

JOHN P. ST. JOHN

THE FATHER OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION

by

Edna Tutt Frederikson
A.B., Parsons College, 1925

Submitted to the Department of History and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Approved by:

James C. Maxin
Instructor in charge.

F. W. Hodder
Head of department.

1931

December 1930

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express her appreciation to all who have aided in the preparation of this biography of John P. St. John. She desires to acknowledge her especial indebtedness to Professor James C. Malin, of the University of Kansas, who supervised in detail the entire work of research, organization and writing; to W.C. Simons, editor of the Lawrence, Kansas, Daily Journal-World, who permitted the use of the files of Kansas newspapers, dating back to 1857, in the vault of the Journal-World; to Miss May Parker, of Olathe, Kansas, who allowed the use of St. John's scrap books; to Dr. Jessie Thomas Orr and to Miss Zoe Thomas, of Olathe, Kansas, who welcomed the author to their home and lent her clippings and letters pertaining to St. John; to H.L. Burgess, of Olathe, Kansas, for personal reminiscences of St. John; to the staff of the Kansas State Historical Society; to Miss Irma Friedrich, of the University of Kansas, who rendered helpful assistance in correcting the manuscript; and to Otto F. Frederikson, the author's husband, who suggested a biography of St. John as the subject for this thesis and who read the manuscript and made valuable criticisms and suggestions.

Edna Tutt Frederikson.

1112 Rural Street,
Emporia, Kansas.

CONTENTS

Part One: Early Life.

Chapter I. Youth.-- Inception of Temperance Principles.-- Years of Varied Experience.....	5
Chapter II. First Years in Kansas.-- State Senator..	25
Chapter III. Temperance Activity.-- Gubernatorial Campaigns of 1876 and 1878.....	42

Part Two: Governor of Kansas.

Chapter IV. First Term: Prohibition.-- Protection of Border.-- Destitution on Frontier.-- Negro Exodus.....	63
Section 1. The Inauguration and the Legislative Session.	
Section 2. Administrative Problems Arising after the Adjournment of the Legislature.	
Chapter V. Leader of Campaign Resulting in First Prohibition Amendment in History.....	93
Chapter VI. Second Term: Beginnings of Enforcement of Constitutional Prohibition.....	125
Chapter VII. Campaign of 1882; St. John Defeated.-- His Principle Sustained.....	169

Part Three: Prohibition Candidate for President

Chapter VIII. Development into a National Character.....	214
Chapter IX. Climax of Career: Presidential Campaign of 1884.....	228
Chapter X. Aftermath: Blamed for Overthrow of Republican Rule.....	264

Part Four: Later Life.

Chapter XI. Leading Prohibitionist.-- Development of Other Interests.-- Break with the Prohibition Party.....	296
Chapter XII. A "Free Lance,"-- Return to Public Favor.-- Renewal of Prohibition Activity.....	328
Chapter XIII. St. John, the Man.-- Place in the Prohibition Movement.....	355
Footnotes.....	367
Bibliography.....	409

PART ONE

EARLY LIFE

CHAPTER I

YOUTH.-- INCEPTION OF TEMPERANCE PRINCIPLES.-- YEARS OF VARIED EXPERIENCE.

John Pierce St. John wrote no autobiography. He had no biographers. And he lived for more than three decades after the great work of his life was done. These facts have been unfortunate for his place in the history of the prohibition movement for they have prevented the present generation from gaining a true perspective of his importance. Had success attended the efforts of an assassin who attempted to take his life after the memorable presidential campaign of 1884, St. John might have become-- like Lincoln and John Brown-- a celebrated martyr, a hero of his cause, with the preservation and veneration of his memory guaranteed by prohibitionists. Even if he had died from a natural cause at this time it seems likely that some relative or friend might have written his story and assured him his rightful place as the father of constitutional prohibition. As it was he lived to be eighty-three years old and died without having anything beyond a few newspaper and magazine articles written to insure the guarding of his ashes in the urn of history. He was too busy earning a living during the last years of his life to write an autobiography and too poor to hire anyone else to set down the story of his career or to publish an

autobiography if he had written one. Moreover, his talent was more for speaking than for the organization of materials for writing. His attempts at composing even brief articles were far from successful, largely because of his meager training in grammar, and consequently he was unable to advertise himself favorably or extensively through the medium of the printed page. After his death his widow tried to interest temperance workers in the writing of his biography but nothing ever came of the attempt because more recent phases of the prohibition movement were pressing themselves upon the public at the time, and the new prohibition leaders had their own problems with which to deal and but scanty knowledge of the generation to which St. John belonged. While accounts of prohibition in Kansas have been written, their chief purpose has been to show that the policy of prohibition was or was not successful and not to deal with the personalities of its originators and heroes. A certain anti-prohibition newspaper in Kansas said in 1881: "The future that St. John has before him is easily predicted. He will become the saint of strong-minded but superannuated old women; he will become a fanatic and orator at Sunday School conventions; and his portrait, for awhile, will figure at temperance meetings; and then be consigned to some cobwebbed garret or barn loft, or be used to replace a broken sash in some wash house."(1) The paper had in part at least spoken truly and St. John was doomed to be almost forgotten.

7

He had been the acknowledged leader of the temperance forces which secured the adoption in Kansas of the first constitutional amendment known to history prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor as a beverage; he had been associated for thirty-four years with what became the definite and permanent policy of Kansas-- constitutional prohibition-- and had aided in making it popular in other states; he had the distinction of being the only Kansan ever to run for the presidency of the United States and of making such a campaign in 1884 as was contemporaneously considered the most important factor in the defeat of James G. Blaine and the election of the first democratic president since the Civil War; he had been the only third party candidate between 1860 and 1912 who could plausibly be accused of turning an election; and he had undergone the vilest of abuse and excoriation. Yet after living to see his honesty and moral courage vindicated and himself restored to public favor, and after becoming before his death the best-loved prohibitionist in the world, it was St. John's fate to have his work practically sink into oblivion. Temperance workers like Neal Dow, John B. Gough and John B. Finch had their biographers and are today given credit for their work. Yet none of these men were more important and some of them were less important than St. John.

Kansas never wavered from the stand for prohibition taken in 1880. St. John, who during his second administration began the work of enforcing the first constitutional prohibitory amendment in history, lived to see practically

every Kansas newspaper as well as every political party in the state favoring prohibition. The republican party made him an outcast from its ranks where he had once reigned but it could never get rid of his idea. In 1917 the state became bone-dry. In 1919 its legislature ratified the national prohibitory amendment by unanimous vote in each of the two houses. Kansas is known more today perhaps because of the staunchness of its position on prohibition than for any other reason. The words of St. John, spoken just after the adoption of the state prohibitory amendment were prophetic: "I am glad that Kansas was the first to adopt such a measure. The time will come when we will refer to it with as great pride as we now do to our early struggles against the encroachments of the slave power in Kansas."(2) If he had lived three years longer he would have seen his dream of a nation free from legalized saloons come true.

This is the story of the man who more than any other was responsible for giving Kansas prohibition and who was a potent factor in the spread of prohibition sentiment throughout the nation. It is the biography of the first and possibly the greatest hero of the constitutional prohibitory amendment movement, of a man whose life furnishes a rich epoch in the history of the fight against the saloon. He may in time be considered as the most important of Kansas governors. It is certain that he was the most significant candidate ever named by the prohibition party for president of the United States. The account has been written from the sources, which are for the most part newspapers and maga-

zines of the period during which St. John did his work, and without any attempt to prettify or to stultify his character and the events of his career.

The son of Samuel and Sophia (Snell) St. John, he was born in Brookfield, Franklin county, Indiana, on February 25, 1833, and was given the name of an uncle. (3) The greater portion of the first fourteen years of his life were spent twelve miles below Indianapolis on a farm which his parents rented in 1837. The farm contained about one hundred and twenty acres and was situated on what became known as St. John's Island, a strip cut off from the mainland by a bayou of the White river. This stream furnished a capital swimming hole for John and his older brother, Mack, and the other boys of the neighborhood, and the wooded sections of the region supplied a place for them to "go 'coon hunting." The rich bottom land was excellent for cultivation and along with his play John found no lack of work on the farm. "I rode an old, blind mule," he says, "while my brother held the plow. The ground being full of roots my brother got the worst of it." Life was pleasant and hard. In the outdoor life he became tough and wiry physically, developing a vigorous constitution which was to serve him well in the rude frontier life in California and under the tremendous strain he imposed upon himself during his public life. The story is told that some neighbors once asked him to ride their horse at a fair and, their horse winning, gave him a quarter. Much elated, he went home engaging in the delightful sport of tossing his coin up into the air and

then catching it. Unfortunately, the ease with which money slipped through his fingers manifested itself at this early age, and, failing once to catch the coin, it rolled away and was lost. Among his other tasks, he used to carry for his mother the materials she used in making carpets,-- a duty which she assumed in order to increase the family income. His ambition at this time vacillated between the wish to become a doctor and the more immediate desire to secure some manual occupation by which he could make a good living.

(4)

One of the pleasant aspects of these years which were filled mostly with struggle and hardships St. John has recorded in a manner characteristic of his religious disposition and of his tendency to add color to his narrative in effort to make a good story: "My first distinct recollection of Christmas takes me back to...St. John's Island... The trees were loaded down with snow, and the ground was covered an inch thick with God's own mantle of purity. A dogwood pole reached from jamb to jamb of an old fashioned fireplace that filled one end of our log cabin. From this pole was suspended, by iron hooks, the big pot in which every day the family dinner was cooked. I had never seen a cooking stove then. The Christmas buck-eye back-log had been rolled into this huge fireplace that Christmas morn, and the shell-bark hickory was burning brightly, seeming to say 'A Meerry Christmas to all!' In front of this fire, by a string attached to a joist overhead, was suspended, within roasting distance, the Christmas turkey. I, then

only a little bigger than the turkey, begged the privilege, which was granted me, of dipping with a long-handled spoon the gravy from the dripping pan and pouring it back over the roast. At noon all gathered in the kitchen around the Christmas dinner table. My dear mother was at one end of the table, and my generous, warm-hearted father at the other. The turkey was cut up and handed round, then there were boiled jowl and cabbage, sweet potatoes, turnips, and lots of pumpkin 'sass'; mince pies, peach preserves, and oceans of sweet cake; while from overhead, the rings of dried pumpkin, the festoons of dried apples, peaches and pepper pods, intermingled with sausages, corn in the husks, and fine pop corn, seemed to join in the festivities. When dinner was over the company passed through the covered entry in which stood the family loom and the soap and meal barrels, into the hewed log-house, where the neighborhood fiddler, with crossed legs and head thrown back, marked time with a number twelve shoe while he played a popular air known as 'Dan Tucker,' and the guests danced a Virginia reel." (5)

In spite of the picture of bounty here drawn, the family was poor, as St. John himself has often testified, adding humorously that he was "brought up on paw-paws and catfish;" and although his father is described by enthusiastic biographers (6) as industrious and as possessed of considerable natural ability, and his mother as energetic and thorough-going, they were unable to afford their

children a good education. Pioneer life in Indiana a century ago was, in fact, more favorable to the development of the physical than of the mental powers. Most families were large and the St. John family was no exception. Farmers' children, moreover, had to help on the farm, and their educational advantages were confined to two short terms each year, taught by such instructors as the limited means of the inhabitants of the district could afford, in a log school house. The formal education of St. John was acquired under these circumstances, and it is easy to believe that this boy with his boundless energy made the most of his meager opportunity, although the financial situation of his parents prevented his graduation from the school. Throughout life he was possessed of a profound desire for knowledge, but the lack of a thorough educational foundation often led him into many errors and his not infrequent use of poor English furnished his political opponents with ammunition in later years. (7) Certainly, however, to the extent that education consists of the development of moral tone, he was comparatively well-educated.

During the stay in Indiana the difficulties of the St. John family were increased. The father fell under the power of the social glass and soon became its slave. "Things about the farm were not as they used to be" is the son's description of that time, and "father was not so well off as formerly."(8) It was decided that John should leave home to earn a living for himself. "I

commenced in the world at twelve years of age," he says, "penniless and without education, and my whole life has been a struggle." (9)

The break with the home life was facilitated by weather conditions in January, 1847, when a freshet washed away the crops and the greater part of the stock belonging to the St. John family. At this juncture a Judge McLain, who was the son of Mrs. St. John by a former marriage, and who was then living in Illinois, came to the assistance of the family. He took the boys with him to his home, John and Mack both riding away on one horse.(10)

His last day at the house on White river St. John has described in these words: "My mother...was not cheerful and happy; how could she be? And though she never spoke of her fears or secret sorrow, yet I saw it all, and, boy as I was, I hated the demon, Drink, that had made such a change in my father, had broken my mother's heart, and darkened my boyhood's home; and I resolved it never should pass my lips, and anything I could do or say should be done to put the blighting curse from other homes. My mother called me to her and said, 'John, my son, promise me you'll always be a man wherever you go.' I promised her, and wherever I went after, and whenever tempted to go astray or do anything that I knew my mother would not approve, that promise kept me right!"(11) In terms like these St. John has many times paid tribute to his mother, who seems to have had great part in molding his character

of mind. His opposition to the use of alcohol in any form had its origin during these impressionable years when he saw his father ruined, the family desolated and his mother disheartened through the intemperance of one member of their home. The foundation of his temperance principles, he often said, was laid in a promise to his mother not to touch any intoxicating drink and always to fight the liquor traffic.

(12)

The parents followed their children to Illinois in the spring of 1847, settling at Olney in Richland county, where both died somewhat later.(13) McLain is said to have continued his half-brother's education in an academy but if so it must have been for a very brief period, for St. John was soon clerking in a store at Charleston at six dollars per month.(14) He is also said to have gone for a time to Chicago, where he clerked in a hotel and worked on a steamer on the lakes. In addition to his regular employment he is credited with continuing his own education by means of books which he borrowed or bought at low rates with a view to fitting himself for a business life.

The events of these years are shrouded in a mystery with which St. John himself helped to clothe them. According to the testimony of friends and relatives, he fell at about the age of nineteen under the influence of Mary Jane Brewer, whom he married in the spring of 1852. The tradition is that she was a designing woman considerably older than he and that he became convinced of her infidelity after living with her for about three months. (15) The

gold fever was sweeping the country at that time, and probably because California seemed to offer the easiest means of escape from the marriage, and the adventurous life the best opportunity to forget and perhaps to rebuild what appeared to be a shattered life, he took a job driving an ox team across the plains. His son Henry, later called Harry, was born after his departure. In 1859 his wife sued for a divorce in the circuit court in Richland county on a charge of wilful desertion "without any reasonable cause or provocation." St. John was duly notified of the pendency of the suit and was represented in court by his attorney. The bill granting the divorce declared that his failure to answer or plead to the cause should "be taken as confess against him, the said St. John," that he should pay the costs of the suit, and that the custody of the child should be given to the mother. St. John carefully avoided references to his first marriage, and accounts of his life, including those in his own letters and interviews, make no mention of it. Who's Who in America, for instance, gives a sketch of his life in every volume from that of 1899-1900 to that of 1918-1919, but contains no record of his first marriage and the birth of Harry.(16)

After leaving Illinois in the summer of 1852, St. John successfully piloted four yoke of oxen across the Rockies. There are various dim stories of the trip to California which vary in detail but have a common purpose-- the demonstration of his virtues. One shows his courage in an

encounter with a band of Indians. Another, to establish his business sagacity, alleges that he and a companion purchased a ferry on one of the far western rivers where they transported immigrants and bought broken-down stock, grazing it for a while and then selling it again. Soon they had made considerable money and continued on their way. According to yet another account St. John had a dollar when he crossed the "Big Muddy;" while a similar story asserts that he had but twenty-five cents when he "sighted the Golden Gate." It is certain that he had no great amount of money when he reached his journey's end.

At Yreka, California, he began the life of a gold miner but his success in mining here and at other places was indifferent. At first he worked for others, receiving ten dollars per day, but soon he acquired a mine of his own through fulfilling the requirements of the law in regard to claims. When he had earned enough to equip it, he hired three men and began work. In an article written in his moral and didactic vein, he later told the story of how he turned over his mine after working it for a week without finding much gold, in order to meet a debt of \$100 for the water he had used in operating. Again he hired himself out. On Monday morning, in less than two hours after starting work, the new owner struck a chunk of gold worth \$1,038, and there were two distinct marks on it made by St. John's pick. Within sixty days \$40,000 in ore was taken from the mine. At first this incident shook St. John's faith in

God, for he could not see the justice in withholding such a fortune from a sober and hard-working young man and giving it to the richest man in camp, but later he piously concluded that he might have become reckless and dissipated had he come into possession of this large sum without working for it, and thanked God for saving him. (17)

Various other occupations claimed a share of his time in California. Adventure and chance beckoned on every hand. When the Modoc Indians of northern California and southern Oregon were giving trouble in 1853-1854-1855, he enlisted and served against them, participating in several engagements and being twice wounded. At the time of his death he still bore in his body the point of a flint arrow-head as a memento of those years. (18) One of his business transactions was a contract to chop and deliver a thousand cords of wood. The principal part of the manual labor involved in the fulfillment of this contract he did himself.
^{t1}"Remember, it is no disgrace to engage in manual labor," he afterwards told young men severely. "Many a street cleaner has made his position more honorable than some United States senators have made theirs." He also clerked, and worked on a steamboat. The latter employment proving more lucrative than the others, the length of his voyages increased. He sailed to South America and Mexico, to Central America and the Hawaiian Islands.

His most memorable Christmas he considered to be the one spent in the mountains west of Colusa, California, where a half-dozen hunters, himself among the number, encamped for

the winter of 1857. His record of killing nine deer being the best for the day, he received, according to an agreement, all that the others killed, making a total of thirty-six, each of which was worth ten dollars.(19)

"I have a warm place in my heart for California, and especially for Los Angeles," he wrote in his old age, when he was fondly contemplating making his home on the west coast. Fifty-eight years before, when he visited Los Angeles, a Mexican offered him seven-hundred acres of land, including a large section of the present site of the city, in exchange for an old mouse-colored mule and a gray horse which St. John then owned. "I indignantly spurned the offer," he said of the occurrence, "and felt insulted to think that the Mexican placed so low an estimate on my business ability. That land was then covered with cactus humps, sand, gravel, sagebrush, greasewood, horned toads, centipedes, tarantulas, rattlesnakes and jackrabbits. The old mule and gray horse long ago passed on to pastures always green, while I am still browsing around, thinking what might have been."(20)

While he was in the West the desire to be a lawyer became his chief ambition, and he began the study of law. The books were obtained from a lawyer in Sacramento and read at night in his cabin, although probably not, as some romantic accounts state, "by the flickering light of the fire" or "the light of a burning pine knot."

After about two years of such study he returned in 1859

to Charleston, Illinois, where he entered the law office of Starkweather and McLain, and was not long afterwards admitted to the bar and made a member of the firm. At this place he offered his hand and heart to Susan J. Parker, who, it is said, always insisted that she hadn't really intended to marry the young lawyer. She was the daughter of Nathaniel Parker, who was for sixteen successive years a member of the Illinois legislature. As a boy clerking in a store at Charleston St. John held Mr. Parker in great awe and, when he saw the formidable figure of that gentleman approaching, preferred to retreat to the rear and perform the hated task of drawing molasses rather than to wait upon him. With the years, however, young St. John's tongue must have acquired some of the persuasive eloquence which afterwards made it noted, and his courage also must have shown marked development, for his marriage with Miss Parker took place on March 28, 1860. Three children were born to the St. Johns, of whom the eldest, a son, died in infancy; Lulu, the youngest, lived until 1903, while John Pierce, Jr., still survived in 1930 and was a resident of Los Angeles, California.

St. John's record in the Civil War was, during his later political career, subjected to close scrutiny and to some adverse criticism because his service was limited to two ninety-day periods.(21) In behalf of St. John it must be said that his service secured promotion for him, that he won the friendship of the colonel of his regiment, and

that he was one of the few soldiers of the Civil War who never applied for a pension.(22) In 1862 he enlisted as a private in company C, Sixty-eighth regiment Illinois volunteer infantry. This company he apparently had helped to raise. His popularity with the troops was shown at the election of officers when he was unanimously chosen captain. The regiment was immediately ordered to Alexandria Court House, Virginia, where he was detached from his command and assigned to duty as aide-de-camp and acting assistant adjutant-general, under General John P. Slough.(23) General Slough recommended him in the following words: "Captain St. John has been energetic, competent and efficient in the discharge of the manifold and arduous duties of an officer on my staff. I sincerely regret that the termination of the time of service of his Regiment deprives me of so valuable an officer."(24)

In 1864, during his second term of service, St. John was appointed commanding officer of the troops at Camp Mattoon, Illinois, by the governor of the state. He also assisted in the organization of the One Hundred and Forty-third regiment of Illinois volunteer infantry, and was elected its lieutenant-colonel as a reward for meritorious service.(25) The regiment, commanded by Colonel D.C. Smith, who became St. John's firm friend, was soon ordered to Memphis, Tennessee, and its service at no time extended beyond the Mississippi valley.(26) Colonel Smith came to Kansas during the hotly-contested campaign for the governorship in 1882 and accompanied St. John on a number of

speaking trips. On several occasions he made speeches in which he referred to St. John in terms of high regard and praised his record in the Civil War. "I was not one of the soldiers who was always burning up with a desire to die for my country," is St. John's own statement in regard to his Civil War service. "In fact, I never saw the time when I would rather not live than die. I always had a warm place in my heart for any old tree, stump or anything that would ward off the bullets of the enemy."(26)

After his return from the army in 1862 St. John was arrested and tried under the Illinois "black laws," which were intended to prevent the immigration of free negroes into the state and which imposed a fine of \$1,000 and two years' imprisonment on any person convicted of feeding or harboring a colored person. St. John's offense was the feeding of a mulatto boy who begged at his door for something to eat, saying that he was nearly starved and that no one would give him food or work because it was against the law. "I called my wife," says St. John in one of his numerous repetitions of this story, "and told her to get the boy a big slice of bread, butter it all over, and get some meat. 'Would it not be better,' she said, 'to have the boy come into the house, as everybody seems to be watching us?' I said, 'No, I want this people to see that I am not afraid to... sustain any of God's poor unfortunates!'" The next morning while he was eating breakfast the sheriff called with a warrant for his

arrest. He was indicted by a democratic grand jury and tried before a democratic judge. Witnesses produced evidence of his crime, yet it does not appear that the indictment was vigorously pushed, and St. John apparently had little fear of the result. When the judge was preparing to acquit him as it seemed, St. John arose and said that he was afraid the facts were not understood, that he had done the act charged knowing it to be contrary to the law, and that he intended to continue to act as he had. With his wonted predilection for the dramatic he continues the story of the incident thus: "I stated that... whenever I found the laws of man interfering with the laws of God I would violate the human law every time." The judge said that he was too late, however, because all the evidence was in, and announced to the "packed court house" that the prisoner at the bar was found "not guilty of the charge," and St. John was "at once set free."(27)

On being mustered out of the military service in 1864, St. John resumed the practice of law in partnership with Judge McLain at Charleston but shortly thereafter, in February, 1865, removed with his family to Independence, Missouri. Two other families, the Lytle and the Dawson, friends of the St. Johns, also went at this time from Illinois to Independence. The law and real estate firm of St. John and Dawson was established at this place, and the partners labored to induce immigration to the section from the East and North. Although not completely successful,

owing to the opportunity of the old settlers to such immigration, St. John was said to have induced more loyal men to settle there than any other man in Jackson county. He was called "about the first carpet-bagger" who settled in the town and openly announced his political principles. It was not long before he was known as an effective public speaker and as the leader of the radical faction in his part of the county.(28) At a time when it required considerable courage to be an outspoken republican in that part of Missouri, he declared his conviction that negroes should have the right to vote and engaged actively in the republican campaigns of 1866 and 1868. In the latter year he made a thorough canvass of western Missouri, speaking in nearly every town of any note or size. The fact that General Grant, whom he greatly admired and later supported for a third term, was the republican candidate for president led him to put forth his best efforts. This aggressive zeal for the republican party, coupled with his loyalty to the Union and his fearless denunciation of the adherents of the Southern Confederacy, brought him into disfavor. It became evident that this section of Missouri was no place for a man who held his pronounced republican ideas and who would not refrain from their free and direct expression.(29)

The immediate occasion for leaving Independence, however, was accidental, arising from the fact that he happened to see a murder committed by one Jim Crochilda, a notorious guerilla, on a street in Independence one day. Seemingly he was the only witness. After being arrested,

Crochilda sent word that he would kill St. John if the latter testified against him at the trial. While St. John was more than once known to speak his mind under circumstances of serious personal risk, he did not desire trouble of this kind, and, other reasons for his removal being ample, he and his family went to Olathe, Johnson county, Kansas, in April, 1869.(30)

During the varied events of his pre-Kansas years St. John developed traits of character which were conspicuous throughout his career. He became self-reliant, independent, aggressive, and thoroughly democratic, learning to deal with men and to influence them through his power of speech. Among the rough mining element and the Indians, in fact, everywhere on the frontier, he undoubtedly came into contact with the liquor traffic in its worst form. This experience, combined with that in his boyhood home, instilled in him a prejudice against the traffic in intoxicating drinks which, developed and intensified by later events, became the cardinal principle in his own life and of signal importance to Kansas and the nation.

CHAPTER II

FIRST YEARS IN KANSAS.-- STATE SENATOR.

Upon coming to Olathe St. John did not enter an entirely strange community for friends and relatives had preceded him. Among them was his brother-in-law, M.V.B. Parker, with whom he formed a law partnership which lasted until it was dissolved by mutual consent in 1876. After a short interval in which St. John continued his activity as an attorney independently, he entered a partnership with Isaac O. Pickering for the practice of law. This arrangement lasted for several years and marked the beginning of a friendship between the partners which endured as long as they lived.

When St. John became prominent as a politician his record in his profession received a good deal attention. At the time he left Independence, Missouri, the local paper stated that he had had a successful practice as a lawyer there. In Kansas his political enemies branded him as a shyster and declared him a failure at the bar while his friends asserted that he was among the foremost lawyers in his part of the state. It was impossible for a man with St. John's gift of oratory not to become well known in his community. As a lawyer, however, he was noted more for the ingenuity of his arguments and the fervor of his utterances than for his power of logic or for his ability to reason keenly. He made a good jury lawyer but lacked the qualifications of a profound thinker and of a

painstaking research student. His abilities were rather those of a politician and popular speaker. The practice of law was, in fact, never particularly to his liking and once his service as governor of Kansas had broken his active participation in the profession he never returned to it. In estimating his success as a lawyer it is necessary to compromise between the extreme statements of those who say that he was rated as the best lawyer in Olathe and of those who call him a lawyer in name only and maintain that he tried few cases, sometimes not appearing in court for a whole year. While Pickering did most of the practicing for the firm of St. John and Pickering, it is perhaps no exaggeration to say that St. John enjoyed a good reputation in his profession.

Previous to his residence in Kansas St. John had made but little demonstration of his temperance principles. Time and circumstances had not been propitious. The temperance movement had largely died out during the Civil War but by 1870 interest in the reform was becoming general. During the early seventies, moreover, the power of the liquor element was increasing. Prohibitory legislation lagged while the liquor interest attained greater political power. The national republican platform, beginning in 1872, and the national democratic platform, beginning in 1876, contained planks bidding for the liquor vote. On the other hand, the friends of temperance were not idle. The National Temperance Society and Publication House, the Independent Order of Good Templars, the Sons of Temperance and other temperance societies were doing effective work. The church, always an important factor

in the fight against the saloon, was holding revivals throughout the country. In 1871 Francis Murphy started his work and in the same year the temperance wave began to sweep over the country. Temperance pledges were signed by tens of thousands. One of the most important phases of the movement was the woman's crusade, which probably was an outgrowth of the pinching times following the panic of 1873 when the sudden destruction of values impressed the cost of liquor upon women. It was inaugurated at Hillsboro, Ohio, in 1873, by Dr. Dio Lewis, and was an attempt by the women to drive the saloons from their city by a crusade of prayer. Organized prayer meetings were held in liquor establishments and on the sidewalks in front of them. Hundreds of saloons were closed in this manner, and the total consumption of liquor was at least temporarily reduced. And although the enthusiasm generated by the crusade was destined quickly to die out, a permanent and important result remained in the organization of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union late in the year 1874. The "ribbon" movements, another significant phase of the temperance revival, were beginning to exert a tremendous influence. Murphy adopted the blue ribbon to be worn by reformed men and others interested, while Dr. Henry A. Reynolds used red and white ribbons as emblems for those who signed the pledge. The political side of the movement was represented by the national prohibition party which put its first ticket in the field in the presidential campaign of 1872.

The effect of all this activity was felt in Kansas, and St. John, who belonged by nature and by training in the temper-

ance camp, was borne along with the tide.. He began the work in which he was to be most successful--that of the popular orator of the common people, the mouthpiece of multitudes representing some reform movement. The years were to call forth his eloquence in turn for free trade, free silver, anti-imperialism and woman suffrage, but the first cause which summoned all his vocal powers was that of temperance. It was not long before he was recognized as one of the most powerful champions of the reform in Kansas.

The temperance movement in this state was attaining a real cohesion by 1872 and the effects were seen in the legislative session of that year when a determined effort was made for a more stringent anti-liquor law. In Johnson county, as in the rest of the state, speakers were constantly in demand, and St. John's services were always available. He is said to have spoken on temperance at every school house in the county and to have developed during the years of this activity such a reputation as a speaker that he could always be sure of a crowd even in inclement weather. Sometimes an anti-temperance school board objected to the use of the school house for such lectures but the temperance sentiment of the community usually was strong enough to overcome such objections. Once, during a speech in an especially rough neighborhood, he said: "I am in the minority now but I expect to live to see myself in the majority." There was derisive laughter from some men in the rear of the room. Years afterward, if we may believe St. John's account, one of those same men shook hands with him

and said, "Well, Governor, you are a sure-enough prophet."(1)

Almost from the first St. John's temperance work assumed a political slant. The anti-license faction had for years fought the license faction in local elections with varying success. At a meeting in the Congregational church soon after coming to Olathe, St. John introduced a resolution to put a local temperance ticket in the field. The ticket which was nominated in accordance with the resolution was elected and the saloons were closed.(2) Victories like this were only temporary, of course, and the fight was renewed by the saloon men at every opportunity. Thus in 1872 the contest was resumed and St. John had another chance to demonstrate that his temperance work was not confined to attempts at moral suasion but was sure to take a political direction. His friend, Frank R. Ogg, was running for county attorney. St. John helped him make his canvass and after he was elected aided him in closing the thirteen saloons then operating in Olathe.(3)

It was not only as a temperance lecturer but also as a speaker for political, patriotic and other occasions that St. John was greatly sought. His reputation early passed beyond the limits of his own county and by 1872 papers in other parts of the state were carrying brief notices of speeches he was delivering. It was to be expected that the republican party would value such an excellent stump speaker, especially since his principles were of the purest republican brand, and would reward his services with a nomination. Consequently it is not surprising to see him become the

republican condidate for state senator from Johnson county in 1872. It was his first candidacy in the county,(4) and he carried on the canvass with all his customary zeal and aggressiveness. At the election in November he had a nice majority of 527 votes over his opponent.(5) While he received the smallest vote of any of the seventeen republican candidates drawing votes from all of Johnson county that year, the margin by which he won was considerably larger than the margin by which the successful candidates for state senator from that county was elected in the preceding and succeeding election.(6)

With his advent into the state senate at its annual session of 1873, St. John made his first appearance in Kansas public life. He is described at this time as a man of "about forty years of age, commanding in appearance, tall and well proportioned, agreeable and easy in his manners," and as having strong features that were "noticeable in a crowd."(7) The legislature of 1873, though connected with events of grave significance for Kansas, secured for itself but little reputation for business and brains.(8) The fight to oust United States Senator Samuel C. Pomeroy overshadowed in importance all other actions and the results were almost as disastrous to the legislature as to Pomeroy. Occurring as it did early in the session, the intensity of the interest it inspired seemed to rob the senators and representatives of the energy to accomplish anything more, and little legislation of general importance was effected. In several ways the session of 1873 provided a good environment for

St. John's apprenticeship in public affairs. In the fight against Pomeroy, for instance, there were excellent opportunities for St. John to give free play to his oratory in uncompromising denunciations of dishonesty and corruption. His aggressive ability at once gained for him a leading position, both on the floor, as a debator, and in the committee rooms, as an efficient business member. In addition to his work on special committees, he served at different times on the standing committees on judiciary and counties and county lines, and as chairman of the appropriations committee. The fact that he was seldom absent (9) made his influence greater, and he asserted himself from the beginning both in introducing bills and in offering amendments to those brought forward by others, as well as in forwarding the general business of the session.

Although he was in full coöperation with the republican members of the senate and usually was found voting with the majority, there were several instances in which he showed independence of judgment on important bills. In one instance he voted with the minority against a bill which provided for the exemption of notes and mortgages from taxation in order to invite capital to the state.(10) This bill passed the house and senate by large majorities but the soundness of St. John's judgment was promptly justified by the declaration of the attorney general that it was unconstitutional. A bill providing for the repeal of the exemption act was introduced by St. John at the opening of the legislature in 1874.

The committee to which this measure and eight similar ones were referred reported a substitute which passed the senate unanimously (11), received only one dissenting vote in the house (12), and was signed by the governor. St. John also differed with the majority in the election of state printer, although he changed his mind after the first ballot and voted for George W. Martin, the majority's choice.(13) Sometimes he employed the commonly-used device of not voting on certain measures, but most of these measures appear to have been of minor importance.

