halstead commented that Campbell "would drive across three counties on a rainy night to clinch a single vote." Attesting to this popularity, hundreds sought the Democrat and his wife to shake their hands and promise continued support and best wishes. 119

During the intervening days after the election and the beginning of the next session of Congress, Campbell made several trips back and forth to the nation's capital. One such trip was to recommend to Cleveland that Edward Lohman be appointed postmaster for the city of Hamilton. Commenting that the President was full of surprises, the Ohioan felt his choice would be honored. In this he was correct; within five days the confirmation of the

---

118 Cincinnati Enquirer, November 3-7, 1886.
119 Sater, Campbell, pp. 26-27.
appointment was made official.

On December 6, 1886, the second session of the 49th Congress convened with Campbell in attendance. Almost immediately he became involved in a controversy which occupied much of his attention during the following days. In the southwest corner of his congressional district the name of the post-office had been changed from Paddy's Run to the more euphorious name of Glendower. The inhabitants disliked the change and immediately protested to their Congressman who wrote that he "had been in no way responsible for this change." Not to be denied in their quest, a petition was sent to Adlai E. Stevenson, First Assistant Post Master General, in which they claimed "the change was in direct opposition to the wishes of a large majority of the citizens who alone are concerned." They denied the assertion of Benjamin Butterworth and ex-Governor Hoadly that the name of Paddy's Run is "absurd and distasteful to the people." Finally, they resolved that despite the disclaimer of James E. Campbell, "he is largely responsible, on account of his inconsistent action, for the dark clouds of suspicion now resting upon him."

Stevenson replied that the Department "would stand or fall by Glendower" and that he considered the issue closed. The irate Ohioans would not be denied their

---

120 Cincinnati Enquirer, November 30, 1886.
quest and after fifteen months, the name, Paddy's Run was restored to its former estate. When the news reached the Ohioans, January 28, 1888, an outburst of joy and gaiety erupted. The Paddy's Run cornet band, named to perpetuate the old name, and in anticipation of its return, turned out in the afternoon, despite the stinging cold, and played from one end of the town to the other, and from house to house for hours. The cannonading continued for four hours, 10:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M., and truly represented the ecstasy of the hour. Murat Halstead, using the disturbance as a means to attack the Democratic Campbell, said, "There never was as much feeling exercised both for and against such a small affair as this, since the establishment of the Post Office Department, and it is hoped that never will such be manifested again." 122

Far more important in national significance during this session of Congress was the presentation and eventual passage of the Interstate Commerce Act. Prior to its final adoption both houses had approved divergent bills. Subsequently, a special committee of members of both bodies was organized to negotiate a settlement. Campbell was selected chairman of the lower house delegation. After it met with the Senate delegates, the joint committee approved a

121 Sater, Campbell, pp. 28-31.
122 Cincinnati Commercial Gazette, January 28, 1888.
compromise and reported their actions to their respective houses. Reporting on this Campbell attacked the measure as an unwise and dangerous bill. Specifically, he alleged that the language of the bill was crude and vague. Noting that as a member of the committee he was confused concerning the meaning of certain phrases, he predicted that outsiders would be more uncertain. He argued that the only reason that the committee approved it was in order to appease "a clamorous but misinformed constituency." He included the acting Vice President and Senator from Ohio, John Sherman, as one guilty of this.

Admitting that the railroads were guilty of intolerable actions, and, that, "Their rapacity and brutality have become a by-word in the land", and that it is the duty and right of Congress to interfere and protect the people from their greed and mismanagement," he nevertheless believed that the proposed bill was not the solution. He argued that in reality the commission was weak and that the ultimate power of the federal courts was impotent to do anything. Furthermore, he suggested that the state courts should be given jurisdiction because the problems would be local and should be solved directly by the people affected. Although he realized that the state courts would have no power outside their borders and that the railroads were interstate in scope, he believed that if the state courts acted in unison throughout the nation then control would
be possible.

Throughout his argument Campbell displayed a basic fear of the growing strength of the federal government. Central to this fear was the power of the President. Not only would this one man be appointing judges, but he also would appoint the five men to the commission. The Ohioan declared, "No potentate in the world would dare attempt the exercise of such arbitrary and unlimited power." To Campbell the commission members would have to look upon the president as "their master, thus a monarch." Moreover, he lamented, "There are not five men living whom I would trust with such unbridled power."

Regarding the bill itself, he suggested that if it had to be passed, then it should be rewritten and made perfectly "precise and clear." Secondly, he desired to see the clause prohibiting pooling removed. He believed that pooling often benefited the public because standard and generally fair prices were arrived at, and that the costs of competition were removed. In its stead he felt regulation of pools individually by state courts would be the answer. In conclusion, he stated that unless the bill was changed as indicated, he would vote against it. 123 The following day when the measure was acted upon, he did

vote nay, but the bill was enacted.

During the same session Campbell openly disagreed with President's Cleveland's veto of the pension bill of 1887, popularly known as the Pauper's Bill. It provided for a pension to all disabled veterans who had served at least ninety days and were dependent upon their own efforts for support. Disabilities from old age and other non-military causes were to suffice as qualifications for the stipend. Also included were dependent parents of soldiers who died in service.

This bill essentially encompassed the basic philosophy of Campbell in this matter. He felt strongly regarding the dependency factor because of his own Civil War disability and truly believed in the duty of the government to render such aid when the applicants were deserving.

Cleveland's veto message asserted that it was wrong to give mere charity seekers an opportunity to receive support from the government. Finally, and in a more economical note, he reminded Congress of the great burden on the Treasury, which such an act would involve. Repeating the policies of his conservative associates, he wanted to lower the governmental expenditures as much as possible. Ultimately, his veto was sustained.125

---

124 Cincinnati Enquirer, January 22, 1887.
125 Merrill, Cleveland, p. 106.
Campbell lamented Cleveland's action and in a later interview stated his concepts regarding the use of the presidential veto power. He asserted that the intent of the veto was not to "control legislation or cudgel Congress to do the White House will. The President is not a legislative body." Positively, Campbell claimed that the veto was only to be used when the chief executive believed a measure was unconstitutional or an encroachment upon his power. Distinctly it was not to be exercised against subjects specifically within the province of the House or the Senate. Tariffs, pensions, and other related financial measures were viewed particularly as belonging within the express power of Congress. Emphatically, Campbell stated, "It is not for a president to check, revise, or direct Congressional action in those directions."¹²⁶

During this eventful session Campbell's interests were also concerned with his own political career. The possibility of his candidacy as the Democratic nominee for the Ohio governorship loomed brightly. A poll of the Democratic members of the Ohio Senate indicated that the thrice elected Congressman was either a first or second choice for victory, if nominated.¹²⁷ The general consensus was that

¹²⁷ Cincinnati Enquirer, February 13, 1887.
Campbell had not offended any large number of people. This was the factor that many believed would ultimately decide the matter in his favor.

Howard Galbreath, managing editor of the Columbus Times, favored the Hamilton resident because he represented "new blood and new confidence." Accepting the political belief that people vote for past winners simply because they regularly are victorious campaigners, Galbreath assumed that by his past election record alone, Campbell would woo more votes from "the floating and uncertain class and lukewarm Republicans than any other man." Unfortunately, he concluded, Campbell was relatively unknown outside of the southern portion of the state. This could be the stumbling block which would prevent his nomination.

Campbell refused to make any public comments regarding his candidacy. He believed that Allen Thurman, the popular and traditional Democratic spokesman in Ohio should be given preference. His actions continued along this vein until July 15, 1887, when Thurman, affectionately termed "the old Roman", announced that he would decline the nomination for the Governorship if offered. On the same day a reporter for the Cincinnati Enquirer wrote that one of Campbell's intimate friends said that because Thurman had

\[128\] Ibid., April 16, 1887.
publicly ruled himself out, Campbell, henceforth, was an active candidate seeking the nomination. The report concluded by stating, "This announcement can be considered as coming from Mr. Campbell himself."

The following day, the editor of the same paper gave his unqualified endorsement for the Butler County Democrat. He described Campbell as a man "who has made so many winning fights, and who carries the prestige of unbroken success." The journalist cautioned that it was not positively known if Campbell desires the nomination, "but it is probable that he will accept it." The only reason given against his being nominated was that the party also needed him in Congress.

Cleveland, Ohio, was the site of the Democratic convention. Early indications appeared that Campbell would be the first ballot leader. The real question was how many votes he would be able to garner. To his usual tune, "The Campbells are Coming," he arrived at the Forest City and made his headquarters in the Weddell House. In an interview on the night prior to the opening of the proceedings he described one opponent, General Thomas E. Powell, as an able "orator and lawyer", and the other, Congressman Martin Foran as a fine "citizen and statesman." Concluding, he predicted that regardless of the outcome a capable

129 Ibid., July 15, 16, 1887.
and worthy nominee would be selected.

The following day the Democrats assembled in the Music Hall and prepared for their tasks. They adopted a platform which promoted regulation of the liquor traffic by a licensing system and endorsed the Cleveland administration. Thereafter James Neal placed Campbell's name before the convention. He proudly described him as "the favorite son who has never met defeat." Neal proceeded to trace Campbell's victorious congressional campaigns against Republican gerrymanderings and prominent spokesmen. He labeled his choice as a military hero, as a man interested in the condition of the workingman, and as a defender of Democratic soldiers in Congress. He concluded by showing Campbell to be "one strong and fearless in debate, thoroughly, equipped to meet any candidate the Republicans may put in the field against him, whether it be Ohio's ice cold Senator John Sherman, or (looking to the future) ex-Governor Joseph Benson Foraker with his cane made of human skin."

Charles W. Baker of Cincinnati followed Neal to the podium and offered Powell as a candidate and later E. M. Heisley of Cuyahoga placed Foran's credentials before the

---

130 It is interesting that this statement was repeated numerous times but it was false because Campbell, as described before, lost the State Senatorial contest in 1879.

131 Cincinnati Enquirer, July 22, 1887.
assembly. Subsequently the voting began and found Powell as the first ballot leader with 321 votes out of 658 cast. Campbell was second with 251, and Foran was a distant third with 85 votes. Immediately a second ballot was taken, and Powell's total grew to 356 votes enough for the nomination. Campbell's total had grown by $\frac{1}{2}$ a vote, while Foran's total had dwindled to 56½. Neal then successfully moved that the nomination be made unanimous which was done amid a scene of great enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{132}

After Powell delivered his acceptance speech, Campbell indicated an interest in making a few comments to the convention. The permanent Chairman, George W. Seney of Seneca, introduced Campbell by calling him the next Democratic Governor of Ohio. Little did he realize that the verbal slip was a true prediction. Campbell thanked Seney for the introduction but qualified it by asserting that Powell would be the next Democratic Governor. After promising to lend his full support to the nominee, he whimsically added that the convention had spoiled a much better speech of his by their selection. Waiting until the laughter ebbed, he continued, "I had a few unexpected remarks to make myself."\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{132}Powell, Democratic Party of the State of Ohio, pp. 303-304; George Jenny, Joseph Benson Foraker As Governor of Ohio, 1886-1890, p. 37.

\textsuperscript{133}Cincinnati Enquirer, July 22, 1887.
This ability to smile after a defeat later proved important. His comments allowed him the chance to get acquainted with the delegates and to remove the liability that he was a political unknown outside of his district.

Reporting the day after the convention, the Ohio State Journal commented that some dissension had appeared in the Democratic ranks. Campbell was regarded as the strongest man individually, but he was not selected because of his position on the pension bill. The newspaper claimed that the nomination would have been his if he had not taken such an open position against the president.

Actually Campbell's political strength was stronger than appeared on the surface. He had only entered the race after Thurman had stepped aside and had still managed to receive over 200 votes. Politically the nomination would have proved disastrous because he would have been pitted against the Republican incumbent, Joseph Benson Foraker, who was still within the good graces of his party. In view, moreover, of the unofficial feelings that Sherman would be the eventual G.O.P. presidential candidate, Powell faced overwhelming odds. Indicative of this apprehension were Campbell's comments concerning the campaign. He stated that there appeared to be a Democratic apathy partly engendered by the President's failure to remove Republicans quickly from office and to replace them with local Democrats. He offered some hope by advising Powell to show
"more hustle" and vigor himself if he hoped to develop a confident feeling among state party workers. Although the Democratic candidate made numerous speeches throughout the state, he was not able to overcome the strength of the opposition. Additionally, he was faced with the Union Labor Party which drew almost entirely from the Democratic party. Consequently Foraker was reelected, and his party maintained a firm hold over the legislature.

Campbell cautiously delivered several speeches in behalf of Powell but generally refrained from lending his complete support. He spent approximately one week in St. Louis, Missouri, attending a national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in late September, and then, he made several trips to Kansas City on business ventures. Finally he again stated he had to assist his daughter in enrolling at a school in Washington, D.C. Consequently he was able to excuse himself from taking a major role in the campaign and was not considered to have been involved in the defeat when the election returns were recorded.

Upon the opening of the fiftieth Congress, Campbell was made a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic Committee. During this session of Congress Campbell's role was passive.

134 Ohio State Journal, July 23, 1887.
135 Cincinnati Enquirer, August 10, 1887.
He neither entered into any long debates nor served on any important committees. His name was often mentioned as the next Democratic nominee for the Ohio Governorship. Perhaps this prompted him to curtail his congressional activities in order not to create any unnecessary liabilities. He did vote for the Democraticly sponsored Mills Bill, which would have lowered the tariff, but he refused to enter into any of the tariff debates which had lasted for months.

One of his proposals did have some later importance. He introduced a bill to regulate federal elections and promote the purity of the ballot. It called for such uniform standards as the size and shape of the ballot. The bill was referred to the Committee on Elections but failed to arouse any interest and eventually died. Later this bill became the basis of the ballot box hoax during the 1889 gubernatorial campaign.

The presidential conventions, nominations, and campaigns of 1888 occupied the main political interest of the nation and Ohio. Campbell remained in the background and was not a delegate to any of the various county, state, or national meetings. He preferred to remain in Washington and devote his attention to his Congressional duties. In reality, however, activity was at a virtual standstill because of the noticeable absence of many members who were actively engaged in the campaigns. Campbell did declare that Benjamin Harrison was a "much stronger man than some
persons suppose," but he calculated that the Hoosier would not carry any of the traditionally Democratic states and would not be an equal match against the Cleveland-Thurman ticket. Despite this pronouncement Campbell possessed an intimation that 1888 would be a Republican year. He declined to gamble his winning record on another congressional election and preferred to return to Hamilton to reorganize his finances.

Campbell was in constant correspondence with Calvin Brice, the Democratic Party's campaign chairman and a fellow Ohioan. Perhaps it was because of his intimate knowledge of current political feelings that he decided to leave politics for the moment and to return to Ohio.

An attempt to induce him to change his mind proved unsuccessful. Even on the day of the congressional nominating convention in Morrow, Ohio, overtures and pleas were offered for his consideration. After a resolution was adopted praising Campbell's work in Congress, William Page of Clermont County moved that the rules be suspended, and that Campbell be nominated by acclamation. Campbell arose with a voice full of emotion and told his constituents that he could not be their candidate, not because of any lack of a sense of gratitude for the great honor bestowed upon him, but because his long neglected private business required immediate attention. He then asked that his name be withdrawn and that John Pattison, the other candidate, be
nominated. This request was carried out with comments that the best man other than Campbell had been nominated.

The fall elections witnessed a virtual Republican sweep across the nation and in Ohio. Harrison emerged as the winner in his race with Cleveland although the latter carried the popular majority. Ohio continued in the Republican corner and gave their G.O.P. Hoosier neighbor a firm vote of confidence. Pattison lost in the congressional race to Henry L. Morey who was able to return to Congress now that Campbell was no longer his opponent. 137

Campbell spent the latter part of 1888 fulfilling his final obligations as a Congressman and was in constant attendance during the opening of the second session of the fiftieth Congress. He remained there until Morey was seated and prepared to assume his duties. A Republican, General Charles Grosvenor, summed up the feelings of other Congressmen in their regard for their departing colleague by stating:

There was no Congressman from any state in the Union who labored more zealously, intelligently and kindly for the people of this district than did James E. Campbell. No letter ever remained unanswered, no request, it mattered not how obscure the maker, went unheeded during the entire six years that he represented the district. 138

As Campbell ended his Congressional career, his last

---

137 Congressional Record, 50th Cong., 1st Sess., p.6692.
138 Cincinnati Enquirer, August 29, 1887.
six years could be described as steady and forthright, rather than sensational or spectacular. He was not a man who constantly sought notoriety by seeking prominent positions or issues. He preferred to complete his routine assignments with a minimum of fanfare and ostentatious display of excitement. He followed his beliefs with a consistency and supported his party as a loyal member. On those rare occasions when he felt his party's leader, President Cleveland, acted against his basic policies, he was not afraid to disagree openly. He earned the admiration of his Congressional colleagues who rightfully predicted that Campbell's political career was not at an end. He was a man who would not be allowed by his friends and constituents to return to obscurity.
CHAPTER IV

VICTORY AND HOPE

The 1880's and 1890's witnessed the growing influence of business on government and politics, and Ohio's economic life became more and more intertwined with the interests of the capitalistic industrial Eastern States. Primarily such national issues as the tariff and financial problems concerned Ohio's political life.

State issues varied from one campaign to another and neither party was eager to consider the economic problems of corporation and railroad regulation. The liquor question retained a perennial interest despite the efforts of both parties to avoid it, the issue being forced because of the presence of both the overzealous prohibitionists and the defenders of the liquor traffic. Oftentimes, the latter joined hands with local politicians in organizing corrupt city machines such as the George B. Cox organization in Cincinnati. For the reformer and the independent voter, the eighties and the nineties were dismal decades.¹

Joseph Benson Foraker occupied the Governor's position

¹Eugene Roseboom and Francis Weisenburger, A History of Ohio, pp. 243-244.
in 1886 following his triumphant battle with George Hoadly. As the titular leader of the Republicans, he attempted to reward his followers and tried to erect a strong state machine loyal to him. For the following four years he garnered some success along these lines, but in general he stumbled through intra-party squabbles which split his party and allowed the Democrats to become a formidable opposition.

Yet, he was an energetic and vigorous executive. His administration began with a struggle over the election of state representatives from Hamilton County. After some highly irregular maneuverings, the Republicans were awarded the disputed seats and proceeded with the Governor to take a firm hold over the reins of the state government.2

Two years later in 1887 Foraker was again elected Governor defeating Thomas E. Powell, The Democratic nominee. For the first time he carried Hamilton County and was now in a position to dictate to the Republicans of Ohio. Feeling that this was an eventual stepping stone for Foraker to the presidency and believing that he had won without the support of such prominent state Republicans as John Sherman and Mark Hanna, the Democrats anticipated an intra-party battle which would help them attain their political ambitions. Their goal was to discredit the Foraker administration and to attempt to add to the brewing fissure.3

---

2Ibid., p. 245.
3Everett Walters, Joseph Benson Foraker, An Uncompromising Republican, p. 61.
The liquor controversy provided a significant and logical issue for the fight against Foraker. It was relatively easy for the Democratic opposition to attack the administration which attempted to handle the controversial issue as gingerly as possible.

Acting upon the direction of Foraker, the Legislature on May 14, 1886, passed the Dow Law. It assessed businesses engaged in the traffic of "spirituous, vinous, malt or any intoxicating liquor," two hundred dollars annually. This money was divided amongst various state, county and municipal agencies to help defray the growing expenditures. In terms of revenue the state benefited from the tax. Approximately two years later, March 26, 1888, the tax was increased to $250.00 annually. On March 3, 1888, a third act granted to townships the right of local option to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages within the district.¹

Because of these acts it was obvious that the liquor question would be a major issue in the governor's election of 1889. Neither the liquor interests nor the prohibition enthusiasts were satisfied. The Democrats could attack the acts without having to propose substitution legislation. Depending upon which group they were trying to woo, they

¹Roseboom and Weisenburger, History of Ohio, p. 245; George Jenny, "Joseph B. Foraker as Governor of Ohio" (Unpublished MS thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 1936), pp. 24, 50-51; Ohio Laws XXXIII, p. 157.
could slant their answers to appease them.

Irregular election proceedings and frauds had led to the formation of a Committee of One Hundred. This organization had I. J. Miller as its president and William H. Taft as a member of its executive committee and was formed to secure honest elections and the honest performance of duty by public officials. 5

The committee, many of whom were Democrats, clearly presented evidence that three Hamilton County commissioners and the police were guilty of fraudulent acts in the recent election. Foraker, attempting to solve the problem, eventually ordered the removal of the three commissioners and was able to have his action sustained by the Supreme Court. 6 The following month he appointed a new non-partisan board of police commissioners and hoped, unsuccessfully, that they would end the disturbance in the Cincinnati area. 7 Finally, the legislature, following Foraker's advice, passed the Pugsley Law which provided for non-partisan election boards in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, and Toledo to select election officials. 8

---

5H. C. Wright, Bossism in Cincinnati, p. 28; Earl Ray Beck, "The Political Career of Joseph Benson Foraker" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1942), p. 56.

6Cincinnati Commercial Gazette, February 28, 1886. There were three Republicans and two Democrats on the court.

7Walters, Foraker, p. 41.

8Ibid., p. 39.
commented that the law was "not all that is needed in the way of amendments to the election laws of Ohio, but it will do for a start." 9

There were some glimmerings of reform during the Foraker administration in addition to the aforementioned Hamilton County reorganizations. The Ohio State Board of Health was established, a Board of Pardons was created, and a Canal Commission was instituted to recover canal lands illegally occupied by private individuals for the state. 10

In general, however, this administration primarily devoted itself to political manipulation and party struggle and did not exert concerted efforts for the effective governing of an emerging and forward looking industrial state.

Foraker developed for his use the technique of waving of the bloody shirt. This device was used whenever issues were clearly controversial and whenever the Democrats appeared to be growing quite strong. On two memorable occasions he employed this tactic although it was used repeatedly whenever the occasion allowed. In defiance of President Cleveland's executive order which directed that certain captured Confederate Civil War flags stored in the War Department be returned to their respective states, Foraker flamboyantly went to the State House Rotunda and

9Ohio State Journal, February 20, 1886.
10Roseboom and Weisenburger, History of Ohio, p. 245.
promised to fight rather than return Ohio's flags. Summoning forth all his emotions, he reiterated the miseries and sufferings rendered in winning the flags, and he vowed they would never be returned while he was able to stop that action. Constantly appealing to the members of the Grand Army of the Republic, he earned the nickname of "Fire-alarm" Foraker, which endeared him to the soldier element and the average Republican voter, though it disgusted the more independent, such as ex-President Hayes.

Secondly, in a speech before the Grand Army of the Republic Encampment at Cleveland in late April, 1886, he attacked Jefferson Davis who at the Confederate reunion in Montgomery, Alabama, had been extolled as a "great patriot who would rank in history with George Washington." So sharp was his criticism of Davis that he was besieged with letters that protested his proposed attendance as a lay delegate to the conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South to be held at Richmond, Virginia. Foraker subsequently declared that other engagements prevented him from attending the Church conference, but he would not retract a word he had said about the former Confederate President.  

Foraker's apparent open break with the Hanna-Sherman

---

11 *Ohio State Journal*, May 1, 1886.
wing came during the Republican national convention of 1888. Senator Sherman was a leading candidate for the nomination and had valid hopes of winning the top position. As early as January 16, 1888, the Governor had written the Senator assuring him of his full support. Foraker delivered a seconding speech for Sherman at the convention and remained steadfast in his allegiance to him. As far as is known, the Governor kept that promise.

Benjamin Harrison received the Republican nomination at the 1888 convention. During the following campaign he did not receive enthusiastic support but carried the state by a plurality of 20,000 votes. Although ex-Governor Foster was named Secretary of the Treasury, there was little active support for the administration within the state. The Republicans, particularly Foraker, suffered because of their party's national program.

Foraker's second term of office was ending at a crucial time. The fiery Republican had hopes of winning a United States Senate seat in 1890. For a time he considered letting his friend, Asa Bushnell, get the nomination for governor and after Bushnell's successful election have the Governor-elect endorse him for the Senate. This plan failed to materialize because Bushnell refused the

candidacy. Originally when questioned about his future, Foraker hesitated to announce his candidacy, but believing that his only chance for the post would come if he remained in a prominent office, the Governor decided to seek a third term.

Richard Smith, a vituperative anti-Foraker Republican, in a caustic editorial asserted, "If Foraker should be a candidate for reelection for governor, or if he should name the candidate, whether it be Bushnell or anyone else, his throat should be cut from ear to ear." Smith implied that Foraker was directly responsible for Sherman's failure in 1888 to receive the Republican Presidential nomination. The Governor realized that if he did not run for a third term, his political career would most assuredly end. The open attack forced Foraker to begin laying his plans for his renomination.  

On May 15, 1889, the Republican State Central Committee met at Columbus to decide the relative merits of the cities that had placed bids with them for the convention. The Committee decided in favor of Columbus. The date set for the meeting was Tuesday, June 25, 1889.

Meeting at the Metropolitan Opera House in Columbus, the assembly entirely filled the building. The first

15 Foraker, Notes of a Busy Life, p. 379; Walters, Foraker, pp. 87-88.
day's business was taken up with such routine duties as select­
ing committees, seating delegates, and special resolu­tions. The following day the platform was presented and adopted. It adhered to the principles of protection at home and abroad as adopted in the Republican National Con­vention of 1888. It also endorsed the administration of Benjamin Harrison and favored the passage of home rule in Ireland. Finally, Governor Foraker's administration was heartedly endorsed. 16

The adoption of the platform was followed by the nom­inations of candidates for the governorship. They included Ebert Lampson of Ashtabula County, John B. Beil of Franklin, Wilson Vance of Hancock, Robert P. Kennedy of Logan County, who received Mark Hanna's support, Asahel W. Jones of Mahoning who was a member of Foraker's staff, Joseph W. O'Neall of Warren County, and H. L. Morey of Butler. 17 Foraker wisely did not allow his name to be presented. During the formal nominations it was believed that if he had done so, he might not have had sufficient votes to overcome the strength of the combined candidates. Realizing also that no one man would get the majority on the first ballot, he withheld his name.

16 Rollin Dean Ashbaugh, "James Edwin Campbell, And the Governorship of Ohio" (Unpublished MA thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1937), pp. 5-7.

17 Ohio State Journal, June 2, 1889.
The first ballot was taken with the vote very much divided. All the candidates received complimentary support. Surprisingly 207 votes were cast for Foraker even though his name had not been placed formally before the convention. On the second ballot he received 254 votes, and no other candidate received even 200 votes. Before the official result could be announced, the delegates began changing their votes until enough votes had been given to Foraker to renominate him. Thereafter, the nomination was made unanimous.

During the years of the Foraker administration, the Democratic Party attempted to present a new image to the business world. Their Republican opponents had repeatedly been the recipients of large campaign contributions which tremendously aided them in bringing the voters to their banner. Forgotten were the greenback principles of the 1870's. Even the revenue tariff views of President Cleveland received only mild support from the Ohio Democrats who preferred to battle the Republicans on the measure of degree rather than on the total removal of protection. Henry Payne, who had defeated the more liberal George H. Pendleton for the Ohio Senate seat in the national Congress in 1884 had aptly demonstrated this
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18Foraker, Notes of a Busy Life, I, p. 392.
emerging conservatism of the party.  

James Edwin Campbell had decided to retire from Congress but had no intention of abandoning politics. He continued to deliver numerous talks throughout the state in defense of his party. These speeches kept his name before the public and gave them an opportunity to meet and listen to one of the few Democrats who possessed victorious election credentials. Understandably his name was constantly mentioned as the probably gubernatorial candidate in 1889.

Remarks stated at a Buckeye reception in Washington D.C. on February 20, 1889, were typical of Democratic sentiments. Judge George Seney from Seneca, Ohio, announced that Campbell had the inside track on the nomination and was truly a popular man as witnessed by his marginal defeat for the honor in 1887 after he entered the race at the last minute. Representative Wilkens added that Campbell was "right on the tariff, right on pensions, and right on everything else."

When Campbell was asked what he thought of these previous comments, he declined to take a direct position on his status. Instead, he simply stated that "anyone who can win" or "any man the Democrats may nominate" would be his
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19 Ashbaugh, "James E. Campbell" p. 7; Foraker, Notes of a Busy Life, I, p. 397. In addition to Foraker and the other main candidates' votes were as follows: Kennedy 127, O'Neill 59, Morey 47. The rest were scattered.
Approximately one month later on March 26 he assumed a more positive position by asserting that if he were nominated, he would be greatly pleased and would wage a determined campaign. He refused, however, to enter into the "rough and tumble scramble" for the nomination. He believed that such high honors should come from a willing and unified party removed from the throes of intra-party battles. He continued mentioning the names of Thomas Powell, Allen Thurman, Virgil Kline, Charles Baker, and George L. Converse as "first-class Democrats and men of ability." Aggressively, he promised that he would take off his coat and work as hard for their election as for his own. He dramatically stated that, regardless of the choice, the Democratic Party's chances were unexcelled and that only a miracle could prevent them from reaping victory in the fall. He aptly predicted that the central issues would rest on home-rule in Ohio and on a defense of the Cleveland administration.

On the following day prominent Ohioans responded to Campbell's statements with complete acceptance. Judge Amor of Knox County said, "It had the true Democratic ring," and Mr. Baughman of Wayne suggested that it was "the kind of talk that suited him." A fellow Butler Countian replied
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that it was "hot Democratic doctrine" and that Campbell's comments, especially those concerning local self government, reflected general Democratic feelings.\footnote{Ibid., March 26-27, 1889.}

Consequently, at this time, Campbell was considered an easy victor for the nomination. His reputation as a brilliant campaigner and the record he had made as a militant member of the majority party in the House of Representatives made him the logical and ideal candidate.

The ensuing month witnessed the first evident divisions within the Republican ranks and significantly indicated that the G.O.P. was facing a difficult time. This prompted other Democrats, who normally would have remained contented in other positions, to indicate interest in the nomination for themselves. Generally they publicly expressed their concern over the available candidates and opened the possibility of their own availability. They did raise the thought that if enough locally sponsored names were presented at the convention, the voting would be so scattered that no one of them could get the required majority. Specifically such a development could only hurt one man's chances, that of James Campbell's. As the leading candidate, he would have to get the nomination early, or he would be denied the honor.

The first prominent man to rise in opposition to
Campbell was Allen W. Thurman, son of the "Old-Roman" and traditional Democratic leader, Allen G. Thurman. The younger man announced that he was an avowed candidate for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination, but he refused to be "a scrambling candidate." When he made this pronouncement, he did recognize that both Campbell and Charles Baker were prominently mentioned as other possible nominees, but he insisted that they would have to support openly a program demanding a significant revenue reform. After Thurman's open declaration Charles Baker followed along similar lines, affirming his availability for the nomination with a stout refusal to campaign openly for votes.

Eleven days after Baker's entrance into the race Thurman and he held a meeting in Cleveland. After approximately a one-hour discussion behind closed doors, they appeared unable to reach a decision as to which should withdraw. Both insisted that they were "out to win" the nomination. Neither was willing to step aside and support the other. Both did agree, however, in direct reference to Campbell, that no young man should be given the nomination without proving himself and offering openly his credentials for examination.
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Virgil Kline of Cleveland reversed the trend and announced positively that he was not a candidate and that he did not intend to be one. He declared that he had no preference among the various candidates, but he believed that Campbell was stronger than he had been in 1887 when he narrowly missed receiving the honor. Thereafter, Kline praised Campbell's past election record and especially noted the Butler Countian's aggressiveness in campaigning. To the Clevelander this was the factor needed to defeat Foraker.25

The last important individual to announce his candidacy was Lawrence Neal of Ross County. In a reply to a reporter's statement that his name had been mentioned prominently, he stated that if his friends wanted to use his name as a candidate, he would allow them to do so, but he would not scramble for the nomination. If, however, it were offered he would shut up his "law office and go into the fight, and go in to win."26

Regardless of these new entrants in the political arena, Campbell continued to remain the leading choice for the nomination. J. A. Norton, Chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee, stated in unequivocal terms that Campbell was the leader. This was apparent to the Democratic spokesman because the Democrats of Dayton had

25Ibid., April 28, 1889.
26Ibid., May 11, 1889.
presented an unusually strong bid to have the nominating convention held within their city. It was no secret that the delegates to the convention of that city were strongly supporting their neighbor to the south and were expending more than the usual energy to have the convention meet within their borders.  

Campbell was staying at the Hotel Astor in New York City when he officially learned that Foraker had been renominated by the Republicans of Ohio. Displaying an overwhelming confidence and optimism, he declared that Ohio would never accept a third-term governor, especially one who had offended the "better class of Republicans." Satirically, Campbell declared that Foraker's real ambition was to go to the United States Senate but "at present was too poor a man to join the Plutocrat Club." Campbell then attacked the city Boards of Public Affairs which had been established under the Foraker administration. Theoretically, they were to be non-partisan groups, but Campbell charged that Foraker had not only appointed none but Republicans but only those members of the G.O.P. who were directly loyal to him. According to Campbell, every Democratic city under Republican rule would rise up on election day and throw both the boards and their members out.
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Prior to the Democratic meeting two other parties held conventions and nominated candidates for the governorship. The Union Labor Party met with less than fifty delegates present and nominated John H. Rhodes for governor. Secondly, the Prohibition Party met at Zanesville, Ohio, on July 25-26, 1889. There they nominated Dr. J. B. Helwig for the top executive post within the state. Their platform advocated the complete elimination of the alcoholic traffic and significantly attacked the Republican attempts to regulate it by saying, "the collection of revenue from an occupation which is criminal in its nature is contrary to fundamental law, and abhorrent to good morals ..."

The reporter covering the convention for the Cincinnati Enquirer said that while no cigars or alcohol were in evidence, lemonade and chewing gum were quite prominent.

While these developments were taking place in Ohio, Campbell remained outside the Buckeye state under the guise of spending a vacation with his family in Deer Park, Maryland. On August 3, he traveled to New York City and as he was making arrangements for his accommodations in Albemarle Hotel, he submitted to an interview. He asserted that while he was vacationing, he had paid no attention to politics. Omitting his own name, he said that

29Jenny, "Foraker as Governor", p. 58.
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"Kline and Neal" and possibly "two others" were the main candidates. He stressed the need for party unity and hoped that no sharp fights developed among party members over the nominations. He insisted that if such a development occurred, the winning candidate would find his chances for election worthless. He then outlined what he believed were the important issues separating the two parties. He took exception with those Democrats who urged that Ohio follow President Cleveland's leadership for the preceding year in making the tariff question the sole issue. He predicted that if the Ohio Democrats followed that policy, "[John] Wanamaker and [Andrew] Carnegie and other protection monopolists will come into the state and swamp us." He concluded by insisting that the Democrats of Ohio had never been able to carry the state on a national issue, and probably never would.31

Campbell did not arrive back in Ohio until August 20, the week of the convention. Initially he went to his two-story brick, bright cherry-red home on the corner of Fourth and Ludlow in Hamilton. There he assembled his family which consisted of his wife, two daughters aged eighteen and eleven, and two sons aged fourteen and four. He reminded reporters of his return of his Civil War liability pension and of his membership with the Masons,

31 Cincinnati Enquirer, August 4, 1889.
Knights of Pythias, Elks, and the Grand Army of the Republic. In essence, he was appealing to as many groups as possible presenting himself as a modest, home loving, family man who took an active interest in his community.32

Possessing an engaging personality, a skill in organization, and an ability as a public speaker, Campbell confidently awaited the opening of the convention. His optimism was valid because one county convention after another had directed its delegates to vote for his nomination as Governor since early summer. The favorable tide displayed a definite trend when such a local county favorite son as Judge W. H. Bull of Zanesville reported in the Hocking Sentinel that he was not a candidate and that he would support Campbell. Added to this was the solid support given Campbell by the large Montgomery County Convention held on August 11, 1889.33

The Democratic convention was called late in the summer. Campbell was accused of having the convention meet at a date later than usual in order to build up his machine. This led to charges by Republican newspapers that the Democratic Party was divided. In answer to this allegation the Cincinnati Enquirer replied, "Because there are two distinguished aspirants for the Democratic convention

32Ibid., August 20, 31, 1889.
33Ibid., May 19 - August 11, 1889.
for Governor in Ohio, the Republican organs are trying to persuade themselves and their readers that the party is rent in twain with great quarrel."^{34}

As the day of the convention was rapidly approaching, the large number of early hotel reservations indicated that the attendance would be high. The Rink, a large wooden building capable of seating several thousand people, eventually proved wholly inadequate to the demands made by crowds of people anxious to be in attendance. Because the candidates generally agreed upon the basic issues, the selection of the candidate was made on personality rather than on policy.

As the convention meeting prepared to begin, it appeared that only two of the candidates, Lawrence Neal and James Campbell, had a chance for the nomination. Neal's supporters claimed victory would be his by the end of the third ballot. This prediction was based on the opinion that on the first ballot the votes would be so scattered that no one would be able to receive the necessary majority; and that the second ballot would witness the elimination of the local favorites and the concentration of votes on Neal, Campbell, and Kline. Finally, Kline's forces were

^{34}Ibid., August 24, 1889; Ashbaugh, "James E. Campbell," p. 7.

^{35}Cleveland Plain Dealer, August 28, 1889.
expected to switch their allegiance to Neal giving him the nomination. Campbell's men confidently avoided all the above speculation and announced that victory would be theirs on the first ballot. Confirming their optimism was the almost complete control of the key committee assignments by the Campbell group.

