

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

Volume LIII

DECEMBER, 1957

NUMBER 4

The Rise of Albert J. Beveridge to the United States Senate

*John Braeman**

"The great day of which I have, since boyhood, been dreaming is nearly upon us," noted Albert J. Beveridge shortly after the beginning of the conflict with Spain in 1898. "For many years I have been talking, writing and speaking of the time when the Republic must embark upon its imperial policy. . . . But now, all at once, the fierce light of war reveals to the American people that this policy which I felt would be delayed for years is upon us, and so it is that, for the first time in my life, I wish I were in public position where I could partly shape the events which are now upon us." But distant from the seats of power, he feared lest he idly sit, a spectator from afar upon the course of events. "It may be," Beveridge added hopefully, "that there is still a sufficient lack of statesmanship to defer this thing eight or ten years," and in that case he should have his chance at shaping the national destiny.¹

But events moved faster than Beveridge dreamed, for he had the self-discipline and impatience of ambition, the will and energy that bred success. A plow boy at twelve, a railroad hand with a section gang at fourteen, a logger and teamster at sixteen, Beveridge had from youth been inspired by dreams of greatness, by an unquenchable faith in his future. Believing that knowledge meant power in this struggle of life, he graduated from DePauw University in 1885 on his first step upward into the world of affairs. Paying his way through college by dint of sacrifice and struggle,

* John Braeman is a graduate student in the department of history, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, and is writing a doctoral thesis on Albert J. Beveridge.

¹ Beveridge to Charles G. Dawes, May 10, 1898, Beveridge Papers, Library of Congress.

Beveridge found that the hardships of his youth had prepared the foundations for the achievements of his mature years. Throughout his future career he displayed that strength of purpose which doubted not his powers. "This absolutely certain inevitableness of my prevailing," Beveridge noted reflectively in his uncompleted autobiography, "... has been a power in my life . . . a faith elemental, primordial, even fanatic if you like."²

The choice of a career at the law came naturally enough. "Lawyers were the biggest men in our own and neighboring counties," recalled Beveridge, "and they were regarded as a very superior type of human being." In the fluid society of a rapidly industrializing America, law provided the smoothest avenue along which a man without capital could rise to wealth and power, and Beveridge followed that path trod by so many ambitious youths of the day. "I would give my clients the very best that was in me," he resolved on beginning independent practice in 1899. "I would put my life into every case."³ Thorough preparation, a phenomenal memory, and a remarkable ability to master detail made him devastating in the court room, and Beveridge climbed rapidly to a position of leadership at the Indianapolis bar.⁴

But politics remained Beveridge's first love, and even before leaving college he had ventured forth into the political fray. "I was a partisan Republican of that white hot kind that in those days resulted from being the son and brother of Union soldiers," he recalled. Hailing Republican victory as a mark of loyalty to the Union and to the men who fought and died for its preservation, Beveridge scornfully denounced

² Claude G. Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era* (Boston, 1932), 1-78, remains the best published account of Beveridge's pre-senatorial career. Deposited among the Beveridge Papers in the Library of Congress are notes prepared by Beveridge in preparation for an autobiography which he never completed, and these notes are a valuable source for understanding the man. The quotation is drawn from this source, which will hereafter be cited as MS Autobiography.

³ MS Autobiography, Beveridge Papers. For details of his legal apprenticeship, see Russel M. Seeds (ed.), *History of the Republican Party of Indiana* (Indianapolis, 1899), 264-272. This biographical sketch is unsigned, but clearly draws upon first-hand information.

⁴ By 1893 Beveridge estimated his to be "the second best single practice in town," Beveridge to John C. Shaffer, November 22, 1893, Shaffer Papers, Indiana State Library. An appraisal of Beveridge as a lawyer by a friendly jurist, Federal District Judge John H. Baker, is in *Toasts, Given at Dinner in Honor of Albert J. Beveridge* (Indianapolis, 1899), 17. The dinner was given by his friend, Charles C. Coffin, on February 13, 1899.

the Democracy for its disloyalty to that sacred cause.⁵ But more than these memories of struggle and sacrifice for the flag inspired his devotion to the Grand Old Party. America was rich and fast growing richer. No nation in the world offered such opportunities, and his own personal experience seemed but confirmation of this truth. Rejoicing in the multiplying proofs of the nation's wealth, he suffered few of the nagging doubts afflicting the millions whom this prosperity had not so benefited. Life had been good to him, and Beveridge, favored by fortune, discerned no radical flaw in the acquisitive America of the years following the Civil War.⁶

"I shall, at all times and ever, be more than happy," he assured a party manager, "to subordinate my own personal desires to what may seem to the best interests of that great party, upon whose success hangs the welfare of the country and therefore the future of civilization itself."⁷ So in every campaign, beginning from the 1884 Blaine-Cleveland contest during his college days, Beveridge stumped the state from end to end on behalf of the G.O.P. He was ever a partisan, lush, prolix, uncurbed in his exuberance, too profuse in eulogies of his party, too bitter with its opponents. But an age finding its model in the flamboyant, impassioned appeals of the years following the Civil War thrilled to his words.⁸

Popularity as a Republican stump speaker drew speaking invitations from beyond Indiana, and by 1898 Beveridge had gained a national reputation. But more importantly, that campaign activity opened a path to political preferment. So well known had Beveridge become politically that the party leaders proffered him the 1894 Republican nomination for the highly lucrative attorney-generalship of the state. Based upon the fee system rather than a regular salary, this office

⁵ MS Autobiography, Beveridge Papers.

⁶ MS Campaign Speeches dated 1888, 1890, 1892, and 1894, Beveridge Papers. A firm protectionist, Beveridge insisted that Republican success meant prosperity speeded forward, whereas Democratic victory ensured disaster, bankruptcy, and poverty. Reflecting the same social outlook, Beveridge responded during the 1896 campaign with a near-hysterical denunciation of Bryan standing with "his goblet of silver filled with revolution's blood red wine," *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, October 30, 1896.

⁷ Beveridge to Louis T. Michener, September 17, 1892, Michener Papers, Library of Congress.

⁸ As a young stump speaker, Beveridge waved the "bloody shirt" with abandon, *Indianapolis Journal*, October 7, 11, 1886. A valuable analysis of his oratory is Herold T. Ross, "The Oratorical Principles and Practice of Beveridge," *Archives of Speech*, I, No. 4 (September, 1936), 99-168.

paid from thirty to forty thousand dollars a year. Beveridge was tempted by so glittering a prize. But fearful lest that place be considered full reward for all the services he had done in the past and all he could do in the future, he finally declined the honor. "It is firing my gun off too soon," Beveridge concluded. "I think that there may be something higher ahead for me—but I shall not care even for that unless I can [do] good for my country—good in the better and nobler sense."⁹

The outburst of the Spanish-American war fired his dreams of political leadership. Destiny, Beveridge felt, had marked him to guide the nation's imperial future. "For myself, if fate could lay before me the choice of a place in history as a free gift of the gods," he exclaimed, "I would rather be the forming and shap[ing mind] which is to mark out our foreign policy from now on than to have been the greatest statesman of the period of the Civil War. For, after all, the latter will be more or less local; the former will be universal."¹⁰ The United States Senate promised that chance, and for Beveridge the hour to try his hand had struck.¹¹

Since 1882, the Democrats had retained control of the Indiana legislature and had maintained in the United States Senate two party stalwarts, Daniel W. Voorhees and David Turpie. But the 1894 campaign, held during the midst of the depression-racked Cleveland administration, marked the end of the Democratic ascendancy. The Bryan-McKinley contest completed the rout, and the Republican-dominated legislature in 1897 replaced Voorhees with the Republican Charles W. Fairbanks. Turpie's term would expire in 1899, and the legislature selected in November, 1898, would choose his successor. Renewed prosperity indicated another G.O.P. sweep in the fall election,¹² and, confident of a second Repub-

⁹ Beveridge to John C. Shaffer, November 20, 22, 1893, Shaffer Papers.