The evidence is abundant that St. John's greatest prominence while in the state senate grew out of his connection with the anti-Pomeroy struggle. Contemporaneously the notices he received in the newspapers of the state were nearly all concerned with his relation to this event, a relationship which was remembered throughout his career. Nearly forty years later an article in the Kansas City Star, regarding a lecture tour he was making in the interest of woman suffrage, said, "St. John first became a political factor in Kansas as leader of the fight on United States Senator Samuel C. Pomeroy."(14)

The dislodgment of Pomeroy from his position in the senate of the United States is one of dramatic events in Kansas legislative history. He had served as senator from Kansas for twelve years and was the most conspicuous candidate for that position in 1873. In the days preceding the election the Pomeroy and anti-Pomeroy caucuses met nightly, but when the day arrived on which the two houses were required to cast

a separate vote for senator, the Pomeroy opposition had not yet agreed on any one.(15) St. John and Pomeroy had been personal friends (16), but St. John was convinced that Pomeroy had been guilty of illegal attempts to secure the votes of the members of the legislature. On the morning of January 28 when the senate met, St. John therefore brought forward a resolution which accused Pomeroy of having employed bribery and deception in his attempts to secure re-election and asked for the appointment of a committee to investigate these charges. The resolution was adopted by a narrow margin and St. John made chairman of the committee appointed in accordance with it.(17) While Pomeroy did not secure a majority of the total votes of the two houses that day, his strength was sufficient to justify hopes of his election and to frighten the opposition into agreement at its caucus that night. Excitement was intense the next day when the senate and house met in joint convention, and the hall where the meeting was held and the surrounding lobbies were crowded with people. The stage was fittingly set for the sensational disclosures of Senator A.M. York who handed to the secretary of the meeting the sum of \$7,000, stating that it had been given him in payment for his vote two nights before by Pomeroy. At the conclusion of York's speech several other members made haste to arise and state that attempts had been made on them to influence their votes by the use of money.(18) While the Pomeroy men were rallying weakly to overcome the influence of York's disclosures, St. John obtained the floor and in a speech of considerable power

defended Colonel York and appealed to the members of the convention to crush the monstrous system of bribery and corruption.(19) When the roll was called immediately thereafter John J. Ingalls, on whom the anti-Pomeroy men had agreed, received 115 of the 127 votes cast and Pomeroy not one. St. John voted for Ingalls and was appointed a member of a committee to wait upon the senator-elect and to escort him upon the floor.(20) That evening he and several other prominent republicans participated in a meeting congratulatory to Ingalls.

During the agitated days following the election St. John was conspicuous in pushing the investigation of the scandal. He introduced a resolution citing the charges against Pomeroy and asking the United States senate to appoint a committee to investigate.(21) His own resolution having been lost sight of in the house, He worked for another resolution which had passed the lower body and which requested Pomeroy to resign his seat, and helped in getting it through the senate.(22) In the discussion of the house resolution he made a speech in which he said that Col. York's exposures were not needed to show that Pomeroy was corrupt; that the latter's army of paid lobbyists, his thousand-dollar-per-day hotel expenses, and a constant stream of whiskey for fifteen days from the Topeka saloons were sufficient proof.(23) When the committee in charge of the investigation drifted from its course and began to investigate the integrity of York, St. John was one of those to express confidence in York's statements.(24) He had

not forgotten the subject when the legislature met in 1874 and during the session urged a resolution providing that Pomeroy should be brought to trial immediately by the county attorney of Shawnee county.(25)

There was nothing particularly conspicuous about St. John's display of temperance principles in the session of 1873. The bill which he offered providing for increased restriction on the liquor traffic was decisively defeated. He himself, though he had answered to roll call, was listed with those "absent or not voting" when the vote was taken.(26) The legislature was, in fact, inclined to leave temperance legislation alone, and several other temperance bills failed to pass the house in which they were introduced.

St. John's enthusiasm for further dram shop legislation was strengthened the next year by the action of his constituents. The temperance people of Johnson county were well organized by the end of 1873 and were calling on their friends in other counties to organize and flood the legislature with petitions for the proper amendments to the dram shop act. They also issued a call for a state temperance convention to be held early the next year at Topeka.(27) St. John acted as the presiding officer of the convention which met on February 3 and adopted resolutions declaring that the legislature ought to enact a prohibitory law placing the sale of intoxicating liquors in the catalogue of crime, and that the women of the state must have the right of suffrage before complete success could be secured for prohibition.(28)

The general increase of temperance sentiment throughout the state also made the legislature more open to suggestions for anti-liquor legislation than before. A total of 35 petitions were presented to the senate and 36 to the house asking for a prohibitory liquor law, besides other petitions for more stringent saloon regulations. There were also remonstrances against any change in the existing license law. Several bills against the liquor traffic were brought into the legislature and one of them passed the house after a warm discussion. In the senate a strong lobby worked against it and it failed to reach a third reading, although it was defended by St. John. It is said that he fought for it "when all around politicians were sneering at the bill and poking fun at the man who championed it."(29) The Olathe correspondent of a Kansas City newspaper attacked him in an abusive article for his work in behalf of temperance in the senate. This attack moved St. John to a display of anger exceedingly rare for him, and led him to offer to do personal violence for the only time of which there seems to be a record. Meeting the correspondent on a street in Olathe one day, he classified him verbally with scoundrels and malicious liars and, shaking his finger at him, demanded, "Do you know what that means?" The correspondent very sensibly withdrew at this point.(30)

The laws passed in 1874 were of no more general importance than those passed in 1873. On the whole St. John seems not to have played as important a role in the session of 1874 as in that of the year before. He served as chairman of two special committees and of the standing committee on

appropriations. He was conspicuous in forwarding the routine business and, as in the previous session, often served as chairman of the committee of the whole. His habit of industry asserting itself, he tried repeatedly to get the senate to meet at nine instead of ten o'clock in the morning, but failed. That punctuality and that devotion to duty which were to make him one of the hardest-working governors the state ever had were already manifest, and his presence is recorded at every meeting of the senate. In the interval since the last meeting of the senate his independence of judgment had developed and he is more often than before found voting with the minority, frequently on important measures. The outstanding traits which he exhibited, aside from his diligence, were honesty and seriousness of purpose, and an aversion for attempts at levity in legislation.

When he was a candidate for a third term as governor, a frequent charge made against him was one sure to strike terror to the public heart--that he was the corporation candidate, the tool of the railways. To refute this allegation his friends referred to his record on the railroad question in the legislature of 1874. At that time he originated and pushed through both houses what became known as the stock-killing law, a measure which was in force for many years and which is said to have saved the farmers and stockmen of Kansas thousands of dollars annually. For the first time owners of stock which had been killed or injured in the operation of railroads were enabled to contest with the companies for the recovery of the value of their stock on

anything like equal terms.(31)

A set of resolutions significant in relation to his later political activity was offered by St. John in the legislature of 1874. While affirming the belief that all necessary state and national reforms could and would be obtained through the republican party, these resolutions also pledged the republican senators adopting them to stand on the side of all necessary measures of reform without regard to the sources of such measures.(32)

The term as state senator had given St. John valuable experience, some of which was to be useful to him during his governorship. He undoubtedly profited later from knowledge gained in the extra session called in the fall of 1874 to adopt measures for the relief of destitute citizens in the western counties of the state. The crops of that section of Kansas had been destroyed during the grasshopper invasion. Several factors helped to instill in him new principles and to strengthen old ones. One resolution considered by the senate provided for an amendment to the constitution conferring the right of suffrage on women,--a reform which he advocated throughout his life. Another was a statement of his later belief that United States senators ought to be elected by direct vote of the people. Both in the Pomeroy scandal and in the impeachment of the state treasurer for official misdemeanors he came into contact with corruption in high political offices. He worked for better railroad legislation. He established a state-wide reputation as a

cold-water advocate. He declared both his devotion to reform and his orthodox republicanism, and made himself a power in the councils of his party. He was tendered a renomination, but declined, and an independent candidate was elected in his place.

In 1874 he worked persistently against the renomination of Governor Thomas A. Osborn (33), whose intemperance in the use of alcohol was no secret. When Osborn was nominated, however, St. John gave him hearty support and took the stump during the campaign. His speaking trip through the second district was considered a great success and a decisive factor in increasing the republican vote.(34) In 1882, when the republicans were threatened with a bolt of the opponents of St. John, he cited his own acquiescence in the verdict of the party as given through its state convention of 1874, and said that he "had never had a political sore on his head yet."(35) Although he did violence to his temperance principles in supporting Osborn in 1874, St. John's conscience was soothed perhaps by the plank in the republican platform that year declaring for such legislation, both general and local, as would be most effectual in destroying the evil of drunkenness. (36)

The republican platform of 1874 contained the first recognition of the liquor question in Kansas by a great political organization. It was, without doubt, largely the result of the woman's crusade which struck the state in February and was in full swing by March. Under the influence of moral and religious excitement the women moved en masse on the saloons,

and sometimes destroyed liquor in addition to praying for the saloon-keepers. Towns all over the state were affected. Sometimes the crusaders, or the liquor men, carried the matter into the police court. This happened at Olathe where Mr. H.D. Fisher, the wife of the Methodist minister, was arrested on complaint of a saloon-keeper for participating in the crusade. Several lawyers in the state volunteered their services in her behalf, but St. John was her chief defender. The case was dismissed, it being understood that it was designed merely as a bluff to the temperance people.(37) By the middle of April, saloon visitation by the "praying bands" was practically at an end in Kansas, as well as in the rest of the country.

The crusade, however, and the factors which brought it about, helped to give the temperance question a position of greater importance before the people. "License or no license" was the issue in the spring elections all over the state, and in many places the struggle resulted in the closing of the saloons. In St. John's home town of Olathe, although the license ticket carried the day, a fee of \$500 was charged for liquor licenses, and violators of the law were vigorously prosecuted. Temperance meetings were held regularly throughout the state and in September a convention at Leavenworth organized the first state temperance party and put the first state ticket in the field. This ticket received a little over 2,000 votes in spite of the strong temperance plank in the republican platform. The year 1875 marked the lull following the temperance storm of 1874--a lull shortly to be broken by far more persistent and general temperance work than had before

been attempted in the state.

CHAPTER III

TEMPERANCE ACTIVITY.-- GUBERNATORIAL CAMPAIGNS

OF 1876 AND 1878.

The temperance movement still showed no unusual strength when the prohibitionists held their state convention at Lawrence, May 2-3, 1876, with 33 delegates from 16 representative districts in attendance.(1) On the first day the convention united on St. John as its candidate for governor, and Reverend A.M. Richardson, a Lawrence preacher who was prominent in Kansas temperance work for many years, notified him of the nomination on the same day. St. John had continued his activity in the temperance cause and was at the time probably the foremost temperance man in the state. But he aspired to something more than the gubernatorial nomination of a weak third party, and upon receiving the notification made the following shrewd reply by telegraph:

"Your dispatch notifying me of my nomination for Governor by the State Temperance Convention of Kansas has just been received, and I assure you that it was a surprise to me. I sincerely thank the convention for the honor conferred, and being a life-long temperance man, am gratified to know that I have the confidence of the temperance men of Kansas. But as I know nothing of the platform or other proceedings of the convention, and being a Republican as well as a temperance man from principle, and believing that the great cause of temperance in Kansas can best be advanced by and through the Republican party, my acceptance of the nomination so generously given to me by your convention must be upon the express condition of its ratification by the Republican State Convention."(2)

A more clever example of diplomatic hedging could scarcely

be found, and it is no wonder that the prohibitionists considered it an unsatisfactory acceptance and substituted another man in St. John's place. The prohibition ticket was even less successful in 1876 than it had been in 1874, the candidate for governor receiving only 393 votes.(3)

The temperance people were not the first to think of St. John as a possible candidate for governor. As early as 1874 at least one newspaper had advocated him for the republican nomination for that office, and in the late summer and the fall of 1875 he was mentioned as one of the aspirants for the nomination the next year.(4) During the winter of 1875-1876 he was named several times as a gubernatorial possibility, and was also suggested in connection with a nomination for Congress or for lieutenant-governor, although the two last-mentioned offices failed to interest him greatly.

The nomination by the prohibitionists and the skillful manner in which he declined--or accepted--first brought him conspicuously before the public as a candidate for the republican gubernatorial nomination in 1876. The Wyandotte Gazette remarked that his reply put a new light on the matter and was as much as to say that he would decidedly like to have the republican nomination.(5) The week following the publication of his reply the Olathe Mirror editorially commended it as a demonstration of his absolute fealty to the republican party, and stated that although the nomination was unexpected on his part it showed the wishes of no inconsiderable part of the Kansas public.(6) The Mirror hoisted his name at

the head of its editorial columns as its choice for the republican nomination for governor, and did not take it down until the nominations were made three months later. Papers throughout the state at once began to discuss the candidacy of Olathe's favorite son, many of them favorably. His attitude toward the liquor question and the prohibition party was generally endorsed as the only sensible one. Several prominent papers published in counties along the eastern border followed the example of the Mirror, which remained St. John's chief advocate, in pushing him for the nomination. The Western Progress, an independent paper published at Olathe, steadfastly opposed St. John, however, on personal grounds.

One of the principal arguments put forward in St. John's favor was his power as a speaker. "It is a necessity," the Mirror said, "that our ticket be headed with one who has ability and energy to successfully prosecute the canvass.-- Col. St. John possesses every requisite qualification. As an eloquent, effective speaker he is surpassed by but few, and his indomitable energy would give new life and force to the canvass.(7) His services in the second district in the campaigns of 1872 and 1874 were recalled, and one newspaper exclaimed enthusiastically: "The campaign St. John would make on the stump would be brilliant and decisive...As a candidate for governor he would go through the State like a whirlwind. He would be elected by 30,000 majority."(8) His reputation as a consistent worker in the party ranks for years was also pointed out, as well as the fact that he had not "held or sought any office either by Federal or State appointment, or

been in any way connected with the 'slush' politics of the State."(9) In general it was not claimed that he was the intellectual superior of any other candidate, although one paper called him "the brainiest man mentioned for governor," George T. Anthony excepted.(10) His accomplishments in the state legislature and his personal popularity in the state were not forgotten, but a more recurrent theme was his integrity of character, his "spotless public and private record." His temperance principles escaped adverse criticism for the most part, and one editorial writer considered his nomination by the temperance convention a recommendation to those who were disgusted with the debauchery of public men. "Whiskey sellers will not be enthusiastic St. Johners," it was said, "nor, should he be elected, will citizens need to blush to hear that the chief executive has been on a drunken spree."(11) The fact that his name had "never been associated with ringmasters and political tricksters" was expected to win the opposition of that class of politicians, but was also counted upon to secure such support from the best element in the convention as would overcome the chicanery and strategy of some of his competitors.

While it was insisted that his candidacy was not based upon locality but upon his personal merits and fitness, the Mirror nevertheless said: "The border tier must not be altogether slighted in the distribution of offices...Johnson county, as one of the most important in the state, in point of wealth and population, can justly claim some little consideration on the part of the convention."(12) Just before the republican state convention met this paper renewed the argument in these words:

"The second congressional district two years ago sent John R. Goodin, a democrat, to Congress. It is the only doubtful district in the State. He is this year a candidate for re-election, hence this district becomes the battle ground of the coming campaign. It would be the part of wisdom to select Col. St. John to be the standard bearer...when by his long residence, and personal popularity and prestige in this district he would secure certain victory for the entire ticket."(13)

The effective newspaper support received by St. John quickly placed him beside John Guthrie, of Topeka, chairman of the state central committee, and George T. Anthony, of Leavenworth, as one of the leading candidates for the nomination. Anthony and St. John made a careful canvass for delegates and when the state convention met at Topeka on August 16 each had approximately fifty delegates pledged to support him. There were somewhat over 200 delegates in the convention and those not pledged to Anthony or St. John were divided among Guthrie and several others. St. John had most of the delegates from the second district, including, of course, a solid delegation from Johnson county. Anthony had not developed as much force as was expected, while St. John and Guthrie had revealed more.

About ten o'clock on the evening of the sixteenth, the convention proceeded to nominate a candidate for governor. Seven ballots were taken. St. John led on the first and third but was one vote behind Anthony on the second and fourth. On the fifth he fell to third place and remained there on the sixth, when Anthony had 81 and Guthrie 78 votes. At this point

St. John withdrew, transferring his 55 votes almost intact to Anthony, who had a majority on the next ballot and was declared the nominee by acclamation.(14)

There is little evidence to show why St. John gave his votes to Anthony. Perhaps the fact that Anthony was known as a temperance man had something to do with it. In 1878 when the transfer of Anthony's votes to St. John resulted in the nomination of the latter, it was charged that an agreement for this end was made between the two in 1876. It is not known whether such was the case. The reciprocal transfer of votes might have taken place without any specific understanding for the purpose. The shifting in both instances of a large number of votes, although regarded as remarkable, was not an uncommon occurrence in triangular political contests.

Whatever the facts in regard to the alleged agreement, the two men were on very friendly terms, and after the convention St. John said of Anthony: "His conduct before and during the convention is beyond criticism, and I'm proud to have been defeated by such a man."(15) He entered the campaign enthusiastically in Anthony's behalf, speaking throughout the state and making what was characterized as a brilliant and effective canvass. As a political orator he came to be considered second to none in Kansas, and he was even asked by the republican state central committee of Indiana to help in the campaign in that state. The content of his speeches varied, because he always spoke extemporaneously, but he usually began by comparing democratic rule in Missouri with republican rule in Kansas, drawing a picture entirely favorable to the latter.

This was followed by a discussion of paper currency and an appeal for hard money. "He then produced the much-talked-of bloody shirt," according to one newspaper account, "and waved it freely and effectively. He flamed it here and there in the very face of Democracy, and just where it ought to be flamed... Every clot on the ensanguined cloth shook out as a taunt to the party that bloodied it and as a scare crow to those who think the garment buried."(16)

Anthony, although a better scholar, was a less effective speaker than St. John, and he appreciated the aid given him. He did not hesitate to call upon St. John to help him combat the influence of his cousin, D.R. Anthony, editor of the Leavenworth Times, who was working to reduce his vote in Leavenworth county. On October 18 he wrote to St. John: "I want two days of your time in Leavenworth county. You can do me more good than any man in the state."(17)

The friendly relations developed between Anthony and St. John during the canvass did not end when the former became chief executive of the state. St. John on several occasions asked for favors from the governor who always showed himself anxious to grant them. On one occasion when he was unable to meet a certain request, Anthony wrote that he regretted it deeply because it would give him "unusual pleasure to do a favor to Col. St. John."(18)

Before the end of the first year of Anthony's administration the temperance storm which had been gathering over the state for the past three years had broken. In July, 1877, Miss Amanda M. Way, a Quakeress, inaugurated the "blue ribbon"

or Murphy movement at Hutchinson. Leading temperance workers in Kansas had for some time been in correspondence with E.B. Reynolds, a noted temperance worker of Indiana, with the idea of inducing him to spend several months in Kansas. Olathe was hopeful of having him first, but he began work at Lawrence in September, and before the close of the month had induced over 2,000 in that place to take the pledge. By the end of February it was estimated that over 100,000 persons were wearing the blue ribbon in Kansas, and the movement was still at its height. Shortly before this it was reported that the Kansas City liquor dealers were supplying Kansas with only about one-third of the amount of liquors they had at the opening of the Murphy campaign. It was not unusual at a meeting to have the number of those signing the pledge nearly equal to the population of the town wherein the meeting was held.(19) St. John was one of the first to welcome Reynolds to Olathe and to cooperate with him in the work there,(20) Olathe proved to be a banner town, for here over 1,700 adherents to the pledge were secured during the Reynolds revival.(21)

Temperance men and women all over the state were laboring for the cause. None was more earnest than St. John. He took all the time he could from his own work, speaking throughout the state during the winter of 1877-1878 and also at Olathe several times. The effectiveness of his work was demonstrated at a meeting in 1877. At the opening of his speech there were 56 in the room who had not signed the pledge. When he finished speaking 52 of the 56 put down their names and donned the blue ribbon.(22) He consistently refused to

accept any pay for his temperance work.(23), a resolution to which he adhered strictly until he left the gubernatorial chair in 1883.

The influence of the Murphy movement was evident in the city elections in the spring of 1878 when temperance was a conspicuous issue. At Olathe St. John was prominent in organizing the movement which led to the nomination of a successful temperance ticket. The temperance people of Lawrence also secured him to speak in behalf of a similar effort there.

The issuance of a call, signed by St. John, Reynolds, and other temperance workers, for a state temperance convention to meet in Olathe May 14-15, 1878, was another result of the Murphy crusade. About seventy delegates, representing Murphy clubs and temperance organizations in various portions of the state, and including the state's most prominent workers in the cause, answered the call. The convention organized by electing St. John temporary chairman, and then proceeded to form an association called the Kansas Temperance Union. This Union was an alliance of all the temperance organizations of the state for the purpose of advancing the general interests of the work. St. John was elected president, an office which also made him head of the executive committee. The important question considered by the convention was that of carrying temperance into politics. It was decided with but one dissenting vote that it was improper and unwise to have a state temperance party and ticket, although the running of temperance candidates for municipal offices were expressly approved.

The culmination of the temperance work of the preceding year was in the Grand National Temperance Camp Meeting held at Bismarck Grove, near Lawrence, August 30-September 10, 1878. This huge convention was planned in June by the executive committee of the Kansas Temperance Union at a meeting in St. John's office, and extensive preparations were made for it. Statesmen, public speakers and workers in the temperance cause throughout the United States were invited, and arrangements were made for special rates on the railroads. Bismarck Grove, a level stretch of land with a lake and many trees, was a commodious and attractive spot for the meeting, the advertisement of which was creating a stir all over the country. The total prospective attendance was estimated all the way from 50,000 to 100,000 and even President Rutherford B. Hayes was expected to be present. The city of Lawrence was naturally in a state of great excitement over the outlook.

St. John, as head of the Kansas Temperance Union and as chairman of the committee on invitations and program, found himself very busy when the republican state convention met at Topeka on August 28, just two days before the camp meeting was to begin. He had not been inactive politically since 1876. He had been spoken of as a possible candidate for Congress, but had refused to consider such a nomination. In 1877 he had been one of the candidates voted on in the state senate for United States Senator. Early in 1878 he was mentioned for the nomination for governor, but was not considered as strong a candidate as John A. Martin, editor of the Atchison Champion, or Anthony. It was only after considerable urging

that he finally consented to make the race and began a late but active canvass for delegates.

The same arguments set forth in his favor in 1876 were used again and several of the same papers that worked for him two years before were active in his behalf in 1878. The Western Progress, his former enemy, now excelled the Mirror in the zeal with which it urged his nomination. One principal reason for which he was advocated was his remarkable popularity with the masses. "Col. St. John has endeared himself to the people by his fearless advocacy of their rights and his unselfish devotion to duty," one political writer said, "He is brilliant if not profound in argument, and the people of his district will always remember his pyrotechnic displays of eloquence in the last campaign that contributed so largely to redeem the old second to the republican party."(25) His canvass for Anthony after the convention of 1876 was called "so manly and generous as to attract general attention," and it was pointed out that both Martin and Anthony had received far greater compensation from the party in the way of office than he ever had. His temperance principles on the whole won for him more favorable than unfavorable comment.

Anthony had run far behind his ticket in 1876 and had lost rather than gained in political strength during his term as governor. His cold, austere manner, his unpopularity, and especially his alleged sympathy with the money interests of the East as opposed to the common people of Kansas and the West, inspired numerous editorials against him. The Leavenworth Times uttered this solemn warning: "The great

majority which the party has always been able to command in this State has caused conventions to exercise less care in the selection of candidates than would be necessary in a closely contested State, but the great unanimity of our people of all parties upon the money question warns us...not...to go too far toward the camp of the money power when choosing our standard bearer next fall."(26) This warning was more seriously considered because this year there was no presidential ticket to strengthen party lines. United States Senator Ingalls might have formed a combination with Anthony that would have been hard to beat had he felt sure that Anthony's ambition would be content with re-election as governor.(27) St. John had an advantage in having no connection with the senatorial fight and in not being feared as a possible competitor by Ingalls.

The announcement by Martin of his candidacy was taken as evidence that he expected to win. He was said to be as strict a temperance man as Anthony, but was generally conceded to have the backing of the anti-temperance wing of the party. He received far greater newspaper support than the others, and was regarded peculiarly as the newspaper candidate. As the time approached for the meeting of the convention, he gradually assumed the lead, with Anthony in second and St. John in third place. Unless a deadlock should occur in the convention, and a compromise candidate have to be substituted for the two leading candidates, St. John appeared to have but little chance for the nomination.

The contest proved even closer than was expected, and the convention was in session nearly three days and nights before

a nominee was finally agreed upon. The committee on credentials was in session nearly twenty hours, and it was not until near noon on the second day that it reported and the convention was ready to ballot for governor. One hundred and forty four votes were necessary to a choice. On the first ballot Martin received 117, Anthony 113, and St. John 56. This was the relative strength of the candidates through 16 ballots. Martin continued to hold a slight lead over Anthony, with St. John drawing a vote varying between 19 and 24 per cent, of the total, and with minor candidates receiving votes only occasionally. The first indication of any one's "wearing out" came on the fifteenth ballot, taken some time after the convention had re-assembled following a recess for dinner. At this time five Cowley county delegates changed from Anthony to Martin amid great excitement. Alarmed, perhaps, by this action, which might presage a stampede for Martin, the St. John and Anthony delegates combined at the close of the next ballot to force an adjournment until morning. Although it was a warm night and the hall was poorly ventilated and closely packed, the motion for adjournment carried by only six votes.(28) It was afterwards said that the adjournment never was really voted and that "counting it in" was an act of treachery to Martin.(29) However that may be, the adjournment furnished all factions an opportunity to hold caucuses. The result was seen the next morning when the first ballot resulted in the nomination of St. John. He received 156 votes and Martin 129. Over night 100 delegates had been transferred from Anthony to St. John "as helplessly as a sack full of kittens."

Those who later regretted St. John's accession to the governorship liked to blame Martin for the nomination. If Martin had not been a candidate, it was said, Anthony could easily have been renominated, but as it was a determined minority had held the balance of power and been able to nominate a man who was certainly not the choice of a majority of the party.(30) Martin's untimely candidacy was thought to have angered Anthony, who threw his influence to St. John for the sake of revenge.(31) It was frequently asserted that Anthony and St. John had made a bargain, a part of which was an agreement by St. John to use his influence for Anthony's election to the United States Senate. St. John in 1882 asserted that he never had made a political combination with any candidate and that Anthony's transfer of votes to him was without any conditions, expressed or implied.(32) None of St. John's close friends ever gave credence to the story of the alleged combination. In November, 1878, Ingalls wrote to St. John: "It would help me if it were generally understood that your coalition with Anthony did not extend to his senatorial aspirations." He expressed his own belief that the alliance did not include senatorial matters, but asked St. John to let an impression to this effect leak out.(33) There is little evidence to indicate whether St. John complied with the request, but he and Ingalls were never on cordial terms.

In most quarters the nomination of St. John was received with approval. At Olathe he was given an ovation. He was fondly nicknamed Johnson county's "Little Giant," and the

delegates who clung to him so tenaciously in the convention were lauded as the "glorious solid fifty-six." His was a nomination well-calculated to produce harmony. There was nothing against him as a politician and as a republican, and from the outset he had been looked upon as the not improbable beneficiary of the intense rivalry between Martin and Anthony. In his speech thanking the convention for the honor conferred upon him, he made a bid for the support of both of his competitors, who were able to give it to him with a good grace. Martin helped him through the columns of his newspaper, and Anthony through his speeches in the campaign.

Although St. John was known as a thorough-going cold-water apostle when he was nominated, this fact was rather overlooked by the convention. Anthony's reputation as a temperance man had also been known at the time of his nomination, but the temperance question had not entered a great deal into his canvass. The delegates came from districts that had been thoroughly canvassed and deeply moved by temperance orators, it is true, yet the subject of temperance was not before the convention and it was inclined to let the matter rest. The platform briefly dismissed the subject by declaring in favor of the election to the legislature of men who would "labor for the enactment of such laws as the best interest of society, temperance and good order shall demand." The greenback party had already expressed its approval of the temperance movement in the state at its convention in July. The democratic convention, which immediately followed the republican, adopted a plank favoring "liberty of individual conduct, un vexed by

sumptuary laws."

Anthony had been an active participant in the Murphy movement of 1877-1878, and there were some who held that the liquor element had punished him by defeating his attempt for a renomination. If it were responsible for his defeat, it only jumped from the "frying pan into the fire." From the convention St. John straightway hastened to Bismarck Grove and threw himself with all energy into the work there. The camp meeting, in spite of being a new experiment in this section of the country, proved a success, and its leaders resolved to hold a similar meeting the next year. This success was natural, considering the wide-spread awakening of the people throughout the whole country on the subject of temperance. At no time in the history of the movement had its prospects been brighter. In Kansas, church conferences, Good Templar lodges, the Sons of Temperance and other religious and temperance organizations were expressing themselves in favor of legislation against the saloons. The lack of a vital issue to give strength or inspiration to the old political parties was urged as a reason for making temperance a political question. It was said that the political party which ignored temperance would lose votes, and by some it was even said that Kansas might be the first of the western states to adopt a prohibitory law. It was the psychological moment when a temperance candidate could profit most from his principles. St. John, always feeling, unconsciously, the pulse of the reform movement, was ready to move with the tide. He was the very center of the activity at Bismarck Grove. If he advertised

the meeting, it did as much for him. Both leading and being led by the temperance workers, he was indefatigable in his efforts. As the "temperance candidate for governor" he delivered several addresses on the liquor question. He was far bolder than he had been in 1876.Flushed with the victory at the republican convention, he made a speech the night after his nomination in which he proclaimed: "I intend to carry the temperance banner triumphantly through the campaign and plant it firmly in the state capitol. I will ask for the repeal of the license law and purge our statute book of that blot."(34) Perhaps this declaration was the mere assumption of a position natural to one who had advocated temperance for years and was not intended to have a political effect. But republican leaders were afraid that his attitude might injure the party and demanded an explanation. He said that he meant to stand by his temperance principles but should not carry the question into politics, a statement which he repeated in several of his speeches during the campaign.(35) He was warned that temperance speeches made while he was a candidate for governor would cost him votes and that he would ruin his political career just as it was beginning. To this he is supposed to have replied: "Politically they may snow me under, but these principles they can never drown. I would rather be defeated a thousand times than climb to office over the heads of broken-hearted women and wrecks of men."(36)

A great deal of disapproval of St. John's temperance utterances was expressed by the Germans of the state, although

several of them had voted for him in the convention. The Kansas Freie Presse, the leading German newspaper in Kansas, was relentless in its denunciation of the president of the Wassernarren (water fools) who had "for years worked against personal freedom." "His chief goal has always been the governor's chair," said the Freie Presse contemptuously. "Politics is the motive of this pious sinner and not the elevation of humanity."(37) While admitting that temperance did not play a part in this campaign, the Freie Presse maintained that the 10,000 German voters in Kansas were opposed to the election of St. John and would vote for the democratic candidate for governor. It retained enough republicanism, however, to say, "Because one candidate on the republican ticket is a dyed-in-the-wool temperance man it is not yet said that the rest of the candidates must be water fools and fanatics. St. John excepted, the republican state ticket is made up of very capable and good men who deserve the full support of all republicans."(38) When the Germans of Atchison called a mass meeting for the purpose of taking action against St. John, republican papers immediately sprang to his defense, and said that the republican party being a party of free thought, he could hold what private opinions he wished. The temperance issue, however, was considered no part of republicanism, and as the representative of the party he was expected not to thrust in his anti-liquor views.

In spite of all that could be done to keep the question out of politics, the effect of the agitation of the past year could be seen in the canvass. It was claimed that in no previous

canvass or election had there been so little liquor used or so little drunkenness; that public sentiment was so strong that candidates dared not throw open saloons or practice indiscriminate treating to secure votes.(39)

The canvass made by St. John this year was one of the most thorough since the organization of the state and attracted an unusual amount of attention. He spoke in every town of note or size in the state, and in many instances addressed audiences both afternoon and evening. In his speeches he avoided discussion of temperance and confined himself mostly to rather intemperate attacks on the democrats, with occasional references to such issues as railroad regulation and the currency. The democratic candidate for governor was comparatively inactive, but the greenback candidate canvassed the state with considerable effect. In view of the strength of the greenback party, which drew largely from republican ranks, and the hostility of the German and liquor elements of Kansas to St. John, a considerable cut in the republican vote for governor was expected. The returns in November showed that the cut was not as great as had been anticipated. While St. John's majority was only two-thirds as large as Anthony's had been in 1876, his plurality was over a third greater, and his vote was much closer to the average for the other candidates on his ticket than Anthony's had been.

Shortly after the election St. John made a speech at Olathe in which he advocated legislation that would control the whiskey traffic in the state, and said that he believed a

greater temperance revival than any that had yet been known would sweep over Kansas during the coming winter. This was the occasion for an editorial in the Freie Presse on the "Prospect for a Deluge." "Just as the cat cannot stop mousing," the editor bitterly reflected, "our prospective governor...cannot stop playing the temperance apostle even now that he has attained his goal."(40) The anticipation of an attempt by St. John to secure stricter regulation of the liquor traffic was quite correct. The Freie Presse's doleful editorial had unwittingly sounded the keynote of St. John's administration.

PART TWO

GOVERNOR OF KANSAS

CHAPTER IV

FIRST TERM: PROHIBITION.-- PROTECTION OF BORDER.--
DESTITUTION ON FRONTIER.-- NEGRO EXODUS.

SECTION I: THE INAUGURATION AND THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

In 1879 when St. John became governor, the state of Kansas had a population of almost a million, with the foreign element constituting slightly over 100,000 of this number. Only the eastern half of the state was well settled, and only about one-seventh of its total acreage was under cultivation. An idea of the degree of development of Kansas may be drawn from the following facts: there were 75 organized counties out of a final total of 105; there were 21 cities with a population of 2,000-16,000, nearly 3,000 miles of railway, and 275 newspapers; the assessed property valuation amounted to \$144,000,000; and the financial and economic condition of the state was excellent. Indeed, during the two years immediately preceding the opening of St. John's administration, Kansas had been enjoying remarkable prosperity. Population had increased at the rate of nearly 100,000 persons per annum; harvests had been most abundant; the facilities of transportation had been greatly increased; manufacturing interests had been prosperous and mineral resources had been rapidly developed.

In view of the success and progress of the state, it was natural that extensive preparations should be made at Topeka for St. John's inauguration, the second formal one in the history of the state. Topeka, the state capital, and the county seat of Shawnee county, was a growing city with a population of nearly 15,000. The state capitol building was in process of construction and many other buildings and public improvements were being carried forward.

The inauguration ceremonies were held at noon, January 13, 1879, on a platform on the east steps of the uncompleted state house, and were preceded by an imposing parade, participated in by military companies from the chief cities of the state. Special trains brought visitors from nearby points and the streets were crowded. The day was cold but clear, and, in spite of the snow on the ground, between ten and fifteen thousand persons witnessed the ceremony. The inauguration and the reception that took place later evoked many expressions of pride throughout the state. It was a propitious beginning for the administration.