Prior to the official opening the leading candidates expressed their views on the impending event. Neal claimed it would be "a sad mistake to nominate Campbell" because the Butler Countian was too inexperienced to debate the state issues against Foraker. Campbell replied by expressing that the convention would make no mistake and that he thanked all those delegates who came to help his cause. He did attack the circular that was being passed about Dayton stating that he was an advocate of a protective tariff. Although he could not directly accuse Neal as the culprit, he did insist that Colonel Simeon K. Donovan, Neal's private campaign advisor, was known to be the man distributing the lie. Finally, Virgil Kline commented that he had "no bias" against any of the candidates and expected that the party would not fail to select a winner.

The meeting was to begin at 10 o'clock, but the seating of the delegates proceeded slowly. It was nearly 11
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o'clock before the convention was formally called to order. The first item on the agenda was the presentation and adoption of the platform which included an endorsement of the National Democratic platform of 1888, an appeal for the regulation of trusts, and a denouncement of the Foraker administration as "the most partisan, demoralizing and extravagant in our history" in his control of the local boards and his quest for a third term." Finally, the Democrats favored home rule in Ireland as well as in Ohio.

Nominations for Governor were next in order of business, and speeches for this purpose were limited to ten minutes. Samuel F. Hunt made the opening speech and nominated James Campbell. He stressed the latter's Civil War record, his successful political career in Butler County, and his later triumphs against Republican gerrymanderings for Congress. He was followed by Martin Foran of Cleveland who presented Kline's name and Frank C. Dougherty who placed Neal's credentials before the assembly. The nominations closed with these three names.

The first ballot was then taken with Campbell getting 372 votes, Neal 252 votes, and Kline with 149 votes. It required 396 votes to nominate. Immediately Auglaize County changed its votes to Campbell, quickly followed by others, so that it appeared that Campbell would be nominated on the first ballot. Before the voting was officially announced, however, a disturbance was created within the
Hamilton delegation. It was charged that Campbell was falsely given all of that county's votes, whereas three or four votes should have been given to Neal. Amidst a great deal of confusion, the chairman had some difficulty in restoring some semblance of order. Hamilton County's vote was accordingly repeated, and Campbell received sixty-five votes instead of the seventy-five originally recorded. Consequently Campbell's total fell to 388 votes, eight votes short of victory. His hopes for a band wagon swing to his corner had failed since the voting was declared as official and closed.

After order was restored, the chairman ordered that the second ballot be taken. Out of the 789 votes cast, Campbell again received 388 votes, Neal 299 votes, and Kline 93 votes. Before the count could be tallied, the Hocking County delegation changed their votes to Campbell which gave him 397 votes, one over the minimum necessary for nomination. When these results were announced, the crowd began to cheer, stopping only to hear the motion made to make the decision unanimous. As the motion was carried, the bands started to play "The Campbells Are Coming," and the crowd continuing to cheer, called for both Neal and Campbell to appear. 38
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Neal spoke first and thanked his followers for their efforts rendered in his behalf. He then called the convention an open meeting of the Democratic Party which had reached a decision in a clean and ethical manner. He charged that the Republican opposition was controlled by a director who refused to allow free and frank discussions of the issues and the candidates. Calling Campbell a winning and capable candidate, he concluded by announcing his full intent to campaign strongly for both the party and its candidates.39

After this endorsement Campbell delivered his acceptance speech. Apologizing for a hoarseness in his throat, he quipped that it would be hoarser before the campaign was finished. Proceeding to lay down the basic issues in the contest, he attacked the two preceding Foraker administrations and added his criticism of a potential third term by stating that George Washington "scorned to accept a third term" and that General Grant had failed of its achievement." Continuing, he shouted, "The very thought is repugnant."

He then turned to his second issue, the question of home rule. Declaring that several cities were innocently robbed of their natural control over local affairs, he charged that Foraker had usurped their basic rights and

39Cincinnati Enquirer, August 29, 1889.
arrogantly had appointed a "baleful sway of incompetent boards which became the political tool of the Governor." Campbell further charged the boards with complete incompetency in handling the public's money and implied that it was not only improper squandering but open graft and corruption.

Next he turned to the national scene. He defended the Cleveland administration by specifically singling out the tariff issue. He maintained that the Republican Senate had stopped the passage of the Mills Bill, which would have resolved the tariff question. He said it was only necessary to look about Ohio to see the true effects of a high tariff system. He rejected Foraker's claim that Ohio was living in a period of general prosperity. He concluded his speech by affirming that victory was certain if the party remained unified and worked together.  

When the news of Campbell's nomination was sent throughout the state, large numbers of notes, letters, and telegrams were sent to Dayton and to the various state-wide Democratic offices applauding the action. The party members displayed an optimism and confidence rarely seen during the preceding turbulent years. Even prominent Republican leaders could not refrain from expressing warm opinions over the nomination. General Charles Grosvenor in a public speech in Xenia stated:

\[40\]Ibid.; Cleveland Plain Dealer, August 28, 1889.
I shall not be found criticizing the able and gallant gentleman the Democrats have seen fit to nominate for Governor, so far as his personal character and relations are concerned. He is a gentleman of high character, power, patriotism, a high order of intelligence and an unswerving honesty and fidelity . . . . He is a true representative of his party,—better in some respects, worse in none, and my complaint against him is solely and simply that he is a Democrat.

After the convention ended, Campbell spent approximately one week in arranging for the plans of his campaign. He was happy to announce that he was receiving valuable advice from Allen G. Thurman, Calvin S. Brice, John M. Pattison, William S. Grosbeck, Frank Hurd, and General G. W. Denver among others. He specifically singled out his fellow townsman, James E. Neal, the ex-Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the Chairman of the Democratic State Executive Committee and as his main advisor. He described his as "the most adroit, suave, and efficient man I have ever seen." Concluding, he added the name of George W. Meeker, ex-mayor of Columbus, as the Secretary for the Democratic campaign and as a man who worked well with others.

On September 3, 1889, the Democrats held a meeting in Columbus to arrange for the final organization of the
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campaign. There Lawrence Neal introduced Campbell to the assembly of party workers as the next Governor of Ohio. Approaching the podium amid enthusiastic applause, the nominee uttered, "If this is the way people feel all over the State, I guess I will be the next Governor." Noting the presence of a man from the State of Georgia in the crowd, he observed that the Southerner was present to witness how a northern state prepared for a campaign. Campbell was pleased to announce that both wings of the party had recognized that the Civil War had ended long ago and that peace and reunion were now the goal rather than Foraker's continual waving of the bloody shirt. In reply to the Governor's and Murat Halstead's public charge that he "had heaped personal abuse" upon them, Campbell said that he had pointed out some general areas where evil continued to exist. He argued that, if both Halstead and Foraker associated evil with themselves, then it was their own guilty consciences which indicted them and not Campbell. The nominee then proceeded to expand upon this theme and announced that he would continue to attack the autocratic Governor who robbed the Democratic city of Hamilton of its right to select its own police, fire, and Board of Health officials. He bluntly commented, "No wonder we dislike Foraker." Emotionally, he next introduced a specific charge with which he would continue to press Foraker throughout the campaign. He asked why the former director of the Ohio Soldiers Orphans
Home in Greene County had been replaced after several years of competent administration by a man whose only claim to the post was that he was a loyal supporter of the Governor. Obviously, the nominee believed that it was only another illustration of the dictatorial appointing policy the Republicans had employed to preserve complete control over all opposition.

Meanwhile Foraker was beginning to change his mind over his chance for reelection. Even before Campbell was nominated, the incumbent had written: "It is to be without question the most bitterly contested fight I have ever had . . . . The Democrats are thoroughly organized and are raising money and doing everything else to make themselves formidable." It was not the Democrats that he feared most, rather it was the anti-Foraker Republicans who were not above damming the Governor with faint praise whenever they could. By late July when it appeared that Campbell would be his opponent, Foraker expressed himself in a more confident vein because he felt he could easily defeat him. This was because the intra-party opposition had curtailed their actions against him at this time. He did not realize that it would arise again when Campbell began his aggressive tactics after his nomination.
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John R. McLean, editor of the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, had a staff man accompany Campbell and gave his meetings greater space and prominence than had ever been given to a gubernatorial candidate. As the campaign grew tempestuous, the big newspapers of the country sent their best men to report. Correspondents representing the great dailies of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, and other cities were astonished at the readiness, brilliancy, and lucidity of the Democratic aspirant. Ernest Chamberlain, afterward managing editor of the New York *World* said, "I have seen them all, but this man, as an all-around campaigner, beats anybody I have ever seen. In one day he covered Jackson, Perry, and Muskingum Counties, making seventeen speeches, no two alike, and leaving each community aflame with enthusiasm." \footnote{Sater, Campbell, pp. 32-33; Meeker, "Campbell," Democratic Party of the State of Ohio, p. 317.}

Generally he arrived in each city, town, or village, or wherever he happened to be speaking, with bands playing "The Campbells Are Coming." This tune served to generate a vibrant feeling of enthusiasm in his audiences. It was estimated that over one thousand bands played it during the time which ended only after the successful inaugural ball. It was the magic touchstone which kindled enthusiasm as tinder aids a fire. Campbell's arrivals were
described as "Prosperity Specials" or "Progressive Flyers." Showing no sign of fatigue, he vigorously and unrelentingly delivered his speeches showing that he was delighted and thriving on the assignment. The last few days of the campaign were more like a continuous meeting rather than separate talks.  

As the campaign continued, Campbell attracted larger and larger crowds. His reputation as an unflinching battler who was able to stand formidably against "Fighting Joe" Foraker spread throughout the state. Overwhelming audiences appeared to listen to expound with ridicule and invective against his noted adversary. Constantly he repeated his charge of the nefarious rule of the Governor and his boards and promised to return home rule if given the opportunity.

Campbell stated that he would have preferred to conduct the battle solely on the significant issues separating the two men. He claimed that he was forced to change this plan because of the vituperative attacks heaped upon him by his opponents. He maintained that Foraker's "sharp tongue" had avoided the main issues and had become a direct challenge to his own integrity and competence. In

46Meeker, op. cit., pp. 315-318.

this respect Campbell was quite able to defend himself and, departing from prepared texts, deliver cogent and revealing comments. For instance, while Campbell spoke from the Court House steps in Marion, Ohio, as the big clock in the tower rang the hour of four, without instant hesitation, he called out dramatically, "One! Two! Three! Four! years of Foraker and no more!"^{48}

On another occasion at the close of a cold blustering date in Mercer and Auglaize Counties, he stopped at a school house in New Bremen to address an awaiting crowd. Appealing directly to party loyalties, he quoted the local mayor, prosecuting attorney, and justice of the peace who had stated that there had been few criminal cases in the area. Filled with emotion he elegantly stated, "I know at once that I am among Democrats."^{49} In Hardin County he mentioned that in all his audiences throughout the state large numbers of ladies were in attendance. He claimed that this was proof that his "cause was right" and one which could be observed and heard by all, for he had nothing to hide and would be willing to compare his record against his opponent who was described as a man filled with insidious deeds.\(^{50}\)

^{48}Meeker, "Campbell," Democratic Party of the State of Ohio, p. 316; Sater, Campbell, p. 33. Warren G. Harding was one of the listeners in the audience.

^{49}Sater, Campbell, 33.
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During the early weeks of September the first indications of the type of campaign that would follow unfolded. Campbell was accused of being a member of the board of directors of an English brewing firm which shipped its products to Ohio. Foraker claimed that all of Campbell's utterances regarding trusts and liquor regulations were false and subject to the utmost criticism. He displayed a certificate of the brewing company and pointed significantly to the Butler Countian's signature on the paper.

Shortly after this charge was levied at Campbell, the Democrat quickly disproved it. He vividly and confidently showed that he was not a member of the board of the brewing company but he was a private attorney hired by a client to legally represent him in completing some business transactions. Hence, it was in this capacity that his signature appeared on the brewing firm's stationery and not because he held interest in the company.

After this public explanation Foraker apologized for the charge commenting that the certificate he possessed was vague and not precise. This weakness of the Republican to jump at any sort of charge against his opponent would prove disastrous later on in the struggle, as he failed to examine and verify the veracity of such charges. Although he had been delivering numerous speeches earlier,
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Campbell formally opened his campaign in Waverly, Ohio, on October 1, 1889. Once again he laid down his basic charge against Foraker as an "arrogant despot who intrenches himself behind the great corrupt patronage of irresponsible boards," which consistently deprived the people of Ohio of their basic right to home rule. Secondly, he mentioned the tariff issue as a vital plank in his program. He recognized that Ohio could do nothing about it independently because the tariff was a national question subject to the United States Congress. He did offer a solution by arguing that Ohio could initiate a trend for the Democratic Party and its policies which would culminate in the Presidential election of 1892. He affirmed that the Republican concept of a protective tariff did not represent equality. He asked how many immigrants, who would soon join the labor force, were denied entrance into the country. He answered by shouting that very few were prohibited. Thus the working elements of the country were constantly facing greater competition for jobs and their employers were benefiting from high tariffs which drove out any foreign competition. Campbell believed that equal treatment should be rendered in all phases of the economic world.

As he was speaking, a shout from the audience asked his position on the flag controversy between ex-President Cleveland and Foraker. Campbell was asked if he would keep the Ohio captured mementoes if he were governor.
The Civil War veteran replied by saying, "Yes sir! And if you want more we will organize the militia and go down South after them."

Returning to the economic issue, he challenged the Republican contention that the revenue received from the high tariff removed the necessity of levying more internal taxes. He maintained that the laboring class was forced to pay higher rates under the protective tariff policy than they would under a low tariff policy added to an internal tax. This was based upon the premise that the wealthy manufacturers would be required to help share equally in the taxes which they were not paying in 1889. Moreover he expected the low tariff program would stimulate increased imports to the degree that the revenues collected would remove any need for an internal tax. He believed essentially only the monopolists were spared the added expenditures because the laboring classes had to buy the higher priced, locally produced products and had no choice. He specifically mentioned the salt, tinplate, and wool producers as the chief exponents of this logic.

In conclusion he turned to the question of home rule. He compared this struggle to the situation in Ireland and commented that at least the British did not try to hide behind devious laws in welding their control. He charged Foraker as a completely despicable man who used democratic institutions to appoint boards which were only responsible
to him and not to the people. 52

After this speech Campbell started on his tour throughout the state. Never repeating the same speech, he usually used each speech as an occasion to expand on his Waverly pronouncements. For instance, his Batavia talk centered on the tariff question and its relation to William McKinley whom Campbell regarded as one of the protectionists' leading exponents. The Democrat denied Foraker's claim that prosperity existed in Ohio. He pointed to the plight of the Hocking Valley miners and the Findlay glassware workers. He denied that protection helped them and argued that only a reduction in the tariff would alleviate the sufferings of the unfortunates. Challenging the Republicans, he demanded that they remove protection from the basic necessities of life. He relented only in the area of luxuries, alcohol, and tobacco, and stated that some items could be kept in the protection category. Finally, turning to McKinley's argument that protection had brought the United States to its prosperity level, Campbell proudly said it was the "national wealth, industry, and the intelligent efforts of the people which were the main cause of our prosperity." 53

Although he often alluded to such national issues as
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the one previously cited, Campbell continually questioned domestic affairs within the Buckeye State. Whenever he was given the chance, he emphasized and repeatedly proclaimed "home rule for the Cities of Ohio and Ireland." Additionally thousands of miniature carpenter rulers were inscribed with the slogan and distributed throughout the state. 54

Specifically, Campbell attacked the various boards established throughout the state under Foraker's administration. In essence most of the boards were originally staffed by local inhabitants who were appointed by local officials or elected by the local voters. Foraker claimed that it was impossible to elect non-partisan boards, especially election and city improvement boards members. Consequently, he argued that the dangers of local partisanship would be removed if the positions were filled with judicious appointments by the Governor.

Campbell retaliated by asserting that in actual practice the boards still remained corrupt and under the influence of certain political bosses, namely Foraker. Speaking at Athens, Ohio, the Democrat proclaimed that "The Boards worshipped Foraker first and God next." Later, while in Napoleon, Ohio, he denied the Republican contention that he was opposed to all election boards and that he favored

mob action. He stated he was not opposed to election laws, but that he was opposed to the partisan manner in which they were conducted under the Republican election boards. Furthermore, he argued that his opponent was evasive when he forcefully claimed that he had rid the city of Cincinnati of boss rule under the control of the local Democratic party. However, the Butler Countian showed that the Queen City was under a machine far worse, that of the notorious Cincinnatian, George "Boss" Cox. He compared the situation in Cincinnati to that of Ireland by stating he had "complete sympathy for Irish home rule", but an Irishman in Ireland had more political rights than an Irish voter in the County of Hamilton. He stated that the citizens were deprived of absolutely all voice in the administration of local affairs by the intervention of the Foraker Boards.

He warned his audience in Bucyrus, Ohio, that if Foraker should be reelected for a third time, they could expect him to start appointing all the judges within the state. He charged that nepotism was a factor in appointments as he singled out the current police chief in Hamilton County as the "brother of a close political
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friend of Foraker."

He constructively promised that if he were elected, he would bring an immediate end to the partisan boards, and he would use his influence for the enactment of laws that would enable the people to choose their own public servants and control their own affairs. Beyond this point he was not specific because he felt that the generalization was satisfactory and that particulars could be developed if he were elected.

Campbell did not stress the pension issue to any degree perhaps because of his open disagreement with the ex-president, Grover Cleveland. On a few occasions, however, he did present his views as he had outlined them earlier. He indicated that he had supported any program which would render aid to needy and physically disabled veterans who were directly injured in the war. Speaking at the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home in Xenia, Ohio, Campbell displayed a deep emotional conviction concerning the operation of the institution under the Foraker administrations. He said that he was filled with great pride when he saw that children of his dead comrades were being given valuable support during the difficult years of their lives. At the same time, however, he burned with disgust over the poor care and general
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lack of interest rendered the misfortunate children by Foraker. Campbell declared in no uncertain terms that it was the direct duty of the government to provide pensions for all misfortunate veterans throughout the state.\footnote{Cincinnati Enquirer, September 27, 1889.}

As Campbell toured the state, his chances for victory were directly aided by dissatisfaction with the incumbent administration. Foraker had confidently anticipated a rather easy victory once the apparently bitter intraparty squabble had ended. As the summer passed, Foraker delivered many speeches, often two a day, and stressed the importance of honest elections, registration of voters, success of the non-partisan boards, and the need for tariff protection.

By midsummer an event occurred which enlivened the campaign and eventually took many votes from the Governor. The state legislature in 1888 amended the Dow Law by increasing the tax paid by saloon keepers and prohibited the sale of liquor on Sundays. This latter provision known as the Owen Law, had generally been regarded as a dead issue throughout the state until July 25, 1889, when the Committee of One Hundred in Cincinnati demanded that Mayor John B. Mosby enforce it. The Committee in its demands implied that the reason for the failure of enforcement was the local Republican judge's desire for reelection. Faced
with their demand, Mosby replied that he would enforce the law.

After the advent of Mosby's declaration the League for the Preservation of Citizens' Rights, composed of saloon-keepers, liquor dealers, and those interested in personal freedoms, was formed to oppose Mosby's enforcement. When a meeting on July 26 was called, a noticeably German-dominated assemblage of over five hundred gathered at the Turner Hall to prepare their defense. Openly defiant, they resolved to continue opening their businesses on the Sabbath and not to shrink before what they considered to be despotic authority. Although only 212 of the assembled throng signed the petition against enforcement, covert sympathy was extended by the thousands of Cincinnatians who regularly spent their Sunday afternoons in the beer halls and beer gardens throughout the city. They believed that they harmed no one and were merely spending a pleasant afternoon with their friends and neighbors. They opposed the puritanical effort to deprive them of their legitimate rights and pleasures. 60

When Foraker read of the Turner Hall meeting, he wrote to Mayor Mosby directing him, "Do not tolerate any defiance of law." He continued by affirming that anyone

who rebels against any legally enacted law was "not worthy to enjoy the free institutions of America." The Mayor was told to "Smite every manifestation of such a spirit with a swift and heavy hand." 61

This bold and decisive position proved costly to the Governor. He lost the support of liquor interests, the saloon-keepers, the personal liberty seekers, and those who were not openly aggressive, but disliked the law and expressed their displeasure on election day. Campbell reaped the benefits without taking a direct position himself. Prior to the election the Ohio State Journal reported that the liquor interests were strongly supporting the Democratic Party financially. The Citizens' Rights League organized and distributed numerous handbills holding Foraker responsible for all the adverse liquor legislation during the previous four years and urging support for the movement to oust the Governor and all his friends. 62

Foraker refused to concede anything and disregarded the rising opposition. He supported Mosby and the subsequent arrests of those Cincinnatians who defied the law and continued this policy in the closing days of the campaign. In a speech in the new Armory Hall in Cincinnati, he vowed that
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he would continue to enforce the laws and that he would never turn his back on duty, party, or friends.  

Foraker did not have a "political machine" in the usual sense of the term. He depended upon strong friendships maintained through personal meetings and voluminous correspondence.

His most important supporter was George B. Cox of Hamilton County, formerly a Cincinnati saloon-keeper who had become a power in politics. By 1884 he had headed the Republican campaign committee and had controlled the appointments within the city.  

Foraker described him saying, "Cox is not a Sunday School supervisor, but he is a man of ability, always reliable, not a bummer nor a politician for revenue . . . ." Foraker believed that the city boss had done more to increase his voting strength than any other man.

Xenia, Ohio, was selected by Foraker for the opening of his campaign. He attacked ex-president Cleveland as an incapable administrator who lacked true patriotism because he had failed to serve in the Civil War in contrast to the Republican President, Benjamin Harrison. The fiery Republican shouted that when Cleveland was defeated, free trade
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was also defeated. In its place, the banner of protection had risen, and the only issue was the specific levels of protection to be adopted by the Republican dominated Congress.

Foraker warned his audience that the approaching election was more than just a battle for the governorship. He called attention to the fact that United States Senator Henry Payne's term of office was ending and that a Republican's election to Payne's seat was imperative in order to have a more acceptable representative.

Turning his attention to his opponent, Foraker charged that Campbell was not a true Democrat. Moreover, he added, the Democrats had not had a true party candidate since Governor Bishop held office twelve years earlier. The intervening gubernatorial candidates were described as merely Republicans who had left their party and thrust themselves on the Democrats. The Governor said, "If you want to vote for a Republican, vote for the winning Republican."

In conclusion he turned his attention to the tariff issue. He argued that contrary to Campbell's claims, workers in free trading nations generally suffered more troubles than those in protection oriented states. Using Great Britain as his example, he called the audience's attention to England's traditional allegiance to free trade and the concurrent number of labor strikes in existence there. He claimed that the reason that there were
few instances of labor unrest in the United States was a result of the relative stability of industries which were not plagued by foreign competition. Furthermore, he stated that Campbell was entirely incorrect when he and his fellow Democrats said protection tended to develop trusts. Again alluding to England, he stated that it was only necessary to count the large industry-controlling trusts there and compare that total to the almost complete absence of similar enterprises in the United States. Thus he ended by shouting that the big free trade nations produced the largest trusts. 66

During the month of September Campbell constantly attacked the various state boards, and he specifically singled out the Board of Public Affairs in Cincinnati, commonly referred to as the B.P.A., as a corrupt and thoroughly partisan body. Although he generated some interest, he failed to demonstrate conclusively that his allegations were true. When he had delivered his official keynote campaign speech in Waverly, Ohio, he had indicated that if it were necessary, he would bring convincing proof of his charges into the contest.

On October 2 Campbell delivered his address in the Pike Opera House in Cincinnati, the focal point of the Board controversy. Campbell opened his speech by referring
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to the vicious and personal attacks on his character. He explained that in an effort to defend himself, he was now forced to take a more open stand on his charges. During the early part of his speech he took an envelope from his pocket and waved it before the audience. Directing the attention of the assemblage to it, he explained that it contained a letter written to George F. Campbell, a Cincinnati contractor, who was sitting in one of the front rows of the audience. The Democratic nominee described his namesake as "a man of reputable character, and a good citizen of the city of Cincinnati," who in the pursuit of his business sold gravel to the Board of Public Affairs. The transaction was described originally as a normal honest arrangement until George Topp, the Chairman and board member who conducted the purchase, wrote a letter to the contractor which directed him to raise the cost of the gravel and to send a part of the difference of the two costs to Topp. The Democratic nominee then read the following letter:

Detroit, Mich.
June 8, 1889

Mr. George Campbell
Cincinnati, Ohio

My Dear Sir,

Please make out your bills for gravel that you have delivered up to Saturday, June 8, 1889. Make the bills $1.00 a yard, and you pay me a drawback of twenty-five cents a yard in cash. I bought your gravel very cheap. It is fairly worth to the city $1.00. Get your bills in such shape that
none will exceed $500.00. Send them to me at Put-in-Bay and I will O.K. them.

George Topp

For a moment the audience was stunned into silence. Then cries calling for Campbell to read the letter again arose. The speaker, however, refused and handed it to the contractor and continued on with his speech in which he noted that Topp was a Foraker appointee and represented the type of government the Republicans had devised. He bitterly accused the Governor of imposing a strict policy of "bossism" and of government by gang rule on Ohio.

The following day jubilant Democrats pressed the Republican Mayor of Cincinnati, John Mosby, to launch an investigation into the affairs of the board. Cautiously the city executive agreed to examine Topp's activities, but he refused to arrange for a general study of the board demanded by his opponents.

On the defensive the Republicans replied that Topp was temporarily insane when the letter was written. Mrs. Topp, members of the Board of Public Affairs, several doctors, and even George Cox signed affidavits to that effect. Mosby accepted this position and conducted his investigation solely on the mental condition of the letter writer. Several other witnesses appeared and averred that
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Topp had written other wild and meaningless letters. Finally, as proof of the general Republican contention, Topp was committed to an asylum. Later, his defenders argued that even if Topp were entirely in control of his mental faculties, the letter to George Campbell was written after the gravel contract had been signed. Hence, the contractor could not have received the higher payment even with the support of the chairman of the Board of Public Affairs. 68

Even though the Republican continually defended Topp's honesty, Campbell's sensational exposure was a staggering blow to their cause. To counteract this scandal Murat Halstead published on October 3 an open letter to Campbell. Since Campbell had resorted to "gangster language and methods" and had used a crazy man's letter in an attempt to challenge the integrity of the board, he [Halstead] would reveal that he had proof that Campbell had a monied interest in a ballot-box monopoly. He charged that when Campbell was a member of Congress, he had introduced a bill proposing that a uniform ballot-box be adopted for all federal elections. Furthermore the incensed editor accused the Democratic candidate of being a major stockholder in a ballot-box company which contained the same dimensions as the one in the proposed bill. Consequently if the bill

were to be adopted and become law, Campbell and his associates, by virtue of their patent monopoly, would be the sole distributor for the nation and would stand to make a tremendous fortune at the taxpayer's expense.

Following his threat Halstead published on October 4 a facsimile of Campbell's signature on a ballot-box certificate. It read:

Washington, D.C.
July 2, 1889

We, the undersigned, agree to pay the amounts set opposite, or any part thereof, whenever requested so to do by John R. McLean, upon "Contract No. 1,000," a copy of which is to be given to each subscriber upon payment of any part of the money hereby subscribed.

It is understood that each subscription of five thousand dollars shall entitle the subscribers thereof to a one-twentieth interest in said contract

1. James Edwin Campbell (Signature). Five Thousand Dollars
2. James Edwin Campbell (Signature). Five Thousand Dollars
3. James Edwin Campbell (Signature). Five Thousand Dollars

Campbell was thus openly accused of trust participation with a product to be sold to the federal government.69

Halstead had launched his attack without the knowledge of Foraker. Although Foraker had knowledge of the document's existence, he was greatly surprised to see the newspaper facsimile of the ballot-box certificate bearing
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Campbell's signature. Furthermore, it was Foraker who had turned the contract over to Halstead, but he had not been prepared to see it publicly exposed at that time.

The affair had begun much earlier than the October 4 exposure date. Its inception began shortly after Foraker's renomination. A Cincinnati lawyer, Louis Hadden, told the Governor that he would probably face formidable opposition in the campaign from prominent Republicans as well as James Campbell, the expected Democratic nominee at that time. When Foraker asked why, the attorney explained that when Campbell had been a Congressman, he had introduced a bill requiring the use of a standard size ballot-box in all federal elections. The company to manufacture these boxes was owned by Campbell and certain Republican leaders who were not designated at the time. They all would make a considerable fortune if the bill were enacted and the monopoly held together. After further questioning Hadden eventually promised that he would be able to obtain the original subscription certificate through Richard Wood of the Hall and Wood Company of Cincinnati, the potential manufacturers of the patented ballot-box.

Following this disclosure, Foraker in early July contacted Wood, for he "thought it was not only a privilege but a duty" to acquire the paper. Wood visited the Republican Governor in Columbus and after some delay he secured an agreement from Foraker whereby Foraker would recommend
Wood for a position as smoke inspector in Cincinnati when Wood produced the ballot-box certificate.

In late August Wood wrote from Washington D.C. asking Foraker for an immediate letter of introduction to be addressed to President Harrison. Foraker wrote the letter for Wood and sent him two hundred dollars along with it to help defray his Washington expenses. Finally on September 1 Wood turned the contract over to Foraker and departed.

Foraker was astonished to find, in addition to Campbell's name, the names of John Sherman, William McKinley, and Benjamin Butterworth among others on the paper. With his secretary, Charles Kurts, and other friends, he examined the signatures and came to the conclusion that they were genuine. Realizing the seriousness of the matter and the impact it could cause on his own party, he decided to wait before taking any further action.

In mid-September the Republican Governor showed the document to Murat Halstead who immediately demanded that either Foraker make it public or he would. The newspaper editor had been an enemy of Campbell for a long time and relished the thought of exposing the Democrat as an unfit holder of public office. He argued that it was his public duty to prevent such a man as Campbell from being elected governor. Unwisely, Foraker agreed to turn over to Halstead photostatic copies of the contract, but it was not to be made public until and unless they both agreed it
was appropriate.

Later on during the month Foraker counselled with other party intimates, who all advised him not to use the paper. Generally following this advice, he remained silent on this issue until September 28. Speaking at the Music Hall in Cincinnati, Foraker impulsively mentioned the possibility of hidden motives for Campbell's proposal of a uniform ballot-box. Furthermore, as he held a Wood and Neal box in his hand, he asserted that it was the same box that Campbell sought to have used in all federal elections. Without mentioning the existence of the certificate he charged his opponent with attempting to form a trust at the taxpayers' expense. Labeling Campbell as the man who opposed trusts, he demanded that his opponent explain his hypocritical actions. 70

Despite the public attack upon his adversary Foraker did not expect Halstead to publish the spurious document, and he did not know that the volatile newspaper man would omit the names of the Republicans. 71 This action incensed Sherman and the others who later castigated Foraker for believing them guilty without even checking with them to see if the document were genuine. If he had, the whole sordid affair would have been avoided.
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Campbell made no rebuttal after the charges were levied against him, and Foraker imprudently took his silence as complicity in the affair. He proceeded to deliver tirade after tirade upon his opponent demanding that an explanation be given. Confident of the Democrat's guilt, he answered for him by observing that an answer would be made up of further lies or an open confession. The Cleveland Leader and Herald wrote that the contract proved that Campbell was in league with the disreputable Democrats who had been guilty of stuffing the ballot-boxes at Cincinnati. This paper was willing to charge Campbell with all the evil that had existed in Ohio for the previous decade.  

While the Republicans were going out on a proverbial limb, silently yet confidently, Campbell secured the services of Judge Judson Harmon, later Governor of Ohio, to conduct a behind-the-scene investigation. He contacted the Hall and Wood Company and quickly learned that Campbell's signature and those of the others on the certificate were all forgeries. The manufacturers confessed they had obtained them from the frank-bearing mail of the several men involved.

Continuing his cautious policy, Campbell slowly started his defense. In a speech at Germantown, Ohio, he began to strike back. He exhibited a letter from Foraker
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to Governor Luce of Michigan that recommended the very same ballot-boxes and the services of Richard Wood. The letter indicated that Foraker had learned that Michigan was contemplating the adoption of a uniform ballot-box and that Foraker was especially happy to recommend the box because of the general satisfaction received by its use in Cincinnati. The Governor concluded the letter by saying, "Any favor conferred upon him (Wood) will be appreciated by me."  

Campbell then explained his own motives for introducing the ballot-box bill in Congress. He related that an attorney for the Hall and Wood Company had requested him to present the bill because all the stockholders were members of the Republican Party. Consequently the lawyer argued that if a Republican had presented the proposal, the danger of a charge of vested interests could be raised. Because of this the ballot-box manufacturer turned to Campbell, a Democrat and a representative from the greater Cincinnati area. Campbell stated that he agreed to propose the bill only on the condition that the Attorney-General of the United States could establish the uniform price of the boxes. In summation, he explained that these were the only circumstances and interests under which he agreed to present the bill. Finally, he stoutly maintained that he
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had no other connection with the company and that the attack upon him was completely false.

By October 10, 1889, Judge Harmon had obtained signed affidavits by Wood and Hadden clearing Campbell of any conspiracy charges and fully confessing that the signatures on the certificate were forged. He then confronted Halstead with the proof and received from the deflated editor his promise to retract publicly his newspaper allegations of October 4.

Humbled and humiliated, Halstead immediately wrote a retraction of his earlier charges. It appeared in the editorial section of the Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette under the heading "A Personal Statement to the Public." In it, Halstead traced the episode back to his earlier statements of October 3 and 4 when he first attacked Campbell. He reported that he had been given a facsimile of the certificate and that it had appeared genuine. It was not until the preceding evening that he was supplied with definite proof that Campbell's signature was forged. Unhesitatingly, he continued, "That there may be no shade of doubt upon my exact meaning, I have to say that Mr. Campbell's signature as it has been used is fraudulent . . . and it is my duty at once to declare the truth." 74
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Defensively, the editor questioned Campbell for not replying to the charges sooner. Furthermore he asked why the Democrat had refused to reply immediately to Foraker's questions of September 28. Halstead maintained that he and his party had been the victims of a cruel hoax themselves and that he was entirely responsible for its public use. He completely exonerated Foraker from any participation in the release of the forgery. Halstead then called the voters to forget what had transpired and stated that both Foraker and Campbell should return to the campaign as of September 28.

It is interesting to note that Halstead did not publish a complete copy of the forged certificate. The names of McKinley, Sherman, and Butterworth were still not released to the public. Not only had Halstead erred in his rash use of the document, but he also made a grave error in omitting the names of the Republican leaders. He left himself and his party open to further attacks of gross partisanship by Campbell and his party colleagues. Halstead and Hadden had both prevailed upon Judge Harmon not to bring forth the remaining names, but they were only able to receive a reply that the decision rested with Campbell and no one else. 75

Claude Meeker, who was later to become Campbell's
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personal secretary, later reported, "Only those who were actively associated with the Democratic campaign that year, can recall the excitement of that memorable October day when the newspapers, with glaring headlines, came out with the news of the Ballot-Box Forgery." Campbell was addressing an afternoon open air meeting at Orrville, Ohio, when "the famous silver-tongued orator, John McSweeney, of Wooster, quivering with excitement, strode into the crowd waving a copy of the Commercial-Gazette containing Halstead's retraction. In stentorian tones, he announced that 'fraud and forgery could not prevail against the just.'"76

The Cincinnati Enquirer wrote that the ballot-box hoax had been exposed and that Campbell showed his ability by remaining silent and letting the Republicans dig their own political graves. Referring specifically to Halstead, the editorialist wrote that in all reality, judging from his past record as an "infamous scoundrel", everyone should have expected some deception. Writing of Foraker, the reporter wondered what action he would take toward Halstead and Campbell. Sarcastically, the writer stated that if Foraker wanted to continue his association with Halstead, then he too would be an "infamous scoundrel."77
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Discovering the truth of the charges, Foraker apologized to Campbell for the personal attack. He repeated Halstead's statement that he was not aware that the certificate would be published, but he still wondered why his opponent had refused to publicly reply to the charges earlier. Furthermore, in response to Campbell's German-town, Ohio, exposure, the Governor replied that the letter to Governor Luce of Michigan was merely a letter of introduction. He positively affirmed that he had no other intent than to introduce the ballot-box to Luce's attention. Aside from that he had no personal interests whatsoever.  

This ballot-box episode proved even more disastrous for the Republicans as the campaign developed. Waiting until the final week, Campbell then disclosed to the public the full contents of the forged document. The names of McKinley, Sherman, and Butterworth were now shown to have been on the certificate as well as the fact that Halstead had purposely omitted them in his attack upon Campbell. The fiery Democrat charged gross partisanship and asked why his name alone had been used.

Not only did the last minute expose alienate voters from the Republican ranks, but it also had the added effect of disturbing the three prominent Republican leaders. They were forced to answer embarrassing questions as to
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why their names had not appeared sooner and what course of action they would take. John Sherman confided in his 

Recollections later that

It has always seemed strange to me that Foraker, having in his possession a paper which implicated Butterworth, McKinley, and myself, in what all men would regard as a dishonorable transaction, did not inform us and give us an opportunity to deny, affirm or explain our alleged signatures.79

Sherman later demanded immediately after the election that Halstead make public the entire history of the "forged papers" and explain why he did not do so earlier. Essentially, Sherman was placing the full responsibility upon the newspaperman because he found his own denials of any connection in the affair were weakly received. 80

McKinley and Butterworth, then Congressmen, both demanded a Congressional investigation based on the original ballot-box proposal of Campbell. The committee, known as the (William) Mason Committee, began in January and conducted hearings until April. Testimony and statements were heard from fifty-four witnesses including the three aforementioned Republicans and Campbell, Judge Harmon, Foraker and Halstead. Highlighting the meetings were the repeated bitter clashes between Charles Grosvenor, who
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represented McKinley and Butterworth, and Foraker. Indeed, the G.O.P. was faced with a wide internal fissure. The final committee report charged that Wood prepared the forged contract and that Halstead and Foraker had aided and abetted the scandal, but they had acted without knowing it to be false. In summation, the report cleared the people whose names were on the contract from any guilt.