¹⁰ Beveridge to John Temple Graves, July 13, 1898, Beveridge Papers.

¹¹ Beveridge to George W. Perkins, July 14, 1898, *ibid.*

¹² It should be noted that Democratic power in Indiana during these years was not as unchallenged as the above statement seemingly indicates. The Republicans did win the Indiana House of Representatives in 1886, and two years later elected the governor and carried the state for Benjamin Harrison for president, although the Democrats managed until 1894 to control the General Assembly on joint ballot for the election of U.S. Senators. For a good summary of the politics of these years, see Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 56-87.

lican in the United States Senate from Indiana, Beveridge laid his plans carefully to ensure he should be that Republican.

At a meeting toward the end of May, 1898, in the Indianapolis law office of James W. Noel, a close personal friend, Beveridge's candidacy had its beginnings. Present were Noel, Frank Littleton, Larz Whitcomb, and Alfred M. Glossbrenner, longtime friends of the hopeful candidate to whom Beveridge bluntly announced his dream of the United States Senatorship. His friends were stunned for the moment by the daring of the scheme, but after considerable discussion boldness proved their ally. During the previous session of the legislature, Littleton had served with such distinction in the Indiana House of Representatives that he had planned to seek renomination in the hope of reaching the speakership. Now, following the discussion, Noel, Whitcomb, and Glossbrenner determined to run for that body in the dual plan of contributing to the selection of Littleton to the speakership and of Beveridge to the United States Senate. A few days later they persuaded Fred Joss, another young lawyer of their acquaintance, to seek a seat in the Indiana Senate in furtherance of their design.¹³

Beveridge had made no mistake in his choice of followers. Though youthful, these friends of Beveridge had gained by 1898 a place of prominence in the life of Indianapolis, insuring invaluable support. Particularly had they been active among that group of younger Republicans, centered in the Marion Club, who were rapidly becoming the dominant force in Marion County Republicanism.¹⁴ Consequently, their successful bids for the desired nominations aroused scant notice, and no hint of Beveridge's candidacy reached the public.¹⁵ A loyal core of support had been thereby secured for the forthcoming legislature, and, during the campaign which

¹³ Beveridge to John C. Shaffer, April 18, 1905, Beveridge Papers, recalls that in May, 1898, the plans were first laid for his senatorial campaign. Details are provided in interviews with James W. Noel and Fred A. Joss, as cited by Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 79.

¹⁴ Biographical sketches of the Marion County five are in Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 140-142, 153-154, 280-283.

¹⁵ *Indianapolis Journal*, June 15, August 4, 1898.

followed, this group provided that day to day leadership so needed by the Beveridge cause.¹⁶

In furthering these plans, Beveridge realized that the chairmanship of the Republican state convention to be held that August promised an unrivaled chance for placing his name prominently before the party faithful gathered from throughout the state. His advisers, he explained to a friendly politician, "regard it of great importance that I meet the sixteen hundred delegates face to face in the active work of presiding over the Convention."¹⁷ But that chance was denied him. "Fairbanks insisted on being the whole thing," Beveridge complained, and the Senator presided in person during the entire session. "Had I conducted the Convention today," he lamented, "I would have, in this single day, done seventy-five percent of the work which will be on our shoulders this Fall and Winter." A serious setback, Beveridge felt, and "my fellows here are furious and bitterly so."¹⁸

But Beveridge and his friends remained undaunted and quietly continued their activity. "We ought to *go slow* and not get any more people in this thing *just now*," urged a confidant in early September.¹⁹ That should be the plan, Beveridge acknowledged, but he warned that his friends must continue their behind-the-scenes activity.²⁰ Nor did Beveridge on his campaign tours in the fall for the Republican ticket neglect to sound the situation. "Men come to me every day," he reported, "and voluntarily pledge themselves to me without my stating to them that I am in any wise a candidate."²¹ "If things go on as they are," he exclaimed jubilantly, "even Mr. Fairbanks will not be able to head things off."²²

The November elections resulting in a G.O.P. landslide insured a Republican successor to the Democratic Turpie

¹⁶ Charles F. Remy, "The Election of Beveridge to the Senate," *Indiana Magazine of History*, XXXVI (1940), 127-128. An active participant in the Beveridge campaign, Remy read this paper before the Century Club on February 26, 1936, and it provides valuable sidelights by an insider on Beveridge's victory. Before delivering the paper, Remy communicated with another leading participant, Harry S. New, and was "pleased that you think my recollections of the Beveridge campaign are fairly accurate," Charles F. Remy to Harry S. New, August 14, 1935, New Papers, Indiana State Library.

¹⁷ Beveridge to Perry Heath, July 18, 1898, Beveridge Papers.

¹⁸ Beveridge to John C. Wingate, August 4, 1898, *ibid.*

¹⁹ Albert M. Glossbrenner to Beveridge, September 4, 1898, *ibid.*

²⁰ Beveridge to Albert M. Glossbrenner, September 7, 1898, *ibid.*

²¹ Beveridge to Charles G. Dawes, October 13, 1898, *ibid.*

²² Beveridge to John C. Shaffer, October 17, 1898, *ibid.*

when the General Assembly convened in January,²³ and now the conflicting senatorial ambitions came to the fore. "The Legislature is Republican," Beveridge wired his close friend, Chicago publisher John Shaffer. "The real work now begins."²⁴ "I do not propose to make a blustering fight," he commented to another friend, "but am going to put up the strongest, most vigorous and most unceasing contest you ever heard of. It shall, however, be dignified throughout. It was decided today that my *personal* work was done and that from now on my friends must do the rest of the work for me."²⁵

Promptly following the election Beveridge made formal public announcement of his candidacy for the United States Senatorship, and his friends opened headquarters at the Denison Hotel to greet the politicians flocking into Indianapolis from throughout the state.²⁶ John C. Wingate, of Montgomery County, was placed in charge, and a wise choice he proved. "Wingate was certainly a character," recalled a contemporary, "popular, unsurpassed as a story teller and greeter, widely known."²⁷ He had masterminded the 1896 nomination of James A. Mount for governor, and now he placed his not inconsiderable talents as a political manager at Beveridge's service.²⁸ A clever and experienced practical politician, he could particularly reassure men of a similar breed that his candidate harbored no dangerous designs. "Mr. Beveridge," Wingate calmed a South Bend political leader, "is one of the original objectors to Civil Service as it is now administered and is still thoroughly of his original convictions. . . . You need have no fears of Mr. Beveridge disappointing you on this proposition."²⁹

²³ John A. Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," *Indiana Magazine of History*, XXIV (1928), 147-150.

²⁴ Beveridge to John C. Shaffer, November 9, 1898, Beveridge Papers.

²⁵ Beveridge to Charles G. Dawes, November 10, 1898, *ibid.*

²⁶ *Indianapolis Journal*, November 12, 1898.

²⁷ Inspired by Remy's article, Harry S. New recorded sometime during 1936 his recollections of Beveridge's election to the Senate in 1899, and a copy is filed among his papers at the Indiana State Library. These recollections will henceforth be cited as the Harry S. New MS.

²⁸ Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 151-153.

²⁹ John C. Wingate to Schuyler Colfax, Jr., December 19, 1898, Beveridge Papers.