The executive department of the state government consisted, in addition to the governor, of a lieutenant-governor, a secretary of state, an auditor, a treasurer, an attorney-general, and a superintendent of public instruction. Each of these officers had a term of two years, beginning on the second Monday of January next after their election. The governor was the supreme executive of the state and his chief duty was to see that all laws were faithfully executed. He might call an extra session of the legislature and might

adjourn it if the two houses could not agree as to the time for adjournment. At the opening of each legislative session he communicated in a written message information on the condition of the state and its institutions and recommended needed legislation. Besides his authority to veto any bill or joint resolution passed by the legislature, he had power to appoint a number of important officers, exercised the pardoning power, and was commander-in-chief of the state militia. While he was held responsible if the laws were not carried out, the execution of these laws were for the most part in the hands of local authorities, and he could do little when the power of his personal influence had been exhausted. Each state officer was an independent employee of the state and the governor could require nothing from such an executive official beyond information in writing. Only the attorney-general was obliged to aid the governor in the enforcement of laws.

Until 1877 the legislature of Kansas had met annually but in this year an amendment to the state constitution requiring it to meet biennially took effect. Thereafter regular sessions of that body occurred in odd-numbered years. Under this system the governor was at a disadvantage in making recommendations for legislation, for the legislative session began in January when he had just assumed his office and when he was inexperienced in state affairs. He was also unable to secure needed legislation during the remainder of his administration unless he called an extra session. This was the situation when St. John became the governor of Kansas.

The second biennial session of the legislature began on

January 14, the next day after the inauguration of Governor St. John. Both houses were overwhelmingly republican. Following a precedent set by Anthony, St. John delivered his message in person to a joint meeting of the senate and house. The message was a short, plain, vigorous document, dealing in a business-like way with the financial condition of the state, its schools, colleges, public institutions, and with several other subjects of general state interest. Except for the section relating to temperance, it was received almost everywhere in the state with favor, although the Freie Presse, as might have been expected, sneered at the whole thing as a "miserable patchwork" and a "tasteless water-soup." The legislature looked upon it favorably and acted upon the majority of its suggestions.

The regulation of railroad rates was regarded as one of the most important questions before the legislature. The republican platform of 1878 had declared for the principle of railroad regulation and asked the law-making body for the establishment of "such passenger and freight tariffs as shall advance the interests and promote the industries of the people." St. John's message called attention to the fact that the existing laws to regulate railway rates were wholly inadequate, and expressed the opinion that additional legislation should be had, but made no specific recommendation.(1) Although several bills were brought forward in each house looking to more stringent regulation of the common carriers, none of them became law.

Following 1868 Kansas had suffered from no general Indian warfare until the fall of 1878 when a band of northern

Cheyennes escaped from their reservation at Fort Reno in the Indian territory south of Kansas and started northward across the state. The frontier of Kansas at the time was located roughly about a hundred miles from the state's western border. The Cheyennes, variously estimated at from one to two hundred in number, moved along this western frontier, killed about forty citizens, burned and carried away large amounts of property, and committed other crimes. The march across Kansas consumed about twenty days. After perpetrating a series of outrages in Decatur county on the northern border the Indians passed out of the state practically unmolested but were captured somewhat later and those held guilty of the crimes in Kansas were returned to the state for trial. The inefficiency of the pursuit of these savages was commented upon by St. John in his message. For the prevention of similar invasions in the future, he advised an appropriation for a military contingent fund to be used by the governor in arming, equipping and mounting a force of militia to patrol the frontier, when in his judgment there was danger from the Indians.(2) The legislature appropriated \$20,000 for the purpose desired.

The event which chiefly distinguished St. John's first administration was the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for prohibition of the liquor traffic. The anti-temperance enemies of St. John felt that their presentiments were verified by that section of his message dealing with temperance. Compared with the messages of his predecessors it was radical, of course, but considering his own views in the matter, it was a conservative, practical statement of

about what he could expect to secure from the legislature. He began by discussing the evils flowing from the use of alcohol as a beverage, and then said:

"If it could be fully accomplished, I am clearly of the opinion that no greater blessing could be conferred by you upon the people of the state than to absolutely and forever prohibit the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. But many people insist that a prohibitory law could not, or at least would not, be enforced, and that any law that cannot be, or is not, enforced, is worse than no law at all."

In spite of this strong personal stand in favor of prohibition he stated that he desired the passage of no law in relation to the enforcement of which there could be any doubt. Instead of prohibition, he therefore recommended such an amendment of the existing local option law as would make it applicable to the entire state. In addition to repealing the proviso which excepted cities of the first and second class from the operation of the local option section of the dram shop act, he wished the legislature to require the names of all those signing a petition for the granting of a liquor license to be published in some newspaper printed, or of general circulation, in the township or ward at least thirty days before the granting of the license.(3) In view of the existing state of public sentiment in Kansas it is probably safe to say that very few petitions would have been secured under these conditions.

Afterwards when St. John's name became inseparably connected with the establishment of prohibition in Kansas, his enemies liked to call attention to the fact that it was not prohibition, but local option, which he advocated in his first

biennial message. This recommendation, however, was consistent with everything St. John had said on the subject of temperance up to that time. While he stood for total abstinence, it was a prohibitory license law which he was understood to advocate in his speech at Bismarck Grove.(4) The Kansas law was already working well in the places to which it applied. Anthony, although opposed to the license system, considered it impossible to secure a change from it and had never gone beyond suggesting some improvements in it.(5) He had not even mentioned the subject in his biennial message. St. John may have feared that a recommendation for prohibition would only have arrayed against him republicans whose influence was needed for the wholesome regulation of the liquor traffic and thus would have done the cause more harm than good. In a letter written in September, 1879, he defended his position by saying that the local option act he had suggested would have resulted in practical prohibition, but added that he had about come to the conclusion that all license laws were a curse which only tended to increase the sale of intoxicating liquor as a beverage.(6) A letter which he wrote in 1880 explains his position more fully: "I deem prohibition...preferable to any local option law, but regard local option as altogether preferable to any system of license...I am inclined to the opinion that local option would have a tendency to lead the people finally to prohibition, if they are not ready now to adopt the latter measure."(7)

Though falling short of the demands of the most radical temperance men, St. John's recommendation for an amendment of

the dram shop act was considered far too severe by many people. If he favored taking temperance and religion into politics he should have run on the ticket of some party favoring this policy, it was said. It was the republican party and not the Bismarck camp meeting that had nominated him. The Freie Presse nervously hoped that the legislature would pay no heed to his foolish proposals, and cautioned watchfulness on the part of the anti-temperance people.

The state of public opinion on the liquor question gave weight to this caution. From 1868 to 1879 there had been little systematic effort to change the regulations regarding the liquor traffic. The tide of temperance sentiment, however, had gradually swelled since the close of the woman's crusade until it had flooded the state during the Murphy movement. While Murphyism was based on the idea of moral and not of legal suasion, it was inevitable that the education of the general public on the evils of the liquor trade and the activity of the Murphy clubs with their thousands of members and of the other numerous temperance organizations in the state should produce a demand for more stringent anti-liquor legislation. In many places it was becoming popular to advocate prohibition. The Bismarck camp meeting of 1878 did much to bring about the desire for prohibition. Another factor in producing it was the work done during the winter of 1878-1879 by a host of Kansas temperance men and women and by a number of workers from outside the state who remained in Kansas after the Bismarck convention was over. The fact that the dram shop act was openly violated in various

sections of the state also resulted in an increased opposition to saloons. During the fall of 1878, J.R. Detwiler, one of the most earnest temperance workers in the state, became convinced that the time had come to secure a prohibitory law. Although he believed that there was no constitutional obstruction in the way of such a law, he thought that the submission of a constitutional prohibitory amendment would be a good method of determining the state of public opinion on the saloon question. Accordingly he established a paper called the Temperance Banner at Osage Mission in October, 1878, to urge prohibition of the liquor traffic by constitutional law. He brought forward the idea of prohibition at the meeting of the Grand Lodge of Good Templars at Ft. Scott shortly thereafter. It was received with favor and a resolution was adopted petitioning the legislature to submit a prohibitory constitutional amendment to the voters of the state. This petition with thousands of signatures was presented to the various senators and representatives by Detwiler, who stayed in Topeka three weeks urging them to submit the amendment.(8) Through his newspaper he reminded them that they were not asked to shoulder any great responsibility but only to take such action as would allow the electorate to decide the matter for itself. He held that prohibition, if adopted, could be enforced, and, if defeated, that the state was not ready for it. The rank and file of the temperance people considered it impossible to secure the submission of the amendment and in the state as a whole

little attention was paid to Detwiler's daring effort. Numerous anti-liquor petitions besides those secured by the Good Templars were presented to the legislature, but most of them asked only for a prohibitory liquor law or for amendments to the dram shop act and not for an amendment. Some of them which had been circulated by the executive committee of the Kansas State Temperance Union embodied the temperance recommendations of St. John's message. There were also a few petitions protesting against any change in the dram shop law.

The members of the legislature had been elected without much reference to the temperance issue, but many of them favored stricter regulation of the whiskey traffic. Their personal sobriety was a fact frequently commented upon by contemporary newspapers. Nevertheless, the action which they took was a surprise and even exceeded the hopes of the governor.

In harmony with St. John's recommendation bills were introduced in both houses to amend the dram shop act. The session was well under way when Senator George F. Hamlin of La Cygne introduced senate joint resolution Number 3 which provided for the submission to the voters of a constitutional amendment.(9) It had been written by Judge N.C. McFarland, a lawyer and temperance advocate living in Topeka, at the request of Detwiler and other temperance leaders.(10) The anti-liquor men in the senate, however, gave more attention to a bill introduced by Senator John T. Bradley of Council Grove,

because they thought that they were more likely to secure its passage. It was more severe than St. John had requested. He had suggested that a petition for a liquor license should bear the names of a majority of the men and women over twenty-one years of age residing in the township where the liquor was to be sold, while the bill required the signatures of two-thirds of such citizens. The opposition of the liquor men in the senate, especially of the members from Atchison, Leavenworth and Wyandotte counties, was aroused against such a measure. A strong liquor lobby worked against it while a temperance lobby labored for it with equal energy. The temperance battle of the session centered about it, neither side having a majority. There were 40 senators. It would require 21 to give a majority for the bill. There were 19 senators for it and 18 against it, and 3 were undecided. In the committee of the whole this division was maintained for days. The debate continued throughout the first half of February, with various attempts to make the bill less restrictive. On February 14 it became apparent in the committee of the whole that the bill probably would carry in the senate. Since teetotal sentiment was even stronger in the house there was little doubt that once through the senate the bill would become law. To avoid this immediate danger to the liquor traffic, a motion was made from the anti-temperance side of the controversy to substitute senate joint resolution Number 3 for Bradley's bill; the liquor men also promised to vote for the resolution on

its final passage provided that the temperance people would make the substitute in committee of the whole. The pro-license men thought that they could defeat the resolution in the house, or, failing there, felt sure of voting it down at the polls. They foresaw, too, that any temperance men voting against prohibition would be severely criticized by the radicals of the temperance cause. Nevertheless, the anti-liquor men were reluctant to accept the substitution suggested for they felt that the chances for the amendment to be passed in the house and ratified by the voters was small.(11) But there were several senators who were distressed by the realization that if they supported the resolution, the liquor interests would attempt to defeat them at the next election, and, if they opposed it, their temperance constituents would be antagonized. In this predicament an opportunity to pass the responsibility on to the house and then to the people was welcomed. The substitute carried by a slender majority in committee of the whole,(12) and when it was put upon its final passage was adopted by the unanimous vote of the thirty-seven senators present. (13) Needless to say, the temperance forces were astonished at this easy victory.

The house had been considering a large number of temperance measures, among them one proposing a prohibitory amendment to the constitution, but all of these were dropped when senate joint resolution Number 3 was received. The fight with all its animosities and bitterness now centered on this resolution. Every influence was brought to

on the representatives. Both liquor dealers and anti-liquor workers lobbied desperately. St. John had not expected the radical prohibitory measure from the senate, but when the resolution passed he changed his tactics and made every effort to get it through the house. "I was governor but I couldn't keep out of the fight," he says. "Violating all precedent I left the governor's office to help fight the battle among the members on the floor of the house."(14) On the evening of March 5 the final vote was taken. The galleries were packed. A call of the house was necessary because several members tried to avoid recording their votes by absenting themselves. The sergeant-at-arms brought in enough of them, however, to pass the resolution 88 to 31, with 10 absent or not voting.(15) There were, therefore, two more votes than were necessary, since 86 was a constitutional majority.

It was a great victory for the temperance forces and according to St. John the announcement of the vote was followed by hearty hand-shaking and loud cheers and the singing of "Praise God from Whom All Blessings Flow."(16)

The story of the passage of the amendment in the house was a dramatic one, and St. John was fond of telling it. Through constant repetitions he fell into several errors. One of them was involved in the Greever story which he repeated many times in ways that do not entirely agree with one another. The following is a typical account:

"At last when the vote was taken...the result showed that the amendment lacked just one vote of having the necessary

two-thirds required by law.... Just at this critical moment, when all seemed to be lost, Margaret V. Greever, the wife of the Democratic member from Wyandotte County, who had voted no, confronted her husband, and pleaded with him, as only a wife can plead, to change his vote. He paused for a moment, then stood with head erect, and facing the speaker, in a manly voice he exclaimed:

"'Mr. Speaker, I change my vote from no to aye.'

"The Representative Hall was packed, and the announcement brought forth round after round of applause, such as was never heard in that hall before. Thus when stalwart men stood there, dumbfounded, not knowing what to do, a bright, plucky woman grasped the situation, changed a vote, turning what seemed to be defeat into a glorious victory."(17)

While it is true that Greever made the change at the request of his wife, it is also true that had he not done so, there would still have been enough votes to pass the resolution. It was a spectacular event but seemingly without the great significance St. John attached to it.

St. John also erred in saying that it was the rum power which induced the temperance people to introduce a resolution for a prohibitory amendment into the senate as a coup to kill a strong license bill just passed by the house. It has already been shown that the prohibitory resolution originated with the temperance forces. The liquor men may justly be held responsible for the passage of the resolution, however. The placing of the proposition before the electorate was an accident of political strategy and not the result of deliberative statesmanship. It does not detract from the courage and consistency of St. John to show that instead of being a leader to secure constitutional prohibition in Kansas at the time when it was thus made possible, he was a surprised and gratified governor who was enabled to endorse a stronger

policy than he had deemed it wise to recommend. On March 8 he put his signature to the resolution and the proposition to amend the state constitution so as to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for medical, scientific and mechanical purposes, was before the people for their decision.

Even after the passage by the house of the resolution submitting the amendment, attempts were made to secure an immediate change in the temperance laws in the direction of greater stringency. One bill for this purpose went through the house but was rejected by the senate. Kansas was to continue under the existing law until the voters decided whether or not to put prohibition into the constitution.

Two other propositions were submitted to the people by the legislature of 1879. One provided for striking out the clause exempting \$200 personal property from taxation; the other for a constitutional convention. The legislature also provided for the erection of a state reform school; for the rebuilding of the state normal school at Emporia; for the completion of the west wing of the state capitol; and for the installation of a coal shaft at the penitentiary. A proposition that had first been made in 1855 and which provided for the annexation of Kansas City, Missouri, to Kansas was revived. The mayor and several councilmen and citizens of Kansas City signed a memorial asking for annexation and had it presented to the Kansas legislature, and a delegation representing Kansas City

commercial interests visited Topeka. The delegation was tendered a reception at which St. John and other state officers spoke, and the legislature appointed a committee to consider further the question of annexation. For some reason, however, interest in the movement gradually died out, and nothing ever came of it.(18)

Another event of some significance during the session of 1879 was the re-election of Ingalls to the United States Senate. Anthony was a candidate but received slight consideration. St. John seems to have kept clear of any connection with the contest, but he participated in a meeting ratifying the election of Ingalls and in his speech paid high tribute to the senator.(19)

SECTION II: ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS ARISING AFTER THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE LEGISLATURE.

With the adjournment of the legislature on March 12 St. John and the state officers were left to face alone the problems that might arise during the next two years. Few governors of Kansas have had to cope with situations so important and so difficult as those confronting St. John. The protection of the border, the destitute on the frontier, the exodus, and the campaign for the adoption of the prohibitory amendment-- these were the most important problems before St. John during 1879-1880, and since under the organization of the state government he could ask for little assistance from the other officials, he had to handle the

situation almost single-handed.

In pursuance of the act appropriating \$20,000 for the protection of the frontier, the governor organized and equipped a Patrol Guard of about forty men and kept them on the southwestern border, patrolling a line from Barbour county west about one hundred miles, from April until November, 1879. He also formed independent military companies on the frontier as well as in the interior of the state and re-organized the state militia. Having secured the co-operation of the national government, he placed scouts in the Indian territory along the southern border of Kansas to give warning of hostile movements of Indians and incidentally to watch for white outlaws. Much of the work connected with the organizing of this protection St. John attended to personally. A part of his policy was the cultivation of friendly relations with the Indian chiefs. After the marauding bands had promised to cease their raids into Kansas, St. John invited six of the leaders to come to Topeka and to smoke the pipe of peace as a sign of good faith. They came and were returned to their people well satisfied with the gifts of calico and food they had received. So effective were the measures taken that during the four years of St. John's administration no one in the state was harmed in person or property by the red men.(20) Indian troubles in Kansas had come to a definite end.

In May, 1879, a series of destructive tornadoes caused great loss of life and property in the northern part of the

state. About forty persons were killed and seventy severely wounded. There being no law which authorized the executive to extend aid from state funds, St. John issued an appeal to the people of Kansas for contributions and named John A. Martin, of Atchison, to receive and distribute them.

Another similar but far more difficult problem confronting St. John was that of relieving the destitute condition of settlers on the Kansas frontier. Thousands of immigrants had come to the state during the decade preceding the election of St. John as governor, and many of them had taken up claims and obtained contracts for land from the railroads in the western and northwestern part of the state. Few had any savings to tide them over a period of hard times; consequently when a drought of approximately two years' duration began in western Kansas in the spring of 1879, it was estimated that about 20,000 people were soon reduced to a condition of destitution.(21) The drought affected practically all of the western third of the state. In some of the counties of this area there were comparatively few settlers, and they could manage to eke out an existence by killing jack-rabbits and antelope, but in twelve or fifteen counties, particularly in Trego, Graham, Sheridan, Gove and Wallace counties, the suffering was acute. Letters depicting the distress and near-starvation on the frontier and asking for immediate aid began to pour into the governor's office and received the response which he always gave to appeals of feeling. The rest of the state being in an unusually

prosperous condition he took the ground that Kansas could care for its own poor and that it was unnecessary to go outside the state to solicit aid; but since much of the destitution was along the Kansas Pacific railway he felt he was justified in asking the road to contribute to the relief. He accordingly wrote a private letter to Jay Gould, president of the road, explaining the situation and stating that publication of the facts would lessen immigration to the section and consequently hurt both the state and the railway, and asking for \$5,000 for fuel, meat and bread.(22) Gould promptly authorized the governor by telegraph to draw on him for the desired sum. St. John personally supervised the purchase and distribution of clothing and provisions, directing that no supplies should be furnished to any man who spent his time or any portion of his money at saloons.(23) He saw to it that the fund was not diminished by costs of disbursement, and also secured and forwarded to Gould vouchers accounting for the expenditure of every dollar of the sum donated. By April of 1880 the Gould fund was exhausted although it had been expended only along the line of the Kansas Pacific railway. By that time rains had come in some places but the drought continued in most of the affected area and destitution increased. In May St. John made a personal investigation of conditions along the line of the Kansas Pacific railway. At Grinnell in Gove county he hired a team and wagon and, taking provisions for temporary relief with him, drove from dugout to dugout. In this manner he visited four counties, talking to the people and observing the con-

dition of the crops, and on returning to Topeka reported that he found the state of things discouraging.(24) The settlers could, of course, have moved away from the region, but he was anxious to have them remain. At the same time he felt that begging for aid in other states would open the way for imposters and bring the state into disrepute, and therefore advised against it. In this position he was sustained by most of the newspapers of the state. He tried to avoid all undue publicity in the matter and urged the authorities in the counties where the destitution existed to do their best to take care of the situation. As a means of preventing any actual suffering, he called a meeting at Topeka of several prominent citizens who organized the "Kansas State Aid Committee" and issued an appeal through the state for money and supplies. The people responded liberally and some donations were received from outside of the state. The committee had complete charge of all relief measures, but St. John continued to exert his influence in behalf of the destitute. On several occasions he asked various churches to meet appeals from the frontier for aid. He also secured railroad passes for persons engaged in the relief work and for destitute persons who wished to go east, and interviewed railway officials with a view to securing their co-operation. The Kansas Pacific railway made arrangements for giving employment to destitute settlers along its route, and also sold sixty thousand bushels of seed wheat on time to the farmers. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe road also proved

itself helpful to the needy on the frontier. When the state legislature convened in 1881 it immediately appropriated \$25,000 for general relief. That year the rains came and the appropriation sufficed to sustain the settlers until the crops were harvested.

St. John's connection with the problem of the frontier destitute inevitably brought some censure upon him. He paid little attention to the abuse he received, but in a private letter pointed out that he had acted quietly in the matter, and said: "Whatever has been done by me was not prompted in any sense by political considerations, and I trust that I may never get down so low as to try to make political capital out of the misfortunes of any class of individuals."(25)

Beginning about 1873 many colored people had emigrated to Kansas from the south. The movement gained impetus with each successive year until it culminated between 1878 and 1882 in a grand rush to Kansas and the north. The migration was known as the Exodus and attracted national and world-wide attention. Bands moved without organization or system from the plantations in the states of the lower Mississippi valley to the Mississippi river, and thence to St. Louis and other cities with no purpose beyond reaching some of the northern and western states where they hoped to enjoy a new Canaan. The origin of the hegira lay in the general breakdown of the political, industrial, educational and social system instituted in the south by the north at the close of the Civil War. It was frequently said that unscrupulous politicians

in the north had invited the movement in the hope of securing negro support in close elections. It was also said that land speculators in the new states west of the Mississippi circulated alluring reports among the negroes who could not withstand the promise of "forty acres and a mule." Crop failures and low prices paid for cotton contributed to the unrest among the colored people in the south. The causes most frequently assigned by the exodusters themselves for the migration were excessive rent and personal violence. Conventions of colored people had for several years considered the question of emigrating, and negroes who had located in the new states added their influence by urging their friends to join them. Benjamin Singleton, better known as "Pap" Singleton, of Kansas, was so active in forwarding the emigration of negroes from his state of Tennessee, and in forming colored colonies in Kansas, that he won the title of the "Father of the Exodus." He was held responsible for the emigration of about eight thousand of his colored brethren into the state.

That Kansas should be the goal of the exodusters was natural since this state was closely associated with the beginning of the conflict which ended in the liberation of the slaves. From St. Louis the exodusters, who were for the most part poorly clad and in absolute poverty, were sent on to Wyandotte at special transportation rates. By the first of April, 1879, there had arrived at Wyandotte 1,300 refugees who were quartered on the river bank. Both St. Louis and Wyandotte objected strenuously to the influx of such large

numbers of paupers, and the newspapers and citizens all over Kansas regarded the immigration as a calamity to the state. Great pressure was brought to bear on St. John to issue a proclamation that would stem the tide before the state was flooded with these poverty-stricken people, but he steadfastly refused. There were no public funds that could lawfully be used for the relief of the exodusters, but something had to be done to meet the problem presented by the accumulation of large numbers of them at Wyandotte, Topeka, Atchison and elsewhere. He therefore called a mass meeting at Topeka on April 20 and the result was the organization and incorporation of the Kansas Freedmen's Relief Association with St. John as president and with other state officers included on the board of directors. Meetings were also held at Lawrence, Wyandotte, Topeka, Manhattan and other towns to devise means to care for the colored immigrants. Strenuous efforts were made to colonize the refugees and to find employment for them, but the temporary barracks at North Topeka soon became overcrowded. In June the Relief Association issued an appeal to the people of the nation asking for contributions, which were received from all over the union and even from England. About \$150,000 was contributed during the first year following the appeal.(26) Efforts to direct the emigration to other and older states were made by the association and its sub-committees and by St. John in personal letters to negroes in the south, to railroad officials and to others in position to exert some influence, but the negroes continued to come at about the

same rate throughout the winter of 1879-1880. The immigration reached its height in the spring of 1880, but a year later had so diminished that the Relief Association dissolved and the barracks in North Topeka were closed. A study of census figures reveals the fact that about 25,000 negroes took up their residence in Kansas during the exodus. A good many of those who came at this time were sent on to other states, while a small number returned to the south after a short interval. It is perhaps safe to say that about half of the negroes who became permanent citizens of Kansas settled in the country; some of them located on land of their own; others on rented land; others became farm hands. The remaining half of the colored immigrants found homes in and around the cities and towns. The principal settlements were in or near Topeka, Wyandotte, Leavenworth, Parsons, Oswego, Baxter Springs, Independence, Emporia, Coffeyville, Fort Scott, Sedan, Chetopa, Hodgeman Center, Osage, Tonganoxie, and Florence. The chief colonies established by "Pap" Singleton were at Dunlap and Nicodemus. Most of the exodusters became good and self-supporting citizens, much to the gratification of St. John who often called attention to their success.

No one worked harder in behalf of the exodusters than St. John. He was always the friend of the negroes, aiding them and championing their rights, and the hold which he naturally secured on their confidence and respect was resented by many politicians. His official letter books are filled with communications on the exodus, many of them from or to negroes. Through the Kansas representatives in Washington he tried to

get aid for the refugees from the national government, but did not succeed. After a few months he and the other state officers resigned from the board of directors of the Relief Association in order to remove any objection to it on the score of politics, but he still continued to co-operate with it in every way. The work done by St. John and the association was approved by perhaps the majority of the citizens, but he was subjected to a great deal of criticism and personal abuse and was burned in effigy several times. He was called "Nigger-lover St. John," accused of inviting the exodus for political purposes and of hurting the state through appeals for aid in the East, and charged with using charity funds for campaign purposes. In reply he said that Kansas had no need of the negroes to increase its 50,000 republican majority and that he had no desire to make political capital out of the misfortune of the blacks; that while Kansas could care for her own poor, she could legitimately ask aid to care for the poor coming to her from the south; that he had receipts for all funds received by him for the relief of the exodusters and had advanced one hundred dollars that had not been refunded to him; and that anyone who could produce a document proving that he had encouraged the exodus was asked to do so. All communications on the matter were on file in the governor's office and he invited inspection and publication of any of them. The following letter written in March, 1880, explains his attitude more fully:

" . . . The records of the office will show that I have at all times, in every communication that I have ever made, to both blacks and whites in the south, advised them against

coming to Kansas in a state of destitution. I have always endeavored to tell them the plain truth. I have said to them that Kansas offered no inducements to any class of immigrants, save and except such as are found in her rich soil, healthy climate, free schools, free ballot, and full protection to the life and property of every law abiding human being.

"I have told these people that there were no 'free homes' and no aid of any kind, but all persons who come here, whether black or white, would be expected to provide for themselves. I have also in many communications to colored men in the south (which communications have been published in the newspapers of various southern states) endeavored to show to them the evil results that would necessarily follow from overcrowding any section of the North with persons who were destitute of means and wholly dependent upon their daily labor for support; and especially calling their attention to the fact that Kansas, being yet in her infancy, could furnish employment to only a limited number of laborers . . .

"I said in the beginning, and I say now, that so long as I am Governor of the State, there shall never be placed at the portals of Kansas a sentinel to make politics, religion, race or color a condition precedent to the right of any human being to come within its borders, who is willing to abide by our laws and labor for his own support . . . I came to Kansas eleven years ago. I was poor and have held my own ever since, and I would have thought it very strange if I had been refused admission because of my poverty.

"The colored people . . . have been robbed, bulldozed and cheated, and deprived of their political rights as well as protection to life and property in the South . . . The true cause of the exodus . . . belongs in the camp of the Democratic party . . .

" . . . Corn, when cultivated by a colored man, grows as rapidly and yields as abundantly per acre, and is worth as much in the market as if the land were cultivated by a white man, and corn is what we want. It is well; and a bushel of corn, after all, is worth more to Kansas than a ton of prejudice."(27)

The announcement in August, 1879, that President Hayes had accepted St. John's invitation to visit Kansas and be present at the agricultural fair at Neosho Falls threw the state into great excitement. The presidential party, of which General William T. Sherman was a member, arrived September 24, visited all the larger and some of the smaller towns, and left five days later. At Neosho St. John welcomed the President in a speech in which he drew a striking picture

of the progress of Kansas since its admission in 1861. Population, wealth, railroads, public institutions, agriculture, --he forgot nothing, and all his statements were bolstered up with official data.(28) Kansas newspapers thought the speech should be scattered broadcast as an immigration document, and the Topeka Commonwealth said: "The Governor has been doing good advertising work for the past forty days. Very much through his influence the State has been talked, telegraphed and written about as no other State ever was."(29) In a speech at Parsons Hayes himself stated that Kansas was the best advertised state in the union.

St. John was blamed because the President did not visit Kansas City, Missouri, and to this fact was attributed the insult given to the governor at the reception to General U. S. Grant at that place in July, 1880. At the Kansas City railway station St. John and the Kansas committee on reception were ignored, and St. John was not introduced to Grant until on the train going to Merriam Park where he was to deliver the address of welcome. At the park he was forced to walk a quarter of a mile through mud to the stand, since carriages had been provided only for the general's party. The formal invitation to the Grant banquet which St. John expected to be given was withheld, and another man was asked to respond to the toast, "The State of Kansas." The Kansas governor was sent only a printed circular relative to the reception and parade and therefore left Kansas City before the banquet was held. In the procession for Grant's review Kansas had twelve military companies while Missouri had only three. Without St.

John's knowledge the Kansas military companies held an indignation meeting and resolved to resent the slights to the governor by going home before the parade, but out of consideration for the Craig Rifles, who had entertained them, reconsidered and took part in the procession. St. John maintained silence during the public discussion of the matter, but the Kansas newspapers, regardless of whether or not they were friendly to St. John, were almost unanimous in their indignation. The adjutant-general of the state was quoted as saying that it made no difference if the governor were "an ignorant and common man," he was entitled to courtesy as the representative of Kansas. The editor of the Kansas City Journal, who was fighting St. John through the columns of his newspaper, and the mayor of Kansas City were the masters of ceremonies at the reception and they were blamed for the discourtesy shown to the chief executive. The Journal insisted that the insult was not intentional, but St. John felt that he had received a personal slight, and the Kansas press was vindictive in its declaration to Missouri that it would not soon forget the matter.

Another event of interest which took place during St. John's first administration was the "water banquet." In January, 1879, when the tide of social activity in Topeka was at its height, the St. Johns sent out invitations to everybody of importance--and to several hundred who were not, so the snobs said--for what turned out to be perhaps the most original exhibition of gubernatorial hospitality ever given at the

capital of the Sunflower State. In a letter to his friend Ingalls, George R. Peck, ex-president of the American Bar Association, described the St. John reception as follows:

"Nothing sybaritic about the governor's feast. No roasted peafowls and pickled nightingales' tongues. I am afraid your classic friend Lucullus--the high feeder, you know--wouldn't have thought much of it as a gorge. The pièce de résistance was aqua pura, served only in one style--cold and in goblets of about the capacity of Poppendieck's schooners. (Poppendieck was the proprietor of a local hotel noted for its bar-room.) I give you my word of honor as a human being, with a tendency to eschew water for internal use, that the state house gang, including both branches of the legislature, ran a bigger risk of submersion last night than anybody since the days of Noah. I can only say that I exceeded the normal capacity of the human stomach by several gallons in my effort to convince this aquamarine from Olathe that I knew a good brand of H₂O when it was set before me."(30)

The cold-water banquet was a political stand from which St. John never receded. Liquor was never afterward served in the Kansas State House.(31)

CHAPTER V

LEADER OF CAMPAIGN RESULTING IN FIRST PROHIBITION AMENDMENT IN HISTORY.

The fact that the submission of the prohibitory amendment was unexpected and came without strong popular demand meant that the temperance forces had a good deal of work to do in educating the public mind but it also put the liquor forces off their guard. It has already been noted that the movement for constitutional prohibition received little attention except in newspapers largely devoted to the temperance cause. Even the passage of the resolution for submission was not an important news story and it was not until midsummer in 1879 that the people seriously began to realize that they could settle the question of prohibition for themselves.

Following the adjournment of the legislature there was little temperance activity until August. In this month the National Temperance Camp Meeting at Bismarck Grove was held, and it was successful beyond expectations. The grove, which was under the management of the Kansas Pacific Railway Company, had been made attractive with fountains, gas lights and a tabernacle seating five thousand persons. Many speakers of national note participated in the meeting, but the chief attraction was the famous Francis Murphy. The programs were much more elaborate than they had been the year before, and it is probable that more than 100,000

persons or ten per cent of the population of the state attended them. St. John was on the ground most of the time during the meeting and constantly worked to inspire the temperance forces with new energy and courage. In addition to the address of welcome on the opening day, he delivered several other lectures during the encampment and was received with tremendous applause every time he appeared upon the platform. His speeches were for the most part devoted to a discussion of the prohibitory amendment, including the story of its submission, a comparison with the Maine law and the refutation of legal objections. He dwelt at length on the enormous cost of the liquor traffic to the state, quoting statistics to show the number of inmates of the penitentiary put there as a result of the use of liquor. Why should we try to prevent the spread of small-pox, he asked, and not of drunkenness, when the effects of drunkenness are so much more ruinous; and why should the statute decree a punishment for intoxication and license the sale of the whiskey which brought about the intoxication. He thanked God that the President's wife, Mrs. Hayes, had banished liquor from the side-boards of the White House and paid a high tribute to the part played by women in the temperance work in Kansas. He would stop the traffic in alcohol through the ballot and he would put the ballot into the hands of the women. If this were done he thought that the amendment would carry by a majority of 150,000 instead of 50,000. The conviction that God was with the temperance workers was firm in his mind and he called on the people to place themselves on God's side.

"One man and God is a majority," he said, adding that while not every temperance man was a Christian, every true Christian must be a temperance man. He declared that it was not conservatism but radicalism that had saved the country in the slavery struggle, and that there was no half-way ground in dealing with the liquor question.(1) This declaration was at variance with statements made in some of his letters which have already been quoted, and must have surprised some people.