The committee, aside from its chairman who completely exonerated them from any guilt, censured Halstead and Foraker for using the contract without definite verification of the signatures. Specifically, Foraker was censured for accepting a document from a man like Wood because the contract itself demonstrated "his depravity." Halstead was censured for only publishing Campbell's name and not the others. It was alleged that this act was partly caused by Halstead's bitter attitude toward Campbell, especially because of the Democrat's constant referral to him as "the ex-Minister to Germany." This statement was used repeatedly by Campbell in reference to the Senate's refusal in the past to confirm Halstead's appointment as ambassador to Germany under President Harrison.


The results of the ballot-box forgery proved decisive in the election. To add to his troubles, Foraker was unable to participate in the closing days of the campaign because of a threatened attack of peritonitis. The illness came at a time that he could least afford to be bedridden. He was unable to tour the state in an effort to overcome the results of both the saloon-keepers' rebellion and the forgery fiasco. Although he had not completely recovered, he made a speech November 1 at Dayton and another the following day at the New Armory Hall in Cincinnati. The latter talk was a typical Foraker outburst containing his usual "Vim, Vigor and Victory" shouts before a cheering crowd of eighteen thousand. Unfortunately for him, he had little time to regain the votes lost to his Democratic opponent.

Campbell ended his campaign at Eaton, Ohio, on November 4. Two days earlier, however, he delivered his last sensational charges when he appeared in the music hall in Cincinnati before a receptive throng of fifteen thousand Democrats. He attacked the Board of Public Affairs as a corrupt body and promised his audience that if he were elected he would repeal the legislation which had established the board and restore home-rule to the city. In reference to George Topp, he asked whether the city could
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continue under such a type of regime. Finally, bringing forth all his invectiveness, he retold the story of the ballot-box and called for the election of men of integrity rather than the unscrupulous scoundrels then in power.  

After a short speech in Eaton, Campbell returned to Hamilton to await the election. James Neal, his campaign manager, predicted victory saying, "I am confident of success. I think we will elect the state ticket and the legislature." Election day in Hamilton and throughout the state was generally a fair day except for the northern lake areas which had a light rain and snow. The early returns on the following day proved inconclusive although Foraker's votes were fewer in comparison with his earlier election contests in the cities, particularly in Dayton, Columbus, and Cincinnati. By midnight of the same day Republicans began to concede the Governorship to Campbell. Responding confidently, the Democrats throughout the state raised a new tune, "The Campbells Have Come!" The entire state ticket and a sizable Democratic majority in the Assembly were running ahead of their opponents. Shouts and opinions were heard proclaiming that Campbell would do for the nation what he had done for Ohio, that is, 
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Although the Democratic plurality fell in the next few days and the state ticket aside from Campbell fell into the Republican column, the state Assembly was under Democratic control. The final returns showed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>379,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foraker</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>368,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helwig</td>
<td>Prohibition</td>
<td>26,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>Union Leader</td>
<td>1,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattered</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campbell's plurality of 10,872 votes was distributed almost evenly throughout the state outside of Hamilton County which gave him a plurality of 7,253 votes over Foraker's 33,550. The Democrat carried every precinct, ward and township of his own Butler County by 3,575 votes.

After the decision was official, Foraker wrote to friends that he was chagrined and mortified at his defeat. He could not get over the feeling that he had been singled out to be alienated. He keenly felt that the lack of support by the Sherman-Hanna Republicans during the campaign had led to his downfall. He demonstrated with some logic that he had received approximately 1200 votes more than he received in 1887 and 8,000 more votes than in 1885. He argued that his personal popularity had risen, but it was the larger turnout that had proved costly. Confidently
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he believed that he received more votes than any other Republican could have under similar circumstances.

Turning to ex-president Rutherford B. Hayes of Ohio, Foraker lamented that his fellow Ohioan had not given him as much support as he might have. Hayes' attitude toward Foraker had been one of cool acceptance. He viewed Foraker as "brilliant, witty, eloquent and very popular with the hurrah boys . . . ." Consequently, he attributed the defeat to blind partisanship by Foraker rather than any other force. William Howard Taft, later President of the nation, expressed the opinion that the defeat was caused by the third term issue, and the Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette said it was the Sunday liquor law and the letter to Mayor Mosby which cost the Republican at least 5,000 Cincinnati votes.

Not to be forgotten, however, was the astute political wisdom displayed by Campbell. His disclosure of the Topp irregularity, his initial silence on the ballot-box forgery, and his ability to match Foraker as a vigorous campaigner were masterful displays. His use of the no third-term motto, his call for home-rule, and his moderate support of the liquor interests all served to bring votes into his column. Finally, he was the standard bearer of
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a united party calling for a state wide change in Ohio's political control. This latter point was evident after the election when throughout the state Democratic jubilation parties proved to be long and enthusiastic affairs. They ridiculed their opponents and singled out such newspapers as the Dayton *Journal* which had strongly endorsed the noble Negro before the election but afterwards had lambasted the "coons who sold their votes to the Democrats." 91

Campbell cautioned his colleagues by affirming that victory now meant responsibility. He announced that as soon as he was inaugurated, he would call for the adoption of a secret ballot system of elections, an honest count, and an end to corruption. Furthermore, he repeated his campaign motto of "No third term" not even for himself.

This high point of Campbell's career would not be easily forgotten. In 1923 at the time of a large eightieth birthday celebration, one of the congratulatory letters recalled the extreme satisfaction attendant upon Campbell's victory. The writer remembered that although he was a mere lad at the time, he had accompanied his father throughout the campaign to hear Campbell speak. He stated that on the day following the election no news had arrived because of the lack of quick communications at the time, but the valley had arranged to fire a series
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of cannon shots to indicate that the Democrat had won. The letter recounted what had appeared to be eons of time and the strain as silence continued. Finally, as he had accompanied his father on a walk to the hill overlooking the town, as they approached the summit, the "boom-boom" of the cannons was heard. The letter writer recalled, "I was overjoyed but I do not remember what I said or did; but with his face lighted up and aglow, almost as I have so often seen it in our own house, father exclaimed: "Campbell is elected! Campbell is elected!"  
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92Sater, Campbell, pp. 36-37.
CHAPTER V

A TURBULENT YEAR

In the months that followed his election victory James Edwin Campbell prepared to lay the foundations for his administration. He had campaigned on several basic issues and was elected along with a Democratic majority in the Ohio General Assembly. Basically conservative, the Governor-elect believed that it was his duty to proceed immediately to carry out his program. He realized that the eyes of the nation were now looking favorably toward him and Ohio. Anyone who was able to defeat such a figure as Joseph Benson Foraker in a State whose leaders included such Republican stalwarts as John Sherman, William McKinley, and Mark Hanna was worth observing. Disregarding internal problems within the state Republican party, Campbell's victory loomed bright upon the political horizon. Campbell's main concern would be the establishment of a successful and responsible Democratic administration. If he could do this, his chances for further national recognition and attainment could be expected.

After a restful vacation immediately after the election Campbell solved certain problems. First he secured a residence in the city of Columbus because at that time
no facilities were provided by the state. After some searching he arranged to rent the Alfred Kelley mansion located on East Broad Street. He leased it for two years with an option for two years thereafter.\(^1\)

Campbell returned to Hamilton, Ohio, to make the final arrangements for his move to the state capital. On January 11 he traveled to Columbus in a special car provided by the Superintendent of the Cincinnati, Hamilton, and Dayton Railroad. He was accompanied by his three oldest children. His wife and youngest son were not able to travel because of the youth's sickness.\(^2\)

Ominously, Inauguration Day, January 13, 1890, proved to be a cold, windy, and rainy day. Despite the weather tens of thousands of Ohioans crowded the principal thoroughfares from one end of the line of march to the other. Accompanied by the departing Governor, Joseph Benson Foraker, Campbell proceeded amidst the constant roars of approval from the crowd. Eventually the parade reached the State House where Campbell was administered the oath of office and delivered his inaugural address.

As he approached the podium, Campbell was as "Tall, strong, straight as a lane, high of head, handsome, with the impalpable something about him which horse folk grasp

\(^1\)Cincinnati Enquirer, January 2, 1890.
\(^2\)Ibid., January 12, 1890.
at under the name of 'class'."³ Departing from the usual custom of delivering an address to the general public, Campbell instead spoke especially to the members of the General Assembly. He said that the election was a complete endorsement by the people of Ohio for home rule. He insisted that the Governor of Ohio should be divested of authority to appoint election boards and clerks and other governing boards which enable him to control virtually most of the cities. He advised the legislature by saying, "The perplexing problem confronting you is to decide what form of government to substitute in the City of Cincinnati for that now enforced, . . ." Turning his attention to other points, he urged the adoption of the Australian ballot, an investigation and reform of the various veteran and orphan homes, the establishment of forestry conservation, and a state library and museum. In conclusion he urged the Assembly to "Devise some legislation that will demand a careful revision and equalization of assessments . . . and . . . cheaper school books".⁴

The incoming General Assembly, the 69th, was controlled by the Democratic party in both houses. The Senate


was composed of nineteen Democrats to seventeen Republicans; the lower House was composed of sixty-four Democrats to fifty Republicans. Perry M. Adams of the thirty-first district was elected president pro tem of the Senate, and Neal R. Hysell of Perry County was elected Speaker of the House. Other prominent Democrats were William A. Taylor, Clerk of the Senate, John M. Pattison, David M. Massie, Guy Mallon, and Harry Daugherty.  

The first president, ex officio, of the Senate was Elbert L. Lampson, a Republican, who had earlier received a certificate of election as Lieutenant Governor. The original returns had given him a victory by a total of twenty-two votes. William V. Marquis, his Democratic opponent in the election, had filed suit against the certification and brought the case before the Senate. After a short investigation the legislative body ruled on January 30 that Lampson's original certificate of election was invalid and that Marquis was legally recognized as the winner. Marquis, who was in his home in Bellefontaine, Ohio, at the time, was notified and given the oath of


6Journal of the Senate, LXXXVI, p. 141. The final vote following party lines almost entirely was eighteen for disposing of Lampson and sixteen for retaining.
office there.  7

One of the first duties of the new assembly was to elect a United States Senator to replace retiring Senator Henry B. Payne. After much speculation Calvin S. Brice emerged triumphant. Campbell, even though he was the titular head of the party, refused to support any candidate. When questioned about his sentiments, he responded that it was a matter for the party and the General Assembly and not for him. He did respond favorably, however, after the decision was announced. 8

After the initial festivities subsided, Campbell was forced to go to Washington, D.C. to testify about his role in the ballot-box investigation. He became the immediate center of attention and was constantly asked his opinion on the future of the Democratic Party on the national scene. When asked if he would support a motion to wage the 1892 presidential election campaign on the tariff issue alone, as the party had done unsuccessfully in 1888, the newly elected Governor answered that the tariff question was important, but he did not feel then that it should be the only point separating the two major parties. When asked if ex-President Cleveland would be renominated for

7Cincinnati Enquirer, January 31, 1890.
8Sater, Campbell, p. 38; Charles B. Galbreath, History of Ohio, II, 646.
the 1892 contest, the Ohioan again hedged by saying that the New Yorker was the "most prominent Democrat today, but two years from now the situation may change". This answer elicited a third question concerning predictions that the Democratic ticket would be Governor David B. Hill of New York for the Presidency and Campbell for the Vice-Presidency. Laughingly, the Ohioan said, "I hadn't heard of it. No one has spoken to me of it. At present, I am devoting all of my time to studying the needs of the State of Ohio." He specifically singled out the need for ballot-box reform.

Campbell remained in Washington for a couple of weeks and appeared on the witness stand for two days. He constantly remained in the limelight and seemed to relish the opportunity to deal with the ideas raised in the various interviews. Although he always hedged or refused to give an open answer of intent, he, nevertheless, acted as a potential candidate for national office. An opinion expressed in the interviews was to the effect that the Ohioan was relatively unknown in the South. Shortly after this point was raised, Campbell detoured on his return trip to Ohio and proceeded to Atlanta, Georgia, where he delivered a reconciliation speech calling for party and national unity.

---

9Cincinnati Enquirer, January 31, 1890.
10Ibid., February 4-15, 1890.
Meanwhile in Ohio the Democrats prepared to reap the fruits of their victory. First on the agenda was a plan to redistrict the state. After several long caucuses the party finally agreed on a plan. Representative William P. Price of Hocking County introduced the proposal on February 17. Despite the attempts of the Republicans to delay the vote or split the Democrats the majority remained steadfast. On February 26 the motion carried by a vote of sixty to forty-six. Action in the Senate, however, was delayed by Senator John N. Soncranct who wished to amend the bill to keep his area Democratic. Because his vote was considered vital by virtue of the close party alignment, it appeared that the bill was doomed. After numerous party pressures the recalcitrant Soncranct decided to vote for the bill, and it was passed and signed by Campbell on March 11, 1890. This gerrymandering proved vital during the following fall elections because the Democrats were faced with the special session disruption, but they still managed to win fourteen of the twenty-one Congressional seats. Notable among the Republican casualties was William McKinley, the chief exponent of tariff protection.

Especially important in the Campbell program was his

---

11Ibid., February 27, 1890.
12Journal of the Senate, LXXXVI, p. 478.
call for home rule for the cities. The issue had been a major factor in the campaign, and the Governor felt his victory was a mandate by the people to grant self-government. The existing Board of Public Affairs in Cincinnati had been created in 1886 under the Foraker administration. The Board had been designed to replace the previous Board of Public Works and was staffed by five members. Most people had expected the usual type of appointments, three members of the majority party and two members of the minority. Foraker, however, surprised them by appointing all five Republicans to the Board explaining that "as long as the Democratic Senators remained away from their duty in the Senate, then he would not appoint one of that party to any office." 

The first response to a change came on February 5 when Representative Charles Jeffre introduced a bill "to create and establish an efficient board of public improvements in cities of the first grade of the first class." It provided for a Board of Public Improvements composed of five members appointed by the Governor, but subject to election at the end of their terms. It also stipulated that removal

---

13Ohio State Journal, May 17, 1886.
14Joseph Benson Foraker, Notes of a Busy Life, I, p. 228.
15Journal of the House, LXXXVI. p. 188.
from the board could only be done by the Probate Court for reasons of misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance. The new board received all the powers which had been formally granted to the Board of Public Works, the Board of City Commissioners, the Board of Public Affairs, and the Board of Health. All of these latter boards were abolished, and the new one was given tremendous control over the city. Politically, the patronage powers were overwhelming.

The Democrats relished the new proposal and were willing to vote upon it immediately. Campbell, however, did not favor the bill which was a flagrant violation of his own publicly announced position upon the question of home rule. Despite his apparent distaste the bill passed the House on February 19 with every Republican voting negatively. The same results appeared in the Senate. Feeling that the bill did offer a liberal reform from the previous act of 1886, Campbell decided to sign it on March 13. Even as he signed the measure, Campbell continued to express dissatisfaction, especially with the means of removal of dishonest or incompetent men. He felt as long as he was given the power to appoint, then he should be given a

---

16 *Ohio Laws*, LXXXVII, p. 62.

17 *Journal of the Senate*, LXXXVI, p. 513. The Governor had no veto at this time.
similar power to remove.

Greatly chagrined by the passage of the act, Campbell was required to appoint the five members to the newly created board. Because of the time involved the Governor was forced to rely upon the recommendations of others whom he believed trustworthy. Three names were mentioned quite early, those of Edward Donham, Louis Reemelin, and Thomas McLaughlin, and the suggestion of two of these proved to be accurate. On March 13, the day Campbell signed the bill into law, he indicated the names of the following appointees: Louis Reemelin, Chairman of the Hamilton County Democratic organization; William Montgomery, who was specifically added to get Irish support; Edward Donham; and George B. Kerper, all of whom were Democrats; and James D. Ellison, a Republican. Of the five, Campbell knew Ellison personally and believed that his appointment was sound. He was slightly acquainted with Donham and Reemelin and was totally unfamiliar with the other two. He was hesitant to appoint Reemelin because he was repelled by his "physiognomy", but he yielded under the advice of the "so-called best citizens of Cincinnati" who aided him in his board selections.

---

18 James Edwin Campbell Papers, Scrapbook entitled "Special Session Ohio Legislature 1890", (Ohio Historical Society Library, Columbus, Ohio) p. 4.

19 Cincinnati Enquirer. March 5, 1890.
The public announcement of the Board membership was well received in Cincinnati, and the Governor received numerous telegrams congratulating him on his selections. One was signed by thirty-seven members of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce who gave their unqualified endorsement of the appointments and one by Judge Judson Harmon, who labeled them "magnificent". The Cincinnati Enquirer under the caption "All Right" expressed its entire satisfaction with the Governor's appointments and added that "upon the part of no person was there an objection worthy of consideration afforded to any of the gentlemen selected . . . ." The following day the appointments were specifically designated as follows:

Col. George R. Kerper 5 year term
Ed. W. Donham 4 year term
J. D. Ellison 3 year term
Wm. Montgomery 2 year term
Louis Reemelin 1 year term.

On March 18, 1890, the five met for the first time and elected Reemelin, President of the Board. Thereafter they prepared to carry out their duties. Notable among these was the removal of fifty-six Republican workers and the appointment of Democrats to fill their positions. J. D. Ellison, the lone Republican on the Board, tried to

---

20 Campbell Papers, "Special Session". pp. 5-6.
21 Cincinnati Enquirer, March 14, 1890.
22 Ibid., March 15, 1890.
stop the wholesale removal by offering merit considerations, but he failed.\textsuperscript{23}

In addition to the home-rule legislation, the General Assembly responded to other items from Campbell's inaugural address. Throughout the campaign the Democrats had recommended the need for basic reform in the state election laws. Notably apparent was the practice of allowing the Governor to appoint the members of the election boards in cities of first and second class size. This practice was altered in an act of April 28, 1890, which changed the method of appointment from the state executive to the local city mayor. Campbell was indeed happy with the change because it now placed responsibility with the local officials and removed from the Governorship the potential danger of selecting overly partisan boards.\textsuperscript{24}

In the area of agricultural improvements, the assembly enacted a series of laws which generally tried to protect the farmer and improve general health standards within the state. A measure dealing with improvements was passed on March 7. The practice of coloring margarine the same as butter was viewed as a basic deception of the public, and it was brought under more stringent labeling controls.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., March 18 - April 11, 1890.
\textsuperscript{24}Ohio Laws, LXXXVII, p. 359.
\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., p. 51.
On the same day a joint resolution stated that literature and studies done at the various state experimental stations would be distributed to the farmers at state expense. Another bill to increase the sales from farms owned by the state stipulated that all directors, boards, superintendents, managers, and stewards of the penal reformatory and charitable and benevolent institutions purchase state raised live stock and farm products. 26

Since labor unions were growing within the state, the Assembly, under Campbell's directions, began formulating rules and regulations concerning their actions. The initial measure passed on March 26 provided for the establishment of a ten-hour work day for railroad train workers. This action was promoted not only out of concern for the workers involved, but also as a safety device to remove the danger of over-tired railroad operators. The law stipulated an eight-hour rest period after a trainman worked twenty-four consecutive hours. Supplementary acts provided for higher pay rates for labor performed beyond the ten-hour day and prohibited companies from compelling their employees to sign agreements which relieved the employers of all responsibility for injuries sustained on the job.

Campbell had recommended in his inaugural address the abolition of the position of Commissioner of Railroads and

26Ibid., p. 334.
Telegraphs and the substitution of a Railroad Commission. He believed that such an important post should not be under the control of only one man. Rather, he preferred to see a board in control, thus removing the tendency of dictatorial or authoritarian administrators. His experience with the Foraker appointees had hardened his views against one-man executives. The legislature, however, was opposed to any such change and refused to alter or amend the existing legislation. Angrily, Campbell then sent a letter to the Senate demanding the removal of the incumbent Railroad Commissioner, William S. Capeller. The Governor charged that he was inefficient and derelict in his duties. In this respect, the Senate responded favorably, and eventually Campbell appointed James A. Norton of Seneca County to replace him.

In April the legislature authorized union labels on union-made goods, established free employment agencies in most of the cities of Ohio, and designated the first Monday in September as Labor Day. Ohio was among the first states to recognize Labor Day as a legal holiday.

In 1890 gas and oil were discovered under some of the vacant canal lands, and a number of oil leases were granted from which the State received one-sixth of the oil

---

28 Journal of the Senate, LXXXVII, p. 126.
produced.\textsuperscript{29} The old canal commission had expired by limitation of law, and a bill was passed April 18, 1890, giving the Governor power to appoint a new one. This commission received much unjust criticism owing to the added duties of providing oil leases for the development of canal lands.\textsuperscript{30}

Campbell's time was not limited entirely to his explicit duties as Governor. He did perform certain duties which were expected but were not required. Notable was a reception given by him for the members of the General Assembly, State Boards, Federal and city officials of Columbus, and members of the press. He and his family were commended for "the charming manner" which "put everyone at ease and made him forget all about inconvenience if he suffered any". Especially praised was the work of Mrs. Campbell who decorated all the rooms and helped make it the "grandest reception ever held".\textsuperscript{31}

The General Assembly adjourned on April 28, 1890. One of the last pieces of legislation adopted was an act which created a School Book Board, which was to examine and establish a fair price on books. It was not to exceed eighty per cent of the lowest price at which the book was presently being sold by the publishers. When he signed

\textsuperscript{29}E. L. Bogart, \textit{Internal Improvements in Ohio}, p. 134.
\textsuperscript{30}Ashbaugh, "Campbell", pp. 33-34.
\textsuperscript{31}Cincinnati \textit{Enquirer}, March 26, 1890.
the bill, Governor Campbell commented, "If this commission discharges the duties of its office properly, it will, without expense or liability on the part of the state, result in cheapening books to sixty or seventy per cent of their present cost. It is, however, not an attack upon school book publishers."  

Campbell did fail to attain one of his major proposals in this session of the General Assembly, the passage of a law establishing an Australian Ballot System. A bill proposing one was introduced in the House as early as February 27, but it was by-passed until April 10 when the House debated upon it for the entire day without reaching a decision. When a vote was ultimately taken on April 16, it did pass by a vote of sixty-two to nineteen. Unfortunately for the Governor, it failed passage in the Senate when all the Republicans joined by one Democrat voted nay and prevented it from enactment. Any further action was postponed until the next session of the Assembly. While Campbell was openly disappointed over the turn of events, he was happy because his party had gone on record as favoring the reform. He felt it was a valuable issue to carry into the fall elections.  

The ending of this first session of the legislation  

32 Ibid., April 28, 1890.  
33 Ibid., April 26, 1890.
was looked upon by the Governor as the culmination of a generally successful period. He believed that the home rule issue had been partly settled and that ultimately, when control of the appointed board members would pass to the local electors, the completion of self-government would be attained. Campbell further believed that once the next session of the legislature met, it would only be a matter of time until his proposals for reform of the orphans' asylums and the Australian ballot would be accomplished.  

Looking back at the previous four months, he was genuinely ready for a well earned rest. His sojourn to Washington to testify in the ballot-box hearings had required valuable time which any new state executive needed. After he arrived back in Columbus, he sadly discovered that his wife was quite ill, and he felt obliged to remain by her side until she was recovering. When he finally actively resumed his role as Governor, he was forced to spend long hours with his private secretary, Claude Meeker, working until well after midnight catching up on his delayed work. Considering the energy needed to cope with a General Assembly and the pressure on the Governor, it was apparent that Campbell started his executive career on a difficult footing.

34 Ibid., April 28, 1890.
35 Ibid., February 19-21, 1890.
Indicative of Campbell's difficulty in acting in a reasonable time was his response to General R. R. Dawes, Trustee of the Ohio Institute for the Deaf. Dawes submitted his resignation from the position soon after the Governor's inauguration, but as the executive explained in late March, he had been unable to accept it because he "was not ready to make any changes in the institution". He considered Dawes a capable public servant, and he was reluctant to lose him. Concluding this letter, Campbell accepted Dawes request asking him if he would consider a possible reappointment provided that such a position developed in the future.36

Such a personal gesture as this was typical of Campbell's concern. He wished to fill his administration with competent and efficient people on whom he could rely. Since he was a prominent national figure constantly in demand for interviews and speeches, Campbell needed reliable people to handle routine administrative duties. Indeed, a Democratic Governor of Ohio during this period was a rare person and consequently a force which had to be reckoned within any of the party's national decisions.

Campbell moved slowly and cautiously in the national scene. He felt that his first goal was the establishment of a sound state administration which he could use as a

---

36 Campbell Collection, James S. Campbell to R. R. Dawes, March 26, 1890.
testimonial to his ability as a public worker. On one occasion he journeyed to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to give a speech on the redistricting movement in Ohio. While he was there, he refused to discuss politics, the recent election, or his own future plans outside of Ohio. When, however, one of his listeners apologized to him because the weather was wet, Campbell replied laughingly, "I have a great amount of tenderness for wet, it was that which elected me Governor." 37

After the General Assembly recessed, Campbell constantly travelled outside Ohio, and though he denied he was a potential national candidate for political office, he proceeded to act like one. In May, while in New York, he claimed that he had not learned officially of any boom which included his name and that of Cleveland's for the 1892 presidential ticket. He commented that the rumor had started "Some time ago . . . in Hagerstown, but it has not reached the Ohio River, and I am inclined to regard it as a very small boomlet." He added that the Democrats of Ohio were not concerned about the presidential nomination because their main duty was to "redeem the State entirely from Republican domination". He viewed the 1889 victory as a first-step and the 1891 contest as the second and most important for the presidency. That election would determine

37Cincinnati Enquirer, March 18, 1890.
not only the Governorship, but the legislature and a United States Senatorship, that then held by John Sherman. With a gleam in his eye, Campbell exposed his plans by saying "... any notion of the Presidency depended upon winning the above contests". If he and his party could win, the Ohio delegation at the Democratic convention would have to be bargained with before any decisions could be reached.

Local Ohio Democrats, however, were not content to wait until 1892. Campbell's abilities, assets, and potential candidacies became a constant news item. Laudatory articles appeared repeatedly in Democratic papers calling attention to the fact that Campbell was attracting the general public with his "youth, good looks, discretion, and an interesting family in his behalf". He was described as "tall and wiry rather than thin, quite straight as becomes a soldier with the Scotish forehead of the Campbell's in a high cranium (and) his eyes are blue". Finally, he spoke "like a man with a long life before him". Such characterizations were not limited to Campbell. His wife proved to be an added asset as a potential first lady who was described as "a beautiful woman, with a skin like the lily-rose, a very small mouth, affectionate expressive eyes, force of character in the midst of this beauty and no other sign of her age than an iron gray tuft in the

---

\(^{38}\text{Ibid., May 6, 1890.}\)
midst of wheaten hair."  

As these early introductions and praises were being framed, Campbell began to encounter his first hurdles in his path for a calm and responsible administration. His Attorney General, David K. Watson, discovered by accident that action by the Standard Oil Company of Ohio which transferred 34,993 shares out of 35,000 to the trustees of the Standard Oil Trust, most of whom were non-residents of Ohio, was a violation of the anti-trust act. He disclosed these findings to Campbell and asked his advice. Without hesitation Campbell told him to prosecute the oil company the same as any other corporation or individual who violated the laws of Ohio. Watson then filed his petition in the State Supreme Court praying that the company should be "adjudged to have forfeited and surrendered its corporate rights, privileges, powers, and franchises, and that it be ousted and excluded therefrom, and that it be dissolved."  

After using many pressures and delays the lawyers of the company were able to prevent some parts of the original petition from being carried out. The Supreme Court refused to forfeit the charter of the corporation, but it did rule that the transfer of shares was illegal and that the trust

---

39Ibid., May 17, 1890.

40Ida Tarbell, History of the Standard Oil Company in Ohio, p. 18.
agreement would be abrogated.

The effects of the case upon the Campbell administration were varied. The Governor was lauded as a brave man unflinching in the face of a colossal corporation. Actually the characterization was inaccurate because Campbell had little to do with the proceedings except his initial support. On the other hand, the fact that the proceedings were started under his administration caused a decided revulsion of big business toward the Democratic Party in Ohio. The election of 1891 would decide whether the support Campbell would receive as a trust-busting reformer could over-ride the disproportionate loss of campaign contributions.

This Standard Oil episode was only the first in a series of controversies Campbell experienced in the summer of 1890. In Washington, D.C. Congress was in the midst of debating the (Senator Henry Cabot) Lodge Election Bill which called for greater federal control of elections than under the existing application of the Fourteenth Amendment. In early August the editor of the Columbus Daily Press, J. H. Galbreath, reported that he had learned that Campbell had declared that "he would resist with the militia the enforcement of the law" in Ohio if it were enacted. Responding to this charge, the Governor immediately sent a

41 Ohio State Reports, XLIX, p. 137.
telegram to the editor offering to give $500.00 to any charity the newspaperman desired "if he could produce any reliable witness" who had heard the Governor make the statement. The wire gave Galbreath until noon of the following day, August 7, to produce the evidence.

Not to be silenced, Galbreath sent an immediate answer to Campbell claiming that his note was vague. He demanded that the Governor sign a pledge stating that he explicitly denied saying he would even use the militia to resist the Lodge Federal Election proposal. Campbell signed the pledge and returned it to Galbreath who promised to publish his proof in his paper on the following day.

As interest generated over the public debate, the presses of the paper worked overtime to supply the additional demand. A three-column report by Galbreath appeared early on the morning of August 7. He related that his witness was the Honorable George L. Converse who had told the editor that he had been informed by Allen W. Thurman who had overheard the pronouncement by Campbell. Even though this was hearsay information, Galbreath accepted it as reliable and valid proof that his charges were correct.

Later in the day when other reporters questioned Thurman at the Governor's office about the editorial, he denied ever saying such a thing to Converse and added, moreover, that he had never heard Campbell make such a
pronouncement. Thus, the dispute boiled down to a question of veracity. Which man was telling the truth? Campbell refused to accept the evidence as given and refused to send the $500.00 to a charity. Galbreath later replied that his proof was valid and charged that Thurman was covering up for the Governor. Despite this retort by Galbreath, however, Campbell remained adamant in his position and ignored the accusations.

After the effect of this attack began to wane, another Columbus weekly paper attacked Campbell and his wife for hiding "a skeleton that peers from the closet of the Ohio Governor's mansion". The reporter claimed that Campbell's mother had been "ignored and banished to an attic backroom in a fourth-class hotel in Middletown because of the influence of Mrs. James E. Campbell". The article claimed that the younger woman was unable to associate with her mother-in-law without creating friction. Hence, she had used her influence upon her husband to have the old lady kept out of the way in Middletown.

Neither the Governor nor his wife would comment upon this charge, but the Cincinnati Enquirer reported after conducting its own investigation that the "old lady is an attractive, sixty-five year old, intelligent woman with silver gray hair and very warm". Contrary to the charges,

42Cincinnati Enquirer, August 6-7, 1890.
the elder Mrs. Campbell stayed in the best rooms of the hotel and ate the best meals. She was financially well off and was a regular recipient of funds from her son. She liked the hotel and had been a regular resident of it for the previous eighteen years whenever she was in the city. 43

Campbell was able to handle these minor problems in a relatively easy manner. His political future still loomed bright, and his administration was fairly capable and tranquil. Unfortunately, trouble had been brewing in Cincinnati which would ultimately confront Campbell with the gravest political decision of his career.

Continuing requests in letters and in private conversations with many prominent citizens of the Queen City for Campbell to intervene into the activities of the Board of Public Improvements, commonly called the B.P.I. started in mid July and grew in frequency in the weeks that followed. Prominent in these requests, and in numerous articles in the German and English newspapers in Cincinnati, were suggestions as to the questionable aims of some of the members of the Board. Hints and implications eventually led to outright charges that fraud and corruption were rampant and that only the Governor could bring it to an end.

One such report had come from the Board of Directors of the Bund for Liberty and Civil Rights which had

43Ibid., August 26, 1890.
unanimously approved a resolution calling for Campbell and Mayor John Mosby to investigate various actions of the B.P.I. Especially noted in this resolution was the flagrant use of patronage in appointing people to carry out various functions under the jurisdiction of the Board. Recognizing that political pressures were great, the Bund directors still maintained that experts and capable personnel should receive the appointments rather than unqualified political henchmen. Surprisingly, the signature of Charles Reemelin, the father of Louis Reemelin, the president of the B.P.I., appeared on the resolution.

Such communications were quietly noted by the Governor and became matters for quiet investigations. One area of concern, however, began to draw Campbell's attention, and he became convinced that some corrupt action was contemplated in the potential granting of an ordinance for a franchise for the Queen City Natural Gas and Fuel Company. Previously the company had requested permission in September, 1889, from the previous Board of Public Affairs to tear up the streets of the city "for the alleged purpose of supplying gas from the Indiana fields". The decision of the board had been favorable at that time provided that the company would have laid all the necessary pipes up to the city limits before any street would be touched. The

\[\text{[Campbell Collection, "Special Session", p. 7.]}\]
franchise had been granted for the term of one year; if the company failed to act before then, the option was to be forfeited.

Nothing was done, however, for eleven months after the franchise was granted and it appeared that the Queen City Natural Gas and Fuel Company would lose its grant. Unexpectedly on August 20, 1890, Louis Reemelin, President of the Board of Public Improvements, proposed an amendment to the original ordinance granting the right to construct mains in the city for supplying natural gas upon certain conditions acceptable to the Board. The key difference from the original request was the inclusion of artificial gas with the originally granted natural gas. The switch would increase from .15 to .50 cents the cost of each 1000 cubic feet of fuel. The proposal did not proceed through the Board quietly, but at once aroused a storm of protest. Onlookers, as well as two of the board members, J. D. Ellison and George Kerper, questioned why the city should renew the franchise after the company had already failed to complete any of its previous obligations. Furthermore, they questioned why there was such a haste to approve the amendment and allow the company to begin tearing up the city streets which cost five million dollars to construct.

Despite the opposition of two board members, Edward Donham and William Montgomery joined Reemelin in voting
for the proposal and recommended its formal adoption by the City Council which generally approved all the B.P.I. recommendations.

The Board's action raised vehement opposition. Rumors circulated that the three who voted for the franchise were paid boodlers of the gas company. Charges that it was "a set-up job" were raised and such questions as, "Can the public have faith?" were asked. Concerned citizens speculated that "legitimate enterprises have nothing to fear from investigation, (but) jobbery had much to fear." 45

When the franchise grant appeared before the City Council, the public anxiously awaited the Council's decision. In the effort to avoid overt controversy, the Council delayed making a final decision then. Meanwhile a B.P.I. member, George Kerper, proposed that the city solicitor call for open competitive bids from all interested gas and fuel companies which might desire to receive the franchise. Because of public pressure the resolution was adopted, and public bids were invited.

Charles Baker appeared before the Board as the representative of a group of interested fuel gas producers who were willing to submit a bid for the gas monopoly.

45 Cincinnati Times-Star, "Surprise Haste", August 21, 1890.

46 Cincinnati Enquirer, September 4, 1890.
He indicated that his corporation would be willing to pay the city $100,000 after the company was given the franchise and had started the actual sale of its product. Furthermore, he offered to pay two per cent of the annual gross receipts for the continuing right of the franchise. This offer added more fuel to the kindling fire. Baker refused under direct questioning to designate who comprised the company. Under the leadership of Board member Montgomery the Board refused to accept the new bid. It was decided by the same three to two vote to continue to support the bid of the Queen City Company.

Before the City Council met to decide what course of action to take, the local Cincinnati newspapers took a very decisive stand. The Democratic partisan Enquirer defended the B.P.I.'s majority decision as a move which "saved the city" and attacked the Baker offer. Sarcastically it concluded by saying, "The whole matter is becoming a stench in the nostrils of our people."

Meanwhile, the Republican Commercial-Gazette charged the Board with being partisan and trying to steam-roller the Queen City's option through the Board and, ultimately, the City Council. Meeting amidst an aura of excitement the Council decided to channel the question into a Committee on Light and hoped that the entire episode would die down.

During the following weeks whenever the Committee on
Light conducted open hearings on the issue, crowds gathered and emotionalism reigned. Repeatedly, the Committee refused to render a decision and every time the Council itself was pressed, it also refused to do anything to hasten any deciding vote. 47

Amid this controversy, rumors circulated that only the Governor could solve the crisis. Since all the B.P.I. members were appointed to their positions by the State Executive, it appeared that it would take only slight pressure from the Governor to establish order from chaos. Expectantly, many Cincinnatians looked to Columbus for some acceptable solution. All that emanated, however, was silence and apparent apathy. The only real clue was a rumor that Campbell was preparing to call a special session of the legislature; however, the session was not to solve the gas problem in the Queen City but to complete the state redistricting program which omitted (by mistake) Storrs township of the newly drawn Second Congressional District. Observers believed that Campbell was "sorely disturbed over the issue", and was preparing to take a rather drastic step to atone for the mistake. 48 They did not realize that behind the Governor's inquiry into the procedures for summoning special sessions was a plan to attack the home-rule issue anew and to squash the turbulence within Cincinnati.