But few gave Beveridge's candidacy much chance, and indeed many were affronted at the boldness of his course. Barely thirty-six years of age, he struck many as unduly ambitious. Let him season a while, they urged, before trying for so high an honor.³⁰ The odds against his candidacy were formidable, but he had that supreme self-confidence which inspired his followers. "I note your 'hope'," he replied to a friend. "As Hamlet says, 'Nay it is not seems, it is.' So in this matter, it is not a question of 'hope'; it is a question of 'will be.' Please remember Beaconsfield's motto: 'Nothing is impossible to the brain and will of man.'"³¹

Beveridge's candidacy had its handicaps, and foremost appeared to be his lack of support among the more prominent leaders of the state.³² But in reality that proved a blessing in disguise considering the bitter factional rivalry prevailing within the Republican party at the time. A deep-seated split, this ill feeling had its beginning in the candidacy of Benjamin Harrison for the 1888 presidential nomination. Most Indiana Republicans followed the lead of John C. New, publisher of the Indianapolis *Journal*, in supporting Harrison. Reading like a who's who of Indiana Republicanism, the Harrison group included the dominant party leadership of that day. But Harrison's foremost rival, Judge Walter Q. Gresham, lacked not his Indiana supporters, and a fierce struggle ensued for control of the party machinery. A politically ambitious young attorney, Charles W. Fairbanks, led the Gresham forces, and, ably assisted by a group of rising young politicians, laid the foundations for a rival political

³⁰ Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 80-81; Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 152.

³¹ Beveridge to John C. Shaffer, June 17, 1898, Beveridge Papers.

³² Remy, "The Election of Beveridge to the Senate," 128. The only Indiana politician of first rank who rallied to Beveridge's side was Perry Heath, First Assistant Postmaster-General and McKinley's chief patronage dispenser, Beveridge to George W. Perkins, July 14, 1898, Beveridge Papers. But there is good reason to believe that Heath was simply using Beveridge as a stalking horse for his own ambitions. In the words of his chief clerk, Heath was "not disposed, just now, to make an open avowal of his candidacy. If he can hold some members uncommitted for a while that will be sufficient," George Allen to David W. Henry, November 22, 1898, Henry Papers, Indiana State Library. Eventually, Beveridge suspected the double game Heath was playing, and sharply demanded that he squelch those persistent rumors about his availability and "come back here and take his coat off like the rest of our mutual friends for me," Beveridge to Charles G. Dawes, November 29, 1898, Beveridge Papers. But the evidence does not indicate that Heath in any way played a significant part in Beveridge's selection.

machine.³³ Therein lay the roots of the factional conflict of the next decade.

From that preliminary struggle the Harrison forces emerged triumphant, and the General's nomination at the Chicago convention meant his friends' continued predominance within the party. But Fairbanks remained undiscouraged, and awaited his day as he quietly spread his personal following throughout the state. Despite the federal patronage in the hands of his foes, Fairbanks had matured his plans so carefully that by 1892 he had become a power to be reckoned with in Indiana politics. Shrewdly supporting Harrison for renomination at the Minneapolis convention, Fairbanks further solidified his position in Indiana, and Republican defeat that year provided the chance for which he had been preparing. Displaced from their federal patronage by deserving Democrats under the incoming Cleveland administration, the Harrison leaders faded into the background, and Charles W. Fairbanks, spending freely of his personal fortune to rebuild the party, had by 1894 grasped the reins of Indiana Republican leadership.³⁴

In 1896, a determined bid by the Harrison forces designed to oust Fairbanks' friend, John K. Gowdy, from the chairmanship of the Republican State Committee failed by a narrow margin,³⁵ and Fairbanks promptly sought to reinsure his future dominance by hastening aboard the Hanna-McKinley bandwagon.³⁶ That course heightened factional feeling to a fever pitch. Harrison's friends charged that McKinley had

³³ The Harrison leaders included Roscoe O. Hawkins, W. A. Ketcham, Riley McKeen, Nick Filbeck, George W. Steele, and Robert S. Taylor, whereas Fairbanks' chief lieutenants were Joseph Kealing, Al Wishard, and Martin Hugg. Valuable in this connection are Remy, "The Election of Beveridge to the Senate," 124-126, and Matilda Gresham, *Life of Walter Q. Gresham, 1832-1895* (2 vols., Chicago, 1919), II, 566-601.

³⁴ Fairbanks' bid for the Senatorship in 1897 occasioned a number of articles reviewing the factional controversies of the preceding years, *Indianapolis Journal*, November 16, 1896, January 13, 1897. Further sidelights are given by the former secretary of the Republican State Committee from 1894 to 1896, Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 65-84.

³⁵ *Indianapolis Journal*, January 22, 28, 29, 1896. E. H. Nebeker, Gowdy's challenger, had been a leading Harrison supporter in 1888, and had been rewarded by appointment in 1891 as Treasurer of the United States, Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 236.

³⁶ Fairbanks' friends, Addison C. Harris and Joseph Kealing, took the lead in forming the Indiana McKinley organization, *Indianapolis Journal*, February 26, 1896.

intrigued with the anti-Harrison forces at the 1892 national convention to defeat the General's renomination, and they were determined to resist the Ohio man's candidacy.³⁷ But the Gowdy-Fairbanks group, closely in touch with Mark Hanna, remained firm in their determination to bind Indiana to the McKinley standard.³⁸

Though Harrison had renounced aspirations for a third presidential nomination,³⁹ his friends sought control of the Indiana delegation to the 1896 national convention on his behalf as a favorite son. Some foreseeing a deadlock hoped that Harrison's name presented at the crucial moment could sweep the convention.⁴⁰ Most simply wished to bargain Indiana's support for generous recognition from the successful candidate.⁴¹ But the Gowdy-Fairbanks group forced through the state convention instructions for McKinley, and they gained the credit with the newly dominant national party leadership.⁴² The Harrison men were furious and sharply assailed their rivals.⁴³ "There is likely to be a very nasty mess," Harrison's former campaign manager warned a young friend about McKinley at the 1896 national convention, "and I don't want you connected with it, particularly as a supporter of a man whose nomination will be succeeded by scandal after scandal. . . . My dear boy, I want you to realize that our party has never yet sold a nomination wholly or partially."⁴⁴

McKinley's nomination meant the continued control of the party in Indiana by the Fairbanks following. The selection of Fairbanks himself as temporary chairman of the national convention at St. Louis publicly demonstrated his closeness to the next administration, and Indianians eager for patronage remembered the hint.⁴⁵ Lest they forget, Perry Heath, chief patronage dispenser for the President-elect, ar-

³⁷ *Ibid.*, February 25, 1896.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, April 14, 22, 30, May 1, 1896.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, February 4, 1896.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, May 2, 1896.

⁴¹ Letter by Harry S. New, dated February 13, 1930, in explanation of certain items among his papers, New Papers, Indiana State Library.

⁴² *Indianapolis Journal*, May 6, 7, 8, 1896.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, May 29, June 1, 1896.

⁴⁴ Louis T. Michener to Beveridge, March 17, 1896, Beveridge Papers.

⁴⁵ For a biographical sketch of Fairbanks stressing this point of closeness to the McKinley administration, see Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 114-118.

rived in Indianapolis during January, 1897, when the newly-chosen Republican legislature had for its consideration a successor to the Democrat Voorhees.⁴⁶ Thus aided, Fairbanks overwhelmed the resistance of his dispirited rivals in his bid for the United States Senatorship,⁴⁷ and the new Senator, holding the federal patronage in his hands, reigned supreme over Indiana Republicanism. Discredited and purged, the Harrison leaders found banishment into political limbo their lot.⁴⁸ "I see the possibilities are that a Mr. Leighty, late a member of Congress, will be Pension Agent at Indianapolis," complained one. "Was Mr. Leighty a Gresham Republican in 1888?"⁴⁹

In light of this situation the Beveridge hopes were apparent. The bitterest feeling had been roused, and neither dared allow its rival to prevail in the 1899 senatorial contest. Therein lay Beveridge's chance. In the 1888 pre-nomination campaign, he had rallied behind the Gresham standard, doing yeoman work in that losing cause.⁵⁰ But during the years which followed, Beveridge remained aloof from the Fairbanks forces, and, falling under the influence of Harrison's manager, Louis T. Michener, became an enthusiastic admirer of the General's.⁵¹ That background made him an ideal compromise choice, neutral between the rival followings. Particularly promising seemed this hope, considering that due to his

⁴⁶ Indianapolis *Journal*, January 12, 1897, notes the presence of Heath in Indianapolis on Fairbanks' behalf. His chief clerk recalled later how "Perry Heath, acting on the permission of President-elect McKinley, went to Indianapolis and swung around enough legislators to insure Fairbanks' election," George Allen to David W. Henry, December 19, 1898, Henry Papers.