It is one of the misfortunes of public position that those who occupy it are likely to be accused of personal motives in what they do. Ordinary motives are not considered sufficient to explain their conduct but some ulterior and selfish purpose is ascribed to them. St. John's connection with the Bismarck meeting was made the occasion for charges in various papers that the encampment was for political purposes and intended to hoist the "accidental temperance governor" into the executive chair for a second term. He denied the allegation and denounced anyone who would prostitute the temperance movement to his own selfish ends. Prohibition, he said, was no more a question of politics than was the religion of Jesus Christ, and every honest Democrat, Republican, Greenbacker and Hard-money man, every Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Congregationalist and Catholic, every creed and congregation, could stand for it. (2) Certain newspapers pointed out that St. John had been a temperance man all his life and identified with all kinds

of temperance work and that his motives would be more justly open to suspicion if he did not identify himself with the present temperance movement.

Although not originally designed to inaugurate the campaign for the amendment, the Bismarck meeting actually did so. Prohibition was the most important topic of discussion, the speakers from outside the state emphasizing the fact that Kansas was the first state to submit the question of constitutional prohibition to the people. The great amount of publicity received by the meeting resulted in giving the amendment its proper significance. From this time until the election the newspapers did not cease to agitate the question.

A convention of the Kansas State Temperance Union met in Topeka, September 30, 1879. St. John presided, took an active part in the meeting, and was re-elected president with the understanding that he should be relieved of the work attaching to the office. In addressing the convention he said that the campaign for the amendment must be carried on in a spirit of kindness and humanity. Even the anti-prohibition papers in their reports of the meeting could find nothing to criticize about him except that his moustache "had on an extra amount of pomatum of the color of the exodusters." The Convention adopted a resolution asking all men, irrespective of party, to vote for the prohibitory amendment and made plans for the employment of speakers to canvass the state, for the organization of each county and school district and for financing the undertaking. Immediately after the convention the Union

was formally incorporated and campaign headquarters, in charge of Reverend A. M. Richardson, were opened at Lawrence. Assistance was given by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Good Templars and other temperance organizations, by various speakers who had remained in the state following the Bismarck encampment and by several temperance papers, chief of which was the Temperance Palladium, established in November at Lawrence with James A. Troutman, a young Topeka lawyer who was later lieutenant-governor of Kansas, as its editor.

The formal opening of the campaign for the amendment by the Kansas Temperance Union was the signal for the commencement of activity by the liquor interests. The first move was the launching of the Liberal Advocate, a pro-liquor newspaper which was first published at Topeka but was later moved to Kansas City. It was so unusual to speak ill of St. John that at first the Liberal Advocate could not restrain a semi-complimentary attitude toward him, but it soon became bitter in its attacks. The founding of the Advocate was followed by the accession to the anti-amendment ranks of the Kansas State Journal, a Republican paper published at Topeka. It became the principal organ of the saloon men and was rewarded by an immediate increase in the number of liquor advertisements it received. George F. Reed, the editor, was prominent in the organization of the People's Grand Protective Union of Kansas at a convention in Topeka in January, 1880. This association was composed almost wholly of saloon keepers, brewers and wholesale liquor dealers, and its avowed purpose

was to defeat the prohibitory amendment. The first step towards this end was to prevent the renomination of St. John and it was given out that the Union had plenty of money to spend for the accomplishment of this object. Subordinate unions were organized at various points in the state and appeals sent out asking for contributions of money. It was said that the sum asked for was \$100,000 and St. John often asserted that \$150,000 was actually received from outside the state. The Union repeatedly asserted its high moral tone and gave as its principal reason for opposing the amendment the belief that it would legalize the manufacture and sale of liquor unrestricted by law.

The organization of the liquor men was undoubtedly effective but that of the temperance people was still more so. Aside from the political party organizations the temperance union was probably as good a fighting machine as there has ever been in the state. It is true that money, the vital equipage of war, was on the other side. The Protective Union received and used large sums of money, although apparently not in a very systematic way. On the other hand, the funds for prosecuting the campaign for the amendment aggregated less than \$2,500. But what the temperance enthusiasts lacked in finances they made up in moral courage and perseverance. The state was thoroughly canvassed and prohibition literature widely distributed. The clergymen were practically unanimous for the amendment. Among religious bodies declaring heartily for the amendment were the state conferences of the Methodist,

Baptist, Congregational, Universalist and Presbyterian churches. The State Teachers Association pledged its influence to secure the adoption of the measure. The Kansas Agriculturalist, organ of the farmers, emphatically declared in favor of it. The Topeka Capital, edited by Major J. K. Hudson, was early in its advocacy of the amendment and proved a great source of strength to the prohibitionists. Although there were several important newspapers fighting prohibition, the amendment received far more extensive support from the state press than its opponents did. The state was divided into districts and speakers assigned to the different sections. The two most conspicuous local speakers were probably Mrs. Drusilla Wilson, of Lawrence, and Miss Amanda M. Way, both of whom were of the Quaker faith. The most prominent out-of-state speaker was E. B. Reynolds, who had already been working in the state for two years. These workers formed large numbers of prohibition clubs, the members of which belonged to various political parties. Prohibition became a popular topic of discussion, temperance sentiment grew rapidly, and when the spring elections were held the anti-prohibitionists were alarmed to find that the temperance forces had carried not only most of the smaller towns, which were conceded to them, but had also gained great strength in many cities which had been considered liquor strongholds.

Under these circumstances it was discouraging for the State Temperance Union to have to practically suspend its campaign for lack of funds. The scheme for raising money by means of pledges, the signers of which promised to pay a small

specified sum each month, had failed. The Union was in debt and unable to pay even the moderate salaries promised to speakers. Consequently many of the lecturers were withdrawn.

Several workers, such as Mrs. Wilson, Miss Way and St. John continued their work without pay. St. John was proud of the fact that he had never yet received pay or expense money for any addresses outside of those connected with his profession, and he made it a rule that his lectures should be free to the public. In a letter written in August, 1880, he said, "Never in my life have I . . . received a single dollar for work done by me for the temperance cause, and God helping me, I never will until Kansas has been made forever free."(3)

St. John had delivered several temperance speeches after he became governor and before the amendment was submitted but his activity greatly increased after the resolution for submission had passed. He devoted every moment he could possibly spare from his official duties to the temperance work. Considering the amount of work he did at his office and the fact that he was also having to deal with such difficult problems as the exodus, the protection of the border and the care of the destitute on the frontier, the number of speeches which he delivered during the twenty-month campaign for the amendment and which totaled between one and two hundred was surprising. During the last seven or eight months before the election he was over almost all of the state. His customary procedure was to work in his office from early Monday morning until Saturday afternoon. He then took the train, delivered

speeches of from one to two hours in length somewhere in the state Saturday night and Sunday afternoon and sometimes Sunday night and returned to Topeka in time to go to work on Monday morning. The train journey often consumed a good part of Saturday and Sunday nights. Frequently he was in his office as early as six o'clock in the morning and he seldom took a vacation. "While it is stated by some," he said in a letter which was not intended for publication, "that I am working in the cause of temperance, to the neglect of my official duties, I desire to call your attention to the fact that since my inauguration . . . I have spent more hours at hard work in my office . . . than any other governor that the State has ever had."(4) The executive copy books, which contain duplicates of letters written by the governors, indicate that this statement was true. The governors who held office during the ten years preceding St. John's administration filled only twelve copy books of average size, and George W. Glick during his two years in the executive chair, 1883-1885, used nine such books, but St. John, the untiring, wrote enough letters during his four years as governor to fill thirty-four of these volumes.

The strain which he imposed upon himself was too much for even his iron constitution, and after an illness of several days in May he was forced to curtail his activities somewhat, at least to the extent of refusing to speak twice in the same day. During the last months before election he was nearly worn out and had to take a few days' rest following the republican state convention. He was a tremendously

popular speaker and in spite of the great number of speeches which he delivered the pressure of official work forced him to decline several times as many invitations to speak as he accepted. Numerous requests for lectures came from other states, but he considered the issue at stake in Kansas too vital to justify him in leaving the state until after the election. If he had had an independent income, he said, he would have resigned and devoted the rest of his life to the overthrow of the rum power in the state and nation.(5)

In advocating the amendment St. John spoke in almost every county in the state and in some places more than once. He not only lectured in all the large cities and towns but frequently in country districts. He appeared as a speaker before church and sunday school conferences, local temperance rallies and picnics, and W.C.T.U. meetings, and was the principal attraction at the district temperance conventions held at such places as Cawker City, Merriam Park, LaCygne, Winfield, and Independence, and at the third National Temperance Camp Meeting at Bismarck Grove. All this served to enhance his popularity with the people. Religious and temperance organizations all over Kansas adopted resolutions commanding his fidelity to the temperance cause and his open stand that enabled all to know where he stood. Reports of his speeches frequently recorded that he "drew the largest audience ever assembled in the town" and that hundreds were unable to gain admission.

The fact that many had heard him speak on the subject before did not decrease the size of his audiences, partly,

perhaps, because his method of treating the matter varied somewhat. He referred to the fact that Kansas had 2,000 saloons, 30 wholesale liquor dealers and 36 breweries, repeated his argument that a large percentage of crime was attributable to liquor and gave statistics to show that the revenue from the liquor traffic did not nearly equal this increased cost of crime. Aside from the revenue derived from the sale of liquor, he said, there was not an argument left in favor of the whiskey men. He showed that prohibitory laws were successfully enforced where given a fair trial and that objections to the amendment originated with and in the interest of the votaries of whiskey and were mere cant for the purpose of making votes. He ridiculed the People's Grand Protective Union and its fear that the amendment would increase the sale of liquor, and said that all opposition to the measure came from a "temperance" standpoint because no one dared to argue against it from a whiskey standpoint. Liquor, he thought, served no good purpose aside from its medical, scientific and mechanical purposes. He quoted many statutes--such as that prohibiting the destruction of certain kinds of game--to prove that our liberties are often restricted by law. "If the law can protect even the dumb beasts, is it not about time that we pass a law for the protection of our boys?" he asked. "We are prohibited from becoming paupers," he continued, "and yet we license the shop that makes paupers, and punish the poor victim. A man is punished for not providing for his family, yet we license a saloon to take away the means of support. We are prohibited from selling

liquor to an Indian. I never could see why a white man, if he behaved himself, was not just as good as an Indian."

Again he said: "We believe that drinking intoxicating liquors as a beverage is either right or it is wrong. If it is right, it is wrong to demand a license for selling it. If it is wrong, then no man should be licensed to sell it."(6) He described the evil effects flowing from the sale of liquor, showed that prohibition and not regulation was the policy of the government in dealing with other evils such as murder and theft and that when the government received a revenue from licensing the sale of intoxicating drinks it became a party to the commission of wrong. "God says, thou shalt not steal, but he does not end by saying unless you petition the city council for a license," was one of his favorite expressions. Another was, "The evil must crush the government or the government must crush the evil." He was fond of drawing comparisons between the anti-slavery and the anti-liquor struggles, and he never forgot that God was on his side. In regard to the criticisms on his course he said he had done that which his conscience approved. "Four or five months ago when the amendment was first discussed by our people," he said, "I was told that I had better let the discussion alone, if I did not I would dig my own grave. I said, let the digging begin now. If such is necessary, let the banner of prohibition be wrapped around me."(7)

The third National Temperance Camp Meeting was held at Bismarck Grove, August 20-30, 1880, but was not as successful as the convention of the preceding year. The most important

program of the meeting was that held on Sunday, August 29, just before the republican convention, when ex-Governor Charles Robinson, who had been writing and speaking against the amendment, met John B. Finch, of Nebraska, in joint debate. All available space was occupied by a crowd eager to hear the discussion. Robinson replied to statements made about him by St. John in a recent address at Bismarck and asserted that during the campaign of 1878 St. John had paid for the drinks of a number of persons in a saloon and had courted the favor of the liquor men. After the debate St. John had a few minutes for rebuttal, and the meeting then with but five dissenting votes adopted resolutions declaring its strengthened faith in the prohibitory amendment and its "implicit confidence in the personal and official integrity and consistency of St. John."(8)

As the fight over the amendment progressed St. John became more and more the target for the criticism of the anti-prohibitionists. It was called improper for the chief executive to work for a partisan measure and especially to speak for it on Sundays, and he was said to be attempting to ride into office on the back of the prohibitory amendment. The importation of temperance speakers from other states and the appeals for funds in the East by the prohibition forces were frowned upon, and it was alleged that St. John had suborned a portion of the press to secure his own ends. Robinson ridiculed him as the "haranguer of ministers, old ladies and small children," and the Liberal Advocate referred to him in succinct terms as "an ass," "a putrid political corpse,"

and an "Idiot boy" who would have made an excellent farm hand. "St. John has no ideas," wrote the editor of the Advocate. "It is not his fault. Nature never intended him for the receptacle of such articles. In all other qualities that go to make a polished statesman he is sadly wanting. In personal appearance he is excelled by many cow-boys . . . and in manners and genteel polish he finds his peer in any man in the common walks of life."(9)

St. John's apologists repeated that the whole reason for the objections to the governor was his opposition to the rum power and dubbed his enemies "whiskey soaks." They said that he "might travel from Dan to Beersheba and lecture every night, and no fault would be found with him if he kept his mouth shut on the liquor question." His Sunday temperance meetings were considered legitimate because they were not political in nature. He had a right to his opinion since he did not try to make prohibition a party question and kept his temperance work and political canvass separate. The widely-quoted charge that he had withheld an appointment to determine if the appointee would vote for the amendment was indignantly refuted. To the fear that the republican party would have to shoulder St. John's temperance principles, his supporters retorted that there had been no alarm lest the party should be held responsible for the conduct of the republican governor of Kansas who had been carried home drunk from the beer-garden nearly every Sunday evening. (The reference was to Governor Osborn.)

St. John had opportunity during the campaign to clearly

define his position on temperance and he did so with refreshing straight-forwardness. He "never intended to occupy an uncertain position upon any question," and he would give no one reason to call him a "moral or political coward."(10) "It is not a question as to whether a matter is popular or not," he declared, "but the main question is whether it is right. If it is right, there is only one position for me to take and that is to be for it."(11) In regard to the temperance issue he stated that he did not use intoxicating liquor or permit it to be brought into his house and declared his personal opinion that it should not be taken into the human system for any purpose. He did not think that the amendment would interfere with the Lord's Supper but held that intoxicating wine was no better in the church than in the saloon.(12) In a reply to a request for advice he wrote in August, 1880:

"In my judgment, it would not be advisable to purchase the influence of any individuals or newspapers . . . If we want the work to prosper, we must have support for the measure prompted by the dictates of conscience, fresh and pure from the heart, and not by purely mercenary motives. The 'People's Grand Protective Union' of this State is using money to subsidize the press as well as individuals. This we have criticized . . . and . . . we should not subject the friends of the good cause to the same criticisms we bestow upon our enemies."(13)

All this was written in connection with the question of state prohibition, but in a letter just after the election in November to Neal Dow, candidate of the prohibition party for president in 1880, he expressed himself in favor of a national prohibitory amendment.(14) The campaign for the amendment in Kansas had resulted in the clarification of his own ideas on the subject of temperance, and his unreserved commitment

to the policy of prohibition.

The amendment had been placed before the people by the votes of the members of all political parties represented in the legislature of 1879, and earnest attempts were made by St. John and other temperance workers to keep it a non-partisan issue. St. John in his speeches and in his letters favored the entire separation of the temperance question from politics and doubted whether it would be best to have the endorsement of any party unless the endorsement of all parties could be secured. He wanted every man to be able to vote for the amendment without feeling that he was arraying himself against the party of his choice, and he accused the saloon element of attempting to force the amendment into politics with the purpose of dividing its supporters. In this connection he stated that he had always opposed a political temperance organization and that he felt an independent temperance ticket would be suicidal to the cause in this election.(15) This was the natural attitude of a stalwart republican like St. John who, although he had supported Grant for a third term in 1880, was an active worker for Garfield after the latter received the republican nomination for president.

There was some truth in St. John's accusation that the saloon men wanted prohibition to become a political question. There were, of course, anti-prohibition republicans, democrats and greenbackers who wished their parties to take no action on the temperance question, but the Liberal Advocate, which was the direct representative of the liquor element,

was vehement in its declaration that keeping the issue out of the party conventions was a mere scheme on the part of some politicians to avoid a troublesome matter. The temperance people were not altogether blameless, and resolutions passed by certain prohibition clubs to support candidates pledged to work for the amendment irrespective of party incited retaliative action from the anti-temperance men.

The fact that prohibition unavoidably became the outstanding issue in the contest for the republican nomination for governor was also due partly to St. John's attitude. He insisted, of course, that his temperance work was not intended for any political purpose and that the adoption of the amendment was with him more important than all personal considerations. Nevertheless, his position did have an effect on the political situation. For one thing, the fact that the campaign for the amendment was in full swing and he was the leader of it was a principal cause for the early opening of the gubernatorial contest. Several months before his first year as governor was over the papers were agitating the question of his successor. For another thing, St. John and the amendment meant almost the same thing in the minds of many people, and the fight for or against the amendment was developing into a fight for or against St. John. Again, the position of the other candidates on the prohibition question was early ascertained and urged as a point for or against them. Several of them were non-committal and the feeling of those favoring the amendment could scarcely be called more than

mild. The Manhattan Nationalist, one of the temperance papers of the state, considered several other candidates "just as good temperance men as St. John" and insinuated that the governor, seeing from the beginning that the amendment would be adopted by an overwhelming majority, had also seen that identification with so popular a cause would better him politically.(16) Other papers said that temperance had done as much for St. John as he had for it. It was generally admitted that St. John's strength over the other candidates was due to his strong stand on the temperance question. The number of candidates in the field was unusually large and this was supposed by some to be a scheme of the whiskey ring to defeat St. John. Knowing that no candidate nominated by the ring "on an anti-prohibition issue could succeed, the Temperance Banner said, the liquor men had adopted the policy of bringing out a number of local candidates who would carry their respective counties and be able to defeat St. John by combining in the convention.(17) The weakness of the opponents of St. John lay in their inability to so combine, and without a combination against him he was almost sure to win.

The overshadowing importance of the temperance question in the republican gubernatorial contest was demonstrated in the newspapers which seldom discussed the two topics separately. Not all papers favoring the amendment were for St. John, but none that opposed it seem to have advocated his candidacy. There were several important daily papers such as the Topeka Commonwealth and John Martin's Atchison Champion working against him, but others equally important,

such as the Topeka Capital and the Lawrence Journal, were supporting him, and he had the larger part of the weekly press on his side. In his home town he received hearty support from the Western Progress and less enthusiastic approval from the Mirror. Aside from the Liberal Advocate and the State Journal, the Freie Presse was the most bitter opponent of the governor. With the Swedes of Kansas St. John was fairly popular and was given the support of the leading Swedish newspaper, the Svenska Harolden, published at Salina, but, if we may believe the Freie Presse, the Germans of the state regarded him as accursed and 25,000 of them were likely to bolt the republican ticket if "Sanct Johannes" headed it. The basis of the antagonism to the "big zero," St. John, was frankly stated: "St. John and the amendment go hand in hand and the nomination of the one signifies the adoption of the other."(18) The warning of the German paper that his nomination might defeat the party in Kansas was echoed by the Kansas Chief when it said such action "would drive out thousands of life-long republicans, while not bringing a single new recruit."(19) It would be as impossible for the republican party to nominate St. John without shouldering his prohibition hobby, the Chief thought, as it would be to nominate a lunatic and ignore his lunacy.

The intemperate nature of the attacks on St. John, the misrepresentation and abuse of him, and the tactless statements made frequently by members of the People's Grand Protective Union that this organization would spend whatever was necessary and make any division possible in the

convention to bring about his defeat were certain to operate to his advantage. The conviction was driven home to the anti-liquor forces that regardless of how good a temperance man was offered in the place of St. John, the defeat of the latter would be heralded over the country as a victory of the opponents of the amendment and would weaken and dishearten those struggling for the success of prohibition. Many prohibitionists felt that while the success of the amendment was not dependent upon St. John's success the bitter opposition of the whiskey men to him forced them to rally to his support. "Temperance men and temperance papers want St. John," said the editor of the Golden Gate, an anti-liquor paper, "because whiskey men and whiskey papers want anybody else."(20) Also, the Palladium reasoned, if the nomination of St. John would commit the party to prohibition, his defeat on this ground would equally commit the party to the other side.(21) The net result of the fight of the Protective Union against St. John was to crystallize temperance sentiment in his favor.

Among the minor arguments used against St. John was one, made without sufficient proof, that money sent to aid the temperance cause and the destitute on the frontier had been used by him to buy up delegates. The record of "Moses" St. John on the exodus question also came in for considerable discussion. Antagonistic papers thought his services to the party did not entitle him to a second term, especially since he had helped to defeat Anthony for a renomination. He was not an "able" man, said the Atchison

Champion, and added with malicious satisfaction: "His hat does not, so to speak, cover the brains of the State, and if he should die tomorrow, moral darkness would not settle down over Kansas like a pall."(22) The Champion also remarked that if St. John were temperate respecting what he put into his mouth he was decidedly intemperate regarding what he took out of it.(23) Occasionally a spirit of sarcastic levity produced such a burst of versification as the following:

JOHN PETERED ST. JOHN

There was an apostle St. John,
Of doubtful apostolic mein;
With swagger and rant and intolerant cant
His demeanor wasn't fit to be seen.

He vaulted astride of hobbies to ride,
Which he urged with unmerciful lash,
But the crowd only laughed at his frantic appeals
And gaily discussed his moustache.

He invited the crowd his hobbies to ride
And urged the last one to hop on,
But they quickly declined, and preferred to hop on
This equestrian apostle John Petered St. John.

On the other hand, St. John's friends celebrated the fact that his enemies were unable to find a single substantial cause for attacking his administration or his honor as a man and claimed that his record as governor being good, party usage entitled him to another term. Old arguments, such as his merit as a speaker and his ability to take care of himself whatever the exigencies of the campaign, were again arrayed in his favor.

In addition to the liquor men a small coterie of politicians had taken a stand against St. John, for they

feared that another term as governor might result in his elevation to the United States senate or possibly to the vice-presidential chair. Many of them were temperance men and others of them might have been had they not felt it necessary to take a position antagonistic to St. John's. In August a meeting of several of the candidates for governor was held for the purpose of combining against him, but nothing seems to have come of it.(24) The people were cautioned by St. John's supporters not to let the wire-pullers control the nominating convention, for the tricksters, while in a minority, were successful politicians and as such were hard to beat. "I have no doubt," St. John wrote, "but what the people are with me, but their will is often defeated through wire-pulling of unscrupulous politicians."(25)

Senator Ingalls was one of those working against St. John and the attacks on the governor made early in the campaign by certain papers were laid at his door. Just before the state republican convention a report emanating from the Kansas City Times alleged that a combination had been made between Ingalls and St. John according to which Ingalls was to support St. John for United States senator in place of the present incumbent, Preston B. Plumb. Both Ingalls and St. John stated that there was no truth in this report.(26) It was considered an attempt to incite animosity on the part of Plumb and his friends against St. John, who had always been Plumb's friend and had helped him to secure the senator-

ship.

St. John maintained that he had kept himself clear of all combinations in connection with the coming republican nomination. "I am not now," he said, "nor have I ever been, a politician in the sense of wire-pulling and packing primaries. Whatever is done for me by my friends I desire to have done openly."(27)

The spiteful animosity of ex-Governor Anthony was another factor against which St. John had to contend. The reason for Anthony's enmity was supposed to have been St. John's violation of pledges made to the ex-governor and his friends in 1876 and 1878. St. John protested that no pledges had ever been made and said with righteous indignation: "When elected, while I felt kindly towards Gov. Anthony, and treated his friends certainly with every consideration and respect, yet I thought then, and still think, that it was my duty to conduct my administration in the interest of the entire people."(28)

August 18, on the eve of the primaries, Anthony wrote a letter to the Topeka Capital in which he said that after the republican convention in 1878 St. John had come to Leavenworth and had compromised himself with the whiskey dealers of that place in a public speech and in private conversation. According to this letter, St. John had said that he was not in favor of extreme temperance laws and believed the present laws as stringent as could be enforced. (29) These charges were widely copied and were thought by some to explain the fact that St. John's message had favored

license and not prohibition. St. John made no public reply but he wrote several private letters in which he branded Anthony's statements as false. The fact that Anthony had taken the stump in St. John's behalf following the Leavenworth speech was considered somewhat against the story, which, if true, would under these circumstances have villified Anthony as much as St. John. One advantage derived by St. John from the controversy was the support of the Leavenworth Times, which neutral before, sprang to his defense as soon as he was attacked by Anthony. It will be remembered that the Times was edited by D.R. Anthony, who usually differed with his cousin, George T. Anthony, on public questions.

Shortly before the republican convention met St. John wrote to the superintendent of the Missouri Pacific railway: "Could you consistently grant me any favors in the way of blank passes, over lines under your control in this State, in connection with the approaching State Convention to be held here at Topeka, September first? If so, I would greatly appreciate the favor."(30) What other railroad companies may have received requests for passes from him is not known, but he was given a number of tickets and used them for the transportation of his delegates to the convention, as several letters in the executive copy books indicate.(31) He also asked for passes for temperance workers from the railroads. Fortunately for him, railroad regulation did not become an important issue in the campaign.

St. John did little in the way of speaking to directly

advance his candidacy for the nomination. He was content to let the record of his administration and his work for the temperance cause stand as his chief recommendation, and to leave his candidacy largely in the hands of his friends. As the campaign progressed he became more and more certain of his renomination, yet he kept a close watch on the liquor element, which he considered his main enemy, lest it should take undue advantage. By May he felt sure that he would receive the nomination on the first ballot and in June he wrote that the Protective Union had about abandoned the attempt to defeat him. He guarded his public conduct carefully to avoid any charge of wire-pulling, and even refused to place his name to a call for temperance mass conventions in July for fear he should be subjected to the charge of trying to make political capital out of them.

St. John's estimate of his strength was accurate. County after county elected delegates to the convention instructed to vote for him. He even secured five out of nine delegates from Leavenworth county, where the Protective Union was said to have spent money freely against him, and in another instance he won the delegation from a county over a popular local candidate. Support of the "governor with the moustache" seemed to be a craze among the people. No candidate for governor of Kansas had ever had as many instructed delegates as St. John, it was said, and he had over 190 out of a total of about 325. By the time the republican convention met at Topeka on September 1, it was conceded on all hands that St. John would be nominated on the first ballot, although

the opposition was so bitter that his nomination by acclamation was not expected. The organization of his opponents was demoralized, but his own forces were well in hand. As fast as delegates arrived at Topeka they were watched by committees from his headquarters and those favorable to him were taken in hand. Both sides engaged in the liveliest caucusing, but at the final meeting of the anti-St. John delegates on the morning of September 1 it was apparent that their case was hopeless.

The day of the convention was one of the hottest of the entire summer, and the crowd that packed the hall of the House of Representatives was exceedingly uncomfortable. The outsiders fairly took possession of the place, making it difficult for many delegates to secure seats and contributing to the confusion. In spite of the discomfort and the bitter contest over St. John the greatest good humor prevailed. Most of the day was spent in completing the organization, which the St. John forces dictated by a two to one majority. The evening session was described by the Atchison Champion in these words: "At 7:30 p.m. the enthusiasm and perspiration reassembled in the State Turkish bath house. Every inch of space, to the last spittoon, was occupied by a sticky and dissolving patriot, and thousands kept pressing to the door after not another person could have been driven in with a maul and wedge."(52) Then came the foreordained nomination of St. John. On the first and only ballot he received 220 votes to 102 for his nine opponents. The candidate standing in second place received only 40 votes or less than one-fifth of the total number

given to St. John.(33) After the nomination was made the state house rang with cheers for fully twenty minutes. Some one moved to make the nomination unanimous, but cries of "No! No!" came so fast that the motion was withdrawn. When quiet was restored St. John was escorted to the platform and made a brief speech in which he called his nomination a victory of the people and made overtures to his opponents for their cooperation with the party.(34) The speech was the occasion for another outburst of applause and the governor's moustache was said to have borne itself "proudly aloft as it heard the plaudits of the crowd."

On the following day the nominations were completed, all but three of the candidates of 1878 being renominated. Colonel C.R. Jennison offered a resolution declaring the nomination of St. John to be due especially to his rigorous opposition to the traffic in intoxicating drinks and pledging him an enthusiastic support because of this fact. The resolution was referred to a committee which was to report at the republican state convention two years later.

The convention likewise refused to commit itself to any stand on temperance in the platform which it adopted without amendment or discussion. The same attitude was assumed by the Greenback-Labor party at its state convention on July 28 and by the state democratic party when it met on August 26. In the latter meeting a resolution declaring the party to be opposed to all sumptuary legislation was offered and tabled.(35)

Some of the delegates to the republican convention were

dissatisfied with the nominations made and held an independent convention at Topeka immediately afterwards. Dr. F.M. Stringfield, their candidate for governor, with H.P. Vrooman, the greenback candidate, and former United States Senator Edmund G. Ross, the democratic nominee, made a total of three men in the field against St. John. Vrooman was a prohibitionist and Ross a decided anti-prohibitionist, and Stringfield's declared purpose was to defeat St. John.

The nomination of St. John had been fairly obtained and it was therefore comparatively easy for his republican enemies to submit to the decision of the majority. Most of them did so submit and several newspapers that had been fighting him now gave him cordial support. The fact that the cold water in his policy was plentifully mixed with "sand" made him more acceptable than he would otherwise have been. His triumph was generally considered the vindication of the principle of temperance and an index to the dominant sentiment of the party.

While the republican canvass in general was not well-organized, St. John's campaign was as vigorous and extensive as ever. Several of his speeches made in September dealt only with temperance, but the state central committee kept him busy during most of October with political addresses. When he did not talk prohibition, he proclaimed the crimes of the democratic party, or discussed the sophistries of greenbackism or the grand principles of the republican party. One of his favorite stories was that about the hunter who

crept into a hollow log to avoid a rain storm. When he tried to creep out he found himself imprisoned in the swollen log. In his hasty review of his life's sins the hunter remembered that he had once scratched his ticket and voted for a democrat and immediately felt so small that he wiggled out without difficulty.

A campaign rally in those days was a brilliant affair and the following is a description of one of the more enthusiastic, such as St. John frequently participated in:

"Early in the evening Kansas avenue began to assume a... brilliant aspect...Chinese lanterns were strung in front of the stores, windows were dazzling with rows of lighted candles, flags were thrown out, and in other ways of decoration the merchants evinced a desire to make it a gala night..."

"The night had scarcely thrown its mantle upon the city when the flambeaux with their torches that gave a powerful light appeared upon the scene. The companies that were in line of march carried over 200 of these brilliant cressets... Added to this was a grand pyrotechnic display which was kept up during all the movement of the procession...The numerous transparencies each bore some motto that was dear to the republican heart."

The fireworks set off at the rally just described cost
\$329.(35)

During the campaign a scheme, supposedly originating with the liquor interests, for the withdrawal of Ross and Vrooman and the substitution of ex-Governor Robinson as a fusion candidate began to be urged. The republicans were somewhat frightened and accused Robinson of having taken his stand against the amendment with the purpose of running as a liquor candidate. It was claimed by those working in the interest of Robinson that the democrats, greenbackers and anti-prohibition republicans were numerous enough to elect him, but the scheme received little encouragement and

was soon abandoned.

The victory of St. John at the republican convention gave the campaign for the amendment a new impetus. The State Temperance Union met on September 16, re-elected St. John president, and laid plans for the fight during the days remaining before election. The cause was aided by Miss Frances E. Willard, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, George W. Bain and John B. Finch, who stayed in the state following the closing of the Bismarck meeting and made many effective speeches.

So true it was that the fight against the amendment was a fight against St. John that the anti-temperance campaign practically came to an end with his nomination. The Kansas State Journal ceased to berate him and the amendment through its columns and the People's Grand Protective Union turned its attention more to the election of members of the legislature which would be called upon to pass laws enforcing prohibition, if adopted.

The Freie Presse, however, never ceased to hate and work against St. John. An editorial in its issue of October 27 read in part as follows: "It remains only for the republican opponents of St. John to strike his name from the ticket on election day in order to have at least the satisfaction of seeing him elected with a much smaller majority than the other candidates on the ticket. Each vote against him on next Tuesday will be a protest against fanaticism and party coercion and will help to lead the party back on the right path."(37)

Fear of an organized bolt induced even those republicans

having a strong personal feeling against St. John to come to his support. Voters were told that defeating St. John would not defeat the amendment and were urged not to let minor considerations or the temporary ascendancy of one man endanger the result of the presidential and congressional elections. It was no time for bolters and independents, according to republican papers, which, just before election, contained many exhortations to vote the straight ticket.

Predictions made by the friends of the amendment as to the majority it would receive varied between 30,000 and 50,000. This was also the estimate made by St. John, who thought that he would have a majority of about 35,000 and a plurality of about 50,000 and would receive about 6,000 less votes than Garfield. He was expected to draw the temperance vote of the democratic party.

On November 2 the general election closed one of the longest and hardest-fought campaigns in Kansas political history. The prohibitory amendment carried by a majority of 7,998, but the other two amendments submitted by the legislature were overwhelmingly defeated. St. John's majority amounted to 31,468 and his plurality to 51,647. He received 6,325 fewer votes than the average given to the Garfield presidential electors.(38)

Whether or not the prohibitory amendment would have been adopted without St. John's support cannot be determined. It has ordinarily been said that constitutional prohibition in Kansas was due more to his influence than to that of any other person, and St. John himself was not averse to

accepting the cred. . But it must not be forgotten that in addition to the expert aid rendered during the campaign by temperance workers of national repute, the time and energy of many local advocates of the amendment were given unsparingly to the cause. St. John's pre-eminence arose from the fact that as governor of Kansas he wielded greater influence than other workers. Without the governorship he would have been one of the leaders in Kansas; with it he was the leader, and other temperance men and women were willing to have it so. He must be given full credit for the services he rendered and for daring to use fully the prestige and influence given to him by his office in the interest of temperance. He risked political annihilation for the sake of his principles. Herein lies his significance.

CHAPTER VI

SECOND TERM: BEGINNINGS OF ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION.