47 Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, September 4, 1890.
48 Cincinnati Enquirer, September 12-19, 1890.
Quietly Campbell made his first move on September 24, when he asked for Louis Reemelin's resignation from the B.P.I. in a letter sent through the regular mail. Amiable in tone, Campbell indicated that he had been told that Reemelin had expressed a willingness to resign in order to end the local disturbance and that such an action would readily be acted upon.  

Reemelin received the letter on September 26, and immediately wrote to the Governor expressing his complete surprise with its contents. He wrote that he had been fully under the impression that Campbell supported him and that he could not understand why his resignation would be called for at that time. Reemelin demanded to know who was the informant that told Campbell that he should be removed from office. In essence, he refused to resign.

On the same day that Reemelin replied Campbell, rumors began to circulate in Cincinnati that the Governor planned to remove at least one member of the B.P.I. and perhaps as many as three. Reemelin was always mentioned as the one of these, with Donham and Montgomery being included as added possibilities. The Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette explained that Campbell had taken offense at

---

49 Campbell Papers, copy of letter, Campbell to Louis Reemelin, September 24, 1890.

50 Campbell Papers, copy of letter, Louis Reemelin to James Campbell, September 24, 1890.
Reemelin's "opprobrious epithet" which he was alleged to have made when he was notified earlier in the year that he had been given only a one year appointment. More importantly, however, the question of civil integrity was now an issue which added fuel to the simmering feud. When Claude Meeker was asked whether the Governor had removed anyone from office, the secretary replied by quoting the Governor, "I have not removed anybody today." Later Campbell himself rendered a few comments saying, "I have no power to remove the members of that Board, although I ought to have that power." He then explained that there was more than one way to remove a man from public office. Specifically, Campbell related that if any appointee of his should prove dishonest, he would use all his influence to compel him to resign.  

51 Finally he admitted that the rumors of crookedness and the open charges of corruption affecting the B.P.I. had convinced him that something had to be done to remove "the corrupt gang" controlling Cincinnati. He refused to give either specific charges against the Board or indications of his plan of action. The only thing he did assert was that something would be done.  

52 When the reports of the interview reached Cincinnati, an enraged Reemelin sent a telegram to Campbell asking if

51 Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, September 26, 1890.  
52 Cincinnati Enquirer, September 27, 1890.
the papers were correct in their allegations that crookedness was charged to exist in the B.P.I. Directly he asked, "Do you charge me with any crookedness?" Concluding his note, he asked the Governor, "Answer at once." Not being a man to sidestep a challenge and feeling that there was no longer time to avoid coming to grips with the crisis, Campbell returned a blunt and frank telegram. He stated that although he had not accused the Cincinnatian with a specific charge, he did believe that he was dishonest. Campbell continued by explaining that this was not only his opinion, but one that "is concurred in by every citizen of Cincinnati" that he had seen or spoken with during the preceding month. He further stated that when he, and he alone, was ready and in the manner he deemed appropriate, he would communicate the information to the proper authorities. Concluding, he issued an ultimatum demanding that Reemelin resign by noon the following Sunday, September 28.

Upon receipt of this latest communique, Reemelin wired Campbell refusing to resign his post. He labeled the Governor's note a "brutal and improper telegram" and demanded once again that his critic list his
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53 Campbell Papers, telegram, Louis Reemelin to James E. Campbell, September 27, 1890.

54 Campbell Papers, telegram, James E. Campbell to Louis Reemelin, September 27, 1890.
Believing that his original telegram had indicated his intentions, Campbell ignored this second wire from Reemelin and waited to see if the accused would relent and submit his resignation.

By this time Edward Donham, Reemelin's associate on the Board, entered the picture and sent a letter to the Governor asking for a specific evaluation of his role. Donham strongly defended his actions and boasted "that no man can say aught against my honesty." He asked Campbell if there were any charges against him, and he offered to go to Columbus and discuss the matter with him if he desired.

The Sunday newspapers were filled with articles describing the actions of the Governor and some of the members of the B.P.I. In actual fact, the only definite item that was known was that Campbell had asked Reemelin to resign and that he implied that he might ask the same of Donham and William Montgomery, the third member of the questionable trio. Campbell would only say that crookedness existed and that something had to be done. Beyond this he would go no further.

Reemelin denied any wrong doing and retorted that,

55Campbell Papers, telegram, Louis Reemelin to James E. Campbell, September 27, 1890.

56Campbell Papers, letter, Edward Donham to James E. Campbell, September 27, 1890.
in actuality, the culprits in the whole sordid mess were George Kerper and J. D. Ellison. He accused the latter, a Republican, of having taken a secret trip to Columbus and having told the Governor a congeries of lies attacking his integrity. Additionally, he asserted that some Cincinnati corporations had spread slanderous rumors against them when he and his two allies refused to support them in speculative schemes.

Both Donham and Montgomery repeated these statements and steadfastly refused to resign. They offered the argument that any resignation at that time would be tantamount to a public confession of guilt or incompetence. They resoundingly shouted they would remain on the B.P.I.

Ellison was not available for any comments because he was out of town. Rumors placed him in Columbus and suggested that he must have known in advance of the dramatic upheaval. Meanwhile, Kerper denied any knowledge of any of the issues or the charges against his colleagues, and he could only propose that they speak for themselves. Indicative of his feelings, however, was the observation that if Campbell asked for a resignation, the Governor must have definite proof of dishonesty.

On September 29 Campbell released to the newspapers copies of all of his correspondence with Reemelin. This

57Cincinnati Enquirer, September 28, 1890.
public exposure continued to keep the crisis at a fever level and kept everyone speculating what proof, if any, the Governor possessed. Rumors were heard that Campbell had proof that Reemelin had accepted a one-hundred-dollar bribe to support certain private corporation proposals in the B.P.I. Frank Kelley, the Secretary of the Hamilton Democratic Committee, offered the opinion that no man with the income of the accused would be foolish enough to sell his vote for a mere $100.00. He joined other local Hamilton County Democrats in switching all the blame upon the Republican, J. Ellison. A few, however, turned their venom upon George Kerper and maintained that he was a paid employee of the Cincinnati Gas Company which had been unable through honest means to get the gas franchise from the city. Now, because of its initial failure, the company had encouraged Kerper to create doubt upon the integrity of the board and to cause the scandal in order to have their request honored. 58

Amid this upheaval Campbell's correspondence was voluminous. The letters that doubted his honorable intentions were few. The vast majority of letters supported his actions as noble, expressing the opinion that he had to act. Some questioned whether the correct villains had been named, but most believed he had done the proper thing,

58 Ibid., September 29, 1890.
and the writers generally had complete confidence in his responsible actions.

As the situation began to polarize, it became apparent that Campbell had taken a definite stand and would not relent. Equally adamant was Louis Reemelin who steadfastly refused to resign and just as strongly avowed his innocence. With such developments the idea of Campbell summoning a special session of the legislature began to gather steam. Speaking in Canton, Ohio, in support of Democratic candidates seeking office in the forthcoming fall elections, the Democratic Governor denied that he had already decided on such a course of action, but he did refuse to comment about the possibility that he might consider such a move.

When he was asked why he simply did not submit his proof to the Hamilton County Probate Court and let that forum remove Reemelin, Campbell replied that he did not wish to be a prosecutor and he still hoped for the resignation. He inadvertently indicated his plans when he stated that the whole problem would be solved by the time of the November elections in order to allow the voters of Cincinnati the opportunity to select their own board members. The voters of Cincinnati could have this privilege by a change in the state laws governing board selection. When he was confronted with this fact, Campbell replied that he would call a special session.

When the Hamilton County Democrats learned of
Campbell's decision, they feared that if the session were called before the election, it would aid chances for a Republican victory greatly. They quoted the Republican Mayor of Cincinnati, John Mosby, who laughingly said the whole mess was an intra-Democratic fight. Moreover, if an election for B.P.I. members were held and the Republicans won, then all of the concomitant patronage appointments would be lost. They could naturally ask, "Why run any unnecessary risks?" Following the political axiom that a successful political party had to reward its supporters, the Hamilton County Democrats believed any present change would lose the loyalty of their workers.  

Other Democrats urged delay on the grounds that a special session would cost the state $100,000. They reached this figure by claiming it would cost $250 per member per day besides the mileage expenses which would surely be appropriated. Campbell labeled the expense ridiculous. He asserted that the cost would be only $1,500 not including mileage. If by chance the latter should be paid, he concluded the total figure would be only $5,300. His figures were based upon the assumption that the legislature knew what caused the present crisis and that it would be an easy matter for them to travel to Columbus, quickly pass  
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59Campbell Papers, "Special Session", letters dated September 29, 1890.
the legislation, excluding committee meetings, first, second, and third readings, and all the other routine procedures which slow down action.

Campbell received his final encouragement for the special session in a letter from Judson Harmon on October 5. In the communique Harmon reported that his recent investigation proved that there was another boodler besides Reemelin. In his letter Harmon expressed a common fear that his note could be damaging in the wrong hands. He did display some confidence, however, when he wrote that he knew of Campbell's "uniform custom of destroying such letters as this" as soon as he had read them.

Harmon argued that the Governor had no alternative but to call the special session. Any postponement or delay would materially benefit the Republicans not only in the forthcoming elections but also in subsequent political races. Harmon assured the Governor that he would be supported by prominent Cincinnatians and that he should not be dissuaded from acting. The letter writer told the Governor that though he would politically antagonize some Hamilton County Democrats, he was faced with the important decision to do what was his duty. Looking glorious ly to the future, Harmon predicted that Campbell's

---

60 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 2-5, 1890. Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, October 4, 1890.
proclamation calling the session would "some day be set in letters of gold in the rotunda of the Capital under (Campbell's) picture." Finally he said that no other Ohioan could possibly do more in dislodging "gang" control over the municipalities of Ohio and promoting self government as an actual fact. 61

Campbell reacted to the challenge on the morning of October 5 when he issued his proclamation calling for a special session of the legislature to be convened nine days later. In his message he said, "Everybody is satisfied that the B.P.I. ought to be abolished." Argumentively he mused that the existing Board should never have been established because it did not conform to the party platform of 1889. Moreover, as he rose from his chair with flashing eyes and a pointing index finger, he shouted, "I believe Reemelin is a dishonest man." Campbell refused to render any judgment concerning Donham and Montgomery, for, since they had not directly questioned him as Reemelin had, he honored their silence. When asked if he would present specific charges against the Hamilton County Chairman, the Governor replied that the legislature was not a court, and, secondly, if he did submit the proof, the result would probably be an investigation, committee reports, and

61Campbell Papers, letter, Judson Harmon to James E. Campbell, October 5, 1890.
constant delays. He considered that the issue involved more than a few individuals. Rather, it centered on the legal structure which permitted such developments to occur. His main goal was to abolish the B.P.I. in order to allow Cincinnatians the opportunity to elect their own controllers in the November elections. Repeating an earlier expressed opinion, he predicted that the session could convene and enact the necessary legislation within two days. 62

Claude Meeker was in Cincinnati when the proclamation was issued. Because of his intimacy with the Governor, crowds gathered to learn any additional news of the upheaval. The affable secretary told his listeners, "You would be surprised were I to tell you the names of some Democrats who to-night have told me that Jimmy Campbell never did a better thing in his life." When part of his audience retorted that the Hamilton County Democrats might not respond to the Governor's call, the excited Meeker snapped, "Who in h--l cares whether they come or not! I guess that we can get along without them." 63

On news of the latest act by Campbell, Reemelin wrote a long letter to the Governor expressing his complete disapproval of the turn of events. Acting the role of an innocent victim of hearsay slander, he asked for an

62 Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, October 6, 1890; Cincinnati Enquirer, October 7, 1890.

63 Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, October 6, 1890.
opportunity to defend himself before the courts or the legislature. He viewed Campbell's refusal to present proof of his allegations as a sinister character-blackening crime. He argued that he had been adjudged guilty without any evidence. He prodded Campbell as a lawyer by saying it was his duty to bring any legal improprieties before the Ohio Bar Association for disbarment proceedings.

Reemelin accused Campbell of being either an "unconscious tool of a corrupt group or as an insane politician with sinister motives." He insisted that any further refusal either to respond openly with the charges or to admit his mistake would be met with a libel suit. The Cincinnatian proudly stated that he would not seek any money, but "simply test the truth of the charges, and have them heard and determined . . ." \(^{64}\)

Campbell again refused to answer Reemelin and steadfastly maintained his position. In the intervening days between the issuance of the proclamation and the actual convening of the General Assembly, speculation was rampant. Many people offered opinions and suggestions as to how to avoid the special session, but they all failed. Campbell did respond favorably to one suggestion, that Reemelin and his two associates resign immediately. Unfortunately the trio were just as adamant in their refusal to step aside.

\(^{64}\)Campbell Papers, letter, Louis Reemelin to James E. Campbell, October 7, 1890.
under compromising conditions.

In the Republican camp happiness reigned. Reports circulated that Mayor Mosby was preparing to publish a slate of Republican candidates who would almost certainly be elected. Party conscious Democrats feared the worst and tried to persuade the Governor to rescind his order. Camp­bell refused and replied to his attackers that the responsibility for any party losses at the polls rested not upon him but upon the recalcitrant board members. Other Demo­crats believed Campbell had been courageous and had aptly demonstrated the reforming tendencies within the party. They believed that the action would bring more votes into their party than would be lost. 65

On the day before the convening of the legislature, interest was displayed not only within the Buckeye State but in the Atlantic coastal states. The perceptive New York Times predicted that the Republicans, hoping for an unexpected opportunity to regain control over the affairs of the Queen City, would join reform-minded Democrats in bringing an end to the B.P.I. Admiringly the Times de­scribed the Ohio Governor as "very cool" and a man "who carries himself as one fully determined to rid himself of all compromising alliances." The paper predicted he would

65Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, October 11-12, 1890; Cincinnati Enquirer, October 8-13, 1890.
win his battle while his principal opponent, Louis Reemelin, was a man who generated neither confidence nor certainty.

As the representatives began to arrive in the Ohio capital, they presented an apprehensive picture. Republicans refused to commit themselves and indicated that they would support Campbell only under conditions favorable to their party. The Hamilton County Democrats shouted boisterously their opposition to the entire proceedings and vowed that they would fight any move the Governor would make in an attempt to disrupt their control over Cincinnati. Generally their party colleagues outside the area cautiously guarded their feelings and could only hope that party unity could be preserved.

Among these visitors was Charles Reemelin, the father of the B.P.I. president and central figure in the corruption charges. The aged gentlemen, looking worried and angered, announced that he had come to Columbus to see that simple justice was done. He firmly supported his son and offered the emotional evidence that his boy had sworn upon his mother's honor that he had done nothing wrong. The elderly man positively said, "I believe him."

On the evening before the opening of the session, the Democratic members held a caucus behind closed doors in the

---

66 *New York Times*, October 13, 1890.

67 *Cincinnati Enquirer*, October 13, 1890.
Senate chamber. After the meeting was called to order by Senator Aaron R. Van Cleef, a committee of three was sent to see if Campbell had any statements concerning the session. Within a short time, the Governor appeared before the interested delegates and told them: "I am to blame for appointing a bad board and you are to blame for giving me the power." He noted that the situation was grave and that he was left with no alternative but to summon them into the extraordinary gathering. Pleading with his audience, he asked them to abolish the existing B.P.I. board and to turn its administration over to the city. Specifically, he asked that the local voters be granted the power to elect their own officials. Concluding his prepared address, he emphasized that he did not intend to levy any charges against any member of the existing board. This was based on the premise that the legislature should be concerned with the legal structure of the law rather than with any individual.

After this brief statement Campbell called for questions from his audience. Representative Day asked what would happen to the individuals on the board whose names had been associated with corruption. Without any investigation, he argued, they would be adjudged guilty. Quickly and directly Campbell replied that they would have "plenty of time to vindicate themselves." Others raised questions as to whether the Governor had consulted with any Hamilton
County leaders or if he had asked for advice from any legislative spokesman prior to his proclamation. Campbell answered in the negative which elicited a rousing response from Senator James Brown of Cincinnati who vowed he would never follow any man who acted without consulting or confronting his accused. He recalled Campbell's Germantown defense of 1889 where he accused Murat Halstead and former Governor Foraker of the same crime. Using Campbell's same phrase, Brown caustically said, "No man but an infamous scoundrel" would charge another man with criminal actions without specific proof. He refused to abide by any unsubstantiated rumors.

Realizing the futility of a heated debate, the Governor left the caucus which decided that no rules would be suspended unless something definite should warrant such action. Meanwhile, their Republican opponents also held a caucus and generally reached the same conclusion. They agreed not to support any alteration of the rules until they were convinced they should so act. Politically, they realized that Campbell needed their support if he were to be successful in making any significant changes in the existing law.

The General Assembly was called to order on October 14, 1890. The first order of business was the

---

Ibid., October 14, 1890.
deliverance of the message by the Governor explaining why he had summoned them and the proposal of constructive legislation to solve the problems. He opened his remarks by saying:

The extraordinary power of calling a special session of your honorable body has been invoked on account of the deplorable conditions of public affairs in the city of Cincinnati, which... can be partially remedied by enabling the people of that city to choose certain important boards at the approaching November elections. The time for beginning the work of official reform has come....

He continued by suggesting that the necessary legislation could be prepared quickly and that the General Assembly could be ended in a short time. Turning to his fellow party members, he recalled the promises rendered in the 1889 campaign and sadly confessed that the promises had not been fulfilled. Chiding them he said, "Do not swerve a hair's breath from your purpose to wipe out the board and eventually submit the whole question to the people". No longer, he stated, could the party fail in its duty. 69

Surprising indeed was the reported reaction by unidentified members of the Republican Party who stated, "Governor Campbell's message is one of the most remarkable documents known to Ohio History. It is a frank, open and unreserved confession of the failure of the executive and legislative branches of the state government to administer... the affairs of the largest city of the State...."

69Ohio State Journal, October 15, 1890.
They were dismayed because of the proximity to the approaching state and Congressional elections which would assuredly react against such an avowal of futility. Equally noteworthy were the Governor's three-level attack upon his own party's failure to provide adequate legislation initially, his own failure to appoint adequate board members, and the failure of the board, composed of a majority of members of his own party to handle the problem effectively. 70

Within the Governor's own party, confusion reigned. Noteworthy was the complete hostility displayed by the Hamilton County contingent which openly expressed their dissatisfaction. They adopted a delaying policy which called for constant interruptions of the proceedings and the continual offering of amendments to and compromises with proposed legislation in the General Assembly and in party caucuses. Initially they were successful because many of the other delegates contacted them and asked for first-hand or eye-witness reports of what had transpired in Cincinnati. 71 Thus the Governor and his followers were forced to negotiate these hurdles.

Immediately after the delivery of Campbell's message both bodies returned to their respective chambers. The

70 Ibid.
71 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 13, 1890; Ashbaugh, "Campbell", p. 38.
House by a narrow 55 to 52 vote decided to send the proposal to its Judiciary Committee, but in the Senate the Republicans were able to exert their strength. They voted against a motion to table the Governor's proposal which was introduced by Senator Pattison, against a motion to suspend the third reading rule, and against a motion to submit the question to the committee of the whole. It soon became apparent that the Republicans realized that as long as they were able to prolong the proceedings, they would be able to fan the flames of the Democratic split, and they would be able to enhance their bargaining position for any possible legislation.  

The fruit of this maneuver was realized on October 16 when Campbell appeared before a Republican caucus. Contrary to later charges that he entered into a formal alliance with his political opponents, the Governor maintained that it was a coincidence that he and the Republicans arrived at similar conclusions. Later in the day, at any rate, the Senate took the first step in solving the crisis. The Gaumer Bill was adopted by a vote of 19 to 17; it provided for the abolishment of the Board of Public Improvements and the creation of a Board of Public Affairs whose members were to be elected in the spring election of 1891. In the interim the Governor would be given the power of
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72 New York Star, October 15, 1890.
removal and appointment over the expiring B.P.I. The House, however, responding to the opposition of the Hamilton County delegation who claimed that Campbell had deserted his own party, rejected the bill. 73

As a consequence of this defeat, the Assembly was forced again to try to find an adequate solution. Outside of Ohio interested reporters viewed the events as a struggle between the honesty of Governor Campbell and the corrupt politicians of his own party who were only interested in preserving their partisan positions in Cincinnati. The Chicago Evening Post hoped that the ending of the conflict would "not be the retirement from politics of the man who has shown the courage to grapple with a notoriously corrupt and powerful ring, the hatred of which eventually imperils his political future, which eleven months ago . . . was as bright as that of any man in the country." 74

Campbell, responding to this latest defeat, decided to offer a new alternative to the Assembly. In a second message he admitted it was no longer possible to allow the Cincinnati voters to elect a new board in November; therefore, he now proposed that any elections to the existing board or any replacement be delayed until the following


74 Chicago Evening Post, October 17, 1890.
April, 1891. Additionally, he again recommended that the B.P.I. be abolished and in its place a non-partisan Board of Public Improvements be created to serve in the intervening period. Its membership would be appointed by the Mayor of Cincinnati, at that time a Republican, John Mosby, who was at least elected by the local people and would be directly responsible to them. Such a proposal Campbell maintained would conform to the doctrine of "Home-Rule". He admonished the law makers to avoid the agents in Columbus who were lobbying for the existing boards and called upon them to rise above politics and solve the troubles. Dramatically, he advised them saying, "There is no middle ground. To delay longer is confession of incapacity. To refuse the passage of the bill is a confession of infidelity."

In response to the second appeal of the Governor, a bill was presented which substantially encompassed his latest proposal. It provided for the abolishment of the existing board and stipulated that the people of Cincinnati were to elect the members of a new board the following spring. In the interim period the power of appointment was bestowed upon the Mayor of Cincinnati, which insured the selection of Republicans to the board. The bill in this form was adopted and the extraordinary session was ended.
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75Ohio State Journal, October 22, 1890.
on October 24, 1890, but not until the Assembly granted what appeared to be a consolation to the Hamilton County delegates. A legislative investigating team was created to determine if any irregularities or corruption had actually occurred within Cincinnati and to arrange for prosecution if such evidence were discovered. The team was to begin its study in late November after the conclusion of the fall elections.

Campbell proudly avowed his satisfaction with the ending of the session. Numerous telegrams were sent to the Governor which supported his views and predicted that the nation, as well as the people of Ohio, would reward his effort. Politically he maintained that the Democratic Party, except for the Hamilton County bloc, was united to a greater degree than before. He predicted success in the forthcoming election and promised that he would tour the State campaigning in behalf of a continued "good government and a clean government."  

In the telegrams and letters that the Governor received were two from J. D. Ellison and George Kerper, the unaccused members of the defunct board. The latter predicted "The Nation will, Cincinnati must, and I do congratulate you on your greatest victory." He lamented

76Ohio Laws, LXXXVIII, p. 6; Sater, Campbell, p. 41.
77Cincinnati Enquirer, October 25, 1890.
that his service for the Governor had not been as a member of a more admirable board, but he was glad that the struggle was ended and he anticipated that their party would rebound from its problems. His Republican associate echoed similar sentiments noting that "the war is over" and that "Campbell never stood so well with his people . . .".

Although these letters were congratulatory, indications emerged that the Ohio voters were not of the same conviction. The special session did create a greater statewide interest in politics, but it also produced a general reaction against the incumbent party. The Republicans were able to make inroads into the Democratic majority despite the general national trend which witnessed a revulsion against the Republican "Billion dollar" Congress.

The ordeal had sapped Campbell's strength, and he found it necessary to remove himself from the efforts of the political world. He decided to follow a cautious pattern and to await the opening of the next regularly scheduled session before he would outline a formal plan. He still anticipated the need to complete his administrative program and to make a decision regarding his political future. There was one hurdle, however, which prevented him from moving onward, the opening of the investigation
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in Cincinnati. The findings of the legislative committee could materially affect any possible hopes for political advancement. 79

79 E. O. Randall and D. J. Ryan, History of Ohio, p. 397.
CHAPTER VI
DEFEAT WITH HONOR

After the turbulent period of the home rule crisis in Cincinnati, James Edwin Campbell and the members of the Ohio General Assembly welcomed the legislative adjournment. The extraordinary session had fanned the flames of party strife and produced a definite intra-party cleavage. Since 1891 would witness an election for the governorship, the Assembly, and subsequently a national Senate position, the need for reorganizing the Democratic Party for the elections was imperative.

James Campbell realized that his own political future was in peril. His first goal would be to obtain his party's nomination for the governorship against almost certain formidable opposition, especially from the southern portion of the state. If he were successful, the prospects of a battle against William McKinley, the rumored Republican choice, would be an even more difficult task. A victory at this point would certainly advance the Hamiltonian as a definite prospect for the Democratic Party's Presidential nomination in 1892. It was no secret that ex-President Grover Cleveland wanted renomination, but he faced strong opposition from Senator David B. Hill of
New York among others. With this opposition possibly deterring Cleveland, a strong candidate equipped with a victory over the chief spokesman of tariff protection would certainly merit serious consideration for the highest honor of his party. The Ohioan knew his obstacles were formidable but they were not impossible to overcome. Consequently, he decided to surmount each hurdle as he approached it.

Immediately Campbell faced the challenge of rebuilding party unity. Joseph Benson Foraker offered the opinion that Campbell had seriously offended his party colleagues in Hamilton County through the abolishment of the Board of Public Improvements. He predicted that the county would never again support Campbell and that the Republicans could expect more than usual support in the fall election contests.¹

This opinion reflected the general consensus of the members of the Ohio General Assembly. They knew that the situation in Cincinnati was such that when the Committee of Investigation created in the special session reported its findings, the entire question would once again arise. Suggestive of this were rumors stating that the committee had not found evidence of any corruption. This would tend to exonerate the three castigated board members, Louis

¹Cincinnati Enquirer, January 3, 1891.
Reemelin, Edward Donham, and William Montgomery. If this were to happen, Campbell's position would be seriously weakened in the eyes of both his party and the general public.

During the latter weeks of November, 1890, the legislative investigating body had conducted open hearings in Cincinnati. The three dismissed board members, local Cincinnatians, various gas company officials, other interested and involved persons, and James Campbell were summoned to appear before the tribunal to give evidence. As was to be expected, Louis Reemelin defended his actions and those of his two colleagues. He was supported by spokesmen of the Hamilton County Democratic Party who unqualifiedly attested to his honesty and faithful public services.

The other two board members, James Ellison and George Kerper, were also summoned to appear before the legislative tribunal and testified that although they personally knew of no specific misdeeds committed by the others, they did question some of the methods of procedure that were employed. Concluding, they both expressed the opinion that because Governor Campbell had forced their removals by such dramatic movements, they were confident that he had actual proof to prompt such action.

Campbell took his turn before the board on November 27, 1890. Amid great excitement, for over five hours
he replied to the interrogations of the committee. Speaking calmly as he twisted his eye-glasses between his fingers, he testified that his first suspicions toward the board were raised in July of the previous summer. Without presenting any details he alluded to an abortion case which occurred in the Queen City and said that that was the first instance of his concern. This occurrence was followed by the gas company ordinance episode which made him determined to "get rid of one member on the board." Following this he reiterated that he then directed his personal secretary, Claude Meeker, to proceed quietly to the city and conduct an inquiry into the situation. This investigation proved that the general public in the area was incensed over the actions of the Board and had lost all respect and confidence in it. After further studies and conferences with his immediate advisors, the Governor explained that he had no alternative but to request Reemelin's resignation. After this failed but before he had decided on any further course of action, he testified that he received a formal affidavit from David Kilgous, president of a Railroad board, charging that his company had been unfairly denied the right to lay tracks in the city of Cincinnati. Furthermore, the latter accused Sol P. Kinion, a prominent local Cincinnatian, of offering
to reverse the B. P. I.'s decision for a bribe of $2,000. Upon receipt of this letter, following outraged newspaper reports of the city's problems, Campbell maintained that he had no alternative but to call the special session and request that the B. P. I. be abolished.

When Campbell was questioned about his procedure in appointing the board, he explained that the bill directing him to create the board in the previous April did not give him sufficient time to survey all possible candidates. He said that he knew very little about Reemelin's background except that his name was presented by people who, he felt, were reliable judges of character. He did add, however, one reservation—that he heard that Reemelin had mismanaged Democratic Party funds in the campaign of 1884, but because this accusation appeared unfounded, he dismissed it as a rumor. When asked if he had changed his mind since the upheaval, Campbell stated that he then felt Reemelin and Montgomery were both dishonest and that Donham was a weak man who lacked the courage to stop the evil activities of his associates.
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2Kinion had testified previously that the charge was untrue and that in reality Kilgour had offered him the bribe hoping he could arrange a reversal of the decision. Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, November 22, 1890. Campbell testified that Kinion had written to him before the calling of the special session and had denied the charge. Ibid., November 27, 1890.
After this answer Thomas McDougall, Reemelin's lawyer, asked the Governor if he had any real proof of his allegations. Campbell replied that he was not prepared to provide any specific evidence showing actual acts of dishonesty.3

Hence, the testimony of Campbell was centered on circumstantial, hearsay evidence. Because he was incapable of producing any specific proof for his beliefs or unwilling to do so, the issue was left in doubt. Unless the investigating body should decide otherwise it appeared that its proceedings had brought forth a great many questionable acts by the abolished B. P. I., but also reflected upon the Governor who failed to prove any of the allegations used to dismiss the board.

Because of these circumstances Foraker's prediction regarding the reopening of the debate appeared valid. After the new legislative session opened and the investigation committee submitted its report, it was obvious that the entire squabble would again arise to arise contention.

The Sixty-ninth General Assembly met on January 6, 1891, for its regularly scheduled session which opened with the deliverance of the Governor's annual

3Ibid., November 21-27, 1890; Campbell Collection, "Special Session", The Ohio Historical Society Library, Columbus, Ohio. p. 52.
message. Campbell cautioned the Assembly to scrutinize carefully proposed appropriations. He explained that according to his calculations the state's receipts would total only $3,400,000 compared to the $4,000,000 for expenditures. After this initial statement he turned to the important question of municipal reform. He asked the legislators to devise a system "which shall end legislative tampering with local affairs of cities." He suggested that the only "true solution would seem to be in a provision whereby cities may govern themselves without interference from any outside authority." He then proposed that every city be allowed to establish its own government so long as it conformed to the State Constitution. He asked that the proposal take the form of a constitutional amendment and predicted that if this were done, there would be no further need for the "ripper legislation" enacted after every change of party control at election time.

Turning his attention to other areas, he requested that the General Assembly adopt the Australian Ballot Bill which it had deferred in the first session. Then, "the people of Ohio would have an electoral system more nearly perfect than now known in any country." He also proposed that the post of Commissioner of Railroads and Telegraph be abolished, and he concluded his message by
asking that basic changes be adopted in the field of education in Ohio by amending the school book purchase law and by providing The Ohio State University with much higher, regular appropriations.

After this beginning the General Assembly slowly proceeded with its duties. Apprehension fell over the group as it awaited the report of the Special Committee which investigated the situation in Cincinnati. Coming as a thunderbolt to the legislators was the decision rendered by the Ohio Supreme Court in the case of the State ex. rel. v. Smith et al. The high tribunal ruled that the law adopted in the previous session was unconstitutional and that the Board of Public Improvements with its five members was still legally entitled to jurisdiction within the Queen City. When he heard this verdict, Campbell declined to comment and merely said that he would refrain from any pronouncements until he had ample time to read and weigh the opinion of the court. He did indicate that even if the law proved invalid, he would again propose a rewriting of the law in order to conform to the court's interpretation. Hence, he was

\[\text{Ohio Executive Documents, 1890, I, p. 3; Cincinnati Enquirer, January 7, 1891.}\]
not going to accept a defeat without a fight.5

During the following weeks of March this downward trend continued. The old B. P. I. reconvened and once again reappointed many of the Democrats who had been removed from positions during the intervening span of time. Happiness again prevailed within Hamilton County, but it was a happiness mixed with anger. Frequently mentioned was the opinion that the disruption should never have occurred and that the entire blame should fall upon the shoulders of James Edwin Campbell. Loud were the threats that the Hamilton County Democrats would never again support him in any election.6

On March 20, 1891, the Investigating Committee submitted its report of over 2,182 pages, containing the testimony of 155 witnesses. It came to the conclusion that it had uncovered no specific evidence that any corruption existed within the B. P. I. It suggested that some members of the board had acted strangely and inappropriately upon several occasions, but that there was no actual proof of misconduct. The Governor, it stated,

---

5Ohio State Reports, XLVIII, p. 6; Cincinnati Enquirer, March 13, 1891.
6Cincinnati Enquirer, March 17, 1891.
had apparently acted upon hearsay evidence gathered from individuals and the local Cincinnati press. It concluded that some degree of reform was necessary, but it offered no concrete proposals. Thereafter, the whole question of municipal reform was dropped. It was hoped that the fall elections would provide an answer to what the people of Ohio wanted in this area.

The second year of Campbell's administration was marked by more positive achievements. Following the Governor's message to the General Assembly in regard to the need for more appropriations for the operation and maintenance of The Ohio State University, Neal R. Hysell, Democratic Speaker of the House, introduced a measure providing for a special levy of 1/20 of a mill on the tax duplicate of the state for the University. Campbell had argued that the federal government through the Morrill Act of 1862 and through subsequent appropriations had given Ohio the basis for development of a notable college-level educational system. He applauded the past actions of Ohio legislators who regularly voted appropriations to further develop the institution, but he now felt it was time to progress further. He pointed out that Ohio now ranked only twenty-sixth in the nation in

---

7Ibid., March 21, 1891.
its educational appropriations, and he felt it was time to improve this standing. He traced the failure of the various University officers to gain regular and sufficient funds under Governors Foster, Hoadly, and Foraker, and argued that it was no longer possible to avoid the state's duty and responsibility to its citizens. He believed that the adoption of such a levy could be done without increasing taxes but that even if a small increase in taxes were necessary the people of Ohio would cheerfully assume the added burden because the cause was worthy.

Because of the combined pressures of the Governor and Democratic Party leaders, and representatives of the institution, the bill was enacted on March 20, 1891. Doctor William H. Scott, President of the University, told Campbell in the presence of "the most enthusiastic and appreciative audience of students that has ever gathered to celebrate any event in the history of the

---

University" up until the time, that:

The State University boys feel that when the verdict of the future is made up, the one act which from its importance and far-reaching results will give the most conspicuous and enduring luster to your administration, will be the passage of the Hysell Bill.9

Later, when the President of the University was preparing his annual report for the year of 1891, he wrote, "The financial resources of the University have gained at a bound as much as they had reached in all its previous history."10

Campbell believed that one of the outstanding achievements in his administration was the introduction of the Australian ballot system in Ohio elections by an act passed on April 30, 1891. At that time only three states were using the system. When the members of the assembly realized during the period between their first and second session that their constituents favored it, they acted quickly in response to the Governor's recommendation. Furthermore, there appeared in such a rush to get credit for its introduction that the problem


10Sater, Campbell, p. 39.
of jealousy almost prevented enactment. After considerable discussion and much publicity the bill was eventually approved. It provided for the use in elections of a modified Australian system which required the appointment in each county of a non-partisan board of four by probate judges. This body would be selected after the applicants were recommended by the city executive committees of the leading parties. They were empowered to erect the secret booths, appoint non-partisan election judges, and have the ballots printed and distributed. The law made it imperative for each party to be headed by a distinctive device or symbol. As a result the Republican Party chose the American eagle, the Democratic Party, a rooster, the Prohibition Party, the rose, and the People's Party, a plow and hammer. In addition the act provided for strict secrecy and severe penalties for corruption and intimidation. In the ensuing years the act remained virtually the same with a few added amendments. It has done much to lessen corruption at election-time and to insure secrecy and greater independence for the voters.11

The legislature also passed an act making it illegal to employ children under fourteen years of age in factories. Another regulatory statute was an act requiring a period of apprenticeship for railroad engineers. The Pennell Act provided for the purchase of school books by the State at a discount of twenty-five per cent below the wholesale price. The ever-difficult liquor problem was dealt with in two statutes. Minors were prohibited from entering saloons under the Holliday Law; while the Phillips Law made it unlawful to dispense intoxicating liquors in brothels. Other acts regulated the insurance business, provided for inspection of building and loan associations, established apprenticeship periods for railroad engineers and conductors, and fixed the compensation of county officers by a proportion based on population.¹²

On March 2, 1891, the national Congress passed a law which refunded the direct tax levied upon states and collected during the Civil War. Ohio received $1,332,026 as its share. Of this amount, $1,000,000 was placed to

the credit of the sinking fund, and the rest was assigned to the general fund. This sudden financial boom caused trouble because the General Assembly reduced the state tax schedules for 1891 instead of applying the refund to a reduction of the state debt. The only state taxes levied were 1.4 mills for general revenue purposes and one mill for common school purposes. Disregarding this fact, the General Assembly made several large expenditures and ended the year with a deficit of $151,000 which would have to be paid from the revenue of the next fiscal year. Hence, a tax increase would be a major issue in the election campaign.

While Campbell was concerned largely with the developments within the General Assembly, he also performed other duties commonly expected of a Governor. Frequently he fulfilled requests to deliver speeches and addresses throughout the State. Admittedly these talks enabled the Governor to enhance his political image in an election year, but Campbell viewed them as a chance to perform some of the responsibilities he believed were a privilege and an honor.

---

13 Ohio Laws, LXXXVIII, p. 448.
this attitude was especially evident in his utterances delivered at various Young Men Christian Association assemblies.