⁴⁷ Indianapolis *Journal*, January 13, 1897.

⁴⁸ Gowdy went to Paris as consul-general, Al Wishard, a longtime Fairbanks friend and manager of his campaign for the Senate, became United States Attorney for the District of Indiana, and lesser lights loyal to the new party leadership received suitable rewards, Harry S. New MS, New Papers, Indiana State Library. Complaints about Fairbanks' patronage policies are set forth in letters of Harrison adherents, James O'Brien to Robert S. Taylor, January 21, 1897, and Calvin Diggs to Robert S. Taylor, August 4, 1897, Taylor Papers, Indiana State Library.

⁴⁹ James O'Brien to Robert S. Taylor, March 20, 1897, Taylor Papers.

⁵⁰ Gresham, *Life of Walter Q. Gresham*, II, 580, 588, 594.

⁵¹ Beveridge to Louis T. Michener, June 10, 1892, Michener Papers. Indeed, during his campaign for the Senate, Beveridge sought to strengthen his position with the Harrison faction by writing a long letter assuring the General of his "profound regard," Beveridge to Benjamin Harrison, January 3, 1899, Harrison Papers, Library of Congress.

youth the Indianapolis candidate had escaped unscarred from the factional ill-will surrounding the more prominent party leaders. "The fact that you are the second choice of the men from nearly all the districts," noted a friend hopefully, "means that you will grow as soon as any weaken, which is inevitable when it comes to the acquisition of votes."⁵²

In the interval, Beveridge lost no chance to present his candidacy in a favorable light. To a hesitant politician he exclaimed sharply:

All I have to say, if fourteen years of service to the party, paying my own expenses and making contributions to the campaign fund (more in this last campaign than all the rest of the candidates for the Senate and Senator Fairbanks combined contributed) without ever having received, desired or asked for anything, does not entitle me to greater support than those who have been perpetual candidates for office, who have not been in the service of the party but a fraction of the time that I have and who have received reward, both in office and money, then I do not understand political obligations.⁵³

Nor did his youthfulness, Beveridge insisted, disqualify his candidacy for that high honor. Learning that Clem Studebaker, the South Bend wagon manufacturer, expressed doubts about a beardless youth of thirty-six for United States Senator, he hastily replied. "Let him know," he urged his friend Shaffer,

that Thomas Jefferson was only thirty-three years of age when he wrote the Declaration of Independence; that Hamilton was only thirty-two when he was Secretary of the Treasury; that Andrew Jackson was in the Senate at thirty; Albert Gallatin. . . at thirty-two; Henry Clay. . . at thirty.⁵⁴

Perhaps more importantly, Beveridge's youthfulness had its advantages for his candidacy. Running as the self-styled representative of the rising generation of Republicans, he had a particular appeal for the younger members of the party. "I don't know what to think of the Beveridge situation," reported an experienced politician to a rival candidate. "If there are as many young men in the General Assembly from the State at large as there are from Marion County, he will be a very formidable quantity in the legislature."⁵⁵

⁵² Robert E. Mansfield to Beveridge, November 19, 1898, Beveridge Papers.

⁵³ Beveridge to E. H. Wolcott, December 15, 1898, *ibid.*

⁵⁴ Beveridge to John C. Shaffer, December 18, 1898, *ibid.*

⁵⁵ William A. Ketcham to Robert S. Taylor, September 3, 1898, Taylor Papers.

At the same time, nothing contributed so much to give an air of solidity to Beveridge's candidacy as the mobilization of a number of leading business men behind him. His speeches had long been in harmony with business aspirations, and now a group of substantial Indianapolis manufacturers, merchants, and bankers formed a Business Men's Association for Beveridge. At first confined to the city, the group decided to extend its organization throughout the state. Under the leadership of David M. Parry, president of the Manufacturers' Association of Indiana and vice-president of the National Association of Manufacturers, a meeting of more than one hundred business leaders from all parts of Indiana was held on December 28. The group voted endorsement of Beveridge's candidacy for the Senate as best serving the interests of the business community, and plans were laid for providing further support.⁵⁶

A few days later, on January 3, as the legislators began flocking into the city, Beveridge's business friends formally opened their headquarters at the Denison to canvass on his behalf.⁵⁷ From their efforts followed a steady stream of pro-Beveridge appeals flooding into wavering legislators from business firms throughout Indiana.⁵⁸ "In the last campaign," boasted Beveridge shortly after his election,

it is a literal truth that . . . heads of the greatest business enterprises left their business, some of them for two weeks, without a moment of attention. This included great manufacturers like D. M. Parry, the biggest cart manufacturer in the world; C. F. Smith, one of the greatest bicycle manufacturers in the world; the managers of our big department stores, etc., etc., et cetera, ad infinitum.⁵⁹

But the issue rested in the hands of professional politicians, not business leaders, and most were dubious about Beveridge's candidacy from the start. Widespread resentment prevailed at what many out-of-the-city people considered the domination of state politics by Indianapolis, and Beveridge, as the sole candidate from that city, suffered the

⁵⁶ *Indianapolis News*, December 28, 1898; *Indianapolis Journal*, December 29, 1898; Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 155.

⁵⁷ *Indianapolis Journal*, January 4, 1899.

⁵⁸ *Indianapolis News*, January 5, 1899; *Indianapolis Journal*, January 5, 10, 1899.

⁵⁹ Beveridge to David Graham Phillips, February 2, 1899, Beveridge Papers.

full brunt of this feeling. Complained the *Worthington Times*,

The hoggish propensities of the Indianapolis Republicans are well exemplified in the announcement. . . that A. J. Beveridge, of that city, would be a candidate for United States Senator. . . . Indianapolis already has one Senator, and the Republicans of the State outside of the city will not take kindly to Mr. Beveridge's candidacy.⁶⁰

Wingate, a rural politician, reinforced by Sid Conger, of Shelby County, and John R. Bonnell, of Montgomery County, sought to allay the feeling throughout the state against the Indianapolis candidate, and they played no small part in gaining Beveridge support from outside the city.⁶¹ But that resentment remained dangerous to his cause, and Beveridge realized fully the difficulty. "Their only hope of defeating me," he acknowledged, "is that I live in Indianapolis. That is my great obstacle. But it is believed by absolutely every one of my friends that we can overcome it."⁶²

The General Assembly convened January 15, 1899, and the rival candidates for the Senatorship struggled for advantage as the day of reckoning drew near. The speakership of the Indiana House of Representatives posed the initial question mark, and rumors freely circulated that supporters of rival aspirants planned a switch to Beveridge's friend, Frank Littleton. Bestowing too many prizes upon Marion County, thus rousing the resentment of the rest of the state, seemed the surest way to defeat Beveridge.⁶³ Friends, fearful of that tactic, insisted that Beveridge urge Littleton to renounce his candidacy, but he indignantly rejected the suggestion. "Gentlemen," he replied, "not another word. Frank Littleton is one of the best friends I have in the world. He is a candidate for Speaker, as I am for Senator. I would rather go down in defeat than imperil by any selfish act of mine the chance of my friend for the office he seeks."⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Quoted by the *Indianapolis Journal*, November 17, 1898.

⁶¹ Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 88-89.