When he entered on his second term as governor of Kansas St. John was forty-eight years old. He is described at the time as slightly above medium height and as well-proportioned and vigorous physically,-- a man of imposing presence, cordial yet firm in his manner. His photographs show him to have had deep-set, piercing eyes, dark hair, a somewhat swarthy complexion, a high, broad forehead, and a rather thin face festooned with a carefully-kept moustache of several inches in length drooping over each corner of his mouth. He was striking in appearance but he was not handsome; and in order to establish his social attractiveness his friends fell back on the smile that lit up his "clear, blue eyes," "the warm recognition" that was "embodied in the hearty handshake and in the agreeably-toned voice," and on the fact that as "Governor" he was the same kind and courteous St. John that he had been as "Colonel."

St. John's second administration began on January 11, 1881, and on the same day the legislature convened in a session which lasted until March 5. The law-making body of Kansas was again composed almost entirely of republicans. Three days after the opening of the session St. John asked for a joint meeting of the senate and house for the purpose

of delivering his biennial message in person. The senate refused and while the house was still wrangling over the matter the governor withdrew the request and sent a copy of the message to both bodies. The courtesy of the legislature in declining to hear the message in joint session was largely but not entirely based on personal spite felt toward St. John. A good many senators and representatives objected to the establishment of the permanent custom of reading the message to the legislature. Many Kansans, however, considered that an unnecessary insult had been given to the governor, and the opposition papers derived much merriment from the snub which he had received "in the house of his friends."

The gubernatorial message was of the same general character as that of 1879, and it was widely praised by the state press for its brevity and for its factual and concise nature. It was called the most business-like state paper any Kansas governor had produced in years and one which might well be a model for governors everywhere. After a recital of facts showing the extraordinary growth of Kansas in population and in wealth during the preceding decade, the message briefly reviewed the financial condition of the state. Among other things the governor recommended the erection of additional buildings at the state insane asylums, an increased appropriation for the deaf and dumb asylum at Olathe, the execution of a thorough geological survey of the state, the establishment of a state land department under a commissioner to handle all business

relating to state lands, and the appraisement of all public lands by a commission created for that purpose. He also pointed out that as yet Kansas had made no provision for the one hundred and thirty-four feeble-minded persons which the census of 1880 showed to be resident in the state and recommended the establishment of a school for their education.

Many of St. John's recommendations were not carried out. In fact, few laws of a general nature were passed by the legislature largely because the debate on the temperance bill consumed so much of the session but partly because too much time was spent on local legislation. The appropriation bills received no small share of discussion and the large sum of approximately one and a half millions which was appropriated led to the charge of extravagance. The bitterness against St. John which had been demonstrated at the opening of the session found expression again in the debate on the bill creating St. John county. A whole afternoon was consumed by the house in a tedious quarrel over the naming of the county, but in the end the bill passed both branches of the legislature and became law. The only veto by St. John recorded in the senate and house journals for 1879 and 1881 was that of the bill ceding jurisdiction to the United States government over the territory of the Fort Dodge military reservation. In stating his reasons for the veto St. John said that if this bill should become law "it would establish a nursery for crime and criminals on the Fort Dodge military reservation, without any power on the part of the State to inflict punishment for offenses

committed thereon. Kansas...should never surrender the right to punish offenders, it matters not where the crime may be committed within her borders."(1)

There were three strong influences at work in the legislature of 1881: first and most important was the temperance question; next in power, although less openly proclaimed, was the matter of railroad regulation; and last, and affecting only the senate, was the race for the United States senatorship, which position would be filled at the meeting of the senate in 1883.

On the subject of the senatorship St. John naturally made no statement in his message, but his influences were thought to be quietly at work. On the transportation question he was likewise silent, as a bid, some said, for the support of the railway companies in his candidacy for the senatorship in 1883. He did not seem to consider the railroad issue as being of any unusual importance in the eyes of the people or to give it any serious thought, although in the campaign of 1882 when it was of especial significance he maintained that he had endeavored earnestly to secure the passage of the railway commissioner bill. It is probable that in his enthusiasm over the passage of the prohibitory amendment he lost a sense of the relative significance of the transportation question, which was then being agitated throughout the country, although temporarily forgotten in Kansas. His omission of any suggestion as to railway legislation was perhaps a factor in the failure of the law-making body to take any

action in the matter. Several petitions asking for stricter regulation of the common carriers were introduced in both houses, and a number of bills providing for such regulation were also brought forward, but none of them became law. Another factor in producing this result was the strong railway lobby which was working assiduously at Topeka and which was especially influential in preventing the enactment by the senate of the measures passed by the house. The railway commissioner bill, for instance, which St. John claimed to have championed, was killed in the upper branch of the legislature, after passing the lower, although very moderate in its provisions.

That the legislature of 1881 should adjourn without passing some bill upon the railway question is not surprising in view of the fact that it was not elected to deal with this subject. Regulation of the railways was not an issue in the campaign of 1880. It was overlooked in nearly every county of the state. Candidates for the senate and for the house of representatives made their canvasses on the prohibition question, which dwarfed all other issues. Having been selected on this basis, the law-makers of Kansas proceeded to do what they felt they were expected to do. They handled the temperance question thoroughly and efficiently.

St. John evinced the keenest concern over the law which was to be passed enforcing the prohibitory amendment and immediately after the election in November, 1880, was urging the temperance workers to form an organization with a view to securing the proper enactment. On December 17, 1880,

he wrote to J.W. Ady, of Newton, a member of the house of representatives:

"...It would be well for the members of the Legislature who are friends of the Amendment, to hold a caucus early in the session, and organize for effective work by selecting floor managers, committeemen, etc..."

"I have but little faith in the efficacy of imposing a fine as a penalty. My judgment is that one month's imprisonment would do more to deter men from violating law than any fine... There should be...provision made for inflicting severe punishment upon every ministerial officer whose duty under the law it is to make arrests, who fails in the performance of such duty, as well also of every county attorney or other officer, whose duty under the law is to prosecute, and who shall fail in the...performance of such duty. ...I would have the law plain, positive and stringent..."(2)

In referring to the prohibitory amendment in his message St. John repeated his usual arguments that no government should license an evil and that revenue derived from the license system did not nearly equal the expense which it imposed upon the people. "All the revenue ever received from such a source," he added, "will not compensate for a single tear of a heartbroken mother at the sight of her drunken son as he reels from the door of a licensed dram shop." The prohibitory amendment now being a part of the constitution, he said, it devolved upon the legislature to provide laws for its rigid enforcement.(3)

The liquor forces gathered their strength in a final desperate attempt to defeat the enforcement of prohibition, but the temperance lobbies were no less active in their efforts to secure legislation that would fully carry out the object of the amendment. The executive committee of the Kansas State Temperance Union held a meeting at Topeka on January 5 to take action looking to the passage of proper

temperance laws by the incoming legislature but decided to prepare no bill since several reliable temperance men in the house and in the senate were already engaged in the task. Representatives of the Kansas Legal Temperance Union, which had been organized after the election of 1880 for the purpose of securing a good prohibitory law and of aiding in its enforcement, were also at the capital. Numerous petitions were presented to both houses praying for a stringent temperance law while others besought leniency, the exemption of wine at the communion from the operation of the law, the compensation of liquor dealers for losses sustained through the adoption of prohibition, and even the resubmission of the amendment. Citizens of Atchison and Leavenworth, where large numbers of the state's 28,000 German population were congregated, were, of course, well represented on the anti-prohibition petitions.

In the senate two bills were introduced on January 10 looking to the execution of the prohibitory amendment and were referred to the standing committee on temperance, of which S.O. Thacher, of Lawrence, was a conspicuous member. This committee carefully considered the bills, as well as suggestions from every source, but finally, after long hours of labor, completed the draft of a substitute bill and reported it to the senate eleven days later. After a debate of some length this bill, with a few amendments, passed the senate on February 11 by a vote of 32 to 7, (4) although many members voted for it under protest that it was not what they wanted.

In the house of representatives a number of temperance bills had also been offered, among them one by Representative Ady, who had consulted with St. John and other temperance leaders and secured their approval of his measure. The house spent several days in discussion of the temperance bill which had been substituted for Ady's and the various other prohibitory measures but on February 12 dropped it and turned to the consideration of the senate bill which had just been received. Several amendments were offered, many of them in the direction of making the measure from the upper house less severe. Those having the bill in management in the house, however, claimed that all legislation in the interest of prohibition must be confined to this one proposition which must be passed in its entirety and that if it were amended in any way the probabilities were that the senate would not concur and that there would be no temperance enactment whatever during the session. Rather than risk securing no law at all, many members voted for the bill in spite of what they considered its imperfections. The bill passed on February 17 by a vote of 100 to 23, (5) largely, it was said, through pressure brought to bear by St. John. Two days later the governor signed the measure in the executive office in the presence of a number of ladies, several of whom had been prominent in the temperance movement in Kansas, and sent the pen which was used for the occasion to the state historical society for preservation as a souvenir.

Outstanding among the anti-prohibition forces in the

house was George W. Glick, of Atchison, who was said to have been elected by a combination of liquor dealers without regard to party.(6) He introduced a joint resolution proposing to submit to a vote of the people a constitutional amendment striking out the prohibitory amendment recently adopted,(7) and later brought forward a proposition providing for the compensation of the brewers and wine-growers of the state for losses suffered as a consequence of the adoption of prohibition.(8) He condemned "the malice and fanaticism" of the temperance men in several speeches, sought to lighten the punishments prescribed by the prohibitory bills, denounced the senate bill section by section and declared it to be unconstitutional.(9) When the latter measure passed the house he arose and said that it was the first instance on record where the Lord was voted down in a public assembly.(10) The next day he entered on the journal of the house a long and formal protest against the baggage of the act. (11) Much weight was added to the protest by the fact that in northeastern Kansas Glick was generally held in high esteem.

The prohibitory law was the result of several widely differing forces in the legislature: first, the radical temperance men who wanted an extreme act; second, the opponents of all sumptuary legislation who wanted no temperance law at all, but, if there had to be one, also wished it to be extreme, thinking that in this case it would force a reaction of public sentiment against it and would be difficult of enforcement; and third, those who were

in favor of a moderate law. The bill that became law seems to have been the effect of the work of the first element and to a small extent of that of the second. It was regarded as an extreme measure, although in many respects it was not as severe as Ady's bill which had received the approval of St. John. (12) A few days after the prohibitory bill had been signed by the governor, a measure providing for its amendment before it went into effect was introduced by S.O. Thacher in the senate. The amendment allowed the use of wine for sacramental purposes and lessened the restrictions imposed upon physicians and druggists and was considered a concession to the adverse sentiment of the people on the bill recently enacted. It carried in the senate but was indefinitely postponed in the house as St. John, who opposed it, had expected.

The liquor law was given great publicity throughout the state, being published in full in many papers and also in pamphlet form. In brief, the act provided that the selling of liquor in violation of law should be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$500 or imprisonment in the county jail for a period of not less than thirty nor more than ninety days, or both such fine and imprisonment in the discretion of the court; that permits for the selling of liquor should be issued by probate judges to druggists who were held under bond; that probate judges should likewise grant permits to manufacture liquor to applicants who were also held under bond; and that before

physicians could prescribe liquor as a medicine they must take oath not to violate the law. It was made the duty of the county attorney to prosecute all cases arising under the act. All places where any kind of intoxicating liquors were sold in violation of law were declared to be nuisances and officers were authorized to examine all suspected places and report to the county attorney. The chief responsibility for the execution of the act thus lay with the probate judges and with the county attorneys. Of the law St. John said: "I think it is as near perfect as it is possible to make a law at present."(13)

The license or local option act which was operative in Kansas prior to 1880 had been regarded as a fairly good law, although more or less openly violated in certain sections of the state. The fact that the prohibitory amendment did not receive a majority of the total number of votes cast at the election and that only 8,000 more ballots were for than against it showed that public sentiment was rather evenly divided and did not offer an unusually bright prospect for enforcement. The senate committee that framed the prohibitory law of 1881 stated that it believed there would be some trouble in the immediate enforcement of any temperance law, and the reception given to the act in some portions of the state indicated that the prediction was correct. In towns like Atchison and Leavenworth the commercial population very generally greeted it with expressions of disgust and threats

of removal from the state if it resulted in business depression. At Leavenworth many physicians declared that they would not take the oath prescribed and the Germans met to protest against its enforcement as wrong and ruinous. Similar meetings in other cities declared against the law. At the convention of the State Pharmaceutical Association at Topeka in April the president of that organization referred to the prohibitory law as "a calamity to the druggists as well as the people of Kansas,"(14) and the association unanimously recommended to the druggists of Kansas that no applications for permits to sell liquor be made except for test cases until the law had been interpreted by the courts. The attitude of some of the leading dailies of the state, like the Atchison Champion, which said that the law could not "be enforced in any city of the state," the Leavenworth Times, which declared that it would become "a dead letter" in all the large towns, and the Leavenworth Press, another daily, which held that paying no attention to the law was the right way to take it, and of a number of weekly papers formed a serious obstacle to enforcement. Fortunately for prohibition, most of the state press regarded the prohibitory law favorably and the opposition was fairly well localized in a few liquor strongholds. Moreover, not all public demonstration was against the law. For example, the state medical association and various church conferences adopted resolutions declaring for its enforcement.

Another handicap to enforcement was found in the legal questions that arose in connection with the constitutional amendment and with the law passed in pursuance thereof and that had to be settled in the courts. This not only required time but kept the people in doubt for months as to what the final result would be. The legality of the amendment and the time when it would take effect had been hotly debated by the press for the many months that temperance had been the one theme of newspaper discussion, and opinions of prominent citizens and of outstanding lawyers of the state were extensively copied. The wide variation in these opinions naturally contributed to the confusion existing in the public mind as to the exact status of prohibition. St. John was one of those whose views were frequently sought. He held that the amendment became effective immediately upon the official announcement of its adoption, that it abrogated that portion of the dram shop act authorizing the issuance of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage but left in force that portion providing penalties for selling without a license, and that licenses issued January 1, 1881, would be null and void.

On November 23 the prohibitory amendment was officially declared a part of the constitution of the state. The next month Judge W.P. Campbell of the district court at Wichita decided in a test case that all penalties for the illegal sale of liquor had been abrogated by the adoption

of prohibition. There were other district courts, however, which declared that the penalties of the dram shop act had not been annulled by the amendment. This uncertainty as to what laws were operative in regard to liquor selling continued until February 22, 1881, when the supreme court of the state in a test case held that the amendment had been legally adopted and was in force but that the punishments prescribed by the license law were also in effect.(15)

The same questions that had arisen in regard to the amendment recurred in respect to the enforcement act when it was passed. Expressions of the press on the latter measure gave especial attention to the effect it would have on the use of wine for sacramental purposes. Temperance newspapers sneered at the "painful anxiety" felt by the saloonists about the communion service and claimed that the church, many of the leading denominations of which had not used fermented wine in years, was not concerned over it. St. John gave it as his opinion that "the quicker the Christian people of this country abandon the policy of claiming protection of law in the use for any purpose of intoxicating wine which we by the same law would prohibit other people from using, the better it will be for Christianity."(16) He did not believe that the Christian people of Kansas were complaining that the law interfered with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper but thought that all the tears were being shed by the "friends of free whiskey."(17) To ridicule the extremes to which the opponents of prohibition would go he related the

following incident:

"In northern Kansas, just after the saloons were closed and the vocation of these men was gone, a number of them were seated on goods boxes, whittling to pass away time, when a deacon came along and one of them said to him: "What are you going to do about this prohibitory law?" Said he, "What about it?" "Why," replied the other, "this interferes with our having wine for sacramental purposes." "Why," said the deacon, "it don't interfere with our church; we haven't used fermented wine for ten years or more... We crush some raisins and we strain off the juice, and it makes a very excellent sacramental wine." "Well," said the saloon-keeper, as his face assumed twice its usual length and tears trickled down his cheeks, "deacon, you may deceive the average member of your church, you may deceive your minister, but you can't deceive our blessed Jesus Christ with raisin-water!"(18)

In spite of his contempt for those who opposed prohibition on the ground that it interfered with the sacrament, St. John nevertheless maintained that it did not so interfere and that reports to the contrary were lies instigated and circulated by the whiskey ring to break the force of the prohibitory law in Kansas. "For," said he, "the advocates of free whiskey well know that when it has been...proved, which it will be, that prohibition in Kansas is a grand success, other states will follow our example, and eventually...prohibition will be a fundamental law of the United States."(19) W.A. Johnston, attorney-general declared officially on March 16, 1881, that there was nothing in the act to make the use of wine at the sacrament unlawful.

In the latter part of May, about a month after the enforcement act became operative, a test case was brought in the Leavenworth district court against S.H. Holmes, a druggist, by the State Pharmaceutical Association, and was decided by Judge Robert Crozier, who held that important

sections of the law were unconstitutional. The momentary hopes of the anti-prohibitionists were obliterated on June 21, however, when the state supreme court in the druggist test cases reversed Judge Crozier's decision, upheld every essential feature of the law, and gave a full interpretation of it.(20)

So effective was the fear instilled by the prohibitory amendment that immediately after its ratification at the election in November, 1880, liquor establishments all over the state began to close of their own accord. The movement was hastened by the action of city councils in certain "temperance" towns where heavy fines were imposed on those dealing in intoxicating liquors. Judge Campbell's verdict that there no penalties for violation of the provisions of the amendment temporarily halted the voluntary discontinuance of liquor businesses, many of them re-opening their doors, but the passage of the enforcement act and the supreme court decision in February gave fresh impetus to the movement for closing saloons. On March 25 St. John wrote: "The good effects of the policy of prohibition are already plainly visible in the closing of the saloons in most of the interior towns of the state; by the first of May we will probably not have an open saloon in the State of Kansas."(21) Liquor advertisements in papers like the Kansas State Journal gradually decreased in number during the months preceding the first of May, when the federal liquor licenses would expire and the prohibitory law become effective.

Notice had been served on the saloons to go and most of the twelve hundred then operaing in Kansas prepared to comply. Many sold their stock at reduced rates in order to close it out. On the last day on which saloons could legally do business, liquor sales were heavy, running up to about \$5,000 at Topeka. A large part of the whiskey, beer and wine which was sold was carried home in kegs, jugs and bottles and stored for future use. A good deal was drunk in the saloons, however, and in several places, notably in the state capital, the evening of May 1 eclipsed anything before seen there in the way of a reckless, drunken spree. The fact that the first of May fell on a Saturday, which was pay-day for many men, made the gait of the evening all the swifter. The streets were filled with a whooping crowd determined to make the most of the last few hours of the old, wide-open style of doing business. By some it was called "Drunkards' Night in Kansas." Nevertheless, there were some towns where there were no unusual cases of drunkenness and disturbance. Promptly at midnight the lights in the bar-rooms were put out and the places closed. In most places they did not re-open on Monday morning, the novelty of prohibition producing something of timidity and fear.

The anti-prohibition forces were not inactive for long. Chief among them were the Germans of the state who were very bitter against the policy of prohibition and who formed both local organizations and a state association to work for its repeal. A State Freeman's League was also organized

to defeat prohibition. Soon after the prohibitory law became effective, large public meetings took place in Leavenworth, Topeka and other cities to formulate plans of action against enforcement. The "Mass Meeting of Fair-Minded Men," which was held in Topeka in July, was of more than ordinary importance. Charles Robinson was the principal speaker and there was nothing temperate in his attacks on prohibition and on St. John whom he as usual branded as a liar. Colonel C.K. Holliday, an important figure in the state's early history, and others also spoke, after which the several hundred citizens who were present adopted resolution declaring that the policy of prohibition had been detrimental to the state, asking for the repeal of the iniquitous laws and heartily endorsing the action of the mayor and city council of Topeka in "their endeavor to save their constituency from ruin." (Saloons had just been licensed in Topeka in defiance of the law.) (22) Apparently the doctrine of nullification was beginning to take hold in Kansas.

The support of S.N. Wood, who, like Holliday, was of importance because of his connection with the early history of the state, and of Robinson was a source of constant encouragement to the anti-temperance men. In one of his letters to the press Robinson quoted Charles Sumner as saying with reference to the fugitive slave law: "'By the Supreme Law which commands me to do no injustice, by the Comprehensive Christian law of human brotherhood: by the constitution I am sworn to support. I AM BOUND TO

DISOBEY THIS ACT!" Robinson then added: "Here, Mr. Editor, are the words of men." He also referred to the disregard of the stamp act by the American colonies and said: "Now this was a law that interfered with no man's liberty or diet, and but slightly with his purse, and here is how men with blood in their veins instead of water treated it."(23) Such statements naturally incited men to set at naught the prohibitory law.

Another factor in encouraging the saloons to re-open was Crozier's decision, which St. John said bore about the same relation to free whiskey that the Dred Scott decision did to the cause of human slavery. Aid and stimulation from the liquor organizations outside of the state also emboldened the whiskey-sellers to violate the law. The seventeenth annual report of the National Temperance Society and Publication House, presented at New York on May 9, 1882, contained the following in relation to the Kansas prohibitory enactment:

"The entire liquor interest of the country is enlisted to break down the law, and immense sums of money have been raised to employ lawyers, pay for liquor, and to liquidate fines, send out speakers against the law, and to fill the public press with misrepresentations as to its enforcement and efficiency. They know that if it... be allowed to stand in Kansas its influence will spread all over the Union and other States will quickly fall into line and sweep the legalized liquor traffic from their borders."(24)

With such encouragements it happened, as might have been expected, that within a surprisingly short time after the prohibitory law went into force a change from the first quiet acquiescence in it was visible. The dealers became

bolder and bolder and bars were put in. Liquor was soon being sold openly in such places as Atchison, Leavenworth, Dodge City, Topeka, Lawrence, Wichita and Wyandotte, and secretly in many other places. In this rebellion the city councils of several towns were participants; in Topeka and in Leavenworth, for instance, the saloons were indirectly licensed by ordinances permitting them to sell "mineral waters and other drinks;" the license fee at Topeka was \$600 annually; at Lawrence the council for a short time virtually licensed the sale of liquor by fining the liquor men once a month \$25, which would have made in a year just what they had formerly paid for license; at Atchison the city government would agree for a monthly consideration not to molest the saloons. By these devices the enforcement of prohibition was defied.

The prohibitionists of Kansas had been delighted with the success attained at once by the prohibitory law. Prior to May 1 they had employed nationally-known temperance speakers to lecture over the state and had held innumerable meetings to urge the vigorous enforcement of prohibition. They continued to use these methods following the date that the law became operative, but less vigorously, for the ready acceptance of prohibition by the saloon men had thrown them off their guard. The prohibitionists, in fact, acted much like geysers. They were too spasmodic and their spasms did not last long enough. The saloons keepers were on the run and the temperance people were foolish enough

to think that they would keep on running whether they were pursued or not. The saloon men did not care for the amendment nor for the law. It was the organized and intelligent activity of the friends of the amendment and of the law that they feared. When that activity ceased they began to return to their old haunts. It was not long until the prohibitionists discovered that they were not at Appomattox but at Fort Sumpter. The war was not fought nor the victory won. Renewed temperance activity began. The Kansas Legal Temperance Association continued its work of seeing that the law was carried out and was aided in attaining this object by the prohibitory leagues, which were formed in various parts of the state, by the regular temperance organizations and by most of the churches. As soon as the supreme court had settled the rights and duties of all parties under the law, prosecutions were much more vigorously pushed than formerly. Little could be done in places where the city governments were in league with the law-breakers, but vehement protests were made in temperance conventions against such blatant violations of justice. Two days after the "Mass Meeting of Fair-Minded Men" at Topeka, for instance, the prohibitionists met to counteract its influence. A large crowd gathered around the steps of the Methodist church from which the speakers delivered their addresses. The "anarchic and revolutionary tendencies" of the anti-prohibition meeting were severely denounced, and St. John in his speech referred to Wood and Robinson as "political chiggers starting festering sores in the body

politic wherever fastening." At the close of the speaking, resolutions were passed by the audience pledging a fearless enforcement of prohibition.(25) In August of 1881, the fourth and last National Temperance Encampment at Bismarck Grove was held under the auspices of the Kansas State Temperance Union, but compared with the three preceding meetings it was not eminently successful. The resolutions passed by the convention declared that in a majority of counties the law had been upheld, although in the larger cities it had been difficult to secure convictions, and that "to cope successfully with the whiskey power in this gigantic struggle to which they are devoting large amounts of money, it is absolutely necessary that funds be liberally contributed to the maintenance of our cause,"(26) By November the necessity of a sum of money beyond the ability of the friends of temperance in Kansas to furnish had become apparent; this fact and the importance of the result in Kansas to the temperance cause throughout the country induced the Kansas State Temperance Union to issue at this time a call for funds to its friends in all the states. The total amount received by the Temperance Union up to that time had totaled less than \$3,000.(27)

All sorts of conflicting reports in regard to the success of prohibition in Kansas were circulated. Churches and temperance workers, brewers' organizations and anti-prohibitionists,--all made estimates proving prohibition a success or a failure. Statistics were found to show the

decrease of drunkenness; others were secured to show an increase. The friends of temperance claimed that their enemies disseminated all kinds of false reports. The Bismarck Grove Encampment resolved that "success had been more general than indicated by the tone of the press of the state" and that "failures are heralded all over the land by our leading papers and the Associated Press under the inspiration of the whiskey power, while our many successes are scarcely known beyond the localities in which they occur."(28)

A great deal of controversy arose over the effect of prohibition on the prosperity of Kansas, the opponents of the policy spreading reports that immigration into the state had practically ceased and that business in general was greatly depressed. In July, 1881, John B. Finch wrote that these reports and those demonstrating the failure of enforcement in Kansas were hurting the temperance work in Iowa terribly and that unless something were done the amendment would be defeated there.(29) St. John ridiculed the statements adverse to prohibition, showing the absurdity of the charge that more liquor was being sold in Kansas than ever before and of the other allegation that 40,000 people had left the state because they could not obtain liquor. He said that no one had left Kansas on account of the prohibitory law except the saloon keepers and wholesale whiskey dealers and that Kansas was more prosperous than ever before. It was probably true that the newspaper exaggerations in regard to prohibition

had assisted the drought in decreasing immigration to Kansas, but the census shows that the population of the state during the decade following 1880 increased at the average rate of about 50,000 annually.

In the face of the varying information which was broadcast, it was difficult for people to determine exactly what the facts were in regard to enforcement. The early trials at Topeka under the prohibitory measure resulted in no conviction. The same situation prevailed in some other towns. Where liquor was sold with the sanction of the city government, few persons were brought to trial, and when they were it was almost impossible to secure a jury that would convict a man even when it was proved that he had violated the law. Witnesses were found willing to swear that they had drunk "sea-foam" or "cold tea" instead of liquor; juries were "hung;" the courts in many instances failed to do their whole duty; and in some cases even the sheriffs and county attorneys sought to obstruct the execution of the prohibitory enactment. At Leavenworth when Frank J. Sibley, a temperance man who had gone there at the request of the prohibitionists to help enforce the law, filed an information against a saloon-keeper, he was beaten and the jury refused to convict his assailant. In other towns the story was different. The saloon keepers at Fort Scott finally agreed in July, 1881, to close if no more suits were brought against them, and a similar agreement was forced in Topeka, although not until over a year later. Prohibition proved effective in most of the country

districts, but the local option law had excluded the saloon from those sections before. In the towns where the prohibitory act was violated, the prohibitionists claimed that its beneficial results were seen in the closing of the dram shops on Sundays and after eleven o'clock at night.

On December 4, 1882, James A. Troutman, secretary of the State Temperance Union mailed a series of questions to every county attorney, county superintendent and police judge in the state, for the purpose of learning the effect and status of prohibition. Replies were received from over one-third of the letters sent out constituted a full report from 66 of the 81 organized counties, including all the populous ones. These replies demonstrated two facts favorable to prohibition: first, that it had materially decreased the number of saloons; second, that a large percentage of the prosecutions under the law had resulted in convictions. Troutman stated the results of his questionnaire in the following words:

"It must be borne in mind that these figures come from the officers of the State, without reference to their views upon prohibition, and therefore are not subject to the imputation of being the product of fanaticism. In our letters we stated that we wanted facts, whether favorable or unfavorable to prohibition..."

"In these 66 counties there were 708 saloons prior to May 1st, 1881, the date that the prohibitory law took effect. There are now, in the same territory, 313 saloons--160, or over half of which are in Leavenworth; leaving but 153 saloons in the 66 counties not including Leavenworth. Prohibition, in less than two years, has closed 395 saloons. During this time the population has increased 12%. If our saloons had kept pace with the population, we shoud now have 792 saloons; so that in reality prohibition has prohibited 479 saloons in the territory named.

"Prior to May 1st, 1881, there were saloons in every one of these 66 counties. Today, the 313 saloons in existence

are confined to 25 counties, over half the number being in a single county. Prohibition has absolutely driven the saloons out of 41 counties, in which they existed under license.

"'You can't convict the saloon keepers' has been so often repeated that many regard it as an axiomatic truth. In the early stages of prosecutions, it was difficult to convict. But the reports of the officers who have charge of this class of cases show that, as a general proposition, it is far from the truth. In the district courts of these counties, there have been 460 cases tried, resulting in 351 convictions, 47 acquittals, and 62 hung juries, or 7 convictions out of every 9 cases tried.

"In Justice Courts there have been 512 cases tried, with 378 convictions, 75 acquittals and 59 hung juries, or convictions in three-fourths of all cases tried. In these cases the fines imposed amount to \$95,200. In addition to these fines there have been 81 saloon keepers imprisoned, for various periods of time, aggregating 137 months, and 19 days, or 11 years, 5 months and 19 days.

"There has been a larger proportion of convictions in whiskey cases than in any other class of cases tried, as reference to the criminal docket of any court in the State will prove. There are now pending in the district courts of the State 218 cases, showing a vigorous determination to complete the work so well begun."(30)

The Kansas State Gazeteer and Business Directory for 1882-1883, the information for which was apparently gathered near the close of 1882 or about the time that Troutman made his investigation, casts a similar light on the situation. The following table (31) is a complete record of the breweries, distilleries, saloons, and wholesale wine and liquor houses listed by the Gazeteer for the state of Kansas:

<u>SERIES</u>	
Atchison.....	1
Cawker City..	1
Fort Scott...	1
Hanover.....	1
Highland.....	1
Independence.	1
Lawrence.....	1
Leavenworth..	2
Marysville...	1
Topeka.....	2
Wichita.....	1
DISTILLERIES	
North Topeka.	1
SALOONS	
Adel.....	1
Alma.....	2
Argentine....	2
Armstrong....	1
Atchison.....	33
Axtell.....	1
Beattie.....	2
Belle Meade..	3
Belle Plaine.	2
Belleville...	1
Burlingame...	3
Burlington...	1
Burr Oak.....	1
Caldwell.....	1
Carbondale...	3
Chapman.....	1
Clyde.....	1
Concordia....	2
Coolidge.....	2
Corning.....	1
Dodge City....	9
Doniphan.....	2
Easton.....	1
Eden.....	1
Eldorado.....	2
Ellenwood....	2
Ellwood.....	1
Eudora.....	2
Fanning.....	1
Fort Riley....	1
Fort Scott....	2
Frankfort....	2
Fulton.....	1
Garden City...	1
Germania.....	2
Grinnell.....	1
Hanover.....	6
Herkimer.....	1
Highland	
Station....	1
Hunnewell....	2
Kinsley.....	3
Lawrence.....	8
Leavenworth...	37
Longton.....	1
Lyons.....	1
Marysville....	10
Millwood.....	1
Muscotah.....	1
Neodesha.....	3
Netawaka.....	1
Nickerson....	1
Normanville...	1
North Topeka..	3
Odell.....	1
Onaga.....	1
Osage City...	3
Oxford.....	1
Peterton....	2
St. George...	1
St. Mary's...	4
Scandia.....	3
Severance....	3
Silver Lake..	1
Solomon City.	6
Spearville...	2
Topeka.....	15
Troy.....	3
Udall.....	1
Valley Falls.	2
Wamego.....	2
Washington...	1
Waterville...	1
Wathena.....	2
Wyandotte....	4
<u>WINES AND LIQUORS</u>	
<u>WHOLESALE</u>	
Concordia....	1
Junction City	1
Leavenworth..	1
Topeka.....	1
<u>RETAIL</u>	
Arrington....	1
Cape.....	1
Eden.....	1
Fort Scott...	1
Grenola.....	1
Lawrence....	1
Leavenworth..	1
Normanville..	1

The defeat of St. John for governor at the election in November, 1882, was looked upon as a victory for the anti-prohibitionists and aroused them to renewed operations. The temperance men likewise rallied and on the very day of the inauguration of George W. Glick, St. John's democratic successor, an enthusiastic temperance convention called by the executive committee of the State Temperance Union met in Topeka. There were present 1,200 delegates from all

over Kansas and \$2,000 was raised to carry forward the temperance work. These efforts by the friends of temperance helped to counteract the influence of Glick's election, but still there was a difference between the enforcement of prohibition by an administration supporting the law and that by one hostile to it. The second of the following tables illustrates this difference.