Possessing an appealing and whimsical style, he first secured the good will of his audiences, and then delivered the major point of his speech. Generally, he began his remarks by saying that the many fine speakers who preceded and would follow him to the podium would demand a great deal of time and attention from the audience, and as a result, he would limit himself to a few short remarks. In Cleveland, he began by saying:

In my short career I have made speeches to deaf and dumb people [laughter] who would not hear what I said [laughter], which is no doubt to their advantage [laughter and applause], and to blind people who could not see me, which was of course their loss [laughter].

After such a typical beginning, he would qualify his later statements by noting that the ministers on the platform would handle the moral questions involved; therefore, he would limit his comments to the physical ones. Employing an historical approach, he then would trace the history of the Y. M. C. A.'s in Ohio and in the specific city in which he was speaking. He always would notice that women were in the audience and would express regret that there was no Y. W. C. A. for them. Rationalizing he said, "Women, thank God, are not so
much exposed to the temptations of life, and I am proud to say that they have not the natural bent for wickedness that the sterner sex has." Thereafter, he stressed the point that the Y. M. C. A.'s served a definite and important service within Ohio. They help guide young men on the proper road to life and equip them with the characteristics that enable them to become contributing members of society. As an after thought he told his listeners that he had just delivered a speech to the inmates of the Ohio Penitentiary, but it was too late for them to be started on the right path. Concluding with a reference to the economic aspect, he related that in his hometown of Hamilton, Ohio, it had cost $150,000 for a new Y. M. C. A. building, and that ten years prior to this they "could build the whole village and heat it" for the same amount. Campbell, however, with a tone of deep conviction said that the money was well spent and that he could think of no finer thing to do than to help the young grow properly into manhood.  

Usually his speeches were greeted warmly by receptive audiences. Campbell said the type of things that his listeners wanted to hear. Although there was a

---

15 Campbell Collection, "Notes and Copies of Speeches".
political intent in this approach, it was apparent that he believed what he said and would have proudly made the same comments even if he were not a candidate seeking support.

During the month of February the famed Civil War General, William Tecumseh Sherman, died. Campbell immediately expressed his sympathy to the family of the deceased and then publicly asked if the burial could take place in Ohio, the soldier's birthplace. He promised that "the people of Ohio will keep his grave clean" and offered to arrange for the erection of a monument fitting to the remembrance of the military hero. Campbell, unfortunately, was forced to tell the people of Ohio that the request was denied and that the family had decided to bury the General in St. Louis. Such actions as this were typical of the warm human character of the Governor. They were the outgrowth of a deep concern for Ohio and its people.

It was in the political arena however, that the attention of Ohio was directed. With eagerness and deep interest Ohioans questioned and commented upon the possible candidates and platforms to be adopted. This

---

16Cincinnati Enquirer, February 15-18, 1891.
concern spread not only to the two major parties but to two other parties which indicated they would select a slate of candidates and adopt platforms for the fall elections.

The Prohibition Party was the first political group to assemble into a convention. Meeting in Springfield, Ohio, on June 11, 1891, they adopted a broad platform which the Ohio State Journal described by stating, "The Prohibitionists set their fish tackles for nearly everything that votes." Their platform denounced the liquor traffic, demanded restriction of immigration and revision of the naturalization laws, advocated women suffrage, recommended liberal pensions based on length of service for all soldiers, and suggested that a revenue tariff should be adopted. They felt revenue tariffs should not be applied on articles that would be sent to the United States by countries that levied tariffs on articles from this country or barred some of our products. Several names were offered as possible candidates for the governorship, but they all withdrew except John J. Ashenhurst who received the nomination. He was the son of an ardent abolitionist and was a vigorous prohibitionist

---

17 Ohio State Journal, June 12, 1891.
since 1869. At the time of his selection he was a newspaper editor of the Martin's Ferry Wooster. 18

In the Republican camp William McKinley appeared to be an almost certain winner for the nomination for the governorship, although two other men were mentioned as possible choices. Asa Bushnell, a close friend and confidant of Joseph Benson Foraker, was being promoted by the ex-Governor's forces as a good candidate. Bushnell, however, had been endorsed by the same group in 1889 but had refused to be considered as a candidate and in early 1891 announced that he was too much engaged in business affairs to be interested in politics. 19 Ex-Governor Charles Foster was also mentioned as a possible candidate "in the opinion of many Ohio Republicans who regulate affairs from the Washington end." It was generally felt that he would serve as a good unifying factor between the Foraker and Sherman wings of the party.


20 Cincinnati Enquirer, December 22, 1890.
In early 1891, however, he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury by President Benjamin Harrison and was thus eliminated from consideration.  

Actually, it was apparent that the two possible rivals for the nomination stood little chance for victory against McKinley, who as early as the previous November, had been proclaimed a martyr to Democratic gerrymandering. At that time he stood directly in the national limelight as the chief spokesman for protection because of his tariff measure enacted in 1890. Because the Democrats had redistricted the state, he had suffered defeat in his quest for reelection. At that time, the Cleveland Leader reported, "that the unyielding Bourbonism of Holmes County was more than even Major McKinley could affect." Hence, his defeat was blamed on forces beyond his control rather than on his own inability to be reelected.

When asked about the defeat of McKinley, John Sherman replied, "It simply means that the Major will be the next Governor of Ohio." He referred to the fact that in the statewide elections the Republicans had won by nearly eleven thousand votes, indicating that a majority of the

---

22 Cleveland Leader, November 7, 1890.
State supported the Republican Party. 23

McKinley neither wanted to be a candidate nor Governor of Ohio. He correctly believed that the office had no real power and was merely a figure-head position. Specifically, he felt that the lack of a veto and the lack of direct control over the other state officers tended to weaken the chief executive. Moreover he did not relish the thought of having to engage in a hard campaign against James Campbell who he believed was certain to be renominated. 24

Despite his personal reluctance to be a candidate, the Republican ex-Congressman was pressed by both personal friends and by unknown individuals who proclaimed that he was the only logical nominee. In the Spring of 1891 shortly before Congress adjourned, a group of Ohio friends visited McKinley in Washington and urged him to run for governor. They declared that he was not only the strongest possible candidate, but that he would also serve as the one man who could again reunite the two wings of the party. Optimistically they told him that he would be

23 John Sherman, Recollections of Forty Years In the House, Senate, and Cabinet, II, p. 1090.

24 Charles Olcott, William McKinley, p. 269.
sure to get a presidential nomination in 1892 or 1896. John Sherman also brought considerable pressure on McKinley to become a candidate. This attitude was prompted not only because of his personal respect for McKinley, but also because he feared for his own reelection to the Senate in 1892. Expecting that his rival Joseph E. Foraker would also desire the honor, Sherman believed that his chances would be greatly improved with a friendly McKinley in the governor's chair rather than someone else in that position.

Finally the most convincing persuasion came from Mark Hanna. He had initially supported Sherman's political prospects, but having failed in 1888 to win the presidential nomination for his protege, he looked elsewhere for a rising star. He had been greatly impressed by McKinley's actions at that convention and by his efforts in pushing the adoption of the tariff of 1890. Hanna now believed that McKinley could be elected governor and could ultimately be groomed for the presidency. Also like as Sherman, he feared his Republican political rival, Joseph Benson Foraker. Hanna had been unable to prevent

---

26Morgan, ibid.
the renomination of Foraker for the governorship in 1889, and he had allegedly withdrawn his support at the polls which permitted Campbell to win. 27 Hence, the struggle for the control of Ohio Republicanism was likely to be renewed if the two wings should be antagonized. Always, William McKinley appeared as the neutralizing force.

Early in March 1891, Foraker demonstrated his interest in Republican unity by agreeing to nominate McKinley for the governorship. McKinley had gone to Cincinnati to ask Foraker to nominate him at the behest of Charles Foster who had previously prevailed upon Foraker to help preserve party harmony. 28 Foraker later confided in his remembrances that he had agreed because he would expect reciprocal support for the 1898 Senate election.

This understanding was publically demonstrated during the succeeding month at the Republican League meeting held in Cincinnati. There the assembly, composed of the


28 Everett Walters, Joseph Benson Foraker, p. 99.

29 Foraker, Notes, I, p. 444.
Blaine, Garfield, and Lincoln Clubs and many others, hoped to give an open demonstration of unity and to appeal especially to young Ohio Republicans. At this meeting McKinley addressed the convention on the subject of the tariff. His talk was described by one reporter as "clerical rather than enthusiastic." The high point of the meeting was a speech delivered by Foraker which endorsed McKinley for the governor's nomination and approved his tariff position. By this act the hopes of any other candidate ended and a warning was delivered to the Democrats that their fall opponents would be members of a unified party rather than a segmented body.

The only apprehension regarding McKinley's nomination was found among the people who felt that his selection would force the party to staunchly defend the protective tariff concept. They argued that the party had met defeat in the 1890 Congressional elections because of the issue and that McKinley had tasted defeat. They would have preferred a less vulnerable person, but

31 Cincinnati Enquirer, April 22-23, 1891.
Despite this minor group, McKinley's arrival on June 16 in Columbus, the site of the Republican convention was hailed as a triumphant procession to a coronation. No one doubted that he would be nominated as evidenced by the early date for the conclave.

The convention assembled in the Grand Opera House which was handsomely bedecked with red, white, and blue decorations and American flags. Many of the delegates had arrived early to help celebrate the nomination rather than to wage a hard political battle. The first session was occupied with the routine tasks of appointing the various committees, and then it adjourned to the following day. The convention reconvened at 10:00 A. M., June 17, and adopted the first report which placed Asa Bushnell in the role of permanent chairman. After a short acceptance speech and the adoption of the platform which endorsed the McKinley Tariff, Sherman Silver Purchase Act, liberal soldiers pensions, and the Harrison administration, Bushnell called for the nominations for the governorship.

---

33 Ohio State Journal, June 17, 1891.
Foraker then appeared before the assembly and nominated McKinley. Surpassing any of his past performances, he described McKinley as "a firm representative of our views with respect to every living issue, and one who in his record and his personality is the best type we have of the illustrious achievements and the moral grandeur of Republicanism." Throughout the speech the crowd demonstrated exuberant enthusiasm both for him and for the nominee. To the audience the Foraker-Sherman split no longer existed and unity had truly arrived. Foraker, sensing this popular acceptance, concluded his remarks. Calling for the suspension of the rules he asked that the nomination be declared by acclamation. This motion carried amid lusty cheering by the delegates. Andrew L. Harris of Preble County was nominated as McKinley's running mate.

In his speech of acceptance, McKinley said he fully supported the platform and promised to wage a hard fight during the campaign. He pointed out that he would need help and that all the party members would be called upon to render assistance. He cautioned that overconfidence

---

Ibid., June 18, 1891; Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, June 18, 1891; Smith, History of the Republican Party, pp. 598-602.
could bring defeat. Looking to the Senate contest of 1892, he hoped that the newly established party unity would remain. He spoke briefly about the monetary plank of the party which advocated the gold standard and the Sherman Silver Purchase Act and stated it was satisfactory to him. He did, however, suggest that unlimited bimetallism could be possible if the rest of the world was willing to leave the single gold standard. Conservatively he concluded by warning those committed to the free coinage of silver, "Experience at home and throughout the world had demonstrated that a fluctuating, irredeemable currency falls most injuriously upon the laborer and agriculturalist of the country." 35

While the Republicans were resolving their differences, the Democrats were having a difficult time. The Cincinnati wing was incensed over Campbell's meddling in their local affairs and openly warned the rest of the state that they could not support him for reelection. In early February an attempt was made at reconciliation. Nearly one hundred prominent party spokesmen met unannounced in the Duckworth Club Building in Cincinnati to draw up plans for the lessening of the tensions. After

much haggling they appointed a committee of twelve to go to Columbus and talk directly to Campbell. They were given a list of points upon which the Hamilton group would not yield. Foremost in this was a demand that Campbell apologize to them for his intervention into their affairs. Obviously this request would never be honored by a man of the firm convictions of the Governor. Consequently, the entire attempt proved futile.36

Ignoring this weak maneuver by the downstaters, Campbell proceeded to display outwardly confidence that his home rule reforms would enhance his political following both within and outside Ohio. Speaking to the Ohio Society at Delmonico's in New York City he told his audience that the Democrats of Ohio were not thinking ahead to 1892. Rather they were concerned about the 1891 fall elections in which a Governor, Lieutenant Governor, the entire state ticket except the Secretary of State, the legislature, and ultimately a United States Senator would be selected. He pointed to the Republicans and hopefully said that they were faced with handling a major political split. He wrongly predicted that they would not be able to mend their differences. Concerning

---

36 Cincinnati Enquirer, February 1, 1891.
the possibility that McKinley would be the G. O. P. nominee, he remarked, "We can and shall win." Later when asked about his own estimation of the Democratic Party's presidential nominee in 1892, avoiding any personal comments, he offered the names of Grover Cleveland, and Senators David Hill of New York and Arthur P. Gorman of Maryland as possibilities. Smiling, he stated that Ohio could play an important role in the convention if the Democrats would win in 1891.37

Although he was outwardly confident, Campbell's political strength was not as great as he indicated. An informal poll of the Democratic members of the Ohio legislature gave Campbell a poor showing. Thirty-three voted for him and twenty took a negative position. Although he held a majority, it was evident that the strength of the negative votes represented a sizable portion of the state officers who would like to see another person carry the Party's banner in November.38

The Cincinnati Enquirer, which now took a dim view of Campbell, added to his misfortune by claiming that he

37 Ibid., February 7, 1891.
38 Ibid., April 22, 1891.
was not a fit candidate and, secondly, that he should step aside for the sake of party harmony. A group, limited to Hamilton County, conducted an open campaign to persuade fellow party members that Campbell could not win and that he was a selfish person trying to build a machine loyal only to himself and not to the party. Constantly attacking his action in the B. P. I. episode, articles repeatedly appeared under such titles as, "Governor James E. Campbell, Why He Should Not Be Nominated," and "Campbell's Renomination Would Be Wrong." This appeal was well received, however, only in the aggrieved region. Thus they turned to other issues and attacked the Governor for political apostasy. On the perennial tariff question the downstaters charged that Campbell was only lukewarm at best on the traditional Democratic anti-protection policy. They argued that Campbell's record in Congress was valid proof of this contention. Pointing to his actions on the Mills proposal, they showed that though many Democrats debated the issue in support of the proposal in the House of Representatives, Campbell remained silent. They equated silence with opposition by maintaining that Campbell's supporters always applauded his oratorical abilities. They asked why he did not employ them at the most crucial time. Contacting Representative Roger Mills, the bill's
initiator, an *Enquirer* reporter asked him for his recollections of Campbell's role in the ill-fated proposal. The Texan recalled that Campbell did support the proposal, but had held reservations since all Representatives had to consider the wishes of their own constituents. Thus, Mills did not criticize Campbell, but demonstrated that the Ohioan did eventually vote for the passage of the tariff bill. Twisting this answer, Campbell's opponents argued that Mills would never attack a fellow Democrat, but he was in the habit of giving ambiguous or qualified references for those who were not loyal party members. Hence, the charge was levied that Mills "damned with praise" Campbell and that he actually opposed the Ohioan and secretly wished for his defeat. Moreover, the reporter claimed that he learned via rumor that Campbell privately had spoken against the bill and had only voted for it because of tremendous pressures by party leaders and fellow Democrats. As a result of this and similar articles the Hamilton County group believed that either Lawrence Neal of Ross County or Representative John G. Warwick, the man who defeated McKinley in 1890, would be a better choice for the

---

nomination because they both completely, openly, and honestly supported a low tariff.

Despite these arguments the Hamilton County group realized that they carried little weight outside their own sector of Ohio. Consequently, they decided to shift their appeal to the rest of the state from Campbell's inadequacies to that of the need of party harmony and unity. Starting in late April and growing with increased frequency in May and June, the group constantly appealed for Campbell to step aside voluntarily or be pushed aside roughly at the convention. Repeatedly articles predicted that only unity and common purpose could defeat McKinley. Scornfully the downstaters vowed never to support Campbell and attempted to assume a type of veto over the actions of the party if it failed to honor their request. Such men as Congressman Irvine Dungan from the Thirteenth Congressional District demonstrated this new approach by noting that Campbell was no longer as strong in 1891 as he was in 1889. He offered the observation that this was not a valid reason alone to drop him from the ticket, but he did feel that others would be able to regain the lost support because they were not tainted with controversy. Other commentators wrote

---

that if Campbell retired in 1891, he would "be known as the David who killed the Goliath of the Republican Party." On the other hand, if he persisted in running again, the question would be "if the Lord was still on David's side."  

Reacting to these new attacks upon the Governor, his supporters defended their hero and offered the catch phrase, "love him for the enemies he has made." He stood as the symbol of reform, honesty, and courage to them. Judge Harmon in Cincinnati predicted that if Campbell were not renominated, it would be a grave blunder by the party because it would appear to the independent and reform-minded citizens that the party had supported corruption and machine organization rather than dedication and justice. 

Attempting to put more weight behind their convictions, the Hamilton County Democrats issued a call on June 18 for an election of delegates to attend the state nominating convention. Notable in the announcement was the stipulation that the delegates would be required to

\[41\] Ibid., May 3, 1891.
\[42\] Waverly Courier, April 28, 1891.
\[43\] Cincinnati Enquirer, April 27, 1891.
vote not as individuals but as a bloc. The reason for this rule was to prevent anyone from voting for Campbell because it was believed that the anti-Governor forces would be in the majority and would then be in a position to dictate to the others. Campbell was staying at the Burnet House in Cincinnati when he learned of this call and responded to interviewers by labeling the whole procedure a "nullity." Exploding for a moment, he replied to those local Democrats who blamed him for the Party's defeats in the 1890 elections by offering the argument that the city was always Republican until he won in 1889. Furthermore, he declared that if the Hamilton County Democrats were planning on carrying out their undemocratic unit rule at the convention, he and the other delegates would shout, "We don't want you!" Finally, as for those Democrats who had said that they would vote Republican if Campbell were nominated he confidently blurted, "Go ahead. I will not truck with deserters!"44

Three days after this exchange the Hamilton County primary gave a sweeping victory for Campbell's opponents. The voter turnout was the largest ever tabulated until then. Many of the ballots read, "No Campbell", "Against

44Ibid., June 18, 1891.
Campbell", and "Any person to beat Campbell." Anti-climactically as a final retaliation against the Governor, Louis Reemelin received a vote on every ballot case as the delegate from the Sixteenth Ward.45

When Campbell was asked his opinion of the latest downstate developments, he emotionally said that none of the delegates should be seated "because they were chosen against his will and before the official call of the State Convention was issued." This outburst caused some outspoken Democrats to denounce Campbell as dictatorial, especially because of the phrase "against his will."46 They argued that Campbell was more arrogant than Foraker ever attempted to be.

Besides Campbell two other individuals were mentioned as front running possibilities for the nomination. Cuyahoga County offered Virgil P. Kline, commonly called the "Bald Eagle." He had failed in 1889 to get the nomination and had been unsuccessful in other election attempts prior to that time. On the other hand, he was a prominent attorney and was associated as a legal counsel for the Standard Oil Company. Realizing that he had no

46Ibid., June 23, 1891.
chance for the nomination in the early rounds, he pur-
sued a middle-of-the-road policy by publicly supporting
both Campbell and his closest challenger, Lawrence Neal.
His actions were based upon the hope that a deadlock
would occur at the convention and that eventually he
would receive support from both factions and would
ultimately emerge victorious.

Neal, on the other hand, pursued a more direct
policy. On May 23 in response to a growing and ques-
tioning concern about his possible availability, he
answered that he was prepared to become an active can-
didate for the nomination. He expressed that by saying:

I feel that I can no longer resist the
urgent appeals that have been made to me by
active and influential Democrats in every
section of the State to become a candidate.

He continued by predicting that William McKinley would be
his opponent and that the vital issue would be the tariff.
He argued that the Democratic Party was compelled to offer
a candidate with a clear-cut position on this issue, and,
in obvious reference to Campbell and the charges levied
against him, the Party could not offer an ambiguous
candidate surrounded by controversy.

\[47\]
Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 16-17, 1891.
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Cincinnati Enquirer, May 23, 1891.
Neal possessed a stronger background than did Kline, and he hoped to gain the support of all those dissatisfied with the incumbent administration. Neal had been elected Prosecuting Attorney of Ross County and was elected from the Seventh Congressional District to Congress in 1872 and 1874, but he failed in reelection attempts in 1880 and 1882. Despite statements to the contrary, his strength was largely limited to Hamilton County, and in some cases this proved detrimental. He was viewed by some as the choice of the disreputable and unloyal element of the party. In an effort to counteract this, he charged that Campbell's forces controlled the State Central Committee and were in actuality the real machine men within the party. He further charged that Campbell was against the farmers and would not be able to command any rural support. Moreover, Neal predicted that if Campbell were nominated, then the People's Party would certainly nominate a candidate who would assuredly draw votes from the Democrats. The Ross Countian said that if he were nominated, however, he could safely predict that the People's Party would support him because of his reputation as a friend to the farmer.\(^49\)

On June 24, 1891, the Democratic Central Committee

\(^{49}\text{Ibid., May 22, 25, June 11, 1891; Ohio State Journal, July 2, 1891.}\)
meeting in Columbus selected Cleveland as the site of the state convention to be held on July 14. At this date Campbell appeared to be a sure winner. Democratic Senator Calvin Brice thought that Campbell would be renominated on the first ballot, but in an apparent act of bipartisanship he said that Neal would also be a good choice.\(^5^0\) Henry L. Morey, Campbell's Republican Congressional opponent in 1881 and 1882, also predicted his renomination. He observed that Campbell controlled the delegates, moved like a politician, and had no hesitation to adopt divergent methods in order to garner more delegates to his side.\(^5^1\) This feeling of an easy victory led some forecasters to predict that Neal would withdraw from the race. Hotly denying this rumor, Neal blustered, "It is a lie originating in Columbus, . . . there is no truth in it."\(^5^2\)

As the date for the opening of the convention drew near, Cleveland became the hub of intense political activity. It was rumored that the National Democratic

\(^5^0\)Cincinnati Enquirer, June 28, 1891.
\(^5^1\)Ibid., July 11, 1891.
\(^5^2\)Ibid., July 13, 1891.
Committee was trying to arrange a compromise between the warring factions. It was no secret that the Democrats had hoped to bring the State under its control in 1892. The party leaders wanted to avert any possibilities which would not only jeopardize local candidates but also national candidates. Failing to get any of the principals to step aside, the Party leaders pleaded with them to use caution in their speeches, to strive for harmony, and to accept the results of the convention. An open and bitter fight would help the Republicans far more than any issues brought forward by their opponents.

Neal was the first candidate to arrive in the Forest City and established his headquarters at the Weddell House. Soon the Kline forces established their headquarters on the same floor of the hotel. After several discussions they both realized that even if they combined their forces, they would not be able to defeat Campbell. Quickly they adopted the plan of introducing numerous local leaders who might possibly be able to draw votes away from their adversary. In this respect the names of Congressman D. M. Harter of Mansfield and Thomas Johnson of Cleveland were mentioned. Unfortunately, the latter squashed any movement for his own

---

53 Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 14, 1891.
candidacy by stating that he had come to nominate Kline, and he would not put himself against his personal choice.

At the time of the convention Kline was traveling in Europe. He had neither accepted nor rejected his own candidacy. He only said that both Neal and Campbell were men worthy of the nomination. Opening up what was called the "big grocery," his supporters "gave everything from liquor to fine cigars free to attract delegates." 54

Joining these two groups at the Weddell House was the Hamilton County delegation led by Michael Mullen and Louis Reemelin. They immediately set about to defeat Campbell by relating to the other delegates that revenge should be inflicted upon the man who had "caused fifteen hundred Democrats to lose their positions with winter coming on." Also they charged that Campbell's forces had tried to buy their votes at the same time telling others that Campbell was the noble, upright crusader. 55

Campbell, displaying extreme confidence, arrived after his opponents and made his headquarters at the Hollenden Hotel. Appearing with Allen G. Thurman, he was surrounded

54 Ibid.; Ohio State Journal July 14, 1891; Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette, July 15, 1891.
55 Cincinnati Enquirer, July 15, 1891.
by a smiling and cheering throng sporting light coats with red lapels, hickory canes, bandanna kerchiefs, and silk hats. Refusing to engage directly in the maneuvering, he attempted to appear as a man fully committed to party unity. Claude Meeker, his secretary, asserted that the Campbell forces recognized what the Neal, Kline, and Hamilton County forces were trying to do, but he remarked that they had no fear. He applauded Neal as an open rival, but he accused Kline of duplicity by showing that he had told both Neal and Campbell he would support them and then had proceeded to try for the nomination himself. 56

Prior to the formal opening of the convention, a dispute arose over the distribution of general admission tickets for the Music Hall, the site of the convention. The Democratic State Chairman Charles Norton, an alleged supporter of Campbell, was accused by the opposition forces of trying to pack the galleries with Campbell adherents. Norton, departing from a general rule which permitted the host county to handle the extra tickets, replied that he feared that the Cuyahoga County officials would pack the hall with Kline supporters. He proposed that a conference be held to solve the problem and indicated that he was willing to turn the tickets over to the Cuyahoga group

56Ibid. , July 14, 1891.
provided that he receive guarantees that certain people get them and that no attempt be made to pack the galleries. The conference was held but proved fruitless. Norton refused to yield without the guarantees, and the Cuyahoga representatives maintained that tradition favored them and that they saw no reason to compromise. 57

In addition to this dispute, a controversy regarding the seating of delegates also arose. The Committee on Credentials, virtually all Campbell supporters, unseated some anti-Campbell delegates from Hamilton and Clark Counties. When the question was raised at the convention, James Neal, Campbell's campaign chairman, exemplified their control over the gathering when he announced that the convention had more important business to do than to wash the soiled linen of Hamilton County. Thereafter, the decision was rendered to refuse to hear the complaint and the proceedings continued. The bitterness of the opposing forces reached such a violent stage that a shooting affray occurred between them in front of the Weddell House. Fortunately no one was seriously injured. 58

57 Ibid., July 14-15, 1891.
58 Van Bolt, "Gubernatorial Campaign in Ohio in 1891," p. 35.
A different type of dispute was raised in the Committee on Resolutions. Congressman Irwan Dungan of Jackson led a group which favored the complete free coinage of silver, and Congressman Michael Harter of Mansfield countered with a limited coinage proposal. The latter pleaded that if the free coinage suggestion were accepted, it could become quite embarrassing for the national party conclave in 1892. After an all night session, the committee adopted the free silver plank by a vote of ten to nine. Later, when the proposal was placed in the platform, the opposition, led by Frank Gorman of Hamilton County, again tried to modify the plank by suggesting that the party should limit itself to the tariff issue which he felt would defeat McKinley. Continuing, he argued that free silver was important only to the millionaire silver mine owners who were really Republicans. However, when the vote was taken, the majority favored free silver by a count of 399½ to 300½. This vote illustrated the trend within the party favorable to the farmer element rather than appealing to the urban, industrial voter. Similarly, a controversy over a graduated income tax was settled in the same manner.  

59 Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 14-16, 1891; Ohio State Journal July 16, 1891.
Conservatives labeled it as "class legislation on a tremendous scale" and stated that it was bait to catch the Farmer's Alliance. 60

The rest of the platform was essentially the same as 1890. It contained an endorsement of Campbell's administration, especially noting the passage of the secret ballot law, a revenue tariff, a proposal for uniform laws on home rule, and liberal pensions for deserving veterans. 61

Following the adoption of the platform was the important tasks of nominating candidates for the governorship. Campbell asked Allen G. Thurman to place his name before the convention, but the elder statesman declined feeling it could be considered in poor taste because his son, Allen W. Thurman, was the permanent chairman of the proceedings. Campbell, in a move for unity, had Michael Ryan of Cincinnati handle the chore with Byron Ritchie of Toledo giving the seconding motion. Thereafter, the credentials of Neal and Kline were laid before the assembly,


61Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 16, 1891; Ohio State Journal, July 16, 1891.

62Cincinnati Enquirer, July 14, 1891.
and the first ballot was taken but not until a lively fist fight within the Hamilton County delegation had delayed the proceedings. The tally read, Campbell 508,716, Neal 134,916, Kline 56, and Thomas Johnson 1. This total was sufficient to give Campbell the nomination. An attempt was made to suspend the rules and make the selection unanimous. This elicited a great deal of cheering but 55 of the 59 delegates from Hamilton County refused. The cheers then loudly turned to boos directed at the downstaters who, in attempting to leave, were forced to push and shove to reach the exits.

After this uproar was quieted and John Marquis was renominated for the Lieutenant Governorship, the candidates were called upon to address the gathering. Neal was unable to be found, but Campbell quickly appeared and delivered a short address stressing the need for party unity and harmony. He called upon Neal's supporters, mainly farmers, and told them that it was imperative for them to bring the members of the Farmer's Alliance within the party fold. Regretably, he somewhat chastised the assembly because of the enactment of the free silver plank. He predicted that the Eastern branch of the Democratic Party loyal to Grover Cleveland was strongly opposed to the plank. Consequently, he cautioned the delegates that their

63 Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 16, 1891.
struggle would have to be waged entirely by themselves. Personally Campbell avoided any direct statement concerning his own views on the issue and instead preferred to stress the tariff question. Justifiably Campbell believed McKinley and his cohorts had tasted defeat in 1890 on that score, and he saw no reason to change the emphasis.

As the convention ended, Campbell knew he was in an unfavorable position because of the Hamilton County walkout. Courageously and optimistically he echoed the feelings of his supporters that he would gain large segments of the independent voters who admired his unhesitant stand against machine politicians.

A letter from John M. Corse, which congratulated the Governor for his victory and promised that he would not only be reelected in November but that he would subsequently be elected President of the United States, was that of a typical correspondent. The writer believed that the American people admired spirit and that Campbell certainly had it. He continued by stating, "The political power of this country has passed West of the Alleghenies and the Mississippi Valley will henceforth make the Presidents."  

64 Ohio State Journal, July 16, 1891.

65 John M. Corse, Winchester, Massachusetts, 20 July, 1891, letter to James E. Campbell, Columbus, Ohio; Campbell Collection.
The final party to nominate a candidate was the People's Party. Within Ohio there were groups which believed that neither of the two major parties truly represented them. Consequently a call for a convention to be held in Cincinnati on February 23, 1891, was issued. Initially the group operated under the title of the National Union Party. It was predicated upon the idea that fundamental reforms were needed in finance, transportation, labor, and land. The call was mainly directed to members of the Independent Party, the People's Party, the Union Labor Party, the Farmer's Alliance, the Farmer's Mutual Benefit Association, the Citizen's Alliance, the Knights of Labor, the colored Farmer's Alliance, and to all other industrial organizations that supported the principles of the St. Louis Agreement of December, 1889. Since the Farmer's Alliance did not want to be associated with an organized party, it declined the invitation. This caused the convention date to be rescheduled to May 19. 66

Assembling on that date members of the various farmer groups predominated. The essential work of the convention was to declare by resolution that a new party, known as the People's Party, was necessary. Its principles were

formulated and a National Committee selected to guide the new organization. Dr. H. F. Barnes of Tiffin was selected as leader of the Ohio branch of the party. Responding to an interview on June 7, Barnes announced that the Party would hold a statewide convention on August 6 at Springfield to nominate a state ticket. Cautiously he remarked that if Lawrence Neal were nominated by the Democrats, the People's Party might experience greater difficulty in organizing than if Campbell were nominated. On the other hand, if Campbell and McKinley were both nominated by their respective parties, Barnes observed that his party might win the election in November.

On August 6 the delegates assembled under a banner reading, "The voice of the people is the voice of God, then let the voice speak and the nation prosper." They drew up a platform calling for "equal rights for all and special privileges to none." It also demanded free and unlimited coinage of silver, the end of alien land ownership, a graduated income tax, female suffrage, government ownership of the railroads, and the establishment of a government loan system to farmers under a subtreasury plan.

After initially offering the nomination to Alva Agee, president of the Farmer's Alliance, who refused, the

67 Cincinnati Enquirer, June 8, 1891.
assembly then mentioned John J. Ashenhurst, the Prohibition Party's nominee. Following some discussion, it was believed that if he were chosen, the Party ran the danger of losing its identity and could disappear. Finally, the delegates turned to John Sietz, a Seneca County farmer, and selected him to be their nominee.

With the conclusion of this convention, the final candidate for the election had been selected. Despite the optimistic statements of the two minor candidates, it was apparent that only McKinley and Campbell had a chance for victory. Interestingly the two men had similar backgrounds. Both were born in Ohio in the early years of the slavery controversy. Each one earned a commendable military record during the Civil War, and ultimately both entered the law profession. McKinley entered politics a bit earlier than Campbell when he was elected Prosecuting Attorney of Stark County in 1868. Campbell waited until 1875 for his election to a similar position. Both men served two terms in the prosecutor's role and were eventually elected to Congress and there served Ohio and the Nation faithfully. While in Congress they became great friends. This friendship was maintained and nurtured until

---

68 Ibid., August 6-7, 1891; Joseph Smith, History of the Republican Party, p. 603.
the two found themselves pitted against each other for the election. In spite of this rivalry and the consequences which might ensue, the two applauded each other and vowed to conduct the campaign as gentlemen. An example of this feeling occurred on the evening of the day when McKinley was nominated when Campbell and his wife appeared at the Neil House where McKinley was staying. Campbell went in and reappeared shortly with McKinley and helped him into the carriage beside Mrs. Campbell. There the three exchanged pleasantries and demonstrated to the onlookers that a true friendship existed between the rivals. After a time, McKinley alighted from the carriage and exchanged cordial good-byes and thank yous with his hosts. Both candidates refused to enter into a personality battle. Rather, they dedicated themselves to a contest on the issues which separated them and their parties. Because of the extreme national interest in the contest, national issues were given a priority over basically state questions in the campaign. 69

69 Ohio State Journal, June 17, 1891; Paul Glad, McKinley, Bryan, and the People, pp. 17-18.
of tariff protection, many adherents to that principle believed that his defeat could bring disaster to those upholding it. Recalling the nationwide defeats of the Republican protectionists in 1890, no one could safely predict how Ohio would vote. For that reason money was poured into the state for McKinley's benefit far beyond anything known in American politics before that time. Mark Hanna handled the acquisition and expenditure of funds. He altered the traditional approach of seeking support from politicians as he appealed to the business interests of the nation because of the tariff question. He was so successful in raising money that McKinley could write to him during the campaign that he had enough. He wrote, "I am a thousand times obligated for your letter with enclosure [funds]. I will forward it at once to the State Committee. I beg you will give all my friends who participated my sincere thanks. It was most generous of you and others and I have to thank you most of all." 71

McKinley opened his campaign on August 22 in Niles, Ohio, his birthplace, and a seat of the steel industry.

70 Meeker, The Democratic Party of the State of Ohio, p. 323; Olcott, McKinley, p. 269.

71 Croly, Hanna, pp. 159-160; Morgan, William McKinley and His America, p. 155; William A. White, Masks In A Pageant, p. 167.
Amid considerable enthusiasm, he crossed under a tin arch erected over the main street, bearing an immense sign: "Protection is Prosperity." One reporter noted that the whole town seemed to be tin-plated as it advertised the budding tin industry fostered by the McKinley Tariff. Leaving the podium, McKinley went into the crowd of over 25,000 and began to shake hands and exchange pleasantries with the workers. His approachability, geniality, and sympathetic charm made him popular with almost everyone he met.

In his opening address he notably minimized the tariff issue and emphasized the currency question. McKinley and his advisors realized the vulnerability of the Democrats on the latter question and decided to emphasize it rather than the protection issue. McKinley carefully noted in his speech that Campbell had commented in the past that he opposed free and unlimited coinage of silver. Now, however, because his party had endorsed it in its platform, "Campbell was willing to chance free silver, although he had doubts about it." McKinley

72 Morgan, op. cit., pp. 155-156; Ohio State Journal, August 23, 1891.

and the other Republicans, persuaded by Gresham's law that cheap money would drive expensive money out of circulation, feared that the United States would lose its gold as silver poured in from other nations.