⁶² Beveridge to George W. Perkins, January 3, 1899, Beveridge Papers.

⁶³ *Indianapolis News*, December 8, 1898; *Indianapolis Journal*, December 9, 10, 1898. A good summary of the maneuvering is in Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 158-159.

⁶⁴ *Indianapolis News*, January 12, 1899, quoted by Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 158.

The political maneuvering of Beveridge's rivals insured Littleton's selection by the end of December, but the Indianapolis candidate's hopes remained undimmed by the plots of his foes.⁶⁵ Perhaps, indeed, they had forwarded his chances. The disadvantages of the two candidacies had been considered from the start, recalled an insider, and Beveridge's friends concluded that Littleton's selection promised a decided gain for their cause. The speakership of the Indiana House of Representatives, with its power and influence over committees and the like, meant in the hands of a Beveridge adherent an advantage scarcely to be overlooked in any calculation.⁶⁶

As the day of the Republican caucus drew near with the Beveridge forces showing a surprising staying power, rumors flew ever more furiously that Senator Fairbanks planned the youthful candidate's downfall. Fairbanks lived in Indianapolis, and many of his friends feared lest the prejudice against the city injure the Senator's chances should Beveridge triumph.⁶⁷ Nor was it a secret that Fairbanks himself regarded Beveridge's candidacy with something less than enthusiasm.⁶⁸ In these circumstances, many saw his clever hand behind the White House announcement, on the day of the caucus, of the nomination of Addison C. Harris, another Indianapolis man, as minister to Austria-Hungary.⁶⁹

That nomination, charged Beveridge's friends, had been deliberately designed to heighten the antagonism throughout the state against Indianapolis and its candidate.⁷⁰ But Fairbanks angrily denied any such intent of injuring Beveridge's candidacy. "Harris' nomination," he insisted, "had . . . no more connection with the Senatorial situation than to use an old figure 'a last year's bird nest.' The President sends nominations to the Senate to suit himself—all depends upon the burden that is upon him." "In a short time," the Senator continued, "I could have interfered with B's chances in a more effective way than by the circuitous

⁶⁵ Indianapolis News, December 31, 1898.

⁶⁶ Interview with James W. Noel, as cited by Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 88.

⁶⁷ Indianapolis Journal, December 20, 1898.

⁶⁸ Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 83.

⁶⁹ Indianapolis Journal, January 11, 1899.

⁷⁰ Indianapolis News, January 11, 1899.

method of nominating a life long friend—such as Harris—from Indianapolis the day of the caucus.”⁷¹

But Beveridge and his friends remained unconvinced. “The appointment of Harris,” he insisted, “was regarded on every hand as a direct blow at me.” And he added:

I think the feeling was pretty general among the people here, during the Senatorial campaign, that the President was against me . . . [for] it was, and for a long time has been, felt that what was desired in certain quarters the chief would do. All this I have discouraged, denied, repudiated. Nevertheless the feeling existed and I won in spite of it and against it.⁷²

That he triumphed over the seemingly insurmountable odds against his candidacy, however, Beveridge owed less to his personal strength than to the continued factional rivalry within the Republican ranks. Control of the party lay at stake, and neither side could allow its rival to prevail. The lines were drawn, and the hostile groupings prepared for their showdown. Behind the candidacy of the most formidable contender, J. Frank Hanly, stood the full strength of the Fairbanks machine. Against Hanly’s candidacy, the Harrison men, hoping for a comeback, rallied their forces to seek the defeat of their longtime foes. But they soon found their own hopes dimmed by the presence in the race of two favorites, Judge Robert S. Taylor and Major George W. Steele.⁷³

An able lawyer and former judge, Taylor had been appointed a member of the Mississippi Valley Commission by President Garfield in 1881, and had so mastered the problems involved that he had been retained despite the political changes in the administration at Washington in the years which followed.⁷⁴ A close friend of Harrison’s, Taylor had made a race against Fairbanks for the Senatorship in 1897 which had further inflamed factional feelings,⁷⁵ and now he faced the Senator’s wrath. “It is said in the papers, and I have private information confirming the report,” Taylor noted in alarm shortly after McKinley’s inauguration, “that our new Senator, being debarred by civil service rules from

⁷¹ Charles W. Fairbanks to Harry S. New, January 14, 1899, New Papers, Library of Congress.

⁷² Beveridge to Charles G. Dawes, March 2, 1899, Beveridge Papers.

⁷³ Remy, “The Election of Beveridge to the Senate,” 128-129.

⁷⁴ Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 168-169.

⁷⁵ *Indianapolis Journal*, January 13, 1897.

making vacancies for his friends among the Democrats, is proposing to make one, at least, among the Republicans, and that Mr. Joseph Kealing is to be appointed in my stead on the Mississippi Valley Commission."⁷⁶ Protests from his friends in Congress helped forestall immediate action along these lines,⁷⁷ but Taylor fully realized his days were numbered if Fairbanks remained the dominant power on the Indiana scene.

Taylor was Harrison's personal favorite for the Senate place. "With reference to General Harrison," reported W.H.H. Miller, Harrison's law partner for a quarter of a century and Attorney-General in his Cabinet, "I showed him your letter yesterday. He read it carefully and said that he knew of no reason why he should be neutral in this matter, that while he could not go out and seek men to try to influence them, yet he should not hesitate to express himself freely to any who would come or be brought to him in favor of your candidacy."⁷⁸ A longtime Harrison partisan, Roscoe O. Hawkins, provided skillful leadership in the legislature,⁷⁹ but Taylor himself, proud and dignified, displayed an impatience for the details of organization and an aloofness from the vulgar pushing of the politicians which further weakened his chances.⁸⁰

Not so formidable a candidate as Taylor, nonetheless Major George W. Steele had been a major figure in state politics for long years. A Civil War veteran who had marched with Sherman to the sea, he had served on Harrison's appointment as first governor of the Oklahoma Territory. Particularly was Steele the favorite of the "old soldier" element, still a political factor of real consequence, and he had been reelected in November, 1898, to his seventh term in the lower house of Congress.⁸¹ A Harrison man from 1888, he had the support of Harry S. New, who had succeeded his

⁷⁶ Robert S. Taylor to Charles H. Aldrich, March 15, 1897, Taylor Papers.

⁷⁷ During his long tenure on the Mississippi Valley Commission, Taylor had made many friends among congressmen from the area, and these led by T. C. Catchings, Democrat of Mississippi, rallied to his defense, T. C. Catchings to Robert S. Taylor, March 7, 1897, Taylor Papers.

⁷⁸ W. H. H. Miller to Robert S. Taylor, November 14, 1898, *ibid.*

⁷⁹ Indianapolis *News*, December 28, 1898.

⁸⁰ Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 156.

⁸¹ Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 122.

father, John C. New, as publisher of the Indianapolis *Journal* and leader of the Harrison forces. New had preferred that Steele not be a candidate lest a second favorite in the field split the Harrison strength, reported another Harrison leader canvassing on Taylor's behalf. But when the Major determined upon the race, New felt under obligation from long family friendship to rally behind him.⁸²

A third aspirant, Frank B. Posey, played a crucial part in the plans laid by the Harrison men for their return to power. No man in southern Indiana had been more prominent in the politics of the state during the previous decade than this former congressman, and his candidacy drew heavily its support from that section.⁸³ But drawn into the race primarily as a decoy to hold the support of his district until the decisive moment had arrived, he made no active canvass. A clever tactic on the part of the Harrison managers, Posey's candidacy withheld crucial support from their feared rival, J. Frank Hanly.⁸⁴

⁸² William A. Ketcham to Robert S. Taylor, November 22, 1898, Taylor Papers.