PERCENTAGES OF UNITED STATES SPIRITS AND FERMENTED LIQUORS TAX PAID BY KANSAS: (32)

Year	From Spirits	From Fermented Liquors
1880	.1434	.2759
1881	.0895	.1915
1882	.0910	.1609
1883	.0929	.1587
1884	.0841	.1525

NUMBERS OF LIQUOR ESTABLISHMENTS IN KANSAS: (33)

Year	Retail Liq- uer Deal- ers	Whole- sale Liq- uer Deal- ers	Brew- ers	Retail Deal- ers in Malt Liq- uers	Wholesale Dealers in Malt Liquors	Distill- eries Operated
1880	1,821	25	39	117		4
1881	1,132	23	25	56	16	8
1882	1,460	16	22	52	18	2
1883	1,898	27	9	51	22	2
1884	1,948	18	17	77	28	4

As has already been noted the governor could do little to enforce the laws save through his personal influence. The prohibitory act of 1881 made it chiefly the duty of the county attorney to enforce it and provided that if he should refuse to do so, he should be removed from office and that his removal should work his disfranchisement from holding office. Aside from his power to co-operate with the attorney-general and to use the military forces of the

state if called on by the local government, St. John could do practically nothing directly. In May, 1881, at the very beginning of the enforcement problem, he explained his position thus: "I have no power to compel officials to do their duty nor...to compel obedience to laws,...except in cases where the civil authorities have exhausted their powers; in such cases I can bring to bear the military power of the State, and should occasion justify such a course I would not hesitate for a moment... I shall devote all the energy I possess and means at my command to a rigid enforcement of the law."(34)

He displayed no unusual optimism in regard to the immediate effectiveness of prohibition, however. He expected that in the larger cities there would be trouble for some time and that, like other laws, the prohibitory act might never entirely suppress the evil at which it was aimed. "Yet I feel sure," he wrote, "that in due time what little whiskey is sold in Kansas will be driven into the dark, deep cellars, where decent people will not hunt for it."(35)

It cannot be doubted that St. John did everything within his power to make prohibition successful. The influence of his oratory he employed constantly in the cause; when he spoke in Kansas he exhorted the people to obey the law; in other states he corrected unfavorable impressions concerning prohibition in his state. In one two-day trip he rode one hundred miles on the train and sixty-six miles in an open buggy; spoke four times for a total of five and a fourth

hours, two hours of which were in the open air with a strong wind blowing; and shook hands and conversed with a multitude of people. On another occasion he made the trip from Wichita to Wellington, a distance of about twenty-five miles, on an evening freight in order to keep a speaking engagement. The speech that attracted the most attention, perhaps, of all that he delivered on the subject of prohibition enforcement was that given at Leavenworth on Sunday, July 24, 1881, in spite of anonymous communications which he received warning him not to go there and in spite of the recent mobbing of Sibley. The story is told that he was met en route to Leavenworth by a number of temperance men whose anxiety was so great that they had come to protect him. He showed them the anonymous letters, of which no one had been aware until that moment, and said: "Our cause must have its martyrs as well as heroes, and I might as well be ready."(36) In his speech he said plainly that the law was being trampled underfoot in Leavenworth and that he blamed the city government and local newspapers for this condition and that if called upon he would bring to bear the strong military arm of the state to enforce the law and demonstrate that Leavenworth could no more nullify the law than South Carolina could twenty years before. "Can Leavenworth consistently come to the legislature and ask for appropriations for her charitable institutions while her citizens violate and her officers refuse to enforce the law?" he asked. The action of a Leavenworth court in dismissing a case when a witness refused to testify instead of sending the witness to jail

for contempt of court he criticized by saying: "The Justice should punish refractory witnesses and the county attorney should prosecute until he bankrupts the county, if necessary, to enforce the law." He was also reported as saying that although he did not wish the constabulary system with police commissioners the next legislature would adopt that system if necessary.(37) The Leavenworth papers were greatly incensed over the speech and it was magnified into a threat to enforce prohibition by a bayonet bill, to suspend writs of habeas corpus and trial by jury and to withhold appropriations from the state institutions at Leavenworth. His enemies said that he was using terrorism.

A text that he frequently employed in making temperance speeches on Sunday was taken from I. Timothy, I:8,9: "But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully; Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient..." This formed the subject of a second address at Leavenworth in May, 1882, when he said that there was no spot in Kansas where nullification could exist with impunity longer than until the next session of the legislature. He further said that he wished the wives and mothers had the power of the ballot, a desire that he also expressed frequently in his lectures elsewhere.(38) These Sunday addresses usually were given a religious tone at their close; a favorite quotation on which to end was: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

The cause of temperance was also aided by St. John out of his rather slender income. For example, he had five thousand copies of a temperance speech by Judge Albert Horton printed and distributed throughout the state at his own expense. Whenever possible he co-operated with the attorney-general. He was an active member of the Shawnee county prohibitory league and personally arranged for an assistant-counsel to aid the county attorney in prosecuting violators of the liquor law.

Of almost equal importance with his speeches were the letters which he wrote. Hundreds of them were sent out. Like his speeches, those to persons in the state dealt mostly with the problem of enforcement while those to persons in other states were devoted to the argument that prohibition was successful. In regard to methods of securing enforcement he said that any violator of the law should be prosecuted in the same way as any other criminal and that the temperance people should unite in an organization through which they could commence and carry on suits. Saloon keepers should be kept in the courts all the time and one prosecution should follow another as fast as possible. He also advised the employment of able lawyers to prosecute the county attorney if that officer should refuse to do his duty.

Robinson and the whiskey ring and their misrepresentations as to enforcement of prohibition and its effect on business and on immigration he denounced in unmeasured terms. Anything that Robinson might say about prohibition in Kansas

"would require no denial among the people of Kansas" as he had "at all times since the agitation of the question of prohibition began in this state been one of the most bitter opponents of the measure,"(39) in spite of the fact that he had voted for the submission of the amendment in 1879. "For several months succeeding the action of the legislature nothing was heard from Governor Robinson in relation to the measure. After the campaign was fairly opened...he came to the front as one of the most active and untiring opponents of prohibition and was at once the acknowledged champion of licensed saloons and his course was...cheered by every distiller, brewer and saloon keeper in Kansas... His relation to the cause of temperance in Kansas is very similar to that of the copperhead to the cause of the Union during the late war."(40) St. John made it clear, however, that he considered Robinson a temperate man personally. As for the whiskey ring St. John said: "We are fighting here on the soil of Kansas today the battle of temperance for the nation, and the rum power has concentrated its forces to defeat prohibition in our State if possible, and to this end it is corruptly using unlimited sums of money in subsidizing the press, bribing officers, jurors and witnesses, stuffing the ballot box..."(41) He thought that the liquor interests were raising a fund of one hundred thousand dollars to use through its secret organizations in Kansas.

In later years St. John turned to Christian Science as a religious belief, but in 1880 he was already making use of its principles. His chief weapon in carrying forward

the fight for the enforcement of prohibition was optimism--at times it must have been a forced optimism, for he could not have been ignorant of conditions which he blithely disregarded. "Prohibition is working," he reiterated incessantly. "There is nothing wrong with prohibition in Kansas." He talked so much and so convincingly about the success of prohibition in Kansas that he made people believe it; in fact, he seemed to believe it himself. Both in his letters and in his speeches he made much of the closing of the saloons in the interior of the state prior to May 1, 1881, of the decrease in the amount of drunkenness and crime following prohibition, of the increasing number of convictions for violations of the prohibitory law and of the lessening number of federal liquor permits which were issued. Statistics were his stock-in-trade. For instance, he had the warden of the Kansas state penitentiary collect information on the number of prisoners in every state prison in the nation and obtain a statement from the warden of each as to the influence of intoxicating liquors in the production of crime. "I propose," he stated, "to be prepared fully to vindicate the policy of prohibition, not only in Kansas, but throughout the entire country."(42) He made good use of the figures thus obtained, since they showed what he wanted them to show,-- that liquor was responsible for a large share of crime. In this connection he liked to use the argument that the penitentiary population in Kansas had decreased under prohibition. Olathe was his favorite example of a

model temperance town. The very best evidence of the success of prohibition, he said, was found in the fact that "the rum power of the country is using large sums of money and putting forth every possible effort to defeat the measure in Kansas. If there is more liquor sold here now than ever before, it is very strange that men engaged in the business should be so utterly opposed to the law."(43)

In his many speeches and letters on prohibition St. John inevitably fell into errors and inconsistencies. For instance, he compared the amount of crime and drunkenness in the five months preceding May 1, 1881, with the five months following that date (44) and at the same time attempted to prove that prohibition aided the prosperity of the state by giving figures on the increase in the valuation of personal property taken from reports made in March, 1881, two months before the law became operative.(45) At one time he said that the first trial under the prohibitory act at Topeka resulted in fining the guilty party one hundred dollars and at another he stated that the first three trials at the capital had resulted in no conviction.(46) His estimates on the amount of violation of the law were almost always under-statements.

But even one so desirous as St. John of seeing nothing that would prove prohibition a failure could not altogether close his eyes to what was happening. The following extracts from his letters show the gradual recession from his statement made May 5, 1881: "There is

not today an open saloon in Kansas."(47)

May 16, 1881: "...In relation to Leavenworth, Atchison and Dodge City,...I am of the opinion that the prohibitory law is not being enforced there as it should be; with the exception of the above named places, I think that the law is being rigidly enforced through the State;...these towns contain one-thirtieth of the population of the State..."

"Topeka contains 20,000 population and there is not a saloon in the city."(48)

May 25, 1881: "With the exception of Dodge City, Leavenworth and Atchison the prohibitory law, throughout the State, according to the best information is being honestly enforced except possibly at Wichita..."(49)

June 7, 1881: "...Here in Topeka, we are meeting with considerable opposition in our efforts to enforce it..."(50)

September 27, 1881: "Prohibition is this State, as a whole, is working splendidly; with the exception of Atchison, Leavenworth, Topeka, Lawrence, Dodge City and possibly two or three smaller cities in the State, our prohibitory law is as honestly obeyed and enforced as any other penal law..., and even in the cities named..., prohibition has proven to be very beneficial."(51)

The growing seriousness of the situation led St. John to issue on December 10, 1881, a proclamation in which he offered rewards for convictions under the prohibitory law and for the removal of officials who failed to enforce it and specifically named Atchison, Leavenworth, Topeka, Wyandotte and Dodge City as the places where the law was persistently violated. It was an extraordinary proceeding but based upon the governor's authority to enforce the laws. The case was not one of the powerlessness of local officers to execute the law but of their refusal and neglect to do so. The statute supplied no explicit form of procedure in such an emergency but the constitution pointed the way to a power that might be invoked and St. John so invoked it. Manifestly there would seldom be a situation that would justify the exercise of this authority by the

governor any more than the present one did.

The proclamation, nevertheless, gave rise to the charge that St. John expected to reap political benefit from it by making the temperance question a factor in the election of members of the next legislature, which would have the choosing of a United States senator. Several prominent republican politicians were said to have requested him not to take the step, fearing that it would destroy party lines and make the issue prohibition and anti-prohibition in the election the next year.

The actual state of enforcement seems to have been little changed by the proclamation for St. John is found writing on February 3, 1882:

"while it is true that in the cities of Atchison, Leavenworth and Topeka, and not to exceed half dozen other smaller towns the prohibitory law is corruptly disregarded, yet those towns do not contain one-fourth of the population of the state, while by the other three-fourths or more, the law is as honestly obeyed and enforced as any other law... prohibiting crime."(52)

And on May 3 he wrote: "Out of 81 organized counties in the State it is safe to say that in at least 65 of them the prohibitory law is as honestly enforced as is any other criminal law."(53)

On May 31: "There are perhaps 30 saloons in Topeka doing business in violation of the Constitution and laws of our state."(54)

On September 20: "I think it is safe to say that of all the prosecutions that have been conducted in the State, at least six out of ten have resulted in conviction." (He referred to liquor cases.)(55)

He also wrote on September 20 that there had been about forty saloons in Topeka during the past year.(56)

At various times St. John stated that he thought prohibition was stronger with the people than ever before and that a return to the old system would be defeated by 75,000

majority. He felt sure that the next legislature would enact amendments to the prohibitory law, which he admitted needed revision, to make it effective in cities of the first class. The amendments he favored would prohibit a man from importing liquors for his own use and increase the fees of the county attorneys to enable them to prosecute the whiskey ring without pecuniary loss. As for the constabulary system which he was accused of advocating, and which he was more than once quoted as mentioning as a possibility, he said that he was opposed to it and that the prohibitory law should stand upon the same footing as all other laws, the enforcement of which should always be brought about through the local authorities elected by the people.

Not long before the election in November, 1882, W.P. Hackney, of Cowley county, and L.W. Breyfogle, of Johnson county, sent to St. John their resignations from the state senate. He immediately wrote to both of them asking them to reconsider because their influence would be needed in the coming legislature to aid in carrying important bills. To Hackney he said:

"You know that I never flatter anybody, and you will not understand it as attempting to flatter you when I say in my judgment your presence in the Senate is of greater importance the coming session than that of any other man in the state. Your familiarity with the fight for prohibition, your knowledge of men as well as of measures, makes it of vast importance that you should be with us in the coming fight." (57)

Hackney, because of this request, withdrew his resignation. Breyfogle likewise remained in the state senate during the

session of 1883.

With his defeat for governor, St. John's activity in behalf of the prohibitory law practically ceased. Prohibition is scarcely mentioned in the letters that he wrote between November, 1882, and January, 1883. From this time on St. John had little connection with prohibition in Kansas. His labor for the cause within the state was practically at an end. His had been the chief influence during the formative period of the work and he had accomplished the task of popularizing the prohibitory law both in the state and in the nation. Thereafter he became a national figure and his activity for the most part was in the interest of national prohibition.

The failure of prohibition to entirely fulfil the expectations of the temperance people led to a demand during the latter part of 1881 and the early part of 1882 for an extra session of the legislature for the purpose of amending the law. St. John never encouraged the idea, feeling that effective enforcement could be secured without this expense. Then, too, although he did not say so, the calling of a special session for this purpose would have contradicted his assertion that prohibition was being properly carried out. He was perfectly willing that the impression should go out among the whiskey ring and among officers who had been derelict in their duty that an extra session would take place during the winter, and in February he wrote confidentially that the fear aroused by this threat had had a very good effect.(58) Another argument used in favor of convening

the legislature before its regular meeting was the need of a reapportionment of the state for congressional representation. By the census of 1880 Kansas had secured seven representatives in Congress, but the fact was not known in time for the legislature of 1881 to divide the state into seven districts in place of the three existing ones. To prevent the nomination of four congressmen-at-large, many papers demanded a reapportionment at once. St. John also refused to call the legislature together for this reason, as he felt it was the wish of the politicians and not of the people, who would have to pay for it. During the campaign of 1882 it was often charged that the railroad companies fearing adverse legislation, had promised St. John their support for a third term if he would not convene the legislature in special session and that he had accepted the offer.

During his two administrations from 1879 to 1883 St. John delivered hundreds of speeches. Those concerned with temperance have already been discussed. In addition to them he gave a large number of addresses on miscellaneous subjects, at patriotic celebrations, county fairs, old settlers' meetings, church encampments, etc. Aside from political questions and temperance, he spoke frequently on the problems of his administration, such as the exodus, destitution, and the protection of the frontier. In view of his attitude on prohibition it is rather surprising to read of his saying in a speech delivered July 4, 1882, that "the great struggle of the American people today...is the conflict of capital and

labor."(59) The crowds that came to hear him were always large, not infrequently numbering between two and four thousand, with many unable to gain admission. The fact that all the churches in a town often dismissed their congregations to hear him when he spoke on Sundays swelled the size of his audiences. Most of his week-ends were spent on speaking tours through Kansas; he also made about a half-dozen trips through neighboring states and the East, usually talking on prohibition but sometimes on the exodus. And always he had to decline a great many more requests to speak than he could possibly accept.

It has already been pointed out that St. John's diligence in speaking in the temperance cause brought him into disfavor with a certain class of people. In fact, all the fame that he achieved as a result of his speaking ability was begrimed by his opponents and many wilful exaggerations were circulated about him. He was, for example, quoted as saying in a speech at Topeka: "Myself and God Almighty have won this victory for temperance by the help of the good people of Kansas;" and in his out-of-state addresses he was reported as slandering the people of Leavenworth as outlaws and anarchists simply because they did "not accept his peculiar sumptuary creed." He was also said to have been in danger of a "rotten-egging" after a speech at Atchison in June, 1881, and to have required the escort of three policeman to see him safely out of the city. More distasteful than the "scoldings" he administered to the people of Kansas were the speeches

he made in the East. When previous governors had gone out of the state they usually had not attracted public attention and consequently no jealousy had been aroused. But St. John commanded public notice and received what amounted almost to ovations, and it was no wonder that his enemies, particularly his political rivals, were ablaze with envy. He was severally criticized as a "gadabout" and as a "cheap notoriety seeker" who spent his time "bellowing around the country," returning to Kansas only long enough to draw his salary. Much of the hostile criticism made about him was intended for political effect and will be treated more fully in connection with the campaign of 1882.

It is undeniable that St. John devoted much time to activities not connected with his official work, but it also seems to be true that his duties were not neglected. He merely worked harder and longer than previous governors had. In spite of the fact that the labors in the executive office more than doubled during his first term, he performed them with a clerical force but slightly increased over that employed by his predecessor. In addition, he not only kept his correspondence in a more systematic way but he also made a more complete record of it than former governors had done. (60) During his two terms he had only one vacation of any length,--a ten-day buffalo hunt in the fall of 1879. Moreover, although his lecture tours outside of Kansas consumed time, it seems likely that the state received sufficient compensation from the large amount of advertising which he

gave it. When he went east to talk temperance, he was prepared at a moment's notice to tell all about Kansas, and the state press could not refrain from chuckling sometimes over the "peculiarly Kansas style" in which the governor got in his work on the unsuspecting representatives of eastern papers which charged a dollar a line for advertisements. His "puffs" of Kansas certainly must have operated to counteract the injury done to immigration to the state by the reports of the anti-prohibitionists.

Not much fault could be found with the appointments made by St. John. Aside from desiring to appoint republicans he was disposed to select the best men without regard to the wishes of the would-be political dictators. Indeed, St. John seems to have shown an unusual amount of independence in his action not only on appointments but on other matters which came up for his decision, refusing to be "bull-dozened, bribed or over-persuaded." It is not to be supposed that he ignored altogether such items as the temperance beliefs of candidates or that his friends and relatives did not receive special consideration. But in view of the fact that, as he said, there were fifty hats for every peg, the selections that he made for the positions under his control proved to be fortunate and gave general satisfaction. Every clerk appointed by him as a part of his executive force, including the adjutant general and the governor's private secretary, held office through both terms. Two appointments are of especial interest: the first, that of W.H. Ward, of

Humboldt, as private secretary to the governor, because he later became a pullman conductor; the second, that of Mrs. Cora M. Downs, of Wyandotte, as a regent of the state university, because she was said to have been the first woman to be appointed to such a position in Kansas or in the country.

If the question of prohibition could have been separated from St. John's administrations, it is fairly certain that contemporaneously they would have been regarded almost without exception as eminently creditable. As it was, he had to wait for vindication for his part in bringing prohibition to Kansas until the policy had proved itself and been accepted as desirable by the great mass of Kansans. The perplexing problems presented by the exodus, the Indians on the border and the drouth in the west he handled in an enterprising and thorough manner, which, while it was bound to displease some, was satisfactory to most of the citizens. His administrations were singularly clean. No breath of scandal tainted them, and although large sums of money were expended in public improvements, no charge of corruption or of graft was made against any member of the state government. St. John's official acts withstood the most searching criticism and even his bitterest political enemies never had the temerity to accuse him of public or private dishonesty. Except for his temperance activity his conduct was in the main considered dignified and honorable, and during his three campaigns for governor he was often called the Bayard of the republican party, "without fear and without reproach."

CHAPTER VII

CAMPAIGN OF 1882.--

ST. JOHN DEFEATED.-- HIS PRINCIPLE SUSTAINED.

The campaign for the republican gubernatorial nomination in 1882 began early. Before the middle of 1881 names were being suggested and by February, 1882, practically all of the Kansas newspapers were in the field in favor of some candidate. St. John's name was early mentioned in connection with the republican nomination but he repeatedly stated that he did not intend to be a candidate for a third term and that he meant at the expiration of his present period of service to retire from politics and to devote himself to the cause of Christianity and temperance. He was not well situated financially and could not afford to ignore the fact that living at Topeka, plus charitable contributions and other items, had cost him annually about a thousand dollars more than his salary, which was three thousand. Furthermore, he had worked very hard and felt the need of a rest. He also found it irksome to be charged with a desire for political promotion in whatever he did, and declared that having arrived at the conclusion that he could better serve the people by "being absolutely free from the embarrassments that naturally follow a candidacy for any office," he would not enter the contest for any position during the campaign.(1)

The pressure brought to bear on him to make the race again was tremendous. Temperance men felt that the prohibitory law was on trial and that it would be unwise to "swap horses in the middle of the stream" and therefore urged St. John to stand by them in this campaign as they had stood by him in 1880. It was these considerations that led him to agree to the publication in the Topeka Capital of the statement that while he was not a candidate for a renomination, he would not refuse it if it were offered.(2)

The editorial in the Capital on February 27, 1882, formally named St. John as the next republican nominee for governor and said that while the continued dominance of the party in the state by a large majority was not to be doubted, his nomination would help to make the victory of the ticket more emphatic than it would otherwise be. The editorial then said:

"....Governor St. John's position upon the temperance question is the thing that makes his nomination proper, not to say strikingly necessary. The question of prohibition per se, or in its abstract aspect, is not and cannot be a political issue in Kansas. That was passed upon conclusively by the people at the polls and through the Legislature. But the question of its maintenance and enforcement in good faith and thoroughly is an issue, and a very grave and pressing one. The Republican party cannot afford to occupy any neutral or doubtful ground in the matter of vindicating the good name of the State against the shame put upon it by the defiance and insolence of the liquor element. Prohibition was adopted by republican votes, and the republican party...must see it made effective in all quarters, at any cost. The sincerity and courage of Governor St. John in that direction have been conspicuously proven; and the people are unwilling to experiment with any new man while the contest is yet in progress, and the Democratic party of the state is preparing to champion the side of the law breakers and enemies of public order and decency."(3)

In many quarters the nomination by the Capital, which had become one of the most important daily papers in Kansas, and St. John's consent to be a candidate were regarded as settling the question of the governorship. Certain state papers had advocated St. John for a third term before the Capital nominated him, but after it had done so newspaper after newspaper swung into line in his favor, apparently feeling that they were getting on the winning side, and there was a general vying for the honor of having first and most consistently supported him. The Capital, however, continued to be his most active adherent.

There were many republican papers that opposed St. John, of course. Among them were the Atchison Champion and the Leavenworth Times as well as such an important daily as the Topeka Commonwealth. Outstanding among the opposing weeklies were the Troy Chief, published by Sol. Miller, a prominent newspaper man who had supported St. John from 1876 until 1882, and the Junction City Union, edited by George W. Martin, a republican politician who later became secretary of the state historical society.

By both friends and opponents the first topic seized upon for discussion in connection with St. John was prohibition. In 1880 no one had maintained more strenuously than he that prohibition must be a non-partisan issue. In November, 1881, he still adhered to this opinion and took the position that the best plan of campaign for the temperance people would be "to appeal to all lovers of

law and order and good government, without regard to the party to which they belong."(4) He amplified and amended this statement in March, 1882, by saying:

"The Democrats will undoubtedly adopt an anti-prohibition platform; while I have always been in favor of keeping this temperance question out of politics yet if the Democrats take the course which I have indicated the Republican party cannot afford to be cowardly touching the matter and my judgment is that we should insert in our platform a plank pledging the party not only to an honest enforcement of the law but to oppose any proposition...which looks to a return to ...license... Upon this issue we can...rally to our support the better element of all parties."(5)

"Any political party can afford to do right," he said again, "without stopping to calculate...the result...for...it will only be a question of time until it will receive the hearty endorsement of the people. The republican party never became a great national party until it stepped boldly to the front and throttled African slavery."(6) When it was said to him that taking temperance into politics would ruin the party, he exclaimed: "Ruin the party! We'll have the grandest Republican party that ever existed in this nation. We will reach out and gather in the honest, warm-hearted Democrats. We will take in the Greenbackers and what will be left of the others?"(7) He thought that the saloon element of the state was composed of at least 85 per cent. democrats and the republican party of at least 80 per cent. prohibitionists, and that upon the square issue of prohibition or license the republicans could carry the state by at least 60,000 majority and perhaps more.(8) It is possible that the fact that he considered prohibition sentiment to be so strong combined with

his recognition of his own inseparable connection with prohibition in the minds of the people led him to desire the question to develop into a party issue and caused him to become a candidate for the republican nomination.

But whether St. John wished it or not, prohibition did become the great outstanding issue of the campaign.

Following the lead of the Capital the governor's other newspaper friends took up the cry that if the coming campaign were to be a temperance war, he should be the standard-bearer. They said that he was so thoroughly identified with the prohibition movement that a crusade without him would be shorn of half of its power; that he should remain governor until the success of the law was assured for he had been tried and found faithful in enforcing it while other men were untried; and that his defeat would be regarded in Kansas and throughout the country as the defeat of prohibition and would encourage the anti-prohibitionists to endeavor to repeal the prohibitory law or to make it inoperative. One newspaper which was opposed to prohibition stated the matter in this frank way:

"The struggle...over the governorship appears to embody this question...: Is the policy of prohibition to continue to be the fixed policy of the State?... St. John represents ...the affirmative...and...it is no fault of his that this is the case. The enemies of the law have very foolishly forced him into that position, and his defeat, if... accomplished, no matter who his successor may be, will be hailed, not only all over this State but all over the civilized world, as a victory over prohibition... Many good Republicans and many...sincere temperance men are opposing St. John's nomination and...every single enemy of the law in the whole land, without regard to politics, in

opposing him... While every one who opposes St. John is not, therefore, an enemy of prohibition, every opponent of prohibition also opposes St. John.

"... The campaign has assumed this attitude and it is the merest nonsense to talk about fighting it out on any other line... The defeat of St. John means a blow against prohibition from which...it would never recover..."

This paper felt that other questions in the canvass, such as the charge that St. John was in league with the railroads, were of no importance and said: "The men who are making the fight on St. John should, once in a while, indulge in a sentiment of honesty... Let it be said...that prohibition is a failure and a fraud, and that, because St. John represents this fraud and proposes to use his power and influence to perpetuate it, he should be defeated. That's the issue."(9)

The Topeka Capital, in replying to the question as to why the interests of temperance demanded the re-election of St. John, stated that for months it had been clamorously charged that St. John had "played out" and the people had "gone back" on him because of his radical temperance views and that the only issue in the campaign was the repeal of the obnoxious prohibitory law and the restoration of legalized saloons. The opposition to St. John being substantially opposition to prohibition, and every argument against him beginning and ending with his relation to it, the people, according to the Capital, proposed to meet it by giving him the signal honor of a third term.(10)

The milder of the St. John men admitted that his re-election was not an absolute necessity to the success^v of prohibition in Kansas but thought that discarding him would

be proclaimed as an anti-prohibition victory and would injure the temperance cause in other states. When it was urged that there were other candidates who were just as good temperance men as St. John, his supporters replied that the nomination of any of them would be a blow to the cause of prohibition in Kansas. This was not regarded as a reflection on such candidates but merely as the result of the fact that the liquor interests had identified St. John with prohibition absolutely and the defeat of him would be heralded as the defeat of prohibition.

It was true that the bulk of the opposition to prohibition was directed against St. John. It could not be doubted that the liquor men feared him more than any other man in the state. St. John in his letters frequently referred to the fact that he had to contend not only with the rum power of Kansas but of the nation and that the whiskey ring was expending a large amount of money to defeat him and elect a "consistent temperance man" or, as St. John said, "a pliant tool of free whiskey." The growing proportions of the prohibition movement had certainly startled the liquor interests and resulted in their increased activity. In March, 1882, the Topeka Capital carried an article alleging that representatives of eastern distillers and whiskey dealers had recently met secretly in New York and planned a campaign against the temperance cause in Kansas the coming summer. According to the account in the Capital, it was agreed that the temperance movement was assuming national proportions and

unless soon checked was likely to destroy the liquor business throughout the union. Because the temperance work had assumed its most formidable aspect in Kansas, it was decided to concentrate upon this state and make a determined effort to carry the next state election. An organization was thereupon effected and arrangements made to provide a large fund by assessment upon all the leading distillers and liquor dealers.(11) Just how much of this report was true is unknown, but there can be little question that the liquor power was alarmed and saw that prohibition must be defeated in Kansas or it would spread to Iowa, Michigan and other states and perhaps throughout the union.

The prohibitionists expected the battle of the nation for temperance to be fought in Kansas that year. Neal Dow wrote in April that he was anxious about Kansas since to win there was "of the utmost consequence to the liquor traffic of the whole country" and to be defeated there would "compel 'the trade' to fall back all along the line." "Therefore," he said, "the liquor leagues are laying themselves out with men, papers and money to contest the ground here to the last inch, but Governor St. John is quite sure of winning. The first fight will be on his renomination. The rummies will lay themselves out to prevent that, but we think they cannot do it, and there is little doubt of his re-election, and the triumphant support of the policy of prohibition."(12)

The brewers' convention held in Washington in the middle

of May made an appropriation with which to fight prohibition in Kansas.(13) The exact use to which the money donated by the liquor power was put is not clear, but friends of St. John said that, for one thing, newspapers were bought up with it and, for another, it was used in connection with the secret, oath-bound societies which were said to be organized over Kansas wherever a sufficient number of advocates of free whiskey could be found. St. John said that the members of these societies took an oath to do all in their power to defeat the prohibitory law and to vote for no man who was in favor of prohibition. (14) It was the policy of brewers' and liquor organizations to advise their adherents to drop their former political affiliations if necessary to fight unfriendly legislation.

A part of the money appropriated by the National Brewers' Association was sent to John Walruff, a Lawrence brewer. The prohibitionists were delighted to have their statements about the methods and purposes of the liquor ring confirmed and amplified by a letter from Walruff to a saloon-keeper in Strong City. The original of this letter fell into the hands of some persons friendly to temperance and a facsimile copy was published in the Topeka Capital on June 3. It was quoted in papers all over the state. After giving detailed advice to the saloon-keeper on how to proceed in selling beer in violation of the prohibitory law, the letter, which was written on the stationary of the Lawrence Chemical Works and dated May 22, 1882, continued as follows:

"... I do not know your politics, but one thing we must unite on, and that is we must work with all our might to send delegates to the state convention who are anti-St. John men first, last and all the time. Even if you should be a Democrat, you can work at the primaries quietly. If we beat St. John, then the backbone of prohibition is broken."

The Capital in a gleeful editorial pointed out this letter from one high in the councils of the liquor party said that if St. John were beaten the backbone of prohibition would be broken, "which would lead one to infer that if anybody else is beaten, even the gentleman who is 'as good a temperance man as St. John,' it wouldn't have any effect toward breaking the backbone of prohibition. ... It is conclusive evidence of the fact that Governor St. John, and no one else, is the man the saloonists and their allies are after... If there has heretofore been any doubt as to the real issue of the campaign, that doubt has now been dispelled. The liquor element are 'anything to beat St. John.'"(15) In a later editorial on the same subject the Capital said: "By their own scandalous tactics, as confessed by Walruff, they [the liquor interests] have so shaped the contest that the people must not only vindicate prohibition but add special emphasis to it by endorsing St. John."(16)

The opponents of St. John found it difficult to explain the Walruff letter and the argument that they were for "anybody to beat St. John." While he was opposed for other reasons than his connection with prohibition, the attacks on him almost invariably simmered down to the temperance

issue. It was objected that his renomination would virtually make the republican party a prohibition party--a "prohibitive" party--a mere personal affair--a St. John party. His Sunday temperance speeches, his arraignment of cities like Leavenworth for violation of the law and his out-of-state speeches were a constant source of irritation to the anti-prohibitionists who could not refrain from such thrusts as these: "St. John has been in intimate relationship with the Deity so long that he is developing attributes that are wonderful, and the way that he flashes across the country like a brilliant meteor is gorgeous and interesting;"(17) and: "The senior member of the firm of St. John and God is busily at work stumping the state for the cause of prohibition and St. John."(18)

The appeal made in November, 1881, by the Kansas Temperance Union to its friends over the United States for money to aid in enforcing prohibition in Kansas was an excellent opportunity for the anti-St. Johnites to say that the purpose of the funds was to elect the governor. Charles Robinson in his lengthy communications to the press was especially emphatic in accusing St. John of begging for fifty thousand dollars through the Temperance Union to use as a corruption fund to further his political fortunes and to force the temperance issue upon the republican party.(19) Indirectly, so far as St. John was identified with the cause of prohibition, the funds of the Temperance Union did aid him, for whatever advanced the interests of temperance also

advanced his interests. The fact that the Union had received donations amounting to only a few thousand dollars and that St. John refused pay for his temperance addresses served to discount the charges against him.

In addition to the anti-prohibitionists there was another class of persons who were working against St. John and who relied largely on the argument that he and prohibition were not identical and that there were other men, better qualified, equally as strong as prohibitionists, who should be substituted for him. This class included a few who were honest temperance men.

All the old arguments against him were revived, for the most part with no attempt at proof beyond bare assertion. On every possible score he was subjected to ridicule and sarcasm. His ability as a lawyer and his popularity with women and children were subjects of satire. He was nicknamed a "featherbed soldier" because his Civil War services had been brief. He was charged with pardoning criminals as payment for political services of their friends and with making himself a boss through the use of his patronage. Even his republicanism was called in question and he was obliged to state in self-defense that during his four years' residence in Missouri and his thirteen years' residence in Kansas he had at his own expense entered heartily into every republican canvass.(20) His enemies also said that his candidacy would disrupt the party and cause other republican candidates to be defeated in close

district counties. They feared that he would run behind his ticket by twenty-five or thirty thousand votes and a democratic governor be elected. When it was thought that the four congressmen-at-large would be nominated by the same convention that named candidates for state offices, it was frequently said that he had formed combinations with various congressional aspirants. The holding of the congressional convention a month before the state convention was more effective in putting an end to this allegation than St. John's affirmation that he had never in his life made a political combination with any candidate.

(21) It was rather difficult of find adequate basis for criticism of his administrations, but something could always be said against the exodus and destitution policies. It was charged that he had taken money donated for relief of the refugees and used it for a campaign fund. There was no justification for this statement since St. John had turned over to the Freedmen's Relief Association all the money which he had received and had a receipt for it, and had advanced about a hundred dollars for relief that had never been refunded to him. He declared that he had never used any money for political purposes except that which he had earned himself (22) and, furthermore, that he had never done anything in connection with the relief of the refugees with a view to securing their votes.(23)

There were men who favored as well as opposed St. John for reasons other than his temperance principles, and

they found in his character, orthodox republicanism and excellent administrations ample reason for a renomination. He was spoken of as the most active and vigorous executive Kansas had ever had and as more widely known inside and outside of his state than any other governor in the United States. It was time, said his friends, to stop treating such a man flippantly and expecting him to "play out."

The enemies of the governor, nevertheless, continued to maintain that there was nothing so brilliant about his administrations as to justify the unprecedented honor of a nomination for a third term. This issue of the third term was much debated during the early months of 1882. Up to that time no governor of Kansas had ever been awarded the nomination for a third term, and there had even been some opposition to the principle of a second term. A factor which St. John overlooked was that public opinion had been more or less educated against the third term in 1880 when General U.S. Grant had sought and been refused a renomination for President of the United States. St. John had been a Grant supporter, maintaining that the question was not how many terms a man had served but how well he had served them; (24) and in regard to his own renomination he said that other state and congressional officers had served three terms and the cry against his doing so originated with the whiskey ring.(25) Certain newspapers cited numerous cases of governors in other states who had been elected for more than two terms and

claimed that the third term argument was a mere pretense.