Observers noticed in the campaign that McKinley was ineffective on the money issue. He lacked the forcefulness and directness that he expressed when he spoke on the tariff question. Such statements as, "The silver dollar has $.80 intrinsic value, the other $.20 depends upon the will of Congress," illustrated this. James Ford Rhodes took a similar point of view when he wrote, "... it is easy to see from his [McKinley's] speeches that he understood the tariff better than finance."^74

Such Republicans as John Sherman eagerly entered the campaign and added to the chorus attacking the Democratic money position. The Senator said, "This campaign is to be the Gettysburg of dishonest money." He appealed "to the conservative men of Ohio of both parties to repeat now the service they rendered the people of the United States in 1875 by the election of Governor Hayes in checking the wave of inflation that then threatened the country."^75

---


^75 Ohio State Journal, August 28, September 4, 1891.
It was on September 7, while visiting at the Burnet House in Cincinnati, that McKinley rendered the first truly confident statement regarding his possibilities. After observing at first hand the ill-feeling toward his opponent, the Republican said, "I think that I will be elected by a sound safe majority." Furthermore, he disregarded the loss of Democratic votes to the People's Party and declared that he did "not think that party will be much of a factor in the campaign." McKinley reasoned that Ohio was normally a Republican State and that the Democratic party's loss of Hamilton County was enough to indicate the almost complete impossibility of its success. Lamenting on only one point, he commented that he took a friendly delight in beating Campbell, but he hoped in reference to Campbell's illness at that time, "that he will get well as there is no glory in whipping a sick man."76

In the Democratic camp Campbell was not faring as well as he would have liked. After supporting James Neal for reelection as Chairman of the Democratic Executive Committee, he journeyed to Pittsburg to deliver an address. He predicted that he would be reelected "with or without

76Cincinnati Enquirer, September 8, 1891.
the vote of Hamilton County." He added that dissension still existed there, but he attributed it to the German temperament which was slow in calming down. He then took an even more optimistic attitude by claiming he would receive more votes in each of Ohio's eighty-eight counties than in 1889. This statement was based upon the opinion that the farmers disliked the McKinley tariff which failed to adequately protect them. Moreover, he claimed, contrary to most other professional analysts, that the People's Party would draw its strength from normally Republican adherents. Alluding to the financial position of the two major parties, he explained that the Democratic campaign would not start until mid-September because they were too poor to start earlier. He announced that he "would be a landslide victor" if his party had the backing that his opponent possessed. When questioned about his plans after the election, assuming that he won, he refused to talk about any presidential ambitions. When asked if he would consider a vice-presidential nomination with Cleveland, Campbell sharply retorted, "The Vice Presidency is not a position that I should think any man would hanker for." 77

77Ibid., July 23, 1891
These early comments of Campbell would soon yield to those of less optimistic tone during the ensuing month. Campbell asked Grover Cleveland to come to Ohio and deliver several speeches on behalf of the party. The Ohioan reasoned that a Democratic victory over McKinley would go a long way in helping the party in 1892. On the negative side he felt that if the Democrats were to lose in 1891, the loss would catapult McKinley and his protection ideas to the forefront. Unfortunately for Campbell, Cleveland refused to come to Ohio. In a letter to a friend Cleveland defended his action by saying,

I have never been a stump speaker and do not think I should be a success in that role. If I went to Ohio, I don't see how I could avoid going to Iowa and speaking in Massachusetts.

He believed, moreover, that he could not support the entire state platform. Specifically he was referring to the silver plank. He believed that if he ignored it or repudiated it, then Campbell's chances would be more hurt than if he did not appear. The ex-President was more direct in a letter to Michael Harter when he wrote, "... I am much disappointed with the Ohio platform..."

---

Somehow the outlook depresses me, for I want very much to see Campbell re-elected as a recognition of his sturdiness and honest efforts to give his State a good clean administration. I hope all will go well and that he will be elected."79

By the end of the month two other acts added to Campbell's misfortunes. Louis Reemelin was overwhelmingly reelected Democratic County Executive Chairman of Hamilton County and promised to use his efforts to keep Campbell from being reelected. He and his local cohorts still hoped that Campbell might step aside for the sake of party unity. Secondly, Campbell became quite ill and was forced to leave the campaign planning. He agreed to take a rest because of the urging of his family, friends, and doctor. He planned to go East to the ocean hoping that its breezes would revive him and allow him to return to the Buckeye State and carry out the campaign.80

In the course of his journey he stopped in New York City; despite his sickness, diagnosed as malaria, he agreed to receive many visitors. He reported that the only purpose of these meetings was to discuss the Ohio

80 Cincinnati Enquirer, August 21, September 2, 1891.
campaign and nothing else. His only official comment was that he expected the Hamilton County Democrats "will come around before election time and support the ticket heartily."\(^{81}\)

The official opening of the Democratic campaign was scheduled for September 17, in Sidney, Ohio. On the previous day Campbell returned to Columbus. He was slated to speak at the Democratic Day celebration at the State Fair held in Columbus. The train arrived late, but Campbell was able to reach the fairgrounds before the crowd dispersed. Although he was still visibly pale from his illness, he prepared the audience for the campaign. Appealing to the farm element, whose presence was usually strong at these gatherings, Campbell stated that he was a farmer and knew about the farmer's problems. He confessed that during the preceding years his obligations had prevented him from spending as much time as he would have liked on agricultural pursuits except the paying of taxes and meeting a mortgage on his small farm. He attacked the tariff position of the Republicans and charged that Americans, particularly farmers, were forced to pay more for American-made goods than foreigners. This was based on the premise that the high tariff rates prevented

\(^{81}\) *Ibid.*, September 5, 1891.
foreign competition and allowed local producers and manufacturers to charge high prices. In the world market, however, these same producers lowered their costs to compete against foreign manufacturers. To the Ohioan, who believed that loyalty should begin at home, this was total injustice. He asserted that the lower classes always bore the burden of the protection policy. In an effort to attack the prosperity theme of his opponent, who attributed it to the tariff, he admitted that the farmer shared in the increased wealth of the country. He argued that this prosperity was false because the world-wide crops were poor that year except those in the United States. He forecasted that once this world problem ended, there would no longer be any foreign markets for the American farmer. Generally these speeches were warmly received by the audience and they helped to invigorate Campbell for the struggle that lay ahead.

The following day he traveled to Sidney and there officially opened his campaign. The weather was a hot 90° day, but the reception was hotter. He attempted to reverse the trend started by the Republicans to focus the contest on the silver issue. He challenged McKinley to talk

82 Ibid., September 17, 1891.
directly and openly about the tariff and its effects upon the common man. Replying to his opponent's interpretation of the Democratic silver plank, Campbell took some liberties in qualifying what the proposal actually meant.

He said:

The Democrats indignantly resent as insolent and untrue the charge that they desire to restore the free and unlimited coinage of silver in any manner except that which will make every silver dollar as good in purchasing power as any other dollar and worth one hundred cents as it is today wherever the American flag covers it.\(^\text{83}\)

In spite of Campbell's pleas McKinley refused to alter the course of the Republican campaign. It was apparent that he looked upon himself as the leader and saw no reason to change in order to pacify or appease his rival. On September 19 the Republican candidate spoke at the Music Hall in Cincinnati. While the address added nothing new to the campaign, there were important indications to be observed. The hall "was packed as never before." McKinley was constantly interrupted by large and enthusiastic applause. Amid the happy throng local Democrats were observed who applauded equally as strong as the Republicans. Hence, it became noticeable

\(^{83}\) Ibid., September 18, 1891; Cleveland Plain Dealer, September 18, 1891.
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that Campbell's hopes of bringing the Hamilton County Democrats back into the fold had failed.

By the end of the month victory for McKinley seemed assured. "Everything out here looks encouraging," wrote his private secretary. "We anticipate a good sound majority . . ., nothing short of a grave mistake on our part can beat us." This appraisal was also reflected within the Democratic ranks which sought to find something to reverse the trend. Eventually they turned to Campbell's successful method of the past, the conducting of a series of debates. Accordingly, James Neal issued a challenge calling for a series of eight debates to be held in the larger cities of Ohio. The Republican campaign chairman, William Hahn, realized that the debates were unnecessary because McKinley was already a safe winner. He knew of Campbell's success in these tilts and feared that the whole scheme could drastically hurt McKinley.

After some discussion Hahn realized that the public might react against McKinley for refusing to participate in the debates. Consequently, he and Hanna and McKinley agreed to face Campbell in one debate. The place and date selected for this confrontation was the small rural

85Morgan, McKinley and His America, p. 156.
community of Ada on October 8. It was argued by the Republicans that the town was in a relatively central location, so that people could come from all parts of the state. From a practical point of view it was a location convenient for both McKinley and Campbell at that date.  

Meeting in Ada, the candidates seemed relaxed and in good spirits. Unfortunately the officials of the contest were not as equally poised. J. M. Van Fleet, Chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Hardin County, opened the meeting by describing the procedures to be followed. He announced that Campbell had drawn by lot the opening and closing spots. He would "open for one hour and five minutes," to be "followed by the Governor—I mean Mr---McKinley." After trying to recover from this disastrous slip which prompted loud cheering by the Republicans, he concluded dramatically by shouting that McKinley would be "followed by Governor Campbell—the Governor, the would-be Governor, and the will-be Governor." Thereafter, the great debate was held. Actually, it was not a debate in the true sense of the word. Campbell, suffering from a sore throat, limited his statements to the tariff issue, and McKinley stressed the currency

---

86 Cincinnati Enquirer, September 30, 1891.
question. Both repeated essentially the same ideas that they had stated previously in other speeches. Both remained polite and courteous and never once directly attacked the other for ungentlemanly behavior. This conduct prompted the following poem to be written the next day:

Jim and Bill put on the mits in Ada.
At the call of time, Jim showed his teeth,
Then there's a fell with Bill beneath.
The sight of blood makes Bill yell;
He goes at Jim and gives him --- fits;
The bottle holders then rub them down,
and Jimmie wins the final round.
Over the ropes the athletes spring,
Slightly disfigured, but still in the ring;
Says each to the other, 'I'm very sorry',
And the band played 'Annie Laurie'!
With the cannons roaring and drummers drumming, 88
The band then played 'The Campbells are coming'. 89

The only discord noted by one reporter was the entry of a Republican band to the grounds while Campbell was speaking. The reporter also observed that the crowd, in excess of 30,000, was disappointed that the two nominees never spoke on the same issue but, nonetheless, they all had a gay time. 89

Both state committees claimed victory in the debate. The Democrats believed that they were so successful that
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they offered to conduct another encounter and the Republicans refused. Furthermore, when Campbell rose to speak in the last fifteen minutes, his friends cheered so long and so loud that he was "scarcely permitted . . . to say a word." The only concession given to McKinley was that he read a good prepared speech, but he was not able to compete with Campbell at repartee. This latter statement was meaningless because McKinley was never given the opportunity to reply.

Realizing that this one debate could not change the forces against him, Campbell spent the remainder of the campaign following his usual formula, talking as often as possible to many people in many different places. Generally ignoring the currency question, he continually stressed the tariff, using every opportunity that he could. McKinley reversed this approach and preferred to hammer away at the vulnerable Democratic silver plank. Occasionally, however, he did revert to his favorite topic, the defense of his tariff act of 1890. In rural areas he emphasized the wool tariff and in industrial regions he limited himself to wages and prices.

At Piqua McKinley laid the basis of a discourse which continued throughout the campaign. He had gone to the mills

---

of Colonel Battelle and before the eyes of the assembled workmen pulled a piece of American tin plate from the bath, stating that the manufacture of this product was another benefit of the high protective tariff. This assertion was based upon the 1890 measure which greatly raised the rate on tin plate in order to induce development at home. At the time of its passage the United States was importing tin plate at the rate of $21,000,000 annually. McKinley believed that not only would the tariff enable Americans to build their own industry, but it would also create 24,000 more jobs. Consequently, it was with pride and satisfaction that he formed a tin cup and waved it before the workers. Using Piqua as an example, he said similar mills were being erected in other parts of Ohio and he included the town of Apollo.

After weighing the speech, Campbell went to Piqua and deflated McKinley's statements by claiming that drinking cups made from such tin would bring lead poisoning "resulting in paralysis and death." Furthermore the so-called new mill at Apollo consisted solely of one room, seven feet by nine feet, staffed by one man and one boy.  

---
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In reply to McKinley's claim that the farmers were in the midst of prosperity, as a direct result of the tariff, Campbell admitted that 1891 was a good year. He claimed that this was caused solely by the world market and not the tariff. Arguing historically, he showed that the value of farmland in Mahoning County had declined $3,000,000 since 1880. He insisted this was the consequence of almost continuous Republican regimes in Ohio.

In addition to the two main candidates other important speakers toured the state. Always McKinley was presented by them as the Apostle of protection. For the Republican side Joseph Benson Foraker delivered numerous talks throughout the southern portion of the state. He was at his best when it came to fanning the fire between Campbell and his downstate rivals. Personally, his intentions for helping McKinley were questionable. Many held the opinion that he was only concerned with keeping a leadership position within his party. Proof of this feeling was found in a gleeful letter Foraker wrote to Murat Halstead stating

93 Van Bolt, "Gubernatorial Campaign of 1891 in Ohio," p. 51. This decline could also be attributed to the work of the decennial tax commission which changed the classification of the farm property in many instances to that of urban property. In 1880 farm property was 62% of the total valuation in Ohio while in 1890, it had fallen to 50% of the total valuation.
that John Sherman, who was campaigning in the western portion of the state, was alienating himself with the Farmer's Alliances and could mar his chances for re-election to the Senate in 1892. Optimistically the ex-Governor hoped that he would replace his intra-party rival.

Republican House Speaker Thomas B. Reed of Maine spoke in Ohio in defense of the high tariff and proclaimed he would "... build a Chinese wall all around this country higher than Haman was ever hung." Joining in this general chorus were Joseph Cannon and William E. Mason of Illinois, and Jacob B. Brown and Charles W. Fairbanks of Indiana.

On the Democratic side, the redoubtable defender of a low tariff, Roger Q. Mills, eager for another chance to battle McKinley, came to the Buckeye State. The Texan, upsetting some Democratic silver adherents, said at Mansfield that silver was not the answer to the nation's problems. Rather, the real question to be solved was the tariff issue. He told the farmers that they did not need

---
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more money in circulation, but a government which would not take money away from them. Others who entered the state and joined Campbell were Congressmen Benton McMillan of Tennessee, G. W. Hewitt of Connecticut, and W. C. Warner of New York.

On the state level Virgil Kline, one of Campbell's foes at the state nominating convention, entered the campaign and spoke for the party. Lawrence Neal, on the contrary, refused to campaign or to endorse Campbell, but as the Democratic press reported, "at least he has not gone over to the enemy." 97

John Seitz, the People's candidate, created little excitement during the campaign. The general prosperity of the farmers kept them from embracing a more radical group. 98 General James Weaver and Jerry Simpson, national leaders of the group, came to Ohio but failed to arouse a significant number of adherents to their cause.

Campbell made several appearances in Cincinnati during the closing weeks of the campaign. Although the gatherings were acceptable in numbers, they were decidedly unenthusiastic in spirit. Trying to enliven his audiences with humor, Campbell managed to create occasional

96 Nation, September 14, LIII, p. 229.
97 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 22, 24, 1891.
98 Sherman, Recollections, II, p. 1119.
stirs but little excitement. The Toledo Blade predicted, "Campbell will find out when it is too late that the voters of Ohio are swayed by sober reason not by flip­pant remarks intended to create a laugh." Weakly the Cincinnati Enquirer replied, "McKinley is flippant without being funny. His speeches are dull history and full of fallacy."  

McKinley delivered his last full speech in Cincinnati on October 30. Talking in the Music Hall amid large floral wreaths and a picture of himself, the Republican displayed tremendous poise and confidence. His audience, about half of which consisted of ladies who continued to wave their handkerchiefs at the slightest provocation, seemed to be a group attending a music recital or a drama rather than a political speech. In concluding his address McKinley asked if a Democratic low tariff had ever created a factory in Ohio or opened a mine or built a fire in a furnace. Recalling the last Democratic sponsored tariff, the Walker Tariff of 1846, the protection adherent shouted that it put out the fires until 1860 when the Republicans relit them. He predicted

99Toledo Blade, October 24, 1891.
100Cincinnati Enquirer, October 24, 1891.
that if there were no tariffs and if prices were the same as in Europe, then the workers would have to accept equal wages as in Europe.\textsuperscript{101} Leaving the southern metropolis, McKinley journeyed north, and with a few closing remarks at Canton, he awaited the election.

The election was the first one to employ the Australian ballot. During part of September and October, numerous procedural questions arose concerning its implementation. Such queries as, "Should the ballots be printed in German?" or "Who will print them?" illustrated the questions asked. Always back of these interrogations were Republicans who constantly taunted the Democratic administration which had prepared the bill. Constant challenges were heard that the Republicans would never create a bill without carefully solving all the possible problems which might occur.\textsuperscript{102}

Election day, November 3, was cool and crisp in Ohio. The headlines of the newspapers repeated the same slogan that "The Eagle vs. the Rooster Refereed by the Kangaroo." The early returns put McKinley in the lead and predictions were made that they indicated he would win. Because the secret ballot was used for the first time, the results

\textsuperscript{101}Ibid., November 1, 1891.
\textsuperscript{102}Ibid., September 12, October 1, 1891.
were quite slowly reported. When the final vote was tabulated the results were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>386,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>365,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seitz</td>
<td>23,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashenhurst</td>
<td>20,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McKinley's plurality totaled 21,511. Ohio returned to the Republican column, the Senate by a count of 21-10, and the House by a 72-35 margin.

In examining the returns it is apparent that Hamilton County played an important role. Almost one-half of McKinley's plurality came from there, whereas, in 1889 Campbell had carried the county. The home-rule disruption of 1890 can be laid as the basis for the political switch.

In reply to the opinion that Neal or Kline would have fared better in Hamilton County and perhaps been successful in the state-wide returns, it is interesting to note that Campbell received the highest number of votes of any of the Democratic state candidates.

Another reason for Campbell's defeat was the belief of many farmers that they owed their current prosperity to the McKinley Tariff. James G. Blaine in a letter to

---
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President Benjamin Harrison expressed this more pointedly when he wrote, "They [farmers] have got it into their heads that we did something for them in the McKinley Tariff . . . We are tending to have the great majority of the farmers with us. Let us encourage them by every means we can use, and not discourage them by anything." The state was prosperous in the fall of 1891. The crop failure in Europe helped the grain exports, and the wheat crop in Ohio was the highest since 1880.

Finally and perhaps most important was the inclusion of the free and unlimited coinage of silver plank in the Democratic platform. The Republicans recognized the Democratic Party split over the issue and even Camp-bell's general aversion to it. It was only weakly that the Democratic candidate could speak on its behalf. In the states of Massachusetts and New York, Democratic candidates were elected to office running exclusively on the tariff issue. Furthermore, in 1892 Grover Cleveland lost Ohio by only 1072 votes after limiting himself also to the tariff question. The New York World claimed, "The one
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issue that hurt Campbell most was the surrender of a meager majority of his party in the State against his own wishes and against the World's warning to the free coinage fallacy." 107 The Philadelphia Record, repeating this opinion, wrote, "The Democrats of Ohio on the silver question have lost not only their State, they have lost the chance of naming the next President of the United States." 108

Summing up the entire episode was Joseph B. Foraker who said he expected Campbell’s defeat. He believed that the administration was poor, and the ideas of the Democratic Party on national policies were bad. On the other hand, McKinley was poised and confident. He knew which issues to discuss and how to appeal to the voters. 109

After this setback, during the intervening months until McKinley's inauguration, Campbell continued to perform his duties as Governor. Disappointed in defeat, but not bitter, he felt that he had done his best and what was right. He looked forward to rejoining his family in a return to Hamilton. Financially he left office as a

107 New York World, November 6, 1891.
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poor man. He never was able to amass a fortune. Again, he would be able to think solely of his family. Never again would he be elected to public office. As his administration drew to a close he was satisfied that he neither had to call out a single member of the National Guard, nor did he have a scandal within any state institution. He knew that his chances for a national office had come to an end although some of his more steadfast supporters refused to believe it. At any rate he would leave the Governorship with the belief that he had remained true to his earnest convictions and had accepted the will of the majority.
CHAPTER VII

A PUBLIC SERVANT AND PRIVATE CITIZEN

The election of William McKinley to the governorship of Ohio in 1891 placed that position again under the control of the Republican Party. This ascendancy lasted until 1905 when John M. Pattison, a Democrat, was elected governor. Because of continued Republican dominance, the success of James Edwin Campbell's election victory in 1889 was significant. He represented the only member of his party to hold that office between 1886 and 1906. Campbell consequently became the elder statesman of the Ohio Democratic Party.

Following his departure from office in January, 1892, the Ohioan continued his dedication to the Democratic Party, Ohio, and the nation. Although he realized that his presidential ambitions had been dealt a deadening blow because of his defeat by McKinley, close friends and supporters encouraged him not to dismiss any nomination possibilities. They urged him to remain in the national scene as a logical compromise choice between the growing fissures erupting within the Democratic party.

Three men, ex-President Grover Cleveland, Senator David Hill of New York, and Senator Arthur Pue Gorman of
Maryland, were often mentioned as potential candidates for the Democratic nomination in 1892. Cleveland politically possessed the strongest credentials of the trio. The Democratic election victories of 1890 prompted Cleveland to take a renewed interest in politics. Until then he had refused to be an open candidate for a third nomination. Cleveland interpreted the Congressional victories as a repudiation of the McKinley Tariff of 1890 and consequently, an endorsement of his own tariff proposals of 1887. The ex-President initially adopted a passive policy and was content to let his opponents take the initiative.¹

Senator David Hill was Cleveland's chief rival. He was supported by Tammany Hall and held control over the powerful New York State Central Committee. In February, 1892, his supporters met in an unprecedented early state convention and directed all the delegates selected for the national conclave to vote for the nomination of Hill. This act elicited a retaliation from the Cleveland supporters who attacked the convention as an undemocratic action. Shortly thereafter, the Cleveland group called a convention to assemble in Syracuse and selected its own slate of delegates for the Chicago convention. The results of this New York upheaval brought the struggle between the two

Aspirants into the open.

As a result of the developments in New York and two other factors, Cleveland was forced to clarify his position. A rumor was being spread throughout Democratic circles that Cleveland had written a letter to Representative John G. Carlisle of Kentucky refusing to be considered for the nomination. William C. Whitney, Cleveland's political advisor, urged his friend to suppress the rumor before it brought untold damage to their cause. Whitney also called attention to the growing number of local conventions throughout the nation which were pledging themselves to the ex-President. He successfully argued that unless Cleveland gave some indication that he would accept the nomination, his chances would be considerably lowered.

Hill's aggressiveness in New York State prompted Cleveland to act. He announced that he would accept the nomination if it were offered to him, and he attacked the Hill maneuver as undemocratic. He called upon all Democrats who opposed the New York Senator to join his fight. By this move Cleveland gained considerable support and prestige. He stood as the defender of honest government and the opponent of machine politics.  

Arthur Pue Gorman's hopes for the nomination were based upon the premise that Hill and Cleveland each would

---

2Ibid., pp. 11-13.
nullify the other's chances for the nomination. The Maryland Senator hoped that once this situation was realized, the delegates would turn to him at the convention. Gorman in 1892 was at the zenith of his political career. His role in defeating the passage of the Force Bill in 1890 had assured him of wide popularity in the South by virtue of his defense of states rights. At the same time, he was feted throughout the North as a champion of Democratic causes whose skill equaled that of Republican leaders in Congress. He was one of the outstanding men of his party and was often spoken of as a logical candidate for the Presidential nomination in 1892. "When his actions—and particularly those of his friends—are evaluated it appears that Gorman might have run in 1892 had a united Democratic party drafted him;" however, he did not relish the role of being an intriguer with either group, and in the end he preferred to let events take their own course.

During the spring of 1892 Hill pressed for support. Traveling throughout the South and West, he called for a more liberal monetary policy of bimetallism. He attacked Cleveland's conservative currency position and suggested that Cleveland had lost in 1888 and would be a sure loser in 1892. Although he did make some progress within the

---

Cleveland organization, he realized that he alone could not defeat his prime adversary. Adopting an old political maneuver, he began to woo potential favorite sons to enter the race. He appealed to them on the grounds that neither of the leading candidates would be capable of attaining the necessary two-thirds majority and that the convention would have to turn to a compromise choice. Behind his plan was the desire to have as many candidates as possible presented on the first ballot so that Cleveland would not be able to secure the required majority. Hill and most other political analysts of the time, felt that if Cleveland failed on the first ballot, the ex-President's hopes for a third nomination would end. The New York Senator further realized that such a plan could also make impossible his own nomination, but he was willing to give it to anyone so long as it was denied to Cleveland.

James Campbell was accordingly approached by the Hill forces and was encouraged to allow his name to be presented to the convention. As the leader of the Ohio delegation, the Hill forces believed that if the candidacy of James Campbell were offered to the convention, he would be almost certain of getting Ohio's votes and possibly a few scattered votes elsewhere. When Campbell refused to become a party to this scheme, the Hill group placed an even
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greater temptation before the Ohioan, an assurance of the nomination for the presidency if he cooperated.

Meanwhile, William Whitney had called for a secret meeting of various Cleveland leaders and advisors throughout the country to take place at the New Yorker's home on West 57th Street. In attendance at this session were Judge William G. Ewing of Illinois, William F. Harrity of Pennsylvania, Samuel R. Honey of Rhode Island, Bradley B. Small of Vermont, Samuel E. Morss of Indiana, William F. Vilas of Wisconsin, William L. Wilson of West Virginia, Don M. Dickinson of Michigan, and John E. Russell, Nathan Matthews, and Josiah Quincy of Massachusetts. With Whitney presiding and George F. Parker acting as secretary, the group made an open and honest evaluation of Cleveland's strength and developed plans for dealing with doubtful areas. In this capacity, the group decided to offer Campbell the permanent chairmanship of the convention. If the Ohioan accepted the offer, he would be demonstrating his loyalty and support for the Cleveland banner. His allegiance would be assured, and this would quench any of the plans by the Hill group to push Campbell and draw Ohio delegates away from Cleveland. The plan, however, met a snag when Campbell refused the offer. The Ohioan claimed that he could best serve the Cleveland cause by remaining a member of the Ohio delegation pledged to Cleveland. Senator Calvin Brice of Ohio, who was also a delegate to the convention, was actively
trying to get Ohio to shift its support from Cleveland to Hill. Campbell contended that his presence was necessary to insure Ohio's continued endorsement of the ex-President. His reasoning was accepted by Whitney who then decided to promote William Wilson, an avid supporter of Cleveland, to the permanent chairman post.

On the eve of the convention, Chicago was a busy place. The meetings were to take place in a huge tent, referred to as the wigwam, on the lake front. The tent was designed to hold the approximate one thousand delegates and twenty thousand visitors expected to witness the spectacle. It was apparent that Cleveland had the inside track and that aside from unforeseen developments, he would be a first ballot winner.

On June 19 Senator Gorman gave evidence that he would not try for the nomination. Late that afternoon a group of anti-Cleveland delegates gathered in the Marylander's room at the Palmer House. Notable among them were Senator Matt Ransom of North Carolina, Senator James K. Jones of Arkansas, and William F. Sheehan of New York, a leader of the Hill forces. For three hours these men tried to persuade Gorman to make an active fight. They estimated their strength at 400 votes; they said that the free silver

forces would be sure to support Gorman on the convention floor; but Gorman utterly refused to join them in a "stop Cleveland" movement. At the end of the conference he announced that he was not a candidate. Instead, he said that Maryland was for Cleveland, and all talk of his own candidacy was misleading and definitely unauthorized. Gorman realized that his entrance into the contest at that time would only serve to stop Cleveland and thus help the Hill forces. Furthermore, Gorman knew that once Cleveland was stopped, the ex-President's delegates would never rally about the man who had caused his defeat. 6

With Gorman successfully eliminated Whitney was able to force other potential favorite sons out of the race. Hill now recognized that he was defeated, but he refused to release his delegates. He did not want to see them turn to Gorman who might be persuaded to enter the contest with the New York Senator out of the way. 7 Ironically, the stubbornness of each of the Senators and their refusal to compromise proved in the end to be the impediment which brought defeat to both of them.

When the convention opened, Edward J. Murphy Jr., Chairman for the Hill group, was found passing out handbills stating that Hill was "The Napoleon of New York

---

politics, who has never met a Waterloo." The politico was overheard telling the delegates that Hill would carry the solid South and the doubtful states of the North. He predicted that the nomination of Cleveland would be political suicide because the ex-President had lost in 1888 and was not a popular man.

The opening sessions of the convention were devoted to routine business. Trouble, however, started to erupt after Wilson took control as permanent chairman. He proved to be incapable of controlling the assembly which had grown restless because of the humid, hot weather Chicago was experiencing. On the afternoon of the second day bedlam occurred when the scheduled speaker, John G. Carlisle, was unable to be found. With a commotion rising on the floor, Wilson called upon Campbell to deliver an address to the convention. After a few short opening remarks which applauded Cleveland's leadership of the party, the lights in the tent went out and an uproar followed. When order was restored, the Hill forces shouted for Bourke Cockran, the New York Tammany orator, to replace the Ohioan. Wilson, hoping to bring some calmness agreed, whereupon Cockran declined the opportunity to speak until later. Wilson thereupon accepted the advice of others on the podium and recessed the

---
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meeting until the evening. 9

The platform indicated the intense feelings of the delegates. Regarding the all important tariff question, Cleveland and Whitney favored a moderate protective tariff which would be decidedly lower than the McKinley schedules of 1890. When the platform, which was influenced greatly by the two New Yorkers, was submitted to the convention for approval, a minority plank which called for a tariff for revenue purposes only was submitted by Tom L. Johnson and Henry Watterson. After some heated debates the minority proposal was accepted by a vote of 564 to 342. A qualifying clause within the adopted plank called for a revenue tariff which would not hurt any existing domestic industries. At the time of its passage Cleveland stated that he could accept the plank; however, after his nomination he did interpret the qualifying clause of the plank as a justification of his moderate protection views.

The platform straddled the currency question when it called for a bimetallic standard and opposed any discrimination in behalf of either metal. It omitted any reference to the question of the free coinage of silver. Many free silverites, especially Southern delegates, opposed the straddling of the issue and talked of supporting the

Farmers' Alliance and the Populist candidates, but they were eventually persuaded to remain within the Democratic Party because they feared Republican victories from a party split.  

As the convention prepared to vote on the first ballot for its nominee, Bourke Cockran openly expressed the fading hopes of the anti-Cleveland forces:

> Every Cleveland delegate whom we can get to go to some other man on this (first) ballot will be so much off Cleveland's vote. We want to keep his vote down. If we can keep it to between 400 and 500 we have no doubt of defeating him.  

William C. Whitney was apprehensive at this point. He admired the young and energetic Campbell, and he knew that he was the recipient of tempting offers to place personal ambition above loyalty. Whitney's fears proved unnecessary because Campbell, despite the advice and entreaties of warm personal friends, declined to enter into any Hill arrangement. Instead, he took a position under Whitney and worked for Cleveland's nomination.  

Whitney's labor with Campbell's support proved successful. Cleveland was nominated on the first ballot,

---
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receiving 61,713 votes, only a few more than the necessary 607 votes. Thus, there was impressive evidence that the loss of Ohio's support might have denied the New Yorker the nomination.  

Despite Campbell's refusal to have his name placed in nomination, he still was honored with two votes on the first ballot. Some of his supporters argued that other delegates were ready to rally around him if he would only give some sign that he would accept the nomination. Many of these supporters and others, such as Biriah Williams of the Washington Star, claimed, "Never did any man have a better opportunity to place ambition before loyalty and friendship." Such was the belief of many that he could have received the nomination, if he had not refused to act. Later, comments were heard that Campbell and his political supporters had made "a great mistake" and lost a real opportunity "to perform a great service for the Democratic Party." By a strange coincidence, William McKinley, who the same year was a delegate to the convention at which
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President Benjamin Harrison was renominated and to whose candidacy he was committed, was obliged to remind the delegates from the platform that he was not a candidate and to insist that his preferences and rights as a delegate be respected.  

Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois was selected as Cleveland's Vice-Presidential running mate. He proved a fortunate choice, for as a campaign orator he had few equals. According to Champ Clark, Stevenson was "the delight of the multitude," for in addition to a commanding stage presence, he "always spoke right out in meetings and did not mince his words."  

In preparing for the campaign, Campbell was mentioned as a possible chairman for the Democratic campaign committee. Don M. Dickinson of Michigan, however, was chosen for the post on August 5, 1892 at a meeting of Cleveland's advisors. The general strategy on the conduct of the campaign was repetitive of the 1888 and 1890 contests. Cleveland avoided the currency question and emphasized the tariff issue. Campbell agreed that this was the best plan. The Ohioan needed only to recall the events of the preceding year to

16 Sater, Campbell, p. 48.  
verify his convictions. 18

Adlai Stevenson visited Butler County on Saturday, October 1. The afternoon meeting was held at Woodsdale Island. Several thousand Democrats from Cincinnati, Dayton, Hamilton, and Middletown attended. Campbell presided over the meeting and was given the honor of introducing the speaker. In the course of the formal address Stevenson was happy to recall a remark made by Campbell at the Chicago convention. The Ohioan was quoted as saying, "Keep your eye on Ohio this fall." Stevenson added that he had always been able to rely on Campbell and was quite happy to accept the opinion. 19

Cleveland and the Democratic Party were aided by problems which rocked the nation and presented serious problems for the Harrison administration. The labor uprisings at Homestead, Pennsylvania, the Coeurd'Alene mines in Idaho, the coal mines of Tennessee, and the switchmen's revolt in Buffalo, New York, aroused animosity toward the Republicans because of their failure to quell the disturbances. Cleveland told various audiences that if the tariff laws were reconstructed to help the laboring class the same as the

18Ibid., pp. 132-137. Thomas L. Johnson had 200,000 copies of Henry George's Protection and Free Trade printed and sent into Ohio for the campaign after he and others had read it into the Congressional Record. Hence, it was mailed under the Congressional franking privilege.
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owners, there would be no strikes or unrest. As a concession to the protection-minded manufactures he commented, "We are not at enmity with the rights of any of our citizens. We are not recklessly heedless of any American's interests nor will we abandon our regard for them." As a result of Cleveland's theoretical solution and Harrison's inability to project a popular image, the Democrats profited from the turbulence.

The last hurdle overcome by the Cleveland forces was the thorny problem of maintaining party unity. The convention had elicited strong and bitter attacks by both the winners and the losers. It was imperative to Whitney that the Tammany Hall and Hill groups be appeased if the Democrats hoped to carry New York State. Tammany Hall under the leadership of Richard Croker was brought back into the fold with comparative ease. Croker believed that politics was equivalent to business. In order to be successful the party had to win elections. Regardless of his personal views of Cleveland the New York City boss was willing to support the nominee. Croker knew that if he failed to fall in line and Cleveland were to win, he and his associates would be overlooked at the patronage banquet. However, if Cleveland were to lose, other Democrats would

20Knoles, The Presidential Campaign and Election of 1892, pp. 142-145.
place the defeat at the feet of Tammany and cause it to lose much prestige.

Whitney found the winning over of Hill a more difficult task, but eventually the New York Senator was persuaded to accept his defeat and endorse Cleveland. In a dramatic speech delivered on September 19 in Brooklyn, Hill uttered his famous words, "I am a Democrat" and would follow the decision of the convention. Actually, Whitney had pressured Hill by threatening a Senatorial boycott if Hill remained outside of the party. Realizing the loss of power certain to follow if the threat was fulfilled, Hill submitted.

As a result of Whitney's leadership Cleveland's election was almost a certainty. On election day the New Yorker maintained the Democratic tradition of securing the support of the solid South and carried enough Northern states to provide a substantial margin of victory. In Ohio, it originally appeared that the Democratic party had elected all twenty-three of its presidential electors; however, the official count tallied twenty-two successful Republicans and only one Democrat. By a strange set of circumstances the lone Democrat had received the highest number of votes, but he was followed in descending order by twenty-two Republicans. The basic reason for this strange outcome was the attitude of both parties that a Republican

21Ibid., pp. 161-163.
victory in the state was assured. Consequently, the Demo-
crats had expended little effort, and the Republicans, feel-
ing safe, allowed their best campaigners, McKinley, John
Sherman, and Joseph B. Foraker, to be sent into more uncer-
tain states. 22

While Campbell's prediction proved invalid in Ohio by
1,072 votes, he was correct in his forecast that Cleveland
would be victorious. He was frequently named throughout
the country as a strong possibility for selection as a mem-
ber of the President's cabinet in 1893. Unfortunately for
Campbell, he was forced to refuse consideration in that con-
nection because of his personal financial situation. He
was never a rich man. Later in life he reached a level of
affluence which allowed him a great deal of freedom from
economic worries, but in 1893 he was on the verge of bank-
ruptcy. He had allowed his business interests to wane dur-
ing his years in public office. As much as he wanted to
accept a cabinet post, he had to think of his family and
its needs. He lamented later, "I had no other asset than
my friends. When penniless and heavy in debt, I turned

22Ibid., pp. 229-230. Some Ohio Democrats believed
that a quiet campaign might see a party victory on the pre-
mise that the Republicans would be lulled into apathy. On
the other hand, they feared that a vigorous campaign would
elicit a similar Republican response which would bring cer-
tain defeat.
again to the law."

Beginning in 1893 Campbell practiced law in Columbus for a time and later had business interests in New York City. Although he was only an occasional visitor to Hamilton, Ohio, he maintained it as his legal residence. He was able to pay off all his debts and to accumulate a substantial surplus.

As the Cleveland Administration progressed, within Ohio McKinley and his Republican colleagues were able to maintain and increase their popularity. Any difficulties which arose were always blamed upon the second Cleveland administration. When Cleveland came into office, the Democratic party faced a severe economic depression which buffeted the nation. Unlike Franklin Roosevelt in a later time, Cleveland believed his duty was not to find new remedies for old problems but to decide which old methods should be reemployed. He believed that the major causes of the economic difficulties were the Sherman Silver Purchase Act and the McKinley Tariff and that other problems which existed in the nation were outside the jurisdiction of the federal government. Cleveland believed
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that local communities should handle any problems that existed within their midst.

First the President proposed the repeal of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act. On October 30 after the House had acted favorably, the Senate added its support to the measure by a count of forty-eight to thirty-seven. In the Senatorial vote the Democratic Party members were noticeably split. They divided equally with twenty-two voting affirmatively and a similar number voting in the negative. Had it not been for the Republicans, Cleveland's proposal would have failed.

By this action Cleveland won only a limited victory. The hated act was gone, but the depression continued. The Democratic Party, moreover, was on the verge of a great split which would result in the emergence of William Jennings Bryan with his appeal to the common man. The old Bourbon conservatives were then to lose their grip on the party.