There appeared rumors in the Indianapolis *News*, December 3, 1898, to the effect that Fairbanks was behind Steele's candidacy, and Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 156-157, 161, accepts this rumor as correct. Apparent confirmation appears provided by a note among the Harry S. New Papers at the Library of Congress, dated July 11, 1929, explaining certain items, in which New claims that he had been an original Fairbanks man and had believed that Fairbanks' interests could be best served by the selection of Steele or Taylor, both of whom were supposedly true friends of the Senator's. Mr. New, however, was not altogether candid in this note. Not merely does this statement run counter to the overwhelming preponderance of evidence, as presented above, about the actual state of factional feeling at the time, but it is directly contradicted by New himself. Writing to Robert S. Taylor, November 16, 1904, Taylor Papers, concerning his own bid for the Senate seat made vacant by Fairbanks' election as Vice-President, New commented that "the same elements that opposed you so vigorously are against me with the same zeal," and, as the Indianapolis *Star*, July 5, 1904, reported, "Big Chief" Kealing and the Fairbanks organization were leading the opposition to New's aspirations along that line. Beveridge, aware of the rumors, remarked on the "political paradox" that Riley McKeen, an old Harrison man and Fairbanks' foremost rival for the Senate in 1897, would be in the Steele combine if Steele were really Fairbanks' man, Beveridge to John C. Wingate, September 21, 1898, Beveridge Papers. The paradox proved more apparent than real, for neither Steele, nor certainly Taylor, nor New at the time, felt friendly toward Fairbanks.

⁸³ Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 212-213.

⁸⁴ Posey's manager recalled how he arranged Posey's candidacy to help defeat Hanly, James M. Huff to Harry S. New, February 19, 1936, and the foremost Harrison leader agreed that Posey's candidacy kept from Hanly a number of votes sufficient to have elected him, Harry S. New MS, New Papers, Indiana State Library.

For divided as they were, the Harrison forces remained firm in their determination to resist the candidacy of J. Frank Hanly to the last. A speaker of force and eloquence, Hanly had risen rapidly from a youth of poverty to a leading figure on the Indiana scene. Although a year younger than Beveridge, he had previously served a term in the Indiana Senate from 1890 to 1894, followed by two years in the lower house of Congress. He had been narrowly defeated for re-nomination in 1896 after the legislature had redistricted him into a new congressional district, and had since been preparing his plans for the United States Senatorship.⁸⁵ A cunning politician, a master of intrigue, Hanly drew behind his candidacy the full power of the Fairbanks wing of the party.⁸⁶ "It was understood from the outset of the campaign," recalled a contemporary, "that the State organization, aided by a clear majority of the State's Republican members of Congress, would favor the election of J. Frank Hanly as Senator."⁸⁷

His campaign manager was George F. McCulloch, Gowdy's successor as state chairman and hence bitterly resented by the Harrison men,⁸⁸ and McCulloch was ably seconded by Joe Kealing, Fairbanks' ablest and most trusted lieutenant.⁸⁹ In the legislature, Martin Hugg, a Fairbanks follower from 1888 and Kealing's law partner, guided the Hanly forces.⁹⁰ The Fairbanks congressional clique, Representatives Charles Henry, James E. Watson, and James Hemenway, lobbied on Hanly's behalf.⁹¹ Nor were the Fairbanks

⁸⁵ Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 160-162.

⁸⁶ Remy, "The Election of Beveridge to the Senate," 128-129.

⁸⁷ Harry S. New MS, New Papers, Indiana State Library.

⁸⁸ *Indianapolis News*, December 23, 1898. McCulloch succeeded to the chairmanship of the Republican State Committee in 1897 when Gowdy went to Paris as consul-general, but in the spring of 1898 he retired from the post supposedly because of ill health. Charles S. Hernly was unanimously chosen his successor, thereby avoiding an open show of the factional trouble which had disturbed the party two years previously, Seeds, *History of the Republican Party of Indiana*, 84. This factional strife, not ill health, explains McCulloch's retirement from the state chairmanship. As the *Indianapolis News*, November 11, 1898, pointed out, the resentment of the Harrison forces directed now against McCulloch as a Gowdy protégé had become so bitter as to threaten party chances that fall, and consequently it was decided necessary that McCulloch retire in favor of the more neutral Hernly. During the 1899 senatorial campaign, according to an insider, Hernly took no sides, Remy, "The Election of Beveridge to the Senate," 126.

⁸⁹ *Indianapolis News*, December 27, 1898.

⁹⁰ Harry S. New MS, New Papers, Indiana State Library.

⁹¹ *Indianapolis News*, December 13, 31, 1898.

federal appointees inactive. Led by Controller of the Treasury Robert J. Tracewell, Collector of Internal Revenue David W. Henry, and Pension Agent J. D. Leighty, they rallied behind the Hanly standard.⁹² His rivals had no doubt what forces lay behind his candidacy. "I understand that Robert J. Tracewell, Controller of the Treasury, is painted red, white and blue for Hanly for Senator," noted Beveridge bitterly. "This is probably inspired by Fairbanks."⁹³

Backed by this well entrenched machine, Hanly was by far the leading contender. The General Assembly included eighty-nine Republicans, which meant that a candidate required forty-five votes in the caucus for the nomination,⁹⁴ and Hanly's friends jubilantly predicted victory. "I am convinced," reported Hanly's campaign manager, "the Tippecanoe man is a winner. . . . A careful count by four of us shows 35 now." Hanly stood within striking distance of the nomination, and the bandwagon appeared his.⁹⁵ But his selection would mean the final elimination of the old Harrison group from any position of influence, and led by New and Hawkins they rallied to defeat him at any cost.⁹⁶

⁹² Indianapolis *News*, December 13, 28, 1898, January 3, 4, 1899; Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 157; David W. Henry to Fred Sims, December 22, 1898, Henry Papers.

A story appeared in the Indianapolis *News*, December 29, 1898, claiming that the Hanly movement was "anti-Fairbanks in the extreme." But considering that the publisher of the Indianapolis *News* was J. Delevan Smith, Fairbanks' cousin, and Fairbanks himself was secretly its owner, most probably the story was planted to diminish hostility to Hanly as Fairbanks' man. At the same time, Taylor sought advantage from the rumor by appealing for support from the unwary on the ground that Hanly had formed a new political machine hostile to Fairbanks, Robert S. Taylor to M.C. Garber, December 30, 1898, Taylor Papers. But this pretended solicitude on Taylor's part for Fairbanks' welfare certainly did not reflect his true feelings. Nor had Hanly constructed a new machine; rather his support came, as the evidence presented above conclusively demonstrates, from that same machine which Fairbanks himself had constructed by the judicious distribution of patronage. At the same time, Hanly's foremost opponents were Harrison men who had been longtime opponents of the Fairbanks leadership of the party, Harry New and Roscoe Hawkins, Nick Filbeck and Riley McKeen. Indianapolis *News*, December 27, 29, 1898, January 9, 1899.

⁹³ Beveridge to Charles G. Dawes, December 13, 1898, Beveridge Papers.

⁹⁴ Remy, "The Election of Beveridge to the Senate," 130.

⁹⁵ George F. McCulloch to David W. Henry, December 11, 1898, Henry Papers.

⁹⁶ Indianapolis *News*, December 27, 29, 1898, noted that what it termed the New-Hawkins machine planned a last-ditch resistance to Hanly's candidacy because control of the party machinery lay at stake.