Of greater significance than the third-term bugaboo was the cry that St. John was a monopolist, the tool of the railroad companies, "the tail of the corporation kite." The charge, before referred to, that he had refrained from calling the legislature in extra session out of consideration for the three leading railway companies which feared stricter regulation and which promised him their support for a third term if he would do as they said was revived. The fact that he had recommended effective regulation of transportation facilities in his message of 1879 and not in that of 1881, and his silence on the question in his speeches were also referred to as significant. According to the custom, St. John, as governor, had asked and received many passes from the railroads for relatives and for personal and political friends as well as annual passes for himself and family. As the number of requests for passes grew greater he became more reluctant to ask the companies to grant them and frequently refused to do so. Before the republican state convention in 1882 as before that in 1880 he asked and received passes for his delegates to the place of meeting.(26) This was a favor usually extended by the railroads to governors who were candidates for a renomination and there is nothing in any of St. John's official correspondence to indicate that there was any special understanding between him and the transportation companies although there was naturally a friendly

feeling on both sides. None who knew him intimately ever believed that he was in league with the railway corporations. The Capital said that the railroads had no reason to oppose him, for he was fair in his treatment of them and they knew definitely what his position was, but that he had framed, proposed and put through the legislature the stock-killing law of 1874,--the only act upon the statute books of Kansas directly in the interest of the people as against the rail-ways.(27)

St. John also hastened to call attention to his law of 1874 and to the fact that in his canvass of 1878 he had advocated the republican plank of that year favoring railroad regu-lation. He explained that while he had not mentioned the subject in his biennial message of 1881 he had sought to secure the passage of the railway commissioner bill. Reports that he had formed a combination with the railroad companies he attributed to the whiskey power, which, he said, was try-ing to throw the people off their guard while it again "fastened its poisonous fangs upon the body politic of Kansas." (28) He gave any one permission to divulge all the facts relating to any combination or trade with which he was connected and asserted that prominent railway officials, whom he named, were working in the interest of the candidacy of Captain J.B. Johnson. "At the primaries here in Topeka," he explained later, "in the second ward where are located all the railroad shops, I was defeated...while I carried the other three wards of the city and every precinct in the

county but one."(29) While emphasizing the statement that he was free of the influence of the railroads, he made clear his intention to treat fairly the corporations as well as individuals.(30)

In spite of all the loud talk about the railroads and the third term, it was true that up to the time the republican state convention was held there was only one real issue--prohibition. The city elections in April, 1882, when the question was prominent in nearly every municipality in the state, forecasted the importance which the subject was to assume. Outstanding men who were in Topeka when the republican state central committee met in May agreed in saying that prohibition was conceded to be the chief and, in fact, the only issue. The topic of temperance was given more than twice as much space in the newspapers as all other issues combined. Each side blamed the other for the emphasis placed on prohibition and for the fact that this issue could not be separated from St. John's candidacy. As a matter of fact, both factions probably were about equally responsible for this condition. Temperance unions passed resolutions supporting St. John and declaring that his re-election would secure the triumph of prohibition; the anti-St. Johnites formed state organizations and resolved to support only such candidates as declared fully against prohibition.

Another evidence of the importance of the prohibition issue was the fact that it was the principal topic discussed in connection with the other candidates for the republican

gubernatorial nomination. The St. John opposition found it difficult to obtain a strong candidate to run against the governor. Many men were discussed, boomed for a short time, and dropped. Only three--John A. Martin, Captain J.B. Johnson, of Topeka, chairman of the republican state central committee, and Judge Solon O. Thacher, of Lawrence,--developed any real strength. Martin was an avowed anti-prohibitionist but the other two were proclaimed as staunch temperance men. While Martin received enthusiastic support in certain quarters, he killed his own boom by refraining from announcing his candidacy.

Johnson's position on prohibition was at first not clearly defined, but somewhat later he came out definitely in favor of it. His advocates then urged him as a more acceptable prohibitionist than St. John, who "by his radical manner of speaking" had made so many bitter personal enemies as to be a weakness instead of a strength to the temperance cause in Kansas. Aside from being denounced as a "plastic prohibitionist" Johnson was attacked as a former railroad attorney who had been elected speaker of the last house of representatives by the transportation companies and who had voted and lobbied against the railway commissioner bill and had packed the house committees in the interest of corporations. Johnson's position as chairman of the state central committee led to the suspicion that he would try to organize and to control the state convention in his own favor. This suspicion was felt by some to be verified by the action of

the committee in calling the convention to meet on August 9, several weeks earlier than was usual, but if there was anything in this move meant to injure St. John, it was not apparent.

Thacher, well-known as a prohibitionist from his record in the state senate, had been spoken of as gubernatorial timber in 1880 but had declined to run. He was brought out definitely as a candidate in April of 1882 and called a "temperance man who was not a fanatic." The attempt was to make him acceptable to both factions--to the one as a prohibitionist, to the other as one who desired the modification of the prohibitory law. He made a rather active canvass for delegates, and received some support as an old-time Kansan who had been president pro tem. of the convention that had framed the state constitution. The Greenback papers, however, attacked him as a railroad attorney, a large land owner and a monopolist. While his newspaper endorsement was greater than that given to Johnson, it was far behind that of St. John.

Thus the campaign continued at a rather staid gait. Competition was not keen enough to spur St. John to unusual efforts, yet he managed his campaign with great energy and skill and averaged more than one political speech each week during the five or six months preceding the convention. Indirectly he furthered his campaign by pressing the temperance workers to hold big county rallies and to make a thorough canvass of the state. He was also aided by the St. John clubs formed at different places. Although he knew that many professional politicians were intensely bitter in their

feeling towards him, he did not doubt the friendship of the masses of the people for him. As early as May 11 he expressed the opinion that he would be nominated on the first ballot by a large majority(31) and with the passage of the weeks he became still more confident.

There were threats of bolting on all sides. The Germans and anti-prohibitionists in general warned their opponents of the possibility of division in the party and even suggested that a new anti-St. John party with Robinson as its candidate for governor be organized. The democrats were cordial in their invitation to the republican anti-prohibitionists to join with them. On the other hand, it was hinted, although perhaps not seriously, that if St. John were not nominated the prohibitionists might organize an independent prohibition party that would split the republican organization in two. The negro voters appeared to be solid for the governor and on the whole the possibility of any kind of an organized bolt was not held to be serious. Whatever disaffection there might be due to St. John's nomination was expected to be made up by votes of the democratic and greenback prohibitionists. From various parts of the state came reports that large numbers of republicans were declaring against St. John while many democrats and greenbackers were stating publicly that they would vote for him.

On an editorial excursion held about the middle of June a vote was taken to determine how the state press stood on the candidates: Of 138 newspaper men on the train, representing

approximately the same number of papers, and including many of the principal dailies and weeklies of the state, 52 were for St. John, 29 for Martin, 23 for Johnson, 14 for Thacher and the rest scattering.(32) From then on St. John's strength increased rapidly. Newspapers quietly dropped other candidates and turned to the "temperance warrior," and by the middle of July his nomination was conceded in every direction. The primaries, which were held on July 27, fulfilled the worst fears of the anti-St. Johnites. Less than one hundred out of three hundred and sixty-five delegates were for candidates other than St. John. He even carried Shawnee county, the home of Captain Johnson, and Leavenworth county, stronghold of the wets. The delegation from Leavenworth, so it was said, was secured by a combination between St. John and James F. Legate, a republican politician of that place. This fact becomes of importance during St. John's campaign for the presidency in 1884. In his own county of Johnson much bitterness was displayed. St. John had a bare majority in the county convention and one of the six delegates elected was against him.

The fact that the state republican convention was held early this year has already been commented upon. St. John sought to make it understood that he had no connection with the decision as to the time, place or manner of holding it. He wished only that it take place under such circumstances as to prevent political trades and combinations which "tend to defeat the will of the people and as a rule are an element

of weakness to those who engage in them."(33)

Many new faces were discernible in the convention when it met in Topeka--a fact which the St. John men took as proof that it was the people and not the machine politicians who were represented. Both factions held caucuses before the convention opened. A roll call at the anti-St. John caucus showed that there were present 79 delegates representing 22 counties. Remarks were made by Thacher, Johnson and Martin but little was done beyond appointing a committee, composed of several outstanding politicians with Martin as chairman, to draft a protest against the renomination of St. John. The caucus was very calm and deliberate, the victory of the governor was frankly conceded, and there was no talk of organizing a bolt.(34) Two hundred and seventy-two delegates reported to the St. John caucus.

Compared with the crowds at previous conventions a small audience was present at the opening of the convention of 1882 in the senate chamber at Topeka on the afternoon of August 9. The fact that there was to be no contest over the gubernatorial nomination had largely removed interest in the meeting. Few conventions had been calmer. While the St. John majority easily controlled the organization of the body, it attempted to conciliate the minority by treating it with conspicuous fairness. Little beyond organizing was accomplished on the first day, but on the morning of the second the delegates proceeded to the adoption of a brief and unequivocal platform. It declared unqualifiedly in

favor of prohibition, demanded laws preventing unjust discrimination on the part of railroad companies, asked the next legislature to submit an amendment to the constitution in favor of woman suffrage, and requested the Kansas congressional delegation to secure an amendment to the revenue laws so as to prevent persons from selling intoxicating liquors in Kansas except under state laws. Contrary to general expectation, the prohibition part of the platform gave rise to no argument whatever but the woman suffrage clause excited a long discussion. In the end the latter clause was adopted by a majority of five.(35)

The next business was the nomination of governor and it aroused no excitement. The first ballot resulted as follows: St. John, 287; Thacher, 62; Johnson, 12; Martin, 2. St. John received four-fifths of the total vote cast--the largest vote given to any candidate nominated by the convention, yet in spite of this overwhelming strength the minority refused to nominate him by acclamation. Upon the announcement of the result of the ballot, the minority presented the protest which its committee had framed and which read as follows:

"The minority of this convention, opposed to the renomination of Governor St. John, through their chairman and secretary, desire to put upon record their formal protest against a violation of the precedents and customs of the party of the state, which have been uniformly against the nomination of a governor for a third term.

"They also put upon record their protest against the re-nomination of Governor St. John, because we believe that his nomination for a third term is personally obnoxious to a large minority of the republican voters of the state, will endanger republican successes in a number of counties, and threatens to alienate the support of a large number of republican voters. The party, even in Kansas, cannot, we believe, afford to force upon such a body of republican voters a candidate who is so obnoxious to them."(36)

The protest did not create any commotion, and the mildness of the manner which characterized its presentation to the convention was the occasion of a good deal of surprise. After the protest had been filed a committee escorted St. John upon the platform and he made a brief, conciliatory speech.(37)

In addition to St. John, five other men were renominated by the convention; only two new names were added to the state ticket. One of the new men was E. P. McCabe, colored, who was nominated for state auditor--the first colored person to run on the republican ticket in Kansas. St. John was said to have promised him the nomination in return for negro support and then to have attempted to defeat him once the gubernatorial nomination was made. Whereupon, according to the story, the minority determined that St. John should accept him and have the ticket "loaded down with a nigger" or else take the responsibility for his defeat. The minority vote added to the majority vote, which was meant to be only complimentary, nominated him.(38) Several months before the convention St. John had written in a letter that while he doubted if McCabe were well enough known over the state to be nominated, the man and his friends had a right to make the effort to secure the nomination and that "as a matter of principle" his color had nothing to do with the question.(39) The only proof offered for the story of McCabe's nomination was newspaper assertion and St. John invited definite proof. The fact that the negro voting

population of the state was demanding representation on the state ticket may have had something to do with the nomination.

In summary it may be said that there were four features of the state republican convention of 1882 which were remarkable: the nomination of a governor for a third term, his huge majority, the nomination of a colored man, and the platform with a woman suffrage plank.

The greenback-labor convention was the next to meet following the republican. On August 23 it nominated Charles Robinson for governor and adopted an anti-monopoly platform. There was no direct reference to prohibition but the platform pledged the party to "the enforcement of all laws upon the statute books of the state of Kansas."(40)

The democratic state convention met at Emporia on August 30 and adopted a lengthy platform, which, while it favored laws that would promote the cause of temperance, demanded the modification of the existing prohibitory law and the resubmission of the prohibitory amendment to the people at the general election in November, 1884.(41) John Martin, who occupied as important a position in the democratic party as John A. Martin did in the republican, was nominated for governor by acclamation but declined because the platform was not satisfactory to him.(42) One of the campaign charges was that a slush fund of about fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, which had been pledged by the liquor men, was not available with Martin as a candidate.(43) At any rate another man was substituted--George W. Glick, anti-prohibitionist leader.

Glick had served several terms in the Kansas legislature and had been the unsuccessful democratic candidate for governor in 1868. He had practised law but for several years had devoted himself to business and to large stock and farming interests near Atchison. As has already been remarked, his name was a power in his section of the state. Even firm republican papers conceded that he was an able and influential man and personally temperate, although as a member of the legislature he had been the inveterate opponent of temperance legislation.

The nomination of Glick helped to invigorate the whole subject of railroad regulation. His ten years' service as a railway attorney and the fact that at one time he had been president of the Atchison and Nebraska railroad company were points in his record which the anti-monopolists did not overlook. His record on railroad regulation in the legislature was not considered to be favorable to the people and St. John in his speeches stressed the point that in 1881 Glick had first secured the amendment of the railway commissioner bill so as to take the life out of it and had then voted against it.(44)

As for St. John, everything that had been said before about his connection with the transportation companies was now repeated. Added to it was the statement that his delegates to the republican convention rode to Topeka on passes while his opponents paid their own fare and that railway employees had been ordered to vote for him by their employers. In

August he went to Indiana to deliver a number of temperance speeches and made the trip in a special pullman palace car. Although it was stated that the temperance workers themselves had paid for the car, St. John's enemies refused to believe it, alleging that it had been furnished by the railways free to the "corporation candidate." The prohibition controversy was said by some to be fostered and encouraged by the railroad companies for the purpose of distracting public attention from themselves.

The speeches of both Glick and St. John showed that they considered the question of railroad regulation as second in importance only to that of prohibition. Both of them stood for reform. St. John emphasized the difficulty of securing adequate laws owing to the powerful railroad lobbies maintained at the state capital and recommended the adoption by the next legislature of an act providing for a board of commissioners to have control of the regulation of the common carriers.

The nomination of St. John had been generally acclaimed as a vindication of prohibition and the expression of a desire on the part of the people to make prohibition permanent. The governor himself took his renomination in this way. This fact and the nomination of Glick as well as the distinctly opposing prohibition planks in the platform made the prohibition issue between the democratic and republican parties clearly drawn. Leading democrats and republicans accepted it as the important subject upon which a decision was to be made. Both parties wanted it to be the basis of the

campaign. The whole question was debated back and forth and statements such as that the closing of the saloons in Topeka by the mayor's proclamation in October was a political move on the part of St. John were common.

Certain men and newspapers which had opposed the governor up to the time of the republican state convention "ate their crow manfully" and came over to his side, admitting that he had obtained the nomination fairly. But the Junction City Union and the Troy Chief, while supporting the rest of the ticket, deliberately bolted St. John's nomination on the score of prohibition, and led the newspaper fight against him. The Olathe Mirror, the ownership of which had recently changed, was an uncompromising anti-St. John paper both before and after his nomination. To undermine its influence St. John and some of his Olathe friends bought and published the Olathe Gazette as a republican-St. John organ. Direct opposition perhaps did less to injure to St. John than the attitude of papers like the Topeka Commonwealth which, while pretending to favor him, actually damaged his candidacy, oftentimes by direct falsification. For instance, it started the report that the governor had decided to withdraw from the contest after a stormy session with a number of prominent republicans and members of the state central committee, and its later denial seemed to be intended to confirm the belief that he had been so requested. Its warnings that there was danger of his defeat and its appeals to republicans to rally were understood to be an encouragement of the anti-St. John republicans

to keep up the fight, as they had prospects of winning. On the eve of the election it was reported that the support of the Commonwealth had been purchased, yet this paper continued to indirectly threaten the republican ticket.

Among St. John's opponents were several temperance men. One, more fanatical than the others, said: "If he (St. John) is not shot or hanged he may bless the fates that men in this world to not always get their dues."(45)

Included with the anti-prohibitionists who were fighting the governor were the Germans of Kansas. They formed a state society called the Volksverein to aid in bringing about his defeat. But far more active than this organization were the Anti-St. John clubs which began to be launched immediately following the nominating convention and the membership of which some times amounted to several hundred. It is to be noted that these associations were not called anti-prohibition clubs, although the basis for their bolt of St. John's nomination, as will be seen from their published declarations, was chiefly, if not almost wholly, his identification with the prohibitory policy which they claimed to be a failure. The leader of them was the Anti-St. John Republican Club of Shawnee county which on October 2 issued an address to republican voters. This address set forth that the nomination of St. John for a third term was in violation of all precedent in Kansas; that it had been accomplished through unfair means; that it was made not because of his ability or services but because of his temperance hobby; that prohibition and woman

suffrage were no part of republican faith and that dictation of what a person should drink was a step towards a censorship unworthy of a free people. The address also declared that 50,000 republican electors in Kansas objected to a third term and ended by calling upon republicans everywhere "to organize and make a bold fight for their principles." (46) About two weeks later the same club sent out another address stating that it now had 600 members pledged not to vote for St. John and asking for the formation of similar clubs in each community. The secretary requested that the names of all anti-St. John republicans be sent to him and that anti-St. John clubs co-operate with him in bringing about the defeat of the governor. (47) According to another address which was published following a meeting of the club at Topeka on October 25, its membership had increased to over 800 and the opponents of St. John had rallied until his defeat was almost certain. The policy of prohibition was attacked with vigor, after which several paragraphs were devoted to an appeal to the colored voters. There had been rumors in opposition papers that St. John was trying to get McCabe to resign his nomination, and thousands of copies of a circular had been disseminated among the negro voters stating that republicans were refusing to support the colored man and urging members of his race to retaliate by bolting all of the republican ticket except him. The address of the Anti-St. John Club of Shawnee county repeated the charge against St. John and called attention to a paper, edited by the governor's adjutant-general, which had refused to

support McCabe.(48)

The Shawnee county club became the central organization of the other Anti-St. John clubs throughout the state, and besides its published declarations it and these subordinate bodies held frequent meetings at which bolting republicans spoke on prohibition, railroads and the re-election of St. John. These clubs encouraged many hesitant voters to decide definitely against the governor and gave solidity to a movement which might otherwise have been broken up by the lash of the party whip.

Among the republicans openly bolting the renomination of St. John were several of prominence, but there was also a large number of outstanding politicians of his party who worked against him secretly. These politicians had distrusted St. John from the beginning of his governorship, being envious of his growing importance as a national figure and of his position as leader of the temperance reform, and fearing that his popularity with the common people might eventually result in his becoming United States senator, or vice-president or even president of the United States. He had been mentioned for all three offices, outside as well as in Kansas, but was most seriously feared as a competitor for a position in the senate. In fact, he was practically the only man feared by Plumb and Ingalls, the United States senators from Kansas. Jealous opponents said that he thought he could ride his temperance hobby into the national senate and that he

desired to entrench himself for two years more in the governor's office in order to move from that vantage point on the senatorship. At the time of the republican convention much was said about the next year being a good one for a lieutenant-governor to grow into a governor when the legislature elected St. John to the senate.

St. John repeatedly asserted that under no conditions would he be a candidate for United States Senator, that he could not afford to make the race and that he did not wish to take any position that would interfere even temporarily with the work that lay so near to his heart.(49) Other politicians refused to take his "no" seriously, however. While Plumb and Ingalls spoke in the canvass, their help was for the ticket and not for St. John personally. Plumb was a prohibitionist and had introduced a temperance bill in the senate as a flank movement, so it was said, on Governor St. John for the senatorship. St. John had considered Plumb as his friend up to that time, but of Ingalls he said in December, 1881: "My relations with him are such that I would not feel inclined to ask any favor at his hands."(50) On the other hand, Ingalls, who was an anti-prohibitionist, felt no friendship for the governor and the observation that "when John P. St. John was projected into the gubernatorial chair the Olympian gods put up their shutters and went fishing" was ascribed to him.(51)

It seems that Plumb, in spite of a public declaration in favor of St. John's re-election,(52) and Ingalls were the leading spirits in the conference held at Topeka some time

after the republican convention to take measures to effect St. John's defeat, if possible. There had been some newspaper gossip in regard to a combination of the United States senators and representatives from Kansas against the governor as early as April, 1882, and George R. Scott, who was sent to Kansas shortly after St. John's nomination as a correspondent for the New York Witness, a religious weekly, stated that a member of this combination told him frankly that the governor was only renominated for the purpose of defeating him and thereby killing him politically.(53) That this was the purpose of the secret organization of republican politicians was confirmed by Frank R. Ogg, of Olathe, who was present at the meeting at Topeka following the republican convention. According to Ogg, there were present besides Ingalls and Plumb a number of prominent republicans, including George T. Anthony, Solon O. Thacher, George T. Peck, general solicitor of the Santa Fe Railway Company, and D. C. Haskell, United States representative from the second Kansas district, but not every one present joined in this secret method of frustrating St. John's election.(54) Some who did not wish to defeat him, and who regarded such a possibility as remote, desired to reduce his vote and thereby lessen his prestige and influence, and consequently cooperated with the others against him. St. John himself remained in ignorance of the powerful combination.

Some time before the election the other republican nominees for state offices and certain prominent republicans met to

request St. John to withdraw, lest he should defeat the rest of the ticket, and to allow the state central committee to substitute another in his place. According to one account these men appeared before St. John and stated their mission. When they had finished he said:

"Is that all you gentlemen wanted to see me about?"

"yes," they said.

"Good day, gentlemen. When the ides of November roll around you'll find that I'll be elected by the largest majority ever given to a candidate for governor."(55)

In addition to the opposition arising within his own party, St. John of course had to contest against that of the democratic and greenback parties. Robinson did not make many speeches but his writing campaign was active although there were only a few greenback papers in the state to aid him. Surprising as it may seem, he passed over the prohibition issue, letting the greenback plank on law enforcement take care of the subject, and stressed the question of monopolies. The motive which the St. Johnites saw in this action was the desire to take from St. John on the corporation issue a part of the dry vote and thus aid in the election of Glick who would receive the wet vote. It was said afterwards that Robinson made the canvass in the interest of Glick and privately advised his greenback friends to vote for the latter, thus betraying the greenblack cause in order to accomplish the defeat of St. John.(56) How much of this was true cannot be determined, but Robinson had not shown

himself to be scrupulous in politics, and he was on friendly terms with the democratic nominee. At the big Glick jollification at Topeka following the election, a telegram from Robinson was read regretting that he was unable to be present.(57)

Glick made an able canvass, speaking in nearly every county in Kansas and receiving rather substantial support from the state press. Prohibition and railroad regulation formed the subjects of his addresses. He repeatedly denounced the enforcement of prohibition and championed moral suasion.

St. John's campaign lacked none of its usual fiery and untiring nature. He was speaking constantly--always to large and enthusiastic audiences, whether in his home community or in sections of the state where a large part of the people disliked him--and always he showed himself a fluent and agreeable lecturer who was both witty and quick in repartee. He spoke chiefly on the themes of prohibition and railroads, and he never engaged in personal abuse of any one. His lectures averaged two and three hours in length and as he made forty of them during the thirty days previous to the closing of the canvass, it is no wonder that he was slightly hoarse for a short time following the election.

The republican canvass in general was slow in getting under way. The prohibition victory in the republican convention was so overwhelming and so easily won that the victors for the most part could see no necessity for special effort in the campaign. There was a feeling of over-confidence in

St. John's triumph and an underestimation of the importance of the bolt of the anti-prohibition republicans. The case of the Topeka Capital illustrates the tendency of the republican campaign. In the five months preceding the convention it was tremendously active in St. John's behalf, often devoting whole pages in one issue to his candidacy. After his nomination relatively little was said until about the middle of October. The republican campaign dragged. Republicans were apathetic and many of them sullen or despondent. The candidates themselves, aided by half a dozen speakers, had practically carried on the whole of the canvass up to that date. About this time, however, republicans all over the state began to wake up to the fact that they were facing a defeat by the enthusiastic democrats. Political rallies were held and two hundred republican speakers were put on the stump. St. John was recognized as the weak spot on the ticket and papers began urging their readers not to scratch it but to vote it straight.

Up to the last St. John felt sure of his election, relying on the support he would receive from the temperance people and especially from the rural population and believing that for every anti-prohibition republican who voted against him a temperance democrat or greenbacker would vote for him. Just as the democrats invited the republican anti-prohibitionists to join them, so did the republicans encourage the democratic and greenback prohibitionists to shelter themselves in the home of their republican neighbors and "warm

up their patriotism by a good republican fire." Democratic papers claimed that they had long lists of republicans who would vote for Glick and republican papers made the same claim in regard to democrats. Reports that Glick would carry what were normally republican counties became more and more common, however, as the election approached and the estimates by which St. John would be elected gradually decreased. Most democrats were not sanguine of the result, although they expected to reduce St. John's majority. But on October 19 Glick and members of the democratic state committee expressed the opinion that he (Glick) would receive a majority of five to ten thousand. At the same time St. John stated in an interview that he expected to receive a majority of fifty thousand and that if Robison withdrew in Glick's favor--a possibility mentioned by some papers--he would obtain an even larger majority over the democratic nominee.(58)

The returns in November showed that St. John's third term voyage had been wrecked by some political undertow and that Glick had been elected by a majority of 8,079. (See table on next page.) The unexpectedness of this result led to many reports of dishonesty in the election. At Leavenworth, if newspaper accounts are to be trusted, the chairman of the republican county central committee had printed and circulated just before election ten thousand republican tickets on which Glick's name had been substituted for St. John's.(59) It was alleged that the same thing was done at other places and that at least 15,000 republicans were thus made to vote for

STATE ELECTIONS

GOVERNOR

1878

1878

	Republican	Democrat	Greenback		Scattering
	John P. St. John	John R. Goodin	D.P. Mitchell		
Total	74,020	37,208	27,057		11
Majority	39,744				
Plurality	36,812				

Johnson County

Total	1,445	710	1,001			
Majority	-266					
Plurality	444					

1880

	John P. St. John	Edmund G. Ross	H.P. Vrooman	F.M. String- field	J.P. Cul- ver	
Total	115,204	63,557	19,477	219	435	48
Majority	31,468					
Plurality	51,647					

Johnson County

Total	1,906	1,305	342			
Majority	259					
Plurality	601					

1882

	John P. St. John	George W. Glick	Charles Robinson			
Total	75,158	83,237	20,933			56
Majority		-13,079				
Plurality		8,079				

Johnson County

Total	1,227	1,492	335			
Majority		-70				
Plurality		265				

Table based on

Kansas Public Documents, 1879-1880: Second Biennial Report
 of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1880, pp. 16-17,
 150-151.

Kansas Public Documents, 1881-1882: Third Biennial Report
 of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1882, pp. 89-90.

Glick while thinking they were voting a straight republican ticket.(60) St. John always insisted that Glick was an honest man and in no way connected with the fraud. Another explanation of the vote made by the St. John men was that in the scramble for local offices republicans forgot the state ticket, while democrats worked with only Glick's candidacy in mind.

The explanation of St. John's defeat on the basis of dishonesty alone was not attempted. It was recognized that there were certain underlying causes of the shift in votes which made possible the election of a democratic governor in a state normally republican by a large majority. The causes which were usually listed included objection to prohibition and especially to the prohibitory law, credence given to the corporation charge against St. John, objection to the third term and to woman suffrage, political jealousies, corrupt use of money and liquor, personal dislike of St. John and the fact that about twenty thousand republicans absented themselves from the polls. Furthermore, there had been a large amount of discontent within the national republican organization since 1880 and this was bound to affect the results in the states in 1882, especially since in that year party lines were not tightened by a presidential contest. Another factor was the growing strength of the democratic party which made gains in several other northern states besides Kansas in 1882.

If we assume that the things people talk about are the

things which guide their actions, we must conclude that the prohibition, monopoly and third term arguments were responsible for the wrecking of St. John's gubernatorial aspirations. Usually the opposition of voters to the governor was not based on any one of these three arguments but on two or all of them. None of the three factors taken alone might have defeated him but the combination, plus the secret hostility of the professional politicians, was too much for him to overcome.

While the third term was not discussed a great deal following the republican convention, the prejudice against it was probably more influential than the newspapers indicated. People would not quickly forget the education received during the contest between Blaine and Grant for the state's delegation in 1880.

Great interest was manifested by the voters in the transportation question, and the railroad charge undoubtedly deterred many from voting for St. John. It is likely that Glick's former connection with the railroad companies also lost for him a number of votes. It would have been logical for those who believed the anti-monopoly issue the most important one of the campaign to vote with the greenback party, for its platform was uncompromising on this score and the record of its candidate for governor on it had not been subjected to scrutiny.

The prohibition issue was at least partly responsible for the propaganda against St. John on the railroad and third

term questions. Besides this, all the objection to prohibition centered on him and consequently it in itself probably influenced a larger proportion of voters against him than either of the other issues. And regardless of whether or not it was the decisive factor, it was so taken by Glick and St. John, by prominent republicans--such as Ingalls(61)--and democrats of the state, and by the majority of papers of all political beliefs in Kansas. The masses of people did not stop to investigate causes. They simply and very naturally ascribed the result of the election to prohibition. The liquor men, ready to grasp any advantage, were quick to make use of this admission. It had been said before the election that St. John's defeat would be heralded by the rum interest as the defeat of prohibition and, with practically every one agreeing, it was so heralded not only in Kansas but all over the nation. The Leavenworth Times, for instance, was pleased because the party was relieved of the burden of prohibition which might have been forced on it in other states and in the national convention in 1884.(62) The Chicago Times remarked with other papers of national circulation that temperance people everywhere had received a crushing blow in the defeat of St. John, the principal representative of prohibition in politics.(63) At the Glick jollifications held to celebrate the democratic victory, Glick declared several times that the election was a triumph of personal liberty over prohibition.(64) One hundred kegs of beer were given by a Milwaukee brewer to the participants

in the Glick jollification at Leavenworth (65), and, if we may believe the newspapers, liquor flowed freely at other similar meetings.(66)

Although the election of Glick was proclaimed as an anti-prohibition victory, the total vote given to him was 1,067 less than that cast against the prohibitory amendment two years previously. In other words, he failed to poll the full anti-prohibition vote. Even if it had actually been an anti-prohibition triumph as far as St. John was concerned, it would not have gone beyond that, for prosecuting attorneys and other local officers favorable to prohibition were generally elected. In Shawnee county, for example, the county attorney, who had been zealous in the prosecution of saloon-keepers, was re-elected by over a thousand majority while St. John lost the same county by more than six hundred. Similar cases existed in other parts of the state. Moreover, the legislature, which represented the people immediately and which was chosen in most cases upon the prohibition issue, was strongly republican and refused both to resubmit the prohibitory amendment and to repeal the prohibitory law, as Glick recommended in his message. The other members of the republican ticket, who had canvassed the state and everywhere adhered to the prohibition plank in the platform, were elected by majorities approximately the same as those usual in a year in which there was no presidential contest. In spite of the ousting of its principal champion, the principle of prohibition had apparently been sustained in Kansas.

St. John took his defeat in a calm and good-humored way, attributing it principally to a slush fund of one hundred thousand dollars which he claimed had been supplied by the whiskey men, and to the treachery in the republican ranks. He repeatedly maintained that his failure to be elected was not the failure of prohibition. "While I am defeated," he said, "I am neither discouraged, dishonored or whipped, but propose in the future, as in the past, to earnestly press the good fight for prohibition."(67) Somewhat later he said that he regarded his defeat as the best thing that could have happened for the cause of prohibition in Kansas.(68) "A thousand St. Johns may go down in the fight for prohibition," he said, "but the principle will still live, and if we but do our whole duty will eventually crown the homes of the nation with...blessings..."(69)

The abuse and vituperation heaped upon St. John by the democratic and anti-prohibition press was increased by that of certain republican papers disgruntled because of the defeat. One paper published a picture of Lydia E. Pinkham with the caption, "Likeness of John P. St. John, First and Last Prohibition Governor of Kansas," and devoted a whole editorial page to abuse of this "wandering spouter and oratorical vagrant." At Olathe he was burned in effigy on a corner of the public square. It was not uncommon for him to receive letters threatening his life, but he paid no more attention to them than he did to the misrepresentation to which he was subjected. The purpose of the governor's enemies was

to place the whole responsibility for the republican disaster upon him and thus destroy his popularity and perhaps outlaw him from the party. Some of his friends hastened to say that the attempt to accomplish this would fail, that he was not dead politically but was still at the head of the most influential faction in state politics, and that the base abuse was securing for him the leadership of the most powerful reformatory movement of the age and of one which would eventually carry elections from one end of the country to the other.

On January 8, 1883, Glick was formally inaugurated governor of Kansas. St. John made a brief address which was well received even by opposition papers. One part of it delineates his character very well: "I earnestly bespeak for my successor fair treatment... Let us ever remember that falsehood and villification in the sober second judgment of all good citizens hurts those who indulge in it more than it hurts them at whom it is hurled." His words might have been an appeal for himself two years hence when the censure he was to receive in connection with the presidential campaign of 1884 was to surpass in severity and in bitterness anything that he had yet experienced.

PART III

PROHIBITION CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT

CHAPTER VIII

DEVELOPMENT INTO A NATIONAL CHARACTER.

During the four years of his governorship St. John had ceased to be merely an important figure in state politics and had become a character of national significance. This fact resulted from several circumstances which will be traced in the following pages. Chiefly responsible for it were the problems of the negro exodus and of the adoption and enforcement of constitutional prohibition, and the advertisement given to these problems and to Kansas and also inevitably to St. John by his eloquent speeches and numerous lengthy letters. There were several other points about his governorship which served to enhance the importance of St. John. His reputation as a political speaker had extended beyond the boundaries of Kansas even before 1878 but the campaign which he made that year and again in 1880 and in 1882 vastly increased it. The brilliant inaugural in 1879, pictures of which appeared in both American and English periodicals, the visit of President Hayes, and questions like the protection of the frontier each served to make somewhat more conspicuous the position which St. John and Kansas were occupying. The exodus to the state, connected as it was with the migration of thousands of blacks from the south to the north and necessitating an appeal for aid all over the United States and even in foreign countries, did more than the

subjects just named to exalt St. John. The benevolent and humane attitude which he assumed and his refusal to forbid the entrance of the refugees won much praise for him.