The second cause to which Cleveland attributed the depression, the McKinley Tariff, became his next center of attention. In the House of Representatives, William L. Wilson introduced a bill aimed at reducing the general tariff duties from forty-nine percent to about thirty

----

percent. Although it did not call for a complete free trade policy, it did include a long free list of raw and unfinished goods. To compensate for the expected loss in revenue an income tax provision was included. When the measure reached the Senate, it was attacked by the Republicans and some Eastern Democratic protectionists who successfully amended the bill. In its final form the bill, known as the Wilson-Gorman Tariff, was adopted and provided for a slight reduction in the McKinley rates. Cleveland, openly disappointed in this development but realizing that at least a modicum of reduction could be attained, allowed the bill to become law without his signature.  

As the depression continued in 1894, dissident elements arose in the nation. Originating in Massillon, Ohio, was the "petition in boots," better known as Coxey's Army. The leader, Jacob S. Coxey, sought to have the government initiate a public works program to provide jobs for the unemployed. Essentially this was to be financed through government bonds which would serve as collateral for $500,000,000 in newly issued paper currency. Starting in the spring of 1894, Coxey and a few hundred unemployed citizens began their march to Washington. The marchers ultimately reached their destination only to have the movement collapse when Coxey was arrested, under orders of Attorney General Richard

---
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Olney, for stepping on the grass. Accomplishing nothing directly, the group illustrated that dissension was alive and that the Democratic Party was not facing the needs of the people.

The Pullman strike added to the prevailing bitterness and ended with interference by the Cleveland administration. The government sided with the railroad interests against the workers. Little did Cleveland realize, nor did many others, that the ebbing years of the nineteenth century not only marked the chronological end of a century but the threshold of a completely new attitude toward the role of the government.

The election of 1894 witnessed notable Republican and moderate Populist election gains. Generally it was the Democratic Party that lost, indicating that the conservative views of the Cleveland wing were losing ground.

Throughout the early years of the second Cleveland administration, Campbell maintained a close contact with the Democratic Party. He served as a consultant to Cleveland on developments within the Buckeye State. He was primarily concerned with the important subject of federal appointments in Ohio. The former Ohio Governor was constantly at odds with Senator Calvin Brice over the matter of recommendations for these positions. Campbell wrote to Cleveland that Brice was backing elements in Cincinnati
"engaged in attempting the defeat of an honest democratic ticket." He charged that Brice was trying to build and maintain a bevy of officeholders loyal to the Senator and not to the President. It was no secret that Cleveland and the Ohio Senator were personal enemies and that Brice had only reluctantly acknowledged Cleveland's leadership after Hill's defeat in 1892.

Campbell substantiated his allegations in a letter that he sent to the President in February 1894. Campbell wrote that the Cincinnati Enquirer was guilty of malicious and vindictive attacks upon Cleveland. Moreover, the Washington correspondent of the newspaper, the same man who was writing the caustic articles, was Brice's personal secretary. Campbell believed that this disclosure was vivid proof of Brice's infidelity to the party. Specifically, Campbell was referring to the Enquirer's attacks upon the forthcoming appointment of Wheeler H. Peckham as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. The journal maintained that Peckham was proposed because he was an enemy of New York Senator David Hill. His appointment was theoretically only to help Cleveland assert his power in New York State. The article suggested that many Senators opposed the appointment, but they feared political repercussions if they
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voted against Cleveland. 28

At the same time that Campbell warned Cleveland of Brice's acts, the former Ohio Governor did attempt to maintain some degree of cooperation with the Ohio Senator. Oftentimes, he tried to arrange compromises on appointment recommendations. He also proposed joint meetings with the President whereby each man presented and defended his ideas. 29

Campbell on one occasion was elated that Cleveland had accepted his recommendation of Captain Joseph Dowling as Collector of Internal Revenue in the Cincinnati District. Brice had opposed the appointment and was reported by the partisan Enquirer as being justifiably upset. The Cincinnati paper wrote that although Dowling appeared personally capable, the method of his appointment was highly questionable. The paper recalled that Cleveland had previously traveled to Cincinnati to personally evaluate the candidates. On this occasion Campbell and Dowling were seen talking with the President, and it was assumed that their conversation concerned the appointment. Dowling was subsequently sent into another room and Cleveland and Campbell then privately discussed the matter. At the end of the
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meeting the two arose laughing, shook hands, and said that everything was arranged. Shortly thereafter, Dowling was officially notified of his appointment. The newspaper charged that the entire procedure was irregular and further alleged that Dowling had failed to file petitions or endorsements attesting to his ability to perform the job. Moreover, it suggested that Campbell was unduly influential with the President and that Cleveland should have consulted more people.

Campbell, however, countered this attack with clippings from the Republican controlled Dayton *Daily Journal*, the Democratic Dayton *Daily Herald*, and comments from Michael C. Ryan, who was recommended for the post by the Solicitor General, and others. All of them concluded that Dowling was an excellent appointment and that Cleveland could not have made a better choice.  

During this period developments within Ohio favored the Republicans. McKinley had been successfully reelected in 1893 and probably could have won a third term if he had wanted it. Preferring to avoid the third term question and to prepare himself for the all important Republican convention of 1896, he decided to step aside. In the quest for the complete support of his own state, he agreed

---

30Campbell to Cleveland, September 27, 1893, Cleveland Papers.
with Joseph Benson Foraker to support the nomination of Asa Bushnell, Foraker's lieutenant, for the governorship. Privately he agreed to support Foraker for a United States Senate post in return for his assistance in the presidential convention. Foraker realized that this was a golden opportunity to fulfill his ambitions and accepted the arrangement.

The plan met a snag, however, when Bushnell refused to be a candidate. Foraker thought of supporting J. Warren Kiefer but dropped that plan when the ex-Governor's supporters, especially George B. Cox, failed to agree. Consequently Foraker again turned to Bushnell who reluctantly agreed to accept the nomination.

Meanwhile Mark Hanna, who looked upon Foraker as a rival and preferred to keep his followers out of office, made it well known that he would support George K. Nash. Hanna, however, earnestly sought a McKinley victory in 1896, hence, he reluctantly agreed to allow the Bushnell nomination to take place.\(^{32}\)

The Republican state convention was held at Zanesville on May 28 and 29, 1895. Thousands thronged the streets,


but only 5,000 were able to crowd into the profusely decorated Memorial Hall.\textsuperscript{33} The proceedings were enlivened by a Sherman-Foraker clash for control, but the decision had already been reached. Bushnell was nominated after six ballots.\textsuperscript{34}

In the Democratic camp it was apparent that victory would not be forthcoming in 1895. Many of the potential candidates shied away from the nomination because they did not want to blemish their records with a certain resounding defeat. The unity within the Republican camp and the failure of the Cleveland administration to handle the depression presented overwhelming odds. James Campbell had gone to the convention as a delegate from Butler County. He had consistently said that he was not a candidate for the nomination and that he would object to the use of his name there. After the convention had assembled, Campbell was annoyed to hear his name placed in nomination. He stood up on the chair which he was occupying and declared that he could not be a candidate saying, "My time belongs to my family and to my creditors." In spite of this declaration Campbell was nominated by acclamation. Thereafter, he went forward to the platform and in one of the shortest acceptance speeches on record, a total of fourteen words, he

\textsuperscript{33}Cincinnati \textit{Commercial-Gazette}, May 29, 1895.

\textsuperscript{34}Foraker, \textit{Notes}, I, p. 452.
exclaimed, "A good soldier may fall, but he dare not falter. I accept the nomination." 35 

In the campaign that followed the Republicans presented a completely unified opposition to Campbell. Virtually every important Ohio Republican participate to the fullest. Especially prominent was Joseph B. Foraker. He knew that not only did Bushnell have to win, but the Republicans had to secure a majority in the legislature if he were to be elected to the Senate. Toward the close of the contest Foraker went so far as to challenge Calvin Brice, the Democratic incumbent, to a series of debates on national subjects. Brice, out of the state as usual, made no reply. 36 

McKinley also campaigned in behalf of Bushnell. While he was somewhat hesitant at first, he realized that his own reputation as well as that of Ohio's depended upon continued Republican control of the state. 

Though he waged the hardest fight of his career, Campbell knew that he had little chance for victory. As in 1891 he asked Grover Cleveland to come to Ohio and campaign in his behalf. Again the Democratic President refused to be a stump speaker. Cleveland was faced with mixed emotions. He blamed Brice for mismanaging his unsuccessful campaign in 1888 and would personally have been delighted in seeing

him defeated for the Senate. The President characterized Brice by writing a letter to Attorney General Judson Harmon, "Of course you know that the objects and purposes of the Senator [Brice] are entirely selfish and cold-blooded. . . ." Unfortunately, Brice had supported Cleveland's monetary position and the executive needed every vote that he could get in the Senate. As far as Campbell was concerned, Cleveland added, "I hope no such good man as Campbell will be sacrificed, that is, I hope the State ticket will be justly and fairly treated." As a concession to Campbell he gave Harmon permission to help Campbell in a moderate way. 37 Generally Cleveland shied away from tying the prestige of the administration to state elections, especially ones that appeared doomed for the Democratic Party.

Adding to Campbell's difficulties was the presence of a third candidate, Jacob S. Coxey, the leader of the famed march to Washington. Running on a nondescript platform, Coxey's appeal was mainly to voters who were normally Democratic. Reacting to the economic problems of the times, he easily appealed to the discontented workers and unemployed classes.

From the early returns on election day it was conclusive that Bushnell had won. The final returns gave the

Republican a plurality of 92,622 votes above Campbell's total of 334,519 votes. Coxey had managed to poll 52,675 votes, mostly drawn from normally Democratic voters.

Campbell for all practical purposes had been a sacrificial lamb to the Republican onslaught. He had not wanted the nomination, but he had accepted it when it had been offered. The economic problems of the nation and the complete Republican unity were forces no Democrat could have overcome. Many believed that any other candidate would have suffered a more smashing defeat than Campbell received. McKinley interpreted the election as a testimonial to his own administration, and he would use it as a valid recommendation for his presidential nomination in the following year. The trend was Republican everywhere.

Despite this second setback Campbell was not ready to withdraw from politics. His concern for the nation and the Democratic Party prompted him to continue his efforts in behalf of both. He continued to journey to the nation's capital and to support the appointments of various people to federal positions. He joined forces with Calvin Brice and others in proposing the selection of W. L. G. Bernard

---


39 Cleveland Leader, September 11, October 6, 1895.
as Assistant Postmaster in Cincinnati. In this quest he talked to the President and was able temporarily to convince him of the need of Bernard's appointment for Party purposes. Although Cleveland reluctantly agreed at the time of the visit, he selected a person less under the influence of Brice.

During the last two years of the Cleveland administration Campbell and the President had become close friends. The Ohioan felt that he could invite the President to his daughter's wedding; and Cleveland took the liberty of recommending a federal position for Campbell's son, Andrew Owens Campbell. In the latter instance Campbell wrote a long letter listing his son's qualifications and directed that Cleveland should not appoint Andrew if he had any reservations regarding the youth's ability to perform the required duties. Also, the Ohioan wrote, "I am your friend, I believe, and will be just as much so, more perhaps—if your ideas in regard to this position lead you to prefer an older, and more experienced man."

The friendship between the two men lasted into the

---


41 James Campbell to Henry Turber, April 29, 1895. Cleveland Papers.

42 James Campbell to Grover Cleveland, May 1, May 2, 1895, Cleveland Papers.
twentieth century. In 1906, Campbell sent a birthday greet-
ing to Cleveland in celebration of the former President's
sixty-ninth birthday. Campbell wrote, "May you live long
and prosper."  

As the major political parties prepared for the presi-
dential conventions of 1896, it appeared that the moderate
elements of both groups were being driven either to the
right or to the left. The Republicans, meeting at St. Louis
on June 16, nominated William McKinley by acclamation amid
a scene of wild enthusiasm. Their platform denounced the
Cleveland administration for its inability to solve the
economic problems of the depression and for its lack of de-
cisive action in the Hawaiian Islands' upheaval. It
pledged to maintain the gold standard and to oppose "every
measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the
credit of our country." The plank further declared that
the Republican Party opposed the free and unlimited coin-
age of silver "except by international agreement with the
leading commercial nations of the earth," which the party
pledged itself to promote. Although the plank called for
ultimate bimetallism, it was generally believed that the
international agreements required for such a policy were

---

43 James Campbell to Grover Cleveland, March 14, 1906, Cleveland Papers.
44 H. Wayne Morgan, William McKinley and His America, p. 214.
impossible to negotiate.

At the same time that the Republicans were arriving at a basis for a common appeal, the Democrats were beset with basic philosophical differences. The Eastern, conservative Bourbons were faced with a growing challenge from the emerging power of the West. The Populist Party had demonstrated its strength in 1892 and 1894. Unless some concessions were made to the liberal wing of the older party, its political future would be in serious jeopardy. As the two wings of the party looked to Chicago in the summer of 1896, both dedicated themselves to total victory. Neither side was willing to compromise or consider the possibility of defeat. With such attitudes the convention proved an interesting show for outsiders and a vital life and death struggle on the part of the participants.

William C. Whitney, Cleveland's political advisor in the 1892 campaign, was recognized as the leader of the conservative wing of the party. By his decision not to seek a third term Cleveland removed himself from the vanguard of the conservatives. In his place the Bourbons sought a man who could lead them to victory. Whitney, although he was viewed as the only man within the party who could stop the silverites from gaining control, was an

open adherent of international bimetallism. After reading Robert Barclay's *The Silver Question And The Gold Question*, the New Yorker was convinced that a single standard was inoperable. After visiting England and conversing with Sir Arthur Balfour, he was fully converted to the bimetallic cause. He maintained this belief even though Balfour subsequently declared that English thinkers should henceforth "put bimetallism out of its misery."

Although Whitney deviated from the gold monometallic belief of the eastern conservatives his name was urged by them for the presidential nomination in 1896. Whitney responded that he was not a candidate and that he would refuse to be considered as one. He knew that his second marriage would be frowned upon by some ultra conservative elements of the American voting public. Personally he confided to friends that his health would never stand the rigors of a presidential life and that he preferred to be an intermittent politician rather than a regular office holder.

As the time for the convention approached, Whitney announced that he planned to travel in Europe and that he would not be in attendance at the conclave. After the silverites announced that they controlled over 600 of the 918 delegates to the convention, conservative Democrats successfully pleaded with Whitney to cancel his trip and to help them. The New Yorker acknowledged that the forces
of sound money would be in the minority, but he hoped to be able to convince over one-third of the delegates that free silver was impractical. Essentially, his plan was to prevent the silverites from gaining the vital two-thirds majority. If he could accomplish this, then in his own words, "the eastern Democrats . . . might yet control the convention."  

The New York Democrats reflected the influence of Whitney's views on the currency question at their state convention in Saratoga. They realized that gold monometalism had little chance for success in Chicago and so they adopted a bimetallic platform. This platform illustrated the hopes and ideas of the conservatives throughout the nation. Their vital money plank read as follows:

We are in favor of gold and silver as the standard money of the country, but we oppose gold or silver monometallism. We believe bimetallism can be secured and maintained only through the concurrent action of the leading nations of the world, and are therefore opposed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver in the absence of the cooperation of other great nations. We favor the rigid maintenance of the present gold standard as essential to the preservation of our national credit.  

With the above plank as their rallying point Whitney arranged for the conservative, Eastern Democrats to travel to Chicago together on the same train. This attempt to

47 Ibid., p. 493.
present a united front failed when liberal reporters noticed the large and expensive quantities of food and drink which were consumed aboard the train. Using this fact, the silverite press characterized the group as a collection of rich and selfish men going to Chicago dedicated to maintaining their control over the Party.

The initial, crucial encounter between the two wings centered on the selection of a temporary chairman. Because the conservatives held control over the National Committee, they built their hopes on the tradition which allowed that body the privilege of appointing the temporary chairman. Meeting in Chicago, the national body by a vote of twenty-seven to twenty-three selected Senator David Hill of New York. The choice of Hill was a good one even though he had long been a rival of Cleveland in New York politics. Although he was sympathetic to the silverites earlier in his career, he now aligned himself with the sound money men. At the time of his selection, he was a supporter of international bimetallism. The silverites, however, refused to accept Hill. They proposed Senator John W. Daniel of Virginia and after they failed in the National Committee, they took the question to the floor of the convention. By a vote of 556 to 349 they overrode the Hill selection and were able to place Daniel in the important position.

\textsuperscript{48}Glad, McKinley, Bryan and The People, p. 132.
The conservatives rationalized their defeat with the comment that the vote indicated that the silverites did not possess a two-thirds majority. This final hope was shortly swept aside after the Committee on Credentials announced that the Michigan and Nebraska delegates as certified by the National Committee were invalidated. In their place silverites were seated. By this maneuver, the silver adherents were now in complete control of the convention and no longer had to worry about the two-thirds rule.

In an effort to regain a modicum of prestige the conservatives presented a motion to endorse the Cleveland administration. An added injury was inflicted upon them when the proposal was soundly defeated by a count of 564 to 357. Until then Cleveland was the only President to have his own party inflict that indignity upon him. After this reversal, the silver plank, aided by Bryan's "cross of gold" speech, was adopted.

Desperately hoping to stop the nomination of the Nebraskan, the conservatives presented numerous names to the convention. Ohio strongly backed John R. McLean, editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer. James Campbell's name was also mentioned in the Ohio delegation, and he did receive one vote on the first ballot. Finally on the fifth ballot Ohio broke from McLean and lent its support for the

eventual nomination of Bryan.

The conservative Democrats now faced an important decision. Should they support Bryan and his free silver ideas or McKinley and his high tariff notions? Either choice would be a bitter one to swallow. Consequently a portion of this group decided to form a National Democratic Party which eventually nominated John Palmer of Illinois as its Presidential candidate. Their platform endorsed Cleveland's administration, the single gold standard, and a tariff for revenue. This group received the blessing of Grover Cleveland.

The remaining Democratic conservatives under the leadership of David Hill of New York decided to remain within the party. James Campbell was one such person. He analyzed his position by declaring that the Democratic Party was the traditional party of the people, the Republican was the party of privilege, and the Populist was the party of anarchy. He believed that it was this situation which had preserved his party until 1896. He recalled that similar differences of opinion had earlier killed the Federalists and Whig Parties. He reasoned that if the conservatives allowed this split to occur, then the Democrats might

suffer the same fate as the two earlier groups.

Campbell believed that a party in order to carry out any program had to have a majority in Congress. He felt that if one portion of the party did not like the ideas of the majority, rather than bolt, it should adopt an inactive rather than an insurgent attitude. Then, if the minority should someday become the majority, it could expect, if not actual support, at least no opposition from the fallen wing. Thus, in 1896, he withheld his outright support from Bryan, and he refused to support McKinley or Palmer.

On October 20 Bryan arrived in Butler County to deliver an address. Campbell was asked to deliver the introductory remarks for the nominee. After hesitating for a moment, Campbell agreed. In a masterful delivery the Ohioan was able to introduce Bryan without having to take a personal position. He said:

The largest audience ever assembled in the City of Hamilton is here today. It has come to greet and listen to the nominee, the regular nominee of the Democratic Party. And he is welcomed here in the old County of Butler, which is known everywhere as the Gibraltar of Ohio Democracy; and he is welcomed as a private citizen of pure life, as a statesman of high motive, and most of all as a Democrat. But you are here to

---
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listen to him, and therefore I present him, the matchless Democratic orator, William Jennings Bryan. 52

Aside from this one instance Campbell took no part in the speaking campaign. He could not honestly say that he believed in the unlimited coinage of silver without the cooperation of any other nation, but so far as voting was concerned, he was a Democrat who believed in his Party and was ready to support its nominee. On election day he voted for Bryan because he felt it was his duty. 53

The election of 1896 witnessed the victory of William McKinley. The nation was not willing nor ready to accept the political philosophy of Bryan. Although Campbell opposed the Nebraskan's notions, he refused to abandon his party.

McKinley subsequently considered the possibility of appointing Campbell to a federal post. He knew Campbell was regarded by fellow Ohioans as a man above reproach and of the noblest character. Other Republicans shared this opinion and suggested that for political purposes as well as for responsible government, the appointment of the Ohio Democrat would be a wise one.

Campbell did respond favorably to feelers put forth

52 Bartlow, et al., Centennial History of Butler County, pp. 133-134.

by Republicans while visiting in Columbus. The Democrat noted in a letter to McKinley that he declined to commit himself so as not to cause undo embarrassment to the President. The offer, however, failed to materialize because Campbell was still plagued by financial troubles which prohibited governmental service at that time.

During the following years Campbell continued to follow a policy of neutrality between the warring factions of his party. He refused to align himself with one wing of his party and to wage a continual campaign against the other. Instead he adopted the role of an elder statesman by attempting to become a soothing force between the various factions which were alive and fighting within the party. Needless to say this intra-party squabbling weakened its appeal at the polls. The Republicans, faced with internal power disputes, were able to unite at election time and maintain continuously a victorious hold over the state.

Obedient to the call of his party in 1906 and 1908, Campbell accepted, as a matter of duty, nominations for Congress and the United States Senate respectively. He knew that he had little chance for victory because the political tide had moved strongly in the direction of the

---

\(^{54}\) James Campbell to William McKinley, April 26, 1898, McKinley Papers.
Republican Party. This was in part caused by the idea that the Democratic Party was in office during the Panic of 1893 and the depression that followed until 1897. The Republicans claimed that they were responsible for the economic recovery which followed. They ignored any mention of the effects that the Spanish-American War and the discovery of gold in Alaska had exerted upon the domestic economy.

Campbell's nomination for the Senate was more of an honor to him as a loyal party member than as an active political candidate. He represented a compromise choice between the Tom Johnson forces and the supporters of the conservatively minded Judson Harmon, but his election would only be possible if his party in spite of overwhelming odds captured control of the legislature. This was one of the last times that Senators were selected in Ohio by the General Assembly. Soon the Sixteenth Amendment would change the procedure.

Alfred Lewis, a former Ohioan and writer residing in New York City commented in 1908 about the Ohio political trends. He felt that Ohio was basically a Democratic State but that the inability of the party to unite had constantly brought it defeat. He hoped that under the growing influence of the Progressives the party members

---

would think more of the people than of their own ambitions. He felt that the nomination of Campbell for Senator was a sign that this change was taking place. He believed that the nomination itself "should insure a Democratic majority in the next Ohio legislature, for the name of Governor Campbell has been a pillar of fire by night and a cloud by day, pointing the way of the population for thirty years." To Lewis, Campbell was the personification of the common man's representative. Possessing little money in comparison with most Senate office holders, he exemplified the man who worked for duty's sake rather than for personal interest. Illustrative of this opinion was the knowledge that the trusts did not like Campbell. Such men as John D. Rockefeller feared the Campbell type and usually resorted to name calling, using such terms as anarchist to attempt to mar the image and reputation of a man of Campbell's stature.  

The Republicans, however, won the election and subsequently selected Theodore E. Burton of Cleveland for the Senate. Campbell would never again be a candidate for public office. On several occasions his name was mentioned at political gatherings as a potential candidate, and he consistently received token votes at party conventions.

Always he refused to be considered and thanked the delegates for the honor of being remembered.

Campbell continued to work for his party, and he also proved to be a diligent and conscientious worker for his state. On February 15, 1895, William McKinley, Governor of Ohio, appointed Campbell as a trustee of The Ohio State University, a position he held until December, 1896. As a member of the board of trustees he did not play a prominent role in decisions. Financial pressures added to the time devoted to his unsuccessful gubernatorial campaign in 1895 forced him to miss numerous meetings. He did serve on the financial committee of the board, and he was a member of the body which proposed an increase tax levy from 1/20 to 1/10 of a mill to be automatically appropriated to the University. This proposal was made in the State Senate by Nial R. Hysell, the same man who, with Campbell, fathered the first bill which had given regular tax appropriations to the school in 1891. The proposal was eventually adopted by the General Assembly and served materially to help the institution in its growth. 57

When Campbell did submit his resignation, his departure from the board was deemed a serious loss by fellow

57 Alexis Cope, History of The Ohio State University, I, Thomas C. Mendenhall, ed., p. 92; James E. Pollard, History of The Ohio State University, The Story of Its First Seventy-Five Years, 1873-1948, p. 131, 141, 420.
trustees. On December 17, 1896, the body adopted a resolution which said that it was with "profound regret", that it accepted his resignation. The Trustees further noted that Campbell's "high character and fine social qualities have endeared him to every member of this body, while his marked services to the University, both as Governor and as one of the trustees, makes his loss deeply deplored." 58

Although Campbell was no longer on the board of trustees, his contributions were such that in 1922 the incumbent board suggested that a new building then nearing completion on the campus be named the James Edwin Campbell Hall. When Campbell was asked for his permission, the ex-Governor agreed with the amendment that it be named after his wife, Elizabeth Owens Campbell. The trustees accepted this change and subsequently the building was formally named the Elizabeth Owens Campbell Hall, the headquarters of the University's Home Economics Department. 59 As a final testimonial to Campbell's concern for the University, in 1926, two years after his death, the Campbell homestead in Columbus was donated to the University in the name of James Edwin Campbell and his daughter. 60

---
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59 Pollard, History of The Ohio State University, p.258; Sater, Campbell, p. 40.
60 Ibid., p. 284.
From 1907 to 1910 Campbell was a member of the commission which revised and codified the laws of Ohio. His appointment to this position was made by Governor Andrew L. Harris, a Republican, who recognized the prestige and forthrightness that the Campbell name would bring to the commission's proceedings and proposals.

During the early years of the Twentieth Century, Campbell became a very popular speaker. He was constantly called upon by many and diverse groups to deliver talks on many different topics. Generally, whenever he was free, he gladly accepted the invitations.

The speeches ranged from an address to the Ladies Crichton Club of Columbus, to the Bankers' Association of Ohio. His theme in the former talk was a defense of the importance of women. He refused to accept the still accepted view of the female sex as the weaker one. He commented, "The experience of a long life has taught me that women are finer, sweeter, and better than men." Declaring that women were intellectually the equal to man, he pointed to the intelligence and abilities of Margot Asquith, the wife of the British Prime Minister, as evidence of this conviction.


In his talk before the bankers he stressed the idea that as a nation develops its financial institutions similarly mature. He stated that if one examined the banking developments of all the nations of the world, one would have a reliable barometer of the level of civilization within each of the countries. He recalled that he had worked in a bank for one year as a youth. The numerous and sundry needs of the profession were such that he decided that he would never become a banker. He added, "I never was an officer of a bank; nor a director in a bank; nor even a stockholder in a bank; I never had any interest in a bank in my life. Quite a number of bankers have had an interest in me."63

Campbell also used the occasion of these talks to speak out about certain events of current interest. In a Jackson Day address in 1907 he used the general topic of Andrew Jackson as a chance to denounce the emerging idea that the government should be used to control and regulate society. In the Ohioan's words, "The essence of Democracy is individualism," and it is the "eternal foe of paternalism, communism, or socialism." He asserted that while some problems and irregularities have existed in the business world and some changes needed to be made, the trend should not be toward complete government control. He suggested

63 Ibid., "Address to Bankers."
that it would be better "for Americans to conduct affairs in their own democratic and unfettered fashion, even with an occasional blunder, than to have all the activities of human life paternally regulated by the most benevolent despotism that could be expected from fallible officeholders." He labeled Alexander Hamilton as a paternalist interested in the dominance of one segment of the community while he lauded Thomas Jefferson as the true representative of the genuine democratic spirit. Claiming that the high tariff notions of the Republicans had been a consistent violation of this spirit, he concluded that these views must no longer triumph. In so far as the claims of the Socialists were concerned that the trusts should be taken over by the government and operated for the benefit of the nation as a whole, he declared, "They wish to change the rule of the plutocracy for the rule of the proletariat." It would place too much power in the hands of a small group of officeholders which could lead to the establishment of despotism in government and servitude in labor. Returning to his basic reliance on real democracy, he concluded by saying that it was the business of the people to support the government and not vice versa. 64

Different speeches varied in the number of times Campbell chose to deliver them. The theme of the

64 Ibid., "Governor Campbell on Democracy."
development of history, however, was the one common thread which was found in them all. The Ohioan oftentimes would aver that if he had not become involved in politics and the law, he would have devoted his life to history. His first main effort along this line came in 1903 when he was asked to deliver an address on the Governors of Ohio under the second constitution at the Ohio Centennial celebration in Chillicothe. The talk centered mainly on a description of the governor's powers as listed in the Ohio Constitution and how various chief executives had been able to expand or reduce their powers depending upon various circumstances and episodes. The address was so well received that Campbell repeated it several times in different locations both within and outside of the state. Usually he included the following analysis to warm the audience to his side. He said; "All here know, I am sure, the four stages of greatness: to be born great, to achieve greatness, to have greatness thrust upon one, and to be born in Ohio."65

Because of this deep-seated fondness for history and loyalty to the state of his birth and residence, it was appropriate that in 1913 he should be appointed one of the Trustees of The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society. He took this honor seriously, and he rendered

65Ibid., "Ohio's Governors;" Galbreath, Campbell, p. 6.
valuable service to the Society. His actions were characterized with so much zeal that he was the unanimous choice of the Board of Trustees for its presidency, a position to which he was elected on September 25, 1918. In this capacity he served a little more than six years until his death.

As president of the Society he frequently appeared before the Finance Committees of the two Houses of the General Assembly to speak in behalf of the biennial budget requests. His knowledgeable remarks on these occasions were generally effective and had much weight in bringing to the Society larger appropriations. He was especially interested in the proposal to build a new wing on the museum to be dedicated to the soldiers who lost their lives in World War I. He was so intent upon convincing the state that it should provide more funds that he decided to devote his entire efforts to its completion. He said on one occasion to a group of friends, "I am no longer engaged in active business pursuits." Shortly afterward as he made a hurried trip in the rain to the State House in order to appear before an appropriation committee, his hat blew off. After chasing the hat he rushed into the State House to be greeted by a friend who recalled the ex-Governor's statement that he had retired from business. He wondered what mission brought the elder man out on such a rainy day.

---
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Campbell answered, "I meant that I had quit business for myself." 67

Campbell was successful in securing an appropriation for the increased funds. During the actual construction of the new wing, he took particular interest in the memorial room and the bronze panels recalling activities in the War. He insisted that at the main entrance to the wing there should be the figure of an American doughboy which should portray to the visitors and to the students of the University as they passed the character of the building and the eventful days of American participation in the war. Campbell was able to live long enough to see this project completed, and he played a prominent role in providing for the actual shaping of the clay model. 68 Standing today, the bronze doughboy is a reminder not only of the first world conflict, but also a reminder of the intense patriotism expended by its initiator.

In addition to his personal concern for these matters, Campbell took delight in representing the Historical Society on numerous occasions. As the president of its Board of Trustees, he was called upon to attend various ceremonies and functions of the Society. In this connection he was more than just a distinguished personality on a

67 Ibid., p. 11.
68 Ibid., p. 7.
platform. For instance October 4, 1922 was designated as the centennial day celebration in honor of the birth of Rutherford B. Hayes. Prior to the actual day of the event Campbell conscientiously worked with the Society and other organizations in planning a successful observance. He suggested in the meeting of the Society trustees that each member "spread the information in regard to the Hayes celebration." On the centennial day Campbell journeyed to Fremont, Ohio, the site of the celebration and Hayes' long time residence. There he delivered a short speech applauding the late President for his contributions to Ohio. Campbell purposely limited his remarks and encouraged Republican associates and acquaintances of the former President to take a more prominent role in the festivities.

On other occasions the former Governor delivered major historical speeches such as the lecture he gave before the McGuffey Society of Ohio on June 22, 1922, in Logan, Ohio. The address centered upon the famous oration attributed to the Mingo Chief, Captain John Logan. Campbell narrated the events leading up to the Logan oration and then proceeded

69"Minutes of The Thirty-Second Annual Meeting of The Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society, Society Building, September 9, 1922," Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society, Vol. 31, p. 630. Hereafter the source will be labeled OAHS.

to analyze Logan's veracity. Alluding to the contradiction between the statement by Logan that all his relatives had been cruelly murdered by Colonel John Cresap and the fact that Logan was later slain by his own nephew, Campbell questioned the contents. Labeling the contradiction minor, Campbell concluded that the "oratory was great for an un-tutored savage." 71

One of Campbell's proudest moments as president of the Historical Society occurred on December 27, 1923. He presided over the opening session of the American Historical Association meetings held in Columbus, Ohio, at the First Congregational Church. He was praised for his handling of the occasion "in his usual felicious manner." On this occasion he introduced Dr. James R. Garfield, son of the late President James A. Garfield. Campbell paid a brief but sincere tribute to the father of the speaker, and then praised the sons "who themselves won honorable positions in the service of their country." 72

Generally Campbell was able to maintain his humor and display a modesty and humility about his career. Speaking at a ceremony in Springfield, Ohio, on August 8, 1924, which commemorated the dedication of a monument in honor

71 James Campbell, "Logan And The Logan Elm," OAHS, Vol. 31, pp. 367-374. John Logan was also known as James Logan.

of George Rogers Clark, he said that Dr. Benjamin F. Prince, a fellow trustee of the Historical Society, should preside over the ceremonies. Campbell said that Prince was a more learned man, a member of the trustees for a longer time, and instrumental in arranging for the construction of the monument as President of the Clark County Historical Society. Nostalgically, Campbell recalled that he was defeated twice for the Governorship, but quickly added, "but then you know a lot of good men who have been elected governor only once." Turning his attention to Frank B. Willis, another one-term governor who was also present on the platform, Campbell queried, "Isn't that so, Willis?" "You bet" was the immediate reply, to which Campbell said, the "only difference is Willis is now a U. S. Senator" and "you can't keep a good man down."73

Campbell often wandered away from his assigned role in these historic meetings and occasionally digressed from his prepared remarks to offer unsolicited opinions. During the Thirty-Ninth annual meeting of the Historical Society, Campbell was supposed to introduce Buffalo Child Long Lance, an American Indian who had joined the Canadian armed forces prior to the United States entry into World War I. Campbell started to introduce the Indian, but

73"Dedication of Monument To George Rogers Clark, August 8, 1924," OAHS, Vol. 33, p. 495-497.
departed from his notes and said that it made his blood boil when he recalled what the United States tolerated before it went to war. After reciting several pre-war episodes, he reasoned "we had so many pacifists and traitors and pro-Germans in this country that we were afraid to go to war. So far as I know, that is the only blot upon the history of the U.S.A., that they did not declare war within twenty-four hours after the Lusitania was sunk."  

Campbell's service for the Historical Society was tenderly rewarded in October, 1923. Then an elm tree was scheduled for planting on the State House lawn. The historical group decided to follow a tradition in naming the tree after a prominent Ohioan whose labors for the state were generally recognized. Taking a seedling from the famed Logan Elm, the directors of the project decided to name the tree after James E. Campbell. 

The tree planting ceremony proved to be a testimonial to the still living Campbell. Frank Talmadge, Chairman of the Logan Elm Committee of the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, delivered a brief address stating that three forces had brought the group together on the State House lawn; "Our love of history, our love of nature, and the love we bear for one man, the first citizen of

---

this State." Thereafter a program continued with a brief comment by Charles B. Galbreath, Secretary and Librarian of the Society, a Planting Song by the Trinity Choir, the recitation of "Trees" by the audience, and the formal dedication of the tree by Henry J. Booth, a member of the Logan Elm committee. In his dedication address Booth devoted the major portion of his talk to the general condition of the State House grounds. Booth said that they were a "disgrace to Ohio" but positive reforms were then being performed. In closing, he called upon a beneficent Providence to grant a long life to the tree and predicted that "the man whose name it bears will be known and honored as long as American history is read—time without end."

After a short and modest reply by Campbell, Booth formally presented the tree to the State of Ohio. Governor A. Victor Donahey, who was expected to accept the tree for the state, was unfortunately called away on business. Jacob Meckstroth, the Governor's secretary, attempted to fill the vacancy by observing that Donahey had warmly hoped to be in attendance at the dedication. The affable secretary, speaking for both the Governor and himself, stated that they applauded the selection of Campbell for the honor and believed that there was no other man more deserving of it.75

75"Dedication of The James Edwin Campbell Elm," OAHS, Vol. 33, pp. 80-86.
Campbell's interest in history was also shown in other ways. He wrote several short monographs concerned with the State of Ohio, Butler County, and the Civil War. James M. Cox, later Governor of the State and Democratic Party presidential nominee in 1920, wrote to Campbell that the copies he had received of the publications were very interesting and objective. He insisted that Campbell should write either a history of Ohio or a book on "Men I Have Met." Cox later wrote that Campbell's work had lived up to all expectations. He claimed that if Campbell became a fulltime writer of history he could be called his discoverer.

Campbell's collection of historical artifacts was another part of his avocation. He possessed autographs of prominent Americans such as James Garfield, Ben Wade, and Atlee Pomerene, pictures of Salmon P. Chase and Horace Greeley, and threads from the flag flown by the Union forces at Fort Sumter. He was proud of this collection and until his death he attempted to broaden its limits and to acquire as many items as possible.