"As it now appears," Taylor conceded, "it is Mr. Hanly against the field." But the Harrison men were not without hope. "My friends do not look upon the situation with dismay," Taylor continued, "but think there is a limit of about thirty-five beyond which Mr. Hanly cannot go."⁹⁷ Plans were laid accordingly. A Steele leader, Henry C. Pettit, assured Taylor that he was the second choice of the Steele men.⁹⁸ And similarly Taylor advised his followers "not to make any wicked fight against Mr. Steele, which might cut us off from the good will of his friends in case he should have to retire from the fight leaving Mr. Hanly in the field."⁹⁹

The caucus of Republican legislators to select the party candidate for the United States Senate had been set for Tuesday evening, January 10, and, as that day drew near, the anti-Hanly leaders were busily sounding the situation. When their canvass of legislators showed that more than the forty-five members required stood determinedly against Hanly, a meeting was arranged under the leadership of Harry New to decide strategy.¹⁰⁰ "I undertook to effect a combination of the field," New later explained, "in which the adherents of each agreed that under no circumstances would they ever go to Hanly."¹⁰¹

The anti-Hanly leaders realized that if any candidate should withdraw prior to the caucus his pledged votes would be released, and they feared lest enough fall to Hanly to nominate him, so close did he stand to victory. The decisive moment for concentrating strength upon a single candidate, they concluded, could only be ascertained as ballot succeeded ballot in the caucus to forestall any last minute electioneering

⁹⁷ Robert S. Taylor to William Bunyan, January 1, 1899, Taylor Papers.

⁹⁸ Henry C. Pettit to Robert S. Taylor, December 5, 1898, *ibid.*

⁹⁹ Robert S. Taylor to Robert B. Hanna, December 21, 1898, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ A canvass of the situation by the anti-Hanly leaders on the evening of January 4, reported the *Indianapolis Journal*, January 5, 1899, showed at least fifty legislators who would never vote for Hanly under any circumstances and who would not be stampeded by the bandwagon proposition. A Beveridge supporter, Charles F. Remy, recalled how he and Robert E. Mansfield, a Steele leader, but a close personal friend of Beveridge, made the poll of legislators which showed the presence of the anti-Hanly majority, Remy, "The Election of Beveridge to the Senate," 130-131. Another participant, James M. Huff, Posey's manager, recalled the scheme in a letter of February 19, 1936, to Harry S. New, New Papers, Indiana State Library. Both emphasize Harry New's preeminent role in the subsequent events which led to Beveridge's selection.

¹⁰¹ Harry S. New MS, New Papers, Indiana State Library.

by Hanly. "This agreement was definitely made and was faithfully adhered to," recalled its foremost architect. "It provided that when the moment for rallying around one particular candidate arrived we would all concentrate upon the man who had more votes than either of the others."¹⁰²

Therein lay Beveridge's hope. If he could start the balloting with as many as a dozen men pledged to stand to the end, his friends would hold the balance of power between the rival factions. Aware that rather than allow Hanly's selection the Harrison forces would throw their support to the Indianapolis candidate, Beveridge's followers concentrated on securing second choice pledges.¹⁰³ "Nine out of ten of the Hanly men are for any one to beat Steele or Taylor," pointed out a shrewd Beveridge supporter. "The same proportion of Taylor men are for any one to beat Hanly . . . [and] in event of a break you will reap the benefit."¹⁰⁴

Beveridge's five Indianapolis friends provided a loyal nucleus of support, and during the previous weeks his managers had been quietly lining up support from throughout the state. As the caucus approached amidst spreading rumors of a crystallizing anti-Hanly sentiment, the Beveridge campaign swung into high gear to push the Indianapolis candidate to the fore as the leading Hanly rival.¹⁰⁵ By the evening before the caucus, fifteen members of the General Assembly had pledged to support Beveridge steadfastly to the end in hopes of that deadlock which promised the Indianapolis candidate his chance.¹⁰⁶ "The situation here is excellent," Beveridge concluded in outlining this strategy. "I am the only one who has a support which will stand by him, if I say so, during five thousand ballots, if necessary. In addition to this, I am the second choice of sixty-five members of the Legislature who have expressed themselves openly; forty-five members only are necessary to a choice."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ Interviews with Noel, Joss, and Glossbrenner, as cited by Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 89.

¹⁰⁴ Nathan H. Baker to Beveridge, December 19, 1898, Beveridge Papers.

¹⁰⁵ *Indianapolis News*, January 6, 7, 10, 1899; *Indianapolis Journal*, January 7-10, 1899. A good summary of this late Beveridge boom is in Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 160-161.

¹⁰⁶ Interviews with Noel, Joss, and Glossbrenner, as cited by Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 89-90; Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 162.

¹⁰⁷ Beveridge to George W. Perkins, December 24, 1898, Beveridge Papers.

On Tuesday evening, January 10, 1899, the eighty-nine Republican members of the General Assembly gathered in the hall of the Indiana House of Representatives as the intrigue and counter-intrigue reached a fever pitch. "The floor managers for Judge Taylor were Senator Newton Gilbert, of Steuben, and Senator R. O. Hawkins, of Marion," Harry New recalled the scene. "I personally represented Major Steele, J. M. Huff represented Posey, and practically all of the original Beveridge following of thirteen were fully consulted. All agreed that whatever might happen none in their respective camps should ever go to Hanly."¹⁰⁸

The Hanly men had determined to cast their full strength from the first in hopes of stampeding the caucus, and, as the balloting began, that candidate stood far to the front. But the anti-Hanly forces held firm, and Beveridge, slowly gaining, held second place as ballot followed ballot. Then on the ninth ballot came the moment of crisis when Hanly reached the thirty-seven votes fixed as the danger point beyond which his foes dared not allow him to gain lest the bandwagon psychology sweep him to victory.¹⁰⁹ "At that stage," Harry New recalled, "it had become perfectly apparent to me that the choice must be made between Hanly and Beveridge." Hurried consultations among the anti-Hanly leaders determined their course, and now the carefully prepared plans unfolded. The scene had been set, and all stood in readiness for that final count naming Albert J. Beveridge the Republican choice for the United States Senate.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Harry S. New MS, New Papers, Indiana State Library.

¹⁰⁹ The caucus was composed of the eighty-nine Republican members of both houses of the General Assembly sitting together, and the balloting as reported by the *Indianapolis Journal*, January 11, 1899, was as follows:

No.	Hanly	Taylor	Posey	Beveridge	Steele
1.	32	19	14	13	11
2.	31	16	12	19	11
3.	33	16	10	20	10
4.	32	17	9	21	10
5.	Thrown out due to error				
6.	30	19	9	21	10
7.	32	16	8	22	11
8.	34	16	10	20	9
9.	37	15	8	20	9
10.	Thrown out due to error				
11.	36	9	8	28	8
12.	35	—	5	49	—

¹¹⁰ Harry S. New MS, New Papers, Indiana State Library.

During the balloting, Beveridge remained in his law office on Pennsylvania Street with a few friends, and Frank Littleton telephoned in the results from the caucus. That he received only thirteen votes on the first ballot stunned Beveridge for the moment. A disloyal pair from that group which had pledged their firm support to Beveridge the night before deserted to the Hanly side, and Beveridge hearing this feared lest his chance had fled.¹¹¹ But as the voting continued, his slowly rising strength restored that supreme confidence in his destiny which had sustained his campaign against seemingly insuperable odds. "That amounts to nothing," he insisted during the fluctuations of the voting. "I'll be nominated."

"Gentlemen, I am nominated," Beveridge calmly announced to his friends when the final count confirmed his faith. Then he hastened to call his wife to give her the news. "Kitty," he cried, "I am nominated, thank God." Reaching his headquarters at the Denison, Beveridge found a cheering crowd of welcome, and, followed by his supporters, proceeded to the State House where sat the caucus awaiting the Senator-designate.¹¹² "Appreciation is a poor word for the honor that you have conferred upon me," he spoke, "obligation does not adequately describe the duty which your kindness has placed upon me." "I have no words to thank you," the new Senator exclaimed. "Words fail me."¹¹³

Beveridge's formal election came a week later, on Tuesday, January 17. The two houses of the General Assembly meeting separately proceeded on that day to cast their vote for the next Senator from Indiana. The Republican majority in each chamber, following the will of the caucus, cast their votes for Beveridge; the Democratic minority honored the incumbent, David Turpie, with their votes; and Populist Alonzo Burkhart found a single supporter in the Senate. The following day, at 12:00 noon, the Senate adjourned to meet with the House of Representatives in joint session to compare the votes cast the previous day and to inform officially the victorious candidate of his election. The vote on

¹¹¹ Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 162; Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 90.