Along this line Campbell attempted to acquire a

---
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78 Miscellaneous items preserved within the Campbell Collection.
complete set of materials and comments upon his own career. He wrote to friends and others he knew asking them to send copies of their impressions of important episodes in his life. Judson Harmon supplied copies of papers giving evidence of Murat Halstead's predicament in the ballot box forgery crisis, and Senator Atlee Pomerene wrote an account of the personal relationship of William McKinley and Campbell in 1891. Campbell wrote that his personal collection contained numerous letters which revealed varied insights into his career. He sought this record for the benefit of his grandchildren and not for posterity's sake. It is unfortunate that the entire collection has not been recovered or its whereabouts ascertained at this time.

Ohio and the nation in the opening years of the Twentieth Century experienced a clash between the emerging ideas of the progressive theorists and the older individually minded concepts of the conservatives. The latter group strongly adhered to the laissez-faire or "let-alone" ideas of Adam Smith. Such principles were engrained in the American tradition coming from eighteenth century economics and pioneer experience, wherein a man's success depended on his own energy and skill in outwitting and subduing the wilderness. Although most Americans were

79Campbell to Atlee Pomerene, August 3, 1912. Atlee Pomerene Collection, The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.
unfamiliar with Smith's formal concepts, the slogan of "free enterprise and individualism" was widespread and popular. Whenever anyone spoke of governmental interference or regulation of any aspect of the nation's economy, the laissez-faire adherents argued against such action and called upon the attackers to "have faith in private enterprise, competition, and natural economic evolution." Their cause achieved a tremendous victory in 1896, and William McKinley lived up to his nickname as "the advance agent of prosperity." Business boomed, fortunes grew, and the stock market overflowed with undigested securities. Politicians by 1900 proudly called themselves "conservatives," and the nation generally liked things as they were. When the agrarian Populists called for changes, the conservatives defended their ideas with an appeal to tradition. The Bill of Rights, the heritage of the pioneer, the Darwinian theory of the survival of the fittest—all added up to the conclusion that every man was responsible for his own destiny.

Despite this aversion to change the growth of an industrially complex society and all of its concomitant consequences forced some people to conclude that changes had to be made. It was this awareness that gave birth to

---

the progressive movement. Basically it was founded upon the belief that government should extend the greatest good to the greatest number, and that it should be clean, honest, and efficient. This notion also assumed a faith and trust in the popular majority. It no longer accepted the concept of Darwinian competition. In its place was substituted a reliance upon cooperation. Government was not to be simply a negative factor in society, but a positive factor, doing things which other agencies could not do and could not do as well. 82

The state of Wisconsin under the guidance of Robert LaFollette did much to initiate the basic progressive program, and much of the Midwest copied it. Progressivism after 1900 at one time or another had complete control of every state but Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and Indiana, where the Eastern industrial ties were strongest.

For some dozen years after the election of George Nash in 1899, the Buckeye State had a succession of Republican governors who chiefly represented business and industrial elements. 83 In 1905, when Myron Herrick, a Republican, lost to John Pattison, a Democrat, the rest of the Republican ticket was elected. Herrick's defeat was not attributed to any large dissatisfaction with Republican

82 Ibid., pp. 120-130.
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conservative ideas. It was instead largely due to some of Herrick's acts as governor. Ohio adopted some progressive legislation which was attributed to the influence of Theodore Roosevelt and that of Ohio reformers like Tom Johnson and "Golden Rule" Jones.

In the Democratic Party a sharp fissure continued to exist after the nomination of Bryan in 1896. The party found itself divided generally into a liberal Bryan wing and a conservative, Eastern, anti-Bryan wing. The Ohio members of the party were equally weakened by factionalism. They were bereft of any inspiring program and continued to be weighted down with liabilities out of the past. They carried the stigma of disloyalty from the Copperhead movement out of the Civil War period, they championed the unpopular side of the tariff issue in opposing protection, and they found themselves branded with radicalism after Bryan's campaign of 1896.

Only on the municipal level did Ohio introduce any significant progressive legislation. Under the leadership of Tom L. Johnson in Cleveland and Samuel "Golden Rule" Jones in Toledo, progressives aptly created a successful

---
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political laboratory for their ideas. Johnson's conduct of affairs within the "Forest City" earned him the applause of Lincoln Steffens who stated that Cleveland was "the best run city in the land." In spite of this success the progressives found it difficult to carry their ideas on to the state level. There the conservatives successfully opposed any sweeping reform legislation from being enacted until 1911 when the voters of Ohio elected to have a fourth Constitutional Convention. In the subsequent elections of delegates the liberal element of the state was victorious. The proceedings starting in early 1912 witnessed the adoption of a number of recommendations calling for greater direct, popular participation by the electorate. Such measures as the use of initiative and referendum typified this acceptance of a government more responsive to the voters.

Although the progressives gained control of the constitutional convention, the conservatives managed to retain a firm grip on the Democratic State and Executive Committees. Judson Harmon, who had been elected Governor in 1910, was their leader and defender. He opposed the new political movement which proposed a more direct democracy and a more positive governmental role than existed.

86 Nye, op. cit., p. 179.
in the regulation of industry and in the provisions for welfare services. Moreover he opposed the initiative and referendum ideas sacred to the progressives who viewed the Governor as "a symbol of reaction." He exemplified the conservative fear of central regulation and control. Harmon believed, as did Campbell, in individual freedom without governmental interference.

In early 1912, the overt split in the Republican camp between Theodore Roosevelt and President William Howard Taft was complete. The Ohio Democrats quickly realized that such a development meant political victory both on the state and national scene. This spurred both the conservative and liberal wings to wage a bitter fight for the ensuing nominations.

Judson Harmon became the choice of conservative Democrats in Ohio for the presidential nomination. His chief opponent was the liberal governor of the State of New Jersey, Woodrow Wilson. Representative Champ Clark of Missouri and Senator Oscar Underwood of Alabama both received strong sectional support from the West and South respectively. The Wilson supporters claimed that the three had entered into an alliance to defeat the New Jersey Governor by having each of the three fight Wilson in

87James M. Cox, Journey Through My Years, p. 132; Warner, Progressivism in Ohio, pp. 214-215.
his own region. Their plan, theoretically, was to prevent Wilson from gaining the necessary two-thirds majority needed for nomination. If they were successful they would then be able to decide among themselves who would get the nod. 88

Generally Wilson represented the choice of the liberal progressive elements within the party. Consequently, within Ohio, his chances for gaining Buckeye support over Harmon were dim. Nonetheless his supporters, led by Walter W. Durbin, Harvey C. Garber, John J. Lentz, and Newton D. Baker, determined in 1911 to prevent Harmon's endorsement at the presidential primary in the state in 1912. Garber and Durbin conferred with Bryan, who agreed to support them in their fight against Harmon. On January 2, 1912, Durbin organized the Progressive Democratic League of Ohio and announced its support of Woodrow Wilson. At the same time Bryan called upon the progressives of the state to vote for Wilson and defeat the conservative Harmon. 89

Newton Baker took control of the progressive organization in the northern portion of the state. He had served as City Solicitor in Tom Johnson's cabinet in Cleveland and had characterized himself as a forward looking progressive. He believed in the ultimate objectives of the movement, but
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he often disagreed with his colleagues on the most suitable means to achieve them. In 1910, while Johnson and the rest of the progressives lost in the municipal elections, Baker was reelected. Johnson shortly thereafter died, and Baker assumed the leadership of the progressive Cleveland Democrats. Consequently in 1912, he was nominated by the progressives and elected mayor of the "Forest City." Adopting the slogan "civitism" he worked for increased self government for the people of Cleveland and often found himself in conflict with the Harmon controlled state government. Contrasting himself with the Governor, Baker admitted that he was "radical and progressive" in comparison with Harmon's "retrospective politics" which were "shaped like a ship's anchor that provided a cumbersome drag against the voyage to better things." 90

As Harmon was a presidential candidate in the primary election, Bryan journeyed to Ohio and for two days flayed Harmon as "the prince of reactionaries," "friend of Wall Street," and a man who "might do in a stone age, [but] he won't do now." In retaliation, Harmon struck back at Bryan, publicizing his own role as a trust buster when he was President Grover Cleveland's Attorney General. 91

91 Warner, Progressivism In Ohio, p. 364.
the primary was held, Harmon emerged victorious in the popular vote by a margin of 6,000 votes, receiving 194,000 votes to Wilson's 188,000 votes. More importantly, however, was Harmon's majority of twenty-three to nineteen margin in delegates. This slim total meant that Harmon would be given all forty-two of Ohio's votes because the state had followed the unit rule principle for the preceding sixty years.

Baker refused to see Wilson lose the nineteen votes and decided to fight to terminate the unit rule tradition. The Democratic State Convention met in Toledo. Although the progressives were able to have their influence felt in the adoption of the party platform and in the nomination of James Cox for the governorship, they failed by a vote of 597 to 355 to break the unit rule policy. James Campbell supported the traditional policy and felt that a good party member should be willing to accept the decisions of the majority. Although he held a degree of sympathy with Baker's pleas that the progressive had been elected to vote for Wilson and that the convention was disregarding the wishes of the party voters in the Cleveland area,
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Campbell still held to his adherence to the decisions of the majority of the party.

Baker, however, refused to accept the verdict. When the national convention opened in Baltimore, Baker first pleaded before the Committee of Rules to suspend the unit rule requirement. That body, staffed predominantly by conservatives, refused the entreaty and instructed the delegates to adhere to the unit rule. Baker then took the issue before the entire convention. There, in what James Cox recalled as the turning of the tide which led to Wilson's nomination, Baker successfully persuaded the convention to release the delegates from the unit rule when their local constituents had initially directed them to vote for another candidate. 94

Campbell, who was chairman of the Ohio delegation disapproved of the decision. He voted for the retention of the unit rule and later, after the rule was dropped, tried to pressure the Wilson supporters into voting for Harmon because he was a fellow Ohioan. 95 Campbell persisted in his support of the Ohio Governor until Wilson was nominated. True to his party convictions he accepted the verdict of the convention. With great enthusiasm he supported the
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nominee both on and off the stump in the campaign that followed.

The eventual election of Wilson pleased Campbell. He was happy that for the first time since 1897 a member of his own party was in the White House and that Ohio had voted Democratic for both the party's presidential and gubernatorial candidates. Generally, Campbell supported Wilson's program of reform, and he became a staunch defender of the President in Ohio. When the war in Europe started in 1914, Campbell paid little attention to the conflict. He accepted Wilson's plea for neutrality and generally upheld a neutralist attitude. When the conflict began to impair American rights, however, he was willing to follow Wilson's lead in denouncing the practice of unrestricted submarine warfare. He refused to support those midwesterners who criticized the President's actions as provocative. Charles W. Bryan, Associate Editor of *The Commoner* and brother of William Jennings Bryan, wrote to Campbell asking him to support the former Secretary of State in his opposition to the Wilson program. The younger Bryan implored Campbell to write to Senators and Congressmen and

---
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use his influence to bring an end to the notions of preparedness and militarism.\footnote{Charles W. Bryan to James Campbell, January 29, 1916, Campbell Collection.} Campbell refused to ignore the challenge of German aggression. Instead he wrote to Newton Baker, Secretary of War, that he would be willing to do whatever he could to help Wilson.\footnote{Newton D. Baker to James Campbell, February 17, 1916; Baker to Campbell, June 3, 1916, Campbell Collection.} Baker answered for Wilson that he was happy for his support and he gladly and proudly accepted it.

The election of 1916 again witnessed a victory for Wilson. As the crisis of the impending war deepened, Campbell was determined to support the administration in any policy it espoused. By April, 1917 Congress had accepted Wilson's proposal and had declared war. Campbell, who was in New York City at that time, said, "President Wilson's address will go down in History . . . as among the greatest of all state papers since history began." Referring to the message as "the greatest blow ever struck against autocracy" he hoped it would encourage the Russian people to wholeheartedly embrace the Kerensky Democratic government.\footnote{James Campbell, "World War Papers," Campbell Collection.} By November he was shocked and saddened that the Bolshevik Revolution had occurred and that Russia was
preparing to leave the war. To the Ohioan even the despotic Tsar was a better ally than the revolutionaries. He argued that the United States owed a debt of gratitude to the Romanoff regime which had refused Napoleon III's effort to have Russia, France, and England force an armistice in the American Civil War. Added to this he said the Romanoff government had been willing to fight the tyrannical Germans while the new government would surrender and indirectly help the Central Powers. Concluding, he declared, "The restoration of that dynasty, with all its shortcomings, is a million times better than the anarchy and reign of terror which is the coming fate of Russia under the new regime." 101

Throughout the War he was active and served as a member of the Ohio Branch of the Council of National Defense. At times, in his drive to help mobilize the state for the conflict, he overstepped his assignment and sought for information highly classified. Newton Baker had to refuse the zealous Ohioan explaining that such requests were in violation of the policies of the War Department. 102

Campbell was also active in helping to raise funds for the Red Cross and other activities. One of the main duties he accepted was that of helping to mobilize the

101 Ibid.
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minds of the Americans in support of the war. Attacking those Americans who charged that the war was caused by capitalist greed and those others who opposed the struggle on pacifist principles, he argued that war was not always bad. He believed that "The most righteous causes have succeeded only through war." He reasoned that war was not "an evil to be deplored, not a duty to be shunned, when it is waged to succor the starving, the sick, the helpless, and . . . to extirpate a cruel, blood-thirsty and rapacious dynasty. . . . under the odious name of 'Prussianism', . . . ."

He was filled with pride and satisfaction during the closing days of the conflict. He applauded the Allied victory and strongly believed that the Germans should be punished. He equated the actions of the German authorities with those of the German people. Labeling anyone who thought of feeding or comforting the people of Germany as mawkish and weak-minded sentimentalists, he believed that the Germans were receiving a just reward for starting the war. He reminded one audience which he addressed of the German shouts of bravado when they marched through Belgium

---
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and sank the "Lusitania." Appealing strictly to emotion, he described the horrible scene of American dead babies floating on the open sea, and he reviewed the German policies which caused untold thousands to starve to death. The incensed Ohioan maintained these atrocities were done as a matter of course and not as an accident or the unplanned result of a broader policy. Finally yielding a little to the spirit of compassion, he stated, "Doubtless we shall have to feed the people of Germany to some extent, but it is like feeding the inmates of the workhouse or the penitentiary—not a labor of love of a right-minded people, but an exceedingly disagreeable necessity." In conclusion, he defended his position as not one of a cruel and vindictive man but of one based upon the premise "to make certain that the punishments of this war shall be so striking and unexampled . . . that no future ruler of homicidal instincts and diseased egotism shall attempt to conquer the world and rule it by force." 105

During the war period Campbell was appointed by Governor Cox to serve as a member of a board to consider the possibility of acquiring a governor's mansion for the State of Ohio. 106 From the period following the Civil War the question of providing a stately residence for the State's
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Chief Executive had been considered. Proponents of the suggestion argued that there was no reason why the State of Ohio could not provide such a residence. They felt the lack of such a home reflected upon the entire state. Other commonwealths provided a governor's mansion as a matter of pride, and Ohio had to adopt a similar attitude if it wanted to be in the forefront of the nation.

Serving with two other ex-governors, Myron Herrick and Judson Harmon, Campbell agreed to a proposal to investigate thoroughly the practicality of acquiring a home. Initially the trio thought in terms of having a mansion built, but after they examined numerous blue prints and suggestions, they decided such a move would be too expensive. Because of the war the project was delayed until 1919. At that time the three agreed that the best answer would be the purchase of an available residence located on East Broad Street in Columbus. This proposal was accepted after numerous small problems of the side porticoes, servant quarters, and front entrances were solved. Campbell had taken the initiative in the move toward acquiring the executive mansion, and he was instrumental in concluding the actual purchase. Herrick wrote enthusiastically to Campbell about his acquisition of a $250,000 residence for Ohio at the cost of only $124,000. Approvingly he added, "It was indeed rare for trustees of public service to make so good
an accounting." Harmon added to this approval by congratulating Campbell for completing the entire purchase with a large unexpended balance. He reported that Harry L. Davis, a Republican and Governor elect in 1921, would occupy the mansion after initially saying he would not. Moreover, Harmon, a fellow Democrat, wrote that Davis had asked the outgoing Governor James Cox to vacate two weeks early.

Although Campbell was seventy-seven years old in 1920, he remained in demand as a speaker. His audiences included church groups, hospital associations, lawyers clubs, the Kit Kat Club (a Columbus lecture group), college organizations, women associations, and others. In all of these addresses he exhibited a growing distaste for the post war era. Defensive of the past he attempted to caution the younger generations that change is not always good. He tried to prove that the old principles of the nineteenth century were still applicable and wholesome. He resented the increasingly dominant attitude that money was the yardstick of success. He charged that man could not serve God and Mammon at the same time. He called for a renewal of the ideas of rugged individualism where each man took care of himself and solved his own problems. No one, he


declared, should be carried along by a paternalistic government.

Ridiculing those who scoffed at the heroes of the past, he said that a Joan of Arc or Florence Nightingale should be admired, for neither was a fortune hunter. They devoted their talents to others, a dedication that the Ohioan felt was laudable. Nostalgically his proposals opposed any type of change which would upset the moral standards of Nineteenth Century America. As he analyzed the nation in the 1920's, he called for a person such as the biblical Moses to appear and guide the nation back on the right path. He reasoned that the American people needed no more Aaron types who placated the crowd but never accomplished anything. He recalled that Moses was not so well liked as Aaron, but in the end it was his aggressiveness and determination which provided the important results.

On one personally touching occasion he was asked to deliver the chief address at the Hamilton High School commencement exercises in 1922. In the speech he told the graduates that "education begins at the cradle and ends at the grave." Cautioning his audience he said that each generation has its troubles, but with the help of a firm


heart and dedication to principle the results will be rewarding. "The overshadowing menace of today," he declared, "is the appalling lust for wealth." Displaying the effects of a Victorian upbringing, he labeled as profit seekers those "who speak of the undressing of women, cosmetics on lovely faces, immodest dancing, detestable jazz, and frivolity." He believed such actions would sap "the sweetness of youth away." He reminded the graduates of their own mothers and suggested that they had aptly demonstrated that such diversions were unnecessary. 111

Although Campbell was outside the main stream of Ohio politics, he nonetheless maintained a deep interest in political developments. Because of this interest he and James Cox became close friends. The friendship consisted of a young politician heeding the advice and counsel of the older and more experienced campaigner. During the closing years of his incumbency as Governor of Ohio Cox recalled that Campbell burst into his office one day waving a piece of paper in hand. Campbell proceeded to tell the story of his discharge from the Navy during the Civil War because of a physical disability. Smiling, the Hamilton native told Cox that after his discharge he and eight of his friends applied for life insurance. All were approved
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except Campbell who was rejected as a poor risk. Now, as he stood before Cox, the old man showed a newspaper clipping which contained an obituary of the last of the other eight men. Campbell, who was then eighty years old, was described by Cox as a man "still very much alive" and "universally beloved." 112

In the Spring of 1920 Cox was urged as a candidate for the presidential nomination of the Democratic Party. As expected, Campbell joined the Cox forces and actively worked for the Ohio Governor. Cox was not the strongest candidate, but he stood as a logical compromise nominee after two cabinet officers, Secretary of the Treasury William G. McAdoo and Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer, each of whom commanded a large number of the delegates, could not secure the necessary two-thirds majority. Cox expected that once the stalemate was apparent at the national convention, he stood to gain delegates from both candidates. Furthermore, his followers claimed that Cox would be able to win the pivotal state of Ohio from Warren G. Harding, the Republican candidate. 113

Campbell wrote a letter in May, 1920, to Senator Atlee Pomerene of Ohio protesting the actions of William H. Hayes, a member of the Republican National Committee. At
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the time the letter was written Pomerene was a member of the Kenyon Committee investigating alleged "slush" funds. Campbell wrote that Cox as early as the previous February had been informed "by good and loyal Republicans" that they were being forced to compel businessmen to turn over large sums of money to Hayes and his Republican lieutenants for use in the presidential campaign. Campbell lamented, "How unfortunate it is that the faith of the American people in their government should be blasted by the spectacle of a Presidency on the auction block. . . ."114

As a consequence of this letter, Edmund Moore, who was Cox's campaign manager, agreed with other state Democratic leaders that Campbell would be a sound choice for the chairmanship of the Ohio delegation. He was a well known and admired leader and would present a good image in the convention. Consequently, Campbell was selected as a delegate-at-large to the convention in San Francisco. The aging Ohioan personally led a group of over two hundred Ohio "boomers" to San Francisco which noisily proclaimed that they had come to nominate Cox.

The Cox headquarters was established at the Palace Hotel, the site where most of the contenders for a liberal liquor plank were housed. Cox opposed the prohibition

---

amendment on the basis of personal freedom. He was not a personal advocate of alcoholic consumption as some dry forces claimed in both the Democratic convention and in the political campaign that followed. When the Ohio delegation arrived, Campbell was interviewed regarding his views of the forthcoming convention. Without any qualifications he said that Cox was "a sure winner over Harding." He did take the interview as an opportunity to discuss Harry Daugherty's successful prediction regarding the closed room nomination of Harding. Campbell recited the events which led up to the 2:11 A.M. phone call from Senator Boise Penrose of Pennsylvania which sealed Harding's nomination. "If anyone says that Harry M. Daugherty isn't a regular union prophet in good standing," said Campbell, "I am here to dispute it. Let us give rousing cheers for Daugherty, Ohio's and the nation's Mother Shipton." At this point Campbell then made his own prediction, "There is going to be a reburial of the political Pharaohs in November."\textsuperscript{115}

On June 27 the Ohio delegation met and organized in an atmosphere described as "so harmonious as almost to lack interest." Campbell as had been previously forecast was elected chairman of the delegation following his nomination by former Governor Judson Harmon. This act led Edmund Moore to say that Ohio had two great living former

\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., June 25, 1920.
executives who were working for the nomination of a third.

At the convention William Jennings Bryan remained in the spotlight. No longer possessing the vigor and prestige of earlier years, he nevertheless continued to command respect. Bryan announced that he was preparing to offer to the convention a plank calling for the complete acceptance of prohibition. As a consequence he was at odds with Cox and anyone who refused to support his position. Campbell startled the Ohio delegation and the wet, liberal forces when he announced that "Governor Cox does not consider the Democratic platform the proper place for treatment of the wet or dry issue. We do not look upon prohibition as an issue one way or the other." Campbell went on to state that Cox had refused to align himself with either faction on the issue, but he would enforce all liquor laws in existence. In essence Campbell tried to remove Cox from identification with either side of the question. Prior to the national gathering, Cox had been given support by the wets who accepted Cox's "personal liberty" views as equivalent to opposition to prohibition. Immediately after Campbell's statement, Governor Edward L. Edwards of New Jersey, a wet and early supporter of Cox, denounced the Ohio Governor as acting with "cold feet" and "pussyfooting."

He charged Cox with duplicity and stated that the New Jersey delegation and other wets throughout the country would never vote for such a man. This remark elicited numerous responses by other members of the Ohio delegation who said that Campbell had not been authorized to make such a pronouncement. Nevertheless, fears were aroused by the Cox forces that New Jersey, California, New York, and Illinois might refuse to support him.

Meeting in the afternoon of June 29 the Ohio delegation tried to salvage the unknown damages created by Campbell's remarks. They decided not to submit any formal instructions on the liquor issue to Senator Pomerene who was Ohio's representative on the platform committee. Moreover, views were presented that in the long run, what was now termed "the Ohio idea," the avoidance of any position on liquor, appeared as a wise position for the entire convention to take. Fortunately for Cox and Campbell this interpretation was eventually adopted by the convention. Bryan's dry plank proposal failed of passage with the Ohio delegation giving 46 nays against 2 yeas. After the Bryan plank was defeated, the furious Nebraskan attacked Cox as
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the cause of his failure to have prohibition accepted. This outburst backfired because Cox once again became the sentimental choice of the anti-dry, Bryan delegates. 

When the time for the nominations for the presidency arrived, McAdoo, Palmer, and Cox emerged as the leaders. The two cabinet members vowed they would never allow the other to be nominated. Consequently Cox's chances grew immeasurably. When his name was formally presented, Harmon, Campbell, and Pomerene were seen "dancing like school-boys." As each ensuing ballot was taken, Cox's total gradually grew. This caused wild responses and cheering amid the Ohio delegation. Entreaties were made to surrounding states to change their votes and join the Cox bandwagon. Campbell, Moore, and the other leaders of the Ohio group tried to restrain their colleagues because they feared such acts would elicit negative responses. They felt that the nomination would come in time and that there was no need to take any foolish chances in hopes of getting an earlier victory. Finally, on the forty-fourth ballot Cox's total surpassed the necessary two-thirds majority and he was nominated. Throughout the balloting Campbell as chairman of the delegation, proudly and
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enthusiastically cast all forty-eight of Ohio's votes for its favorite son. After the convention was over, Benjamin Franklin Irvine, editor of the Portland (Oregon) Journal told Cox that it was Campbell's voice which won him over to the Ohio Governor. Irvine, who was blind, said:

I fell completely in love with Campbell. There was something in his voice besides confidence. His words and intonations suggested an affection as well. That is why I was in favor of your nomination.123

The naming of Cox made it certain that an Ohio newspaper man would be the next president, for the Republicans had already nominated the publisher of the Marion Star, Warren G. Harding. In addition the Prohibition party's candidate, Aaron Watkins, was a Methodist minister from Cincinnati. The League of Nations issue, the prohibition question, and the desire to return to normalacy, enabled Harding to emerge as the victor. The Republican carried Ohio by a plurality of over 400,000 votes and the nation by an electoral vote of 404 to 127.124

After Cox lost the election, he returned to Dayton prepared to accept his defeat. Although publicly he would not admit it, he was saddened at his retirement from the Governor's post in Ohio. Campbell encouraged

123Cox, Journey Through My Years, p. 81.
the disillusioned Cox by indicating that he still had time to return to political office if he so desired. In the succeeding three years the two remained in constant contact with each other. Personal visits, with Campbell and his family going to Dayton or Cox traveling to Columbus were frequent. Judge Claude Meeker, Campbell's former secretary, was a third participant at these meetings.

As another Democratic Presidential Convention year approached in 1924, plans were laid by Cox's supporters for his renomination. This notion was disclosed on February 7, 1924, in a letter from Campbell to Cox. The aged politician wrote to the three-time former governor that many members of the Ohio Democratic "Old Guard" had asked Campbell to try to convince Cox to allow his name to be placed upon the Democratic presidential primary ballot in Ohio. Campbell wrote that this was not a matter of personal ambition on the part of the Ohioans, but it was their considered opinion that Cox was "the only and logical choice" if the Democrats hoped to win in November. On February 13 Cox consented to be a candidate. He wrote to Campbell that he had "no personal inclination to be a candidate," but if the Ohio Democrats were willing to nominate him, he would accept. Cox's open acceptance was necessitated by an Ohio law which required primary candidates to formally allow their names to be placed on the ballot. Cox, if he so desired, could have refused to
allow his name to be used simply by refusing legal permission. Another law provision stipulated that a second or alternative choice had to be placed on the ballot. In this case, James Campbell's name was used although the octogenarian had no ambitions whatsoever. It was merely to comply with the law that Campbell agreed to have his name listed.

In his recollections Cox wrote that the real reason behind his becoming a candidate was his conviction that William McAdoo should not receive the nomination. The former Secretary of the Treasury had taken political positions with which Cox could not agree, McAdoo had proposed that the Democratic Party drop the League of Nations issue, a motion which bordered on political heresy in the viewpoint of Cox. Moreover McAdoo's refusal to condemn the Ku Klux Klan and his wooing of the Anti-Saloon elements further irritated the Ohioan. McAdoo mistakenly allowed his name to be placed on the Ohio ballot and suffered a huge defeat at the hands of Cox who claimed McAdoo's votes had come from not only the dry forces, Klan supporters, and anti-Catholic zealots, but from the prohibition gangsters who thrived on the dry laws. Cox did not expect to win the nomination, but he did feel he would be able
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126 Cox, Journey Through My Years, pp. 324-325.
to prevent McAdoo from attaining the two-thirds majority.

In the primary election in which Cox was victorious, former Secretary of War, Newton Baker, was able to deliver the support of Cleveland Democrats to the Cox column. James Campbell was again selected as a delegate-at-large to the national convention. Judson Harmon cautioned Campbell that at his age he should consider his health and allow younger men to handle the arduous chores. Harmon wrote, "It will be a loss to all of his, but it would be only temporary and we can face it for the sake of having you yet many years if you will be wise." In spite of this plea Campbell did go to New York and took an active part in the proceedings.

Upon its arrival in New York the Ohio delegation again selected Campbell to be its chairman. It dedicated itself to work for the nomination of Cox although conversations were overheard that said that the former governor did not have a chance and that Baker would be the second choice. Despite this pessimism the Ohioans did not abandon their cause. They further agreed to support Baker's suggestion that the party endorse the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations. The
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convention, however, refused Baker's direct statement and instead straddled the issue by saying, "there is no substitute for it as an agency working for peace." Cox later claimed that if he were nominated, he would not accept unless the plank was changed.

The Ohioans also agreed to censure the Ku Klux Klan. On the day following the caucus, June 25, Walter W. Durbin, a member of the State Executive Committee, charged that Campbell, as the presiding officer, did not allow any nay votes to be given. Accordingly, Durbin presented a petition to Campbell asking that the Ohio delegation reconvene and vote again on the Klan issue. Campbell refused to accept the petition claiming that the issue had been voted upon and that it would be impossible to reassemble the delegation either on or off the convention floor. Durbin replied to this decision with an outburst that claimed Campbell had railroaded the anti-Klan plan through the group. Furthermore, Durbin stated he would bring the issue forward on the convention floor and that he would demand justice. On the following day, however, Durbin dropped his protest. He was told in no uncertain terms that unless he played ball the entire strength of the Old Guard leaders in the state would be thrown against him.
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when the time came for the election of the next state executive committee and that a determined fight would be waged against him in his own district to even keep him off the state central committee. Although Ohio voted against the Klan, the measure in the convention to censure it failed adoption by a vote of 546.15 to 541.85.

Baker had been selected to make the nominating speech for Cox. In this connection Baker had submitted for editing purposes a copy of his address to Campbell, who made a helpful suggestion to limit the extent of the opening remarks of the speech and to increase the time devoted to the summation phase.

Campbell's appearances at the convention were warmly received by fellow delegates. Amid the turbulent and intensely heated debates, differences were put aside long enough to extend sincere and united congratulations on the eighty-first birthday of the Ohioan. To Campbell also fell the duty to call the attention of the convention to the death of President Calvin Coolidge's son and to offer a resolution expressing united and deep sympathy over the misfortune.

131 Ohio State Journal, June 25-26, 1924; Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 25, 1924.
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As the balloting continued, the convention remained in a deadlock. Ohio continued steadfast in its support for Cox until the sixty-fourth ballot. From that point until the seventy-third, the Ohioans supported Newton Baker. Thereafter, they slowly and steadily voted for John W. Davis of West Virginia, the ultimate winner on the 103th ballot. During the balloting, many pleaded with Cox, who remained in Dayton, to come to New York and break the deadlock. Because Cox was nominally still the titular head of the party, it was hoped that he would be able to accomplish what the convention had failed to do. Cox replied negatively to this suggestion. He wrote to Campbell and authorized his elderly friend to remove his name from consideration by the convention whenever he deemed it prudent. Cox felt that his main goal, that of preventing McAdoo from being nominated, was accomplished. Thereafter he was satisfied to accept whomever the convention selected.  

After the convention ended Campbell declared that Cox's message was an unselfish act which brought party
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unity. Campbell believed that Cox's leadership was "directly responsible for the nomination of Davis" and that if it had not been for his directive amid a hopeless situation, the party would never have been able to settle its differences.

The accolade at the convention was not the first to be bestowed on Campbell in celebration of his birthday. One year previously, July 7, 1923, a huge party had been given in observance of his eightieth birthday, and he had received numerous telegrams from many important people of the country congratulating him. Greetings were received from such people as President Warren G. Harding, former President Woodrow Wilson, Chief Justice William Howard Taft, and all the former Governors of Ohio still living. The list included Myron Herrick, Ambassador to France. Campbell stated on the morning of the day of the celebration:

I don't know what my Democratic friends will say of the congratulations that I have been receiving from a distance. Some of them are from big Republicans. I have here a telegram from Uncle Joe Cannon with whom I served in Congress, a cablegram from Myron T. Herrick, our ambassador to France, and the last but not least, a very cordial message from Warren G. Harding, President of the United States, who is now on the Pacific Coast. 137

Among those who delivered addresses at the banquet in

136 Ibid., p. 329.
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the evening were Governor Victor Donahey, former Governor James M. Cox, former Secretary of War Newton Baker, and Claude Meeker, private secretary to Campbell when he was Governor of Ohio. At the conclusion of the program General Edward Orton, Jr. presented to Campbell an artistically wrought book signed by the guests and bearing the following message on the inside cover:

A patriot of the War of 1861-65, a statesman of long service, a former governor of Ohio, an outstanding man of affairs, a courteous and unassuming gentlemen whom we delight at all times to honor for what he is even more than for what he has done. 138

Campbell was quite proud of this occasion and decided to ask all of the participants to write out their comments and to send them to him. He was especially concerned with the reminiscences of his past political life and its influence on the unfolding of Ohio History. He believed that such a collection would not only be a gift to his own vanity, but it would also be a valuable contribution to later historians who "undoubtedly will be under great obligation to me." 139 In this endeavor Campbell did not live long enough to complete his plans. His time expended for the Historical Society, speeches, and politics, prevented
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him from finishing the undertaking.

On December 17, 1924, Campbell attended a testimonial dinner to former Federal Judge John E. Sater. When the dinner was over Campbell chatted with a few old friends. When he was asked how he felt, he remarked, "I'll live to be a hundred." Appearing to have his usual zest for life, he returned to his home and prepared to go to bed. Approximately one hour later he was stricken and died peacefully at 10:30 P.M. Although his death was not expected by his friends and associates, it did not come as a distinct shock to members of his household. Signs of his failing health had been evident since the 1924 convention. In October, Campbell had failed to attend a meeting celebrating "Ohio History Day at Logan Elm Park," because of a physical indisposition. Such an act was rare for Campbell who dearly loved to attend such occasions.

When the news of his death spread throughout Ohio and elsewhere, sympathetic and laudatory responses were rendered. The Cincinnati Enquirer, which had opposed Campbell since the Queen City upheaval in 1891, described him as the "grand old man of Ohio politics" who "did not attain to the seats of the mighty in national affairs, but always
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stood within their shadow." Campbell was characterized as a man of honesty and courage, who continued to live and fight for his convictions when others had long since retired to private oblivion. The New York Times described Campbell as one of the best known Democrats in Ohio and one of the widely known leaders among the national party hierarchy. He was given credit for the nomination of Cox in 1920 and for the strong but unsuccessful attempt by Cox in 1924.

Prior to Campbell's death, he had asked to be buried with the simple dignity of a private citizen. His family intended to comply with this wish but relented under the warm entreaties of friends who asked that Campbell be given a ceremony in keeping with his contributions to Ohio. As a consequence the funeral was conducted on a compromise basis. His remains were taken to the State House rotunda where his body rested in state from 9 A.M. until 1 P.M. At that time, accompanied by an escort of Civil War veterans, his body was taken to the Broad Street Presbyterian Church where Reverend Doctor Samuel S. Palmer conducted the services. In his remarks, the officiating clergyman stated that the accomplishments and influences of Campbell
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were great. Prophetically he said, "Campbell still lives," and his memory will continue to serve as a guide and example for younger generations to follow. Among the pallbearers was James Cox who said, "Governor Campbell was more than an individual in the life of Ohio. He had grown into an institution." Other honorary pallbearers were Judson Harmon, Newton Baker, and Governor A. Victor Donahey who said, "Campbell had been the beloved dean of Ohio Democracy." 144

George F. Parker, a close friend of Campbell, wrote a fitting tribute to the late Governor in the New York Times. Parker wrote that Campbell was a Civil War veteran who bravely and courageously faced untold difficulties. From that time until the end of his life, his career followed this pattern. During his Congressional years, his term as Governor, his staunch loyalty to Grover Cleveland and his final months as an active delegate working for James Cox in 1924 demonstrated his unyielding convictions. Parker recalled talking to Campbell in Madison Square Garden during the opening sessions of the heated Democratic convention, and he heard the Ohioan say that if he should die in a couple of months because of over-exertion and activity, Parker should not be surprised. He had disobeyed his

144 Ibid., December 21, 1924; Cleveland Plain Dealer, December 20-21, 1924.
doctor's orders, but the cause was so great that he was willing to shorten his life in its behalf.\textsuperscript{145}

To many, Campbell at the time of his death and for a number of years earlier, was a man who had failed to adapt his ideas and actions to the Twentieth Century. His rejection of such well accepted concepts as government regulation of business, industry, and the economy was based primarily upon a Nineteenth Century concept of individual freedom as the anthesisis of governmental regulation. During the 1890's when the reforming elements of the West arose within the Democratic Party, he was appalled and refused to consider their programs as legitimate. Their ideas seemed to violate his personal tenets. On the other hand, he was equally opposed to the Republican Party's concepts of protectionism and favoritism to the business interests. As the nation entered the Progressive period and adjusted itself to an industrialized society, Campbell fell into the background. He refused to abandon his ideas simply for expediency. Maintaining the courage of his convictions, he oftentimes spoke out in defense of them.

Although he refused to yield and join his opponents, he remained a loyal Democrat. Campbell believed that his party and the nation were going astray. His attitude was

\textsuperscript{145}New York \textit{Times}, December 22, 1924.
one which placed him at the disposal of both his party and
the nation. He worked within the party as he sought to
bring it and the nation back to the principles and way of
life he had known and respected.
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