¹¹² Remy, "The Election of Beveridge to the Senate," 131-133.

¹¹³ *Indianapolis Journal*, January 11, 1899.

the joint ballot read: Beveridge, 87, Turpie, 56, Burkhart, 1, with four members absent due to illness. A committee of three members from each house informed Beveridge of his election, and, escorted to the speaker's chair, the Senator-elect delivered his speech of acceptance outlining the principles which would guide his future course.¹¹⁴

The significance of Beveridge's selection had its dual aspect, for Indiana and for the nation. Friend and foe fully understood its meaning for Indiana Republican politics, and they laid their plans accordingly. In command of the full force of federal patronage, Fairbanks could have carried the day for Hanly had he acted more decisively. But overconfidence proved his undoing. "It is quite true, as you say," learned a Hanly leader to his alarm, "that Senator Fairbanks is not taking sides in this contest. This seems all the stranger when you and myself know that Perry Heath, acting on the permission of President-elect McKinley, went to Indianapolis and swung around enough legislators to insure Fairbanks' election."¹¹⁵ He had neglected to act when action could have saved the situation, and now he regretted his error.

"I had a long talk with Senator F. the other night, having called to see him at his request," reported Robert J. Tracewell to David W. Henry shortly after the election. "I told him in a diplomatic way about what took place after Hanly was defeated . . . [and] he now seems to realize the situation." In the future, Tracewell felt certain, "his friends will have nothing to complain of respecting his willingness to get charge of the party organization in Indiana. In my judgment, he is at work now, and will never let up until things are going right. He now knows who his friends are, and when and how he made a mistake."¹¹⁶

Nor was Beveridge inactive. Aware of Fairbanks' hostility, he moved to consolidate his newly-won position. A rival political machine was forming, fashioned by the skillful hand of the young Senator-elect. "I wish to the Lord you could

¹¹⁴ Coffin, "The Senatorial Career of Albert J. Beveridge," 164; *Indiana Senate Journal*, 61 Sess., 1899, Part I, 126-127, 147; *Indiana House Journal*, 61 Sess., 1899, Part I, 213-215.

¹¹⁵ George Allen to David W. Henry, January 23, 1899, Henry Papers.

¹¹⁶ Robert J. Tracewell to David W. Henry, January 23, 1899, *ibid.*

have been at a dinner given by Charles E. Coffin last night," he wrote a supporter. "Hawkins and New were there . . . [and] they fully, unreservedly, and in the most ultimate degree laid down their arms."¹¹⁷ That combination which had elected Beveridge to the United States Senate now joined to wrest full control of the party machinery, and a new phase of factional strife had begun in Indiana Republicanism.

But Beveridge's selection had its significance beyond Indiana upon the national scene. "The new Indiana Senator has never held office," remarked the *American Monthly Review of Reviews*, "and he comes into this high place in a manner that must please the young men of the country in some such way as Governor Roosevelt's election last November pleased them."¹¹⁸ Political leadership had begun to shift from the men born in the 1830's and 1840's, and Beveridge's elevation marked another instance of the rise of a younger generation into the seats of power. That younger generation had found the depression of the 1890's a searing experience which portended the end of a way of life most Americans cherished. The agrarian revolt, the wave of bitter, bloody strikes had created a near-panic in middle class America, and Beveridge's earlier mood of buoyant optimism never quite returned. The nation had grown up in the happy assumption that the social conflicts troubling less fortunate lands could never happen here, but by the close of the century Beveridge feared that this was no longer the case. Widening class fissures cast their shadow across the American scene, and this larger issue concerned the youthful Senator-elect as he addressed the General Assembly.¹¹⁹

Representing as he did the spirit and desires of a middle class fearful for the future, Beveridge promised a middle

¹¹⁷ Beveridge to Schuyler Colfax, Jr., January 14, 1899, Beveridge Papers.

¹¹⁸ "The Rise of Mr. Beveridge," *American Monthly Review of Reviews*, XIX (1899), 141-142.

¹¹⁹ Beveridge's "Reply to Altgeld" speech, *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, October 30, 1896, reflects his sense of panic at the 1896 Bryan campaign, and his "Lincoln, the Conservative" speech, *Indianapolis Journal*, February 13, 1898 (reprinted in Albert J. Beveridge, *The Meaning of the Times and Other Speeches* [Indianapolis, 1908], 28-36) shows how the crisis of the 1890's, climaxing in the Bryan campaign, aroused a concern, largely lacking previously, for the social problems following from the rapid industrialization of the country.

ground between left and right, between ultra-reactionary and wild-eyed radical. In an uneasy and fearful mood in face of the trusts multiplying on the one side, and labor and populist movements on the other, he pledged to stand above the contending classes, an impartial arbiter devoted to the national good. "And so, gentlemen," he declared to the Indiana legislature,

I shall fearlessly stand in the Senate of the United States for the business interests of the country, when that means the welfare of all the people; I shall fearlessly stand by the labor interest of the land, when that means the prosperity of all the people; I shall just as fearlessly stand against the demands of any class, when these demands do not involve the interests of the entire American people and the ongoing of the imperial American Republic.

His real impulses deeply conservative, Beveridge sought by the resounding phrases of a fervent nationalism to still that lurking menace of social upheaval haunting middle class America. "Fate," he exclaimed, "has woven the life and welfare of every citizen of our sacred Nation into the life and welfare of every other citizen beneath the flag." No classes, no sections, Americans were brothers joined by the bonds of immortal memories, by the kinship of glorious hopes, by the indissoluble decrees of historic destiny. "The people, the whole people and nothing but the people," Beveridge cried, "is the intellectual atmosphere in which a lawgiver should live and move and have his being." To know no class but the nation became his ideal, to know no dream but its onward march his life work.

"The unconquerable heart of the pioneer still beats within American breasts," he rejoiced, "and the American flag advances still in its ceaseless and imperial progress, with law and order and Christian civilization trooping beneath its sacred folds." If America should renounce that ideal of future expansion beyond its present bounds, Beveridge warned, its fate shall necessarily be the sad refrain of internal dissension, class hatred, sectional division. But through faith in the imperial destiny of the American people, through fulfillment of its civilizing duty to mankind lay in its hope of salvation. By looking outward America shall regain that sense of national purpose so needed in domestic concerns, by

governing others it shall learn to govern itself. This country had not begun its age of decay, he promised a worried America, but remained the land of the future. The dawn of a new era of national advance approached, and, in the boldness of his youth, the newly-chosen United States Senator from Indiana, Albert J. Beveridge, had become its prophet.¹²⁰

¹²⁰ All quotes are from Beveridge's speech of acceptance before the General Assembly, reprinted in *Toasts, Given at Dinner in Honor of Albert J. Beveridge*, 76-82. This speech is typical of the trend of Beveridge's thinking following the crisis of 1896, as reflected in his speeches, Beveridge, *The Meaning of the Times*, 1-57.

Longfellow Sesquicentennial

Since 1957 is the sesquicentennial year of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1807-1882), it will interest many to know that on December 30, 1881, James Whitcomb Riley called at Craigie House in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to visit the New England poet. This visit occurred shortly before Longfellow's death. Mr. Riley's account of his visit was published in the *Indianapolis Journal*, April 29, 1882, under the title, "An Hour with Longfellow." It has been reprinted in Edward Wagenknecht's recent biography entitled *Longfellow: A Full-Length Portrait* (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1955.)

For this information the editor is indebted to Mr. Frederick E. Schortemeier, Indianapolis.