Of greater importance than the exoduster policy, however, was St. John's position on prohibition. He was already known as an earnest temperance worker before the national temperance camp meeting at Bismarck Grove in 1878 but his participation in that event after the republican convention had nominated him for governor secured for him comment in national anti-liquor publications as well as making him known to thousands who attended the meetings. His part in the camp meetings of 1879, 1880, and 1881 at Bismarck increased his significance among the anti-saloon workers and led to his receiving the title of "the Messiah of the temperance people."

Never since civil war days had Kansas been so extensively advertised as it was through its primacy in the adoption of constitutional prohibition. The attention of the nation and even of the world was attracted to it as soon as the legislature of 1879 had submitted the prohibitory amendment--the first ever put before the people of a whole state--and did not cease until prohibition had been adopted and put into effect. The temperance forces throughout the country watched the contest with intense interest. Following the election in November, 1880, St. John was literally deluged by hundreds of letters pouring in from all part of the United States and even from abroad, congratulating him on

his re-election and on the adoption of the amendment and thanking him for his efforts in behalf of prohibition. These letters, which often contained requests for information and advice as to methods of carrying on a temperance campaign, came from all sorts of individuals but especially from preachers and temperance workers and included such well-known persons as Henry Ward Beecher and T. Dewitt Talmage. St. John was constantly receiving copies of resolutions adopted by women's and temperance organizations, endorsing him and prohibition. For example, the annual session of the Independent Order of Good Templars of Maryland which met at Baltimore in November, 1880, unanimously adopted and sent to the governor the following resolution: "That we recognize Governor St. John of Kansas as one of the most reliable and staunchest Temperance champions in the country and we heartily congratulate him upon the glorious victory achieved in his state by the adoption of constitutional prohibition of intoxicating liquors as a beverage."(1)

Interest in the Kansas prohibitory law continued unabated during St. John's struggle to enforce it. For a time he received on an average of six letters each day making inquiries in relation to it. The proclamation of December 10, 1881, for the purpose of securing better enforcement of prohibition elicited several letters of commendation from Christian and temperance organizations and from men like Neal Dow and George R. Scott, of the New York Witness. A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of citizens at Canton,

Maine, illustrates the enthusiasm displayed by the temperance element all over the country. It extended thanks to St. John for his "noble, heroic and persistent attempt to execute the laws of his state" and exclaimed: "Governor St. John! The eyes of Maine are upon you, and tens of thousands elsewhere are watching with greatest interest your heroic efforts to close the dram-shops of Kansas."(2) Temperance conventions hung in a conspicuous place on the platform the portrait of St. John with a scroll bearing an appropriate quotation attributed to him, such as the following: "I can afford not to be governor but I cannot afford to sacrifice my principles."(3) The national convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in 1880 telegraphed him recognizing his faithful adherence to the principle of prohibition and in 1881 sent him the expression of its "cordial sympathy and unwavering faith." Woman suffrage organizations saw in him a firm champion of their principles and did not fail to write him extending their congratulations. Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, of Iowa, well known in anti-saloon work, wrote him in July, 1881, urging him to speak on temperance at Saratoga and Chautauqua Lake, New York and saying: "Your name has come to be loved the country over and your presence will cheer our temperance hosts."(4) Shortly before this E.B. Reynolds had written from Indiana that no one could give the temperance work in that state a better send-off than the chief executive of Kansas.(5)

In May, 1881, the Independent Order of Good Templars held

its annual meeting in Topeka. The fact that this organization was international in its scope and included a membership of nearly one-half million and had never before held an annual meeting in so small a city or west of Missouri was taken as an unusual honor to Kansas and to St. John, who delivered an address of welcome. Members of the order who responded to the addresses of welcome stressed the point that Kansas was the first to declare in her fundamental law that the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for use as a beverage was a crime. On the fourth day of the meeting a rising vote of thanks was extended to St. John for his earnest interest in the temperance cause.(6) The annual session of the Independent Order of Good Templars in 1882 and in 1883 again paid particular attention to prohibition in Kansas. The resolution adopted in 1882 declared that "the gallant fight made by Governor St. John and the friends of Prohibition in Kansas commands our warmest commendation, and we extend our congratulations and sympathies to them in their desperate struggle with the entire liquor interest of the nation."(7) All this was a magnificent advertisement of Kansas and its governor.

Manifestations of St. John's growing national popularity are seen in the hundreds of invitations received by him to speak both in and outside of Kansas. These invitations began to pour in at an ever-increasing rate from the ~~beginning~~ opening of his administration and naturally most of them had to be declined. They came from everywhere over the United States and included

requests for speeches on various topics, sometimes, for instance, on the exodus but usually on prohibition.

In the early part of December, 1880, St. John made his first lecture tour in the East, delivering a speech at Cooper Institute in New York City on the exodus and another in Reverend T. Dewitt Talmage's Brooklyn tabernacle on prohibition in Kansas. He also made two speeches on the same subjects in Chicago. In April of the following year he again went east, speaking on prohibition in Chicago, Philadelphia, New York and Washington, D.C. During August, 1881, he answered the call of the temperance workers in Indiana and spent five days speaking there and near the close of the year made brief lecture tours in Illinois and Nebraska to aid the temperance cause in these places. He again went east in January, 1882, speaking in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and in Brooklyn, and before a joint session of the state legislature at Des Moines, Iowa. He returned to Iowa in June and made twelve speeches which undoubtedly aided materially the successful campaign for the adoption of the constitutional prohibitory amendment in that state. Later in the same year he spoke in Boston and twice in Chicago. In addition to these tours he made several short trips to Colorado, Missouri, Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin, where he discussed the success and benefits of prohibition in Kansas.

On all of his trips St. John was received by immense audiences and flattering ovations. The New York Times, in reporting his speech given at Cooper Institute in December,

1880, under the auspices of the New York Temperance Society, said: "When Governor St. John, a plain, business-like man... arose, the people present stood upon their feet cheering." (8) When he spoke in Talmage's tabernacle in Brooklyn in January, 1882, the large edifice was unable to hold the audience and Mr. Talmage stated that there had never been such a crowd in the building.(9) While he was in New York at this time, St. John and Governor A.H. Colquitt of Georgia, also a temperance worker, were given a notable reception at the home of William E. Dodge. Over two hundred prominent men of the city, including such figures as Jay Gould, were present. At Denver, Chicago, Washington, Philadelphia, Boston--everywhere the story was the same. The Kansas governor was met with enthusiasm and praise, tendered large receptions at which many persons of note were present, and lauded by the temperance and religious press.

He was not only pressed to deliver many speeches but he also received a large number of requests for articles and letters on temperance, most of which were refused. Temperance and religious papers were anxious to secure something from his pen for publication, and several other newspapers and magazines also sought to obtain expressions on the exodus and particularly on prohibition from him. Many of his letters and speeches found their way into print. He was extensively interviewed and quoted and he never failed to make full use of all opportunities to secure newspaper space. There appeared a host of eulogistic articles, paying tribute to

him as the benefactor of the colored race and the champion of prohibition.

Other manifestations of his prominent position in temperance circles are apparent in the gifts--many of them having considerable monetary value--which he received and in the dedication of temperance verses, songs and song books to him. "We'll Never Have License Again" was the title of one of these musical effusions. This increasing influence among anti-saloonists was also recognized by his election to office in national temperance organizations and by the rather frequent suggestions of him for important federal offices. In November, 1879, he was chosen president of the National Christian Temperance Union to succeed Francis Murphy, who very bitterly opposed the choice on the ground that the Kansan had had very little to do with the temperance movement and had never done anything for the Union to merit such distinction. When the election took place in spite of his opposition, Murphy declined to serve as one of the vice-presidents.(10) In 1880 St. John was again elected president of the Union. Beginning at this time he served for several years as one of the vice-presidents of the National Temperance Society and Publication House--a position of no great importance because of the large number of vice-presidents but significant in that he was the only Kansan holding office in this organization for many years. He was also elected as a vice-president of the International Temperance Society at the annual meeting of this association

in July, 1879.

It has already been mentioned that St. John was considered by many republicans, irrespective of their views on prohibition, as a possible candidate for the United States senate not long after he took over the reins of government in Kansas and the impression was conveyed to the country at large that he was very likely to be elected to this office. Even after the disastrous defeat of 1882 he was still mentioned, although not enthusiastically, for that position. While there was less prospect that he would ever be nominated for vice-president by the republican party he was nevertheless named in this connection several times beginning about October, 1879, by the out-of-state as well as by the Kansas press--and even by a few papers in addition to those devoted to temperance. There were a number of temperance papers which had the temerity to pleasantly suggest the prohibition governor as the republican candidate for president. Such a prominent weekly as the New York Witness made this suggestion in December, 1880, soon after the governor's election for a second term. St. John was also thought of as the candidate of the prohibition party for either president or vice-president, but because his staunch republicanism was well known not much was made of the possibility, at least not until after his defeat in 1882.

While this defeat killed him politically, so far as advancement through the republican party was concerned, it vastly increased his importance as a prohibitionist.

Senator Plumb said before the election that St. John, if defeated, would be a greater man than if elected and in a way this was true. Disaster often increases a man's significance. At the opening of the campaign early in 1882 no state in the union was governed by a man more widely known than Kansas, and as much interest centered in him as in Chester A. Arthur or in Samuel J. Tilden. No other Kansan had ever occupied a position similar to his as the head of a reform which was becoming national in character. The prohibition issue which was considered to be at stake in the Kansas election in 1882 amplified the national interest in the outcome of this contest. George R. Scott wrote to St. John in May, 1882, after his paper, the New York Witness, had nominated the Kansan as a candidate for the presidency in 1884, in these words:

"If there is a public man I respect above all others in this country it is you. ... You, Sir, are the national representative of Prohibition. The good people of this country know no other. I hope...you may be renominated and re-elected. --Last Sunday night I addressed an immense audience on the struggle in Kansas; and if the citizens of your State could have seen the way your name was received, it seems to me they would know nothing among men save St. John. ... You would be astonished to see what an interest is being taken in your coming State election hereabouts. I cannot help doing all I can, (in the paper with which I am connected, and in speaking to the people) to say kind words, as well as discreet ones, about you. I feel that the fight in Kansas is pregnant with mighty results to the whole Union. ... Your re-election would do more to encourage temperance action throughout the Union than anything I can conceive of."(11)

The jubilation of the liquor forces over the ousting of St. John and the general acceptance of his defeat as a blow to prohibition caused the anti-liquor faction to

rally to his defense and to their cause. The abuse which he underwent made him all the more noble in the eyes of his prohibitionist contemporaries.

The closing of his terms as governor of Kansas was the real beginning of his career as a professional temperance lecturer. Some had thought that his defeat would bring to an end his activity for temperance but during the year following the termination of his gubernatorial duties he was working almost constantly in the cause. The animosity which he met everywhere in Kansas as a result of his defeat seriously handicapped his work in this state, but he remained president of the Temperance Mutual Benefit Union of Kansas during 1883. After presiding and giving the principal address at the meeting of the Kansas State Temperance Union in Topeka on January 9, 1883, he tendered his resignation from the office of president of this body--a position which he had held for six years. Aside from this address and those in September at the meeting of the State Temperance Union and at a prohibition camp meeting in Merriam Park, he did very little speaking in Kansas.

But if the "silvery tones" of his voice were in slight demand on the soil of Kansas, the pressure upon him from elsewhere made up for this fact many times. He was offered twelve thousand five hundred dollars and expenses paid to lecture in England and Scotland for one year (12), but he preferred to remain in America where nearly every state in the Union was anxious to secure his services. Just what

financial remuneration he received for his speeches is not known but it is likely that during the first few years following 1882 his income from the lecture platform amounted to about ten or twelve thousand annually. After some years the amount he received for one lecture decreased and during his later life grew still smaller. Until he quitted public office he had never accepted any pay beyond his expenses for his work in the interest of temperance, and he had objected to the collection of any voluntary contributions at places where he spoke.

St. John's lectures during 1883 and 1884 took him into most of the more important states as well as into southern Canada. He aided in prohibitory amendment campaigns in a number of states. During February and March, 1883, he spoke forty times in thirty different places to a total of about seventy-five thousand persons. In August of the same year he delivered twenty-four open-air speeches in New York and during July and August of 1884 made fifty more speeches in the same state in one circuit. In fact, he delivered more speeches in New York than in any other state. Practically all of his lectures were made in big cities and he was invariably received by a large and enthusiastic crowd and frequently honored with a reception. One of his most outstanding receptions was given to him in Boston on Washington's birthday, February 22, by the temperance societies of Massachusetts. A choral concert of fifty musicians and a chorus of six hundred voices were features of the affair which lasted during the day and

evening and at which ex-Governor John D. Long, of Massachusetts, Governor A.H. Littlefield, of Rhode Island, John B. Gough and other notables were present. In the evening St. John addressed an audience estimated at about ten thousand.

His speeches varied little from those which he delivered in Kansas and which have already been discussed. He dealt with the history and success of prohibition in Kansas and the resulting prosperity of the state, and paid particular attention to the benefits derived by Olathe from the prohibitory policy. His lectures were replete with flattering references to his home state and town. The customary arguments for prohibition he enforced with statistical data and enlivened with reasoning like this: "Why should we give the protection of prohibition to the thief inside the prison and withhold it from the honest man on the outside?"(13) He never wearied of drawing an analogy between the struggle against slavery and that against alcohol or of repeating that the temperance question was doing more to blot out prejudices between the north and south than any other problem that had arisen. "Upon this great platform...the entire north and south can stand," he said.(14) Woman suffrage was another reform which he seldom failed to mention, because he felt that if this were accomplished the liquor question would be settled. He hailed the day when the mother would also have a voice in saying whether her son should "be sent to heaven or to hell."(15) Education, he further said, was the principal

means for bringing about an emancipation from the power of strong drink, and this emancipation must be achieved because this nation could not continue to exist "half drunk and half sober."(16)

After this wise St. John spoke. He was forceful in his arguments, clear and earnest in his language, fervent in his manner. His personality and his record combined to give him a reputation which at the time surpassed that of Neal Dow, John E. Gough or Francis Murphy. By the middle of 1884 he was everywhere recognized as the foremost of the exponents of the prohibitive principle as applied to the sale of intoxicating drinks, and consequently it was natural that the prohibition party should turn to him as the one best fitted to carry its presidential standard that year.

CHAPTER IX

CLIMAX OF CAREER: PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1884.

Prohibition was rapidly growing in importance as a national issue at the time St. John was defeated for governor. Stimulated by the success of prohibition in Kansas, the temperance workers were making a general effort and in many places were acquiring such solidity as to call for respectful attention from the politicians. By the spring of 1883 the question of the regulation of the liquor traffic or its absolute prohibition had been before more than three-fourths of the state legislatures, and the proposition for a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, had been prominently before nearly half of them; in two states (besides Kansas) the proposition had been submitted to a vote of the people; in three others it passed one house and failed in the other; in several states the vote by which submission was lost had been very close.(1) The increase of temperance sentiment was shown in the growth of temperance organizations, the resolutions of churches, the large attendance at the numerous temperance camp meetings which were held each summer in various parts of the country, the election returns in places where a prohibitory amendment had been submitted, and in the large number of appeals and petitions which were submitted to state legislatures asking permission for the

people to vote on state constitutional amendments. Articles in newspapers indicated that the prohibition idea might sweep the whole country and there were predictions that it would shape the politics of most of the states of the Union before ten years had passed. The topic occupied a good deal of space in papers like the St. Louis Globe-Democrat which spoke of the tremendous popular force at work in the direction of prohibition and said: "The signs of the times indicate that the politico-moral question of the generation now coming on the political stage will be prohibition, as emancipation was that of the generation now retiring from it."(2) Not only in the United States but abroad, in England, Ireland and Canada, the temperance idea was making progress. The liquor forces were alarmed at the rapid growth of the reformation and at the consequent pressure on them and, according to the prohibitionists, had declared war against all political parties and all legislators opposed to them.

St. John early recognised this increasing prominence of prohibition and reported after a lecture tour in December, 1880, that the entire East was becoming intensely worked-up over the matter.(3) He frequently referred to the world-wide reputation gained by Kansas through its primacy in the adoption of constitutional prohibition and said that nothing except Christianity came so near to the hearts of the masses as prohibition. During 1882 and 1883 he predicted many times that in ten to thirty years not a state in the Union would sanction the distillation or sale of intoxicating

liquor. The ovations given to him on his lecture trips naturally strengthened his opinion of the significance of Kansas as the leader in the temperance reform and of himself as the leader in Kansas.

Many republicans feared that St. John might leave the party or attempt to harm it in some way in revenge of his defeat and of the abuse heaped upon him in consequence; and the expansion of the importance of prohibition as a factor in national life and St. John's connection with it increased their apprehension. Apparently, however, he bore no ill-feeling towards his party. He ignored the attempt to read him out of the republican ranks, asserted his interest in state politics and his intention of participating actively in the next election and declared in May, 1883, that he had always been a "straight republican" and felt an "utter contempt for a political bolter and kicker." He also showed a magnanimous spirit towards those who had protested against his nomination in the convention of 1882, saying, "I hope I shall never be so mean and contemptible as to nurse a personal matter like that to the detriment of the party."⁽⁴⁾ As late as February, 1884, he stumped the second district in behalf of the republican congressional candidate. This is practically the only mention of his participation in state politics although the newspapers frequently carried interviews with him on the political situation in Kansas. He was mentioned as a candidate for the state senate, the United States congress, and the governorship, but never enthusiastically.

Many of his friends preferred that he should not be a candidate for any position and he himself declared that he wanted no office, having enlisted for life in the war against dram shops.(5)

The determined effort on the part of a certain element in the republican party to force him out of the party's ranks could not fail to embitter him, in spite of the vaunted staunchness of his political belief. In April, four delegates-at-large to the national convention were selected by the state republican convention at Topeka, but although the naming of St. John as one of them would have been in the interest of harmony and although his nomination was pressed by the Topeka Capital and a few other newspapers for the purpose of conciliating him, he was not elected. It was well known that he wanted to go the national convention but his friends did not even dare to nominate him, knowing that he would be defeated and fearing the sting might drive him from the party.

A few days after the selection of delegates to the national republican convention, St. John made a speech on harmony in the party. He stated that he had never been in discord with his party and that it was the anti-prohibitionists and not the prohibitionists who had bolted. He also said that the bolters who had supported S.O. Thacher for the gubernatorial nomination in 1882 refused to do so now, thus demonstrating their lack of desire for harmony, and that the prohibitionists comprising seventy-five per cent. of the

party were willing to unite on him.(6) He felt that the republican party in Kansas, if it were not lacking in moral courage, should assume the burden of prohibition as a party measure for which it was responsible. At the meeting of the Kansas State Union in January, 1883, he had offered the following resolution which was adopted in spite of the fact that the platform of the Union declared against the organization of a new party: "That we hereby pledge ourselves to vote for no man nor support any party that favors licensed dram shops."(7) He now declared that he was more in favor of this resolution than ever and added: "I...have lived nearly all my life on the border between the fires of freedom and of slavery. I have had my republicanism burned and blistered into every bone and fiber of my organization, and as a life-long republican... I desire to see the party march onward... But it is better that it suffer a thousand defeats and be right than gain a single victory through sacrifice of principle." The republican party, he thought, could not keep harmonious step to "the music of the Sabbath-school and beer garden" at the same time.(8)

There was a tendency on the part of many prohibitionists to consider the stopping of the liquor traffic through the agency of the existing parties hopeless and to favor the support of a national prohibition organization. Neal Dow, for instance, wrote in the latter part of 1883 that the prohibitionists had fully made up their minds to break with the republican party in Maine (9), and the annual convention of

the Independent Order of Good Templars in May, 1884, resolved to indorse an independent prohibition party unless one of the other parties declared for suppression of the liquor traffic.(10) St. John had formerly looked for prohibitory legislation through the agency of the republican organization. One of his earliest expressions on the subject was in September, 1879, when he said: "I believe that prohibition not only can but should be reached without the organization of a third party. The friends of temperance should be so earnest, honest and determined in the work as to make their power felt by all political parties to the end that no political party will dare to array itself against the cause of temperance."(11) The question arose in Ohio during 1882 when the republican party favored license as to whether the prohibitionist faction of the party should support it or an independent prohibition organization. St. John, being asked for his opinion, offended some temperance men by writing: "It seems to me there is no longer any reason for the friends of temperance in Ohio to withhold their earnest support to the Republican party of that state. The fact is rapidly developing that the Republican party of this country is to be the great party of morality, sobriety and good government against the Democratic party, that seems wedded to the cause of free whiskey."(12) This position was to be expected from the republican candidate for governor of Kansas, but it represented an advance over his earlier position that prohibition was in no sense a political issue. It was during

the campaign of 1882 that he also asserted that he always expected to be a republican and would in no event be an independent candidate for any office.(13)

After his defeat St. John was not so sure of the purity of the principles of the republican party. In his lectures during 1883 he gave the party several severe "tongue lashings" for its "cowardly attitude" on the question of intoxicating drinks, and said that any political organization the existence of which depended on its friendship with the rum power would and ought to die. Prohibition was in his opinion the issue of the future and the party ought to espouse it, and although it might be beaten in 1884 it would sweep the country in 1888. "History repeats itself," he said. "In 1840 James G. Birney found only seven thousand opposed to slavery; that seven thousand grew until Lincoln became president."

Various suggestion that St. John should join with the prohibition party had been made following the disaster of 1882. As it became more apparent that he was permanently outlawed from the republican party and could hope for no political preferment from it, and as his enunciations on prohibition became more decided and radical, prohibitionists began to regard him as the most desirable candidate that the prohibition party could name. George R. Scott wrote of the situation:

"Early in the year 1884 the avowed Prohibitionists of this country began to look around for a Presidential candidate, and having become identified with the new party, I commenced a correspondence with many of its leaders and found out that

they favored Mr. St. John, provided that he was willing to come out of the ranks of the Republican party and declare himself to be a third-party man. At that time there seemed little probability of his doing so, but in reply to a letter asking about his position he wrote me that if the Republican party, at its coming National convention, did not insert a strong prohibitory plank in its platform and nominate a man who was in sympathy with it, he would refuse to support its nominees; but had no desire to become the candidate of any party."(14)

It was almost certain that the republican party would not make a declaration in favor of prohibition, but it would have savored too much of revenge had St. John left his party prior to the action of the convention. After this action his defection from the republican ranks would seem natural and sincere. These were perhaps the reasons why the national central committee of the prohibition party allowed itself to be persuaded by St. John and other temperance leaders to postpone the prohibition convention, which had originally been planned for May, until after the conventions of the larger parties had had a chance to take a stand on temperance. Many prohibitionists, in spite of St. John's statements that he would be a candidate for no office, believed he could be prevailed upon to accept the nomination of the prohibitionists for president if he were given a chance to gracefully drop his republican allegiance.

The democratic party, in line with its general reputation as the friend of the liquor interests, declared against sumptuary laws in its national convention. The republican convention met at Chicago early in June. Frances E. Willard presented to its platform committee, as she had to that of the democratic convention, a petition from the national

Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking the party "to advocate and adopt such measures as are requisite to the end that prohibition of the importation, exportation, manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages may become an integral part of the national constitution and that your candidate shall be by character and public life committed to a national prohibitory constitutional amendment."(15) The republican platform ignored the subject of temperance and renewed its allegiance to the Rastall resolution of 1872 which had made a bid for the liquor vote. Later the memorial presented by Miss Willard was found by the janitor on the floor of the committee room, covered with tobacco spittle. A facsimile of the stained paper was made and published broadcast by the prohibitionists as a campaign document against the republicans who had thus "disrespectfully treated the petition of the christian women." James G. Blaine, the republican nominee for president, had previously expressed himself in favor of the distribution of the federal liquor tax to the states as a permanent resource to them--a proposition which implied the permanent intrenchment of liquor in the national revenue system. Later in the campaign Blaine increased the antagonism of the temperance men by purposely refraining from voting on the state constitutional prohibitory amendment when it was before the voters of Maine. The position of Senator John A Logan, republican nominee for vice-president, was not much more satisfactory than Blaine's to many prohibitionists, as

he had advocated the use of liquor revenue for school purposes.

Immediately after the republican convention Mr. Scott telegraphed St. John, asking him his opinion of the action of his party. Miss Willard wrote to the Kansas ex-governor that she was through with the republican party and asked his cooperation in building up the prohibition party. Other temperance workers wanted to know whether or not he was going to remain with his party. St. John, on June 4, before the nomination of Blaine and Logan, had already declared that he would no longer act politically with the national republican party (16), but on June 14 he allowed the following statement from him to be published: "The action of the Chicago convention in wholly ignoring the temperance question ...is an insult to every prohibitionist in the land. ... Such political cowardice ought to be condemned by every christian man and woman in the United States, and...it shall never be indorsed by my ballot."(17) "It is not that I object to Blaine so much as to the platform," he said. "...There is a bid for a Land League vote, a bid for the wool vote and the anti-Chinese fellows, and, while it touches on these purely sectional issues, it ignores totally the only real vital issue of the day and the great moral sentiment of the country."(18) He said that he had asked that the prohibition convention be postponed because he believed it meant danger to his party and hoped that the republican organization would favor prohibition in its plat-

form. Thus, he said, the republicans were given fair warning and an opportunity to guard against possible defeat by the prohibition party, which he thought would poll five hundred thousand votes and make itself felt in every state especially in Kansas, Maine, Iowa, New York, Ohio and Missouri, and at least jeopardize if it did not defeat the republican ticket.(19) The deliberate defeat he received in 1882 was evidently rankling in his mind when he said later that he did not stay in the republican ranks and "treacherously stab it in the dark" but let the world know where he stood.(20)

Thus it was that St. John, who had said that whatever his political fortunes might be he would always be found battling for the "grand principles of the G.O.P."(21) and who had also said that no man with political aspirations would accomplish anything by bolting (22), joined the ranks of the prohibition party. The preceding discussion has shown that there were several factors which induced him to take this step. Of course it was said by republicans that his motive was revenge and that he desired not to elevate prohibition but to defeat the republican party. It would have been only natural if St. John, who had been the idol of his party, had resented the slurs he received and the loss of his prestige after his failure to be elected the third time; but the attitude of the old parties, the refusal of legislatures to submit prohibitory amendments and the growing tendency of temperance workers to favor an independent prohibitory organization also had their influence on him.

Furthermore, it is possible that he had become intoxicated with the increasing prominence of the prohibition issue and believed it destined to cause a change as vital as the abolition question, had developed an exaggerated view of his own significance and hoped to see himself the Lincoln of the emancipation from strong drink. He always maintained that it was the disrespect shown to the W.C.T.U. memorial which was the decisive factor with him, and in the last speeches which he made before his death thirty-two years later he was still showing his worn facsimile of the petition and calling attention to its tobacco stains.

St. John did not break his connection with the republican party in Kansas when he sundered it with the national organization. Before the state convention met, however, he made the public statement that if it did not unequivocally endorse prohibition he would "condemn its cowardice" with his voice and vote.(23) When it met, the convention declared in its platform that prohibition had been adopted as the organic law of the state by the people "without distinction of party," favored a "faithful and honest enforcement of the Constitutional Amendment," and arraigned Glick for his pardoning of convicted saloon-keepers.(24) This was indeed a recession from the platform of 1882 which had declared unqualifiedly in favor of prohibition and pledged such additional legislation as should secure rigid enforcement. St. John pointed out that the platform of 1884 repudiated prohibition as a republican measure, had no word

for the prohibitive principle or the effects of the policy in Kansas and no declaration against resubmission but only a promise to enforce the law. What party would have dared not to pledge allegiance to the constitution, he asked. He also objected to the nomination for governor of John A. Martin because the latter had fought the amendment and was then, he said, advertising in his paper, the Champion, saloons which were still operating in Atchison.(25) On these grounds St. John committed himself to the prohibition party both in the state and in the nation.

The majority of prohibitionists in Kansas desired no third party but wished to work through the republican organization to gain their ends. This was the attitude of the Kansas State Temperance Union and such men as James A. Troutman. Nevertheless, a prohibition party convention was held at Topeka on July 17 and presidential electors named and instructed to work for the nomination of St. John.(26)

After he had left the republican party the demand for St. John as the prohibition nominee for president increased in spite of his earnest protestations to his friends and through the press that he would not accept it even though it should be tendered to him.

The national convention was held in Lafayette Hall in Pittsburgh, July 23 and 24, with 700 delegates and alternates, representing 31 states and territories, in attendance. A considerable number of women were there, most of them representing the W.C.T.U., which, in common with other

temperance societies, had been asked to send delegates. Intense moral earnestness and enthusiasm characterized the gathering. The W.C.T.U. memorial, which the other political conventions had rejected, was adopted with cheers and a general uprising, and the five general officers of the W.C.T.U. were included in the list of vice-chairmen. On the second day the nominations were made. Upon the call of the states several candidates for the presidential nomination were presented: Dr. R.H. McDonald, of California, Gideon T. Stewart, of Ohio, James Black, of Pennsylvania, General Clinton B. Fisk, of New Jersey, and St. John. It was rumored that McDonald, if nominated, would head the campaign fund with a subscription of a million dollars.(27) George C. Christian, of Illinois, nominated St. John. Miss Willard in a seconding speech said: "We must choose the one who, as a sun-glass, will focus the most votes, and I believe Governor St. John to be that man."(28) Other seconding speeches were made by Mrs. Clara T. Hoffman, president of the W.C.T.U. of Missouri, Dr. A.A. Miner, of Massachusetts, Michael J. Fanning, of Michigan, A.A. Hopkins, of New York, and Eugene W. Chafin, of Wisconsin, who was himself to be twice the prohibition candidate for president. All the names were withdrawn except that of St. John and he, upon motion of John B. Finch, was nominated unanimously in the midst of the greatest enthusiasm. As soon as the nomination was declared a picture of St. John was displayed from the stage while the delegates and spectators joined in singing, "Glory! Glory!

Hallelujah! Our Cause is Marching On!" and "Praise God from Whom All Blessings Flow."(29) Honorable William Daniel, of Maryland, was given the nomination for vice-president by a unanimous vote.

The platform which was adopted acknowledged "Almighty God as the rightful sovereign of all men, from whom the just powers of government are derived," declared that both the great political parties virtually recommended the perpetuation of the liquor traffic and that a separate party was necessary for the effectual enactment and enforcement of prohibitory laws. It also denounced the encouragement of the importation, manufacture, supply and sale of alcoholic beverages by national revenue laws and demanded the abolition of the revenue from alcoholic liquors and tobacco; asked that Congress submit a national prohibitory amendment to the states, exclude the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages from the District of Columbia and the territories, and thereafter admit no state into the union until its constitution should prohibit polygamy and the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. Faith in woman suffrage was declared but "the practical outworking of this reform" was relegated "to the discretion of the Prohibition party in the several States according to the condition of public sentiment in those States."(30)

At the time the nomination was offered to St. John there was no assurance that he would accept. He had positively instructed his friends before the convention to prevent his

nomination and during the meeting repeated his decision several times. John B. Finch, head of the great Order of Good Templars, who was made chairman of the national central committee, was not in favor of the Kansan's nomination unless the latter had agreed to accept, feeling that refusal to run after the nomination was made would injure the cause.(31) At the same time he earnestly desired to have the prestige of St. John's name on the ticket and, along with several other delegates, sent a number of telegrams during the progress of the convention entreating him to signify that he would not decline. Two of the telegrams sent on July 22, the day before the convention, opened, read:

"You will be nominated by acclamation. Your friends cannot prevent. Please untie our hands and stand by the men who have stood by you in years past. Duty calls you. We cannot stay in the convention that will certainly nominate you if you are going to decline afterwards and hurt the cause, us and yourself. What shall we do? Will you decline or accept when nominated? Answer at once, Monongahela House, Pittsburgh. For God's sake, give us your ultimatum."(32)

"You will be nominated even if you positively refuse. The question is what you will do after the inevitable nomination. For your friends' sake, telegraph us you will accept."(33)

St. John's reply to all requests to say that he would consent to run was the same. A telegram to John B. Finch on July 22 was a typical reply:

"I cannot accept but am heart and soul with you to stay. Please don't let them shelve me with a nomination but let me fight in the rank with the people where I can do a great deal more good for the cause than I could do as a candidate."(34)

Several friends of St. John then asked Finch to send no more telegrams to their favorite, offering assurances that while the ex-governor would not make the pledge desired, he would

accept if nominated, and the convention proceeded to name him as the party's standard-bearer.

On July 24 a telegram was sent informing him of his nomination and on the next day the notifying committee received the following answer:

"I was at the Lakeside yesterday and did not receive your telegram until this morning. While I did not seek or desire the nomination, I greatly appreciate the unanimity with which it was given, as well as the honor conferred.

"I can only say now that I acquiesce in the action of the convention, and looking to God for his guidance, shall try to do my duty."(35)

In commenting on the fact that St. John did not receive the telegram of notification until the day after it was sent, because he was traveling from place to place speaking on temperance, George R. Scott said: "That does not look like the action of a man who was so anxious for a nomination as to desert his party in the hope of getting it."(36)

St. John dreaded to accept the nomination because he fully realized that his candidacy would subject him to all manner of abuse, falsehood and villification and that it would be said that he had left the republican party for the purpose of running for president on the prohibition ticket. His expectations were fulfilled. Before the national prohibition convention met, republican papers in Kansas tactfully expressed the opinion that the ex-governor was too honorable to accept the prohibition nomination if offered and indicated that if he were so treacherous as to do so he would deserve--and get--the severest denunciation from his former political friends. Most Kansas newspapers saw nothing

of which to be proud in the nomination. It was a cause for shame that "the man who was twice honored by being made chief executive of the State, and who received that honor at the hands of the republican party, should now accept an empty and hopeless nomination, the only purpose of which is to secure the defeat of the republican ticket."(37) He was regarded as one who in a moment of foolish pride dragged himself down from a proud position as the unselfish advocate of a great moral principle and butied himself in the slough of despondency awaiting all soured and disappointed politicians. As for his reason for bolting, republicans said that prohibition must come up from the states through the delegates to the national convention and not be carried home by the delegates from the national convention to the states, where there was no public sentiment to support the issue; in other words, that a national issue in any party must be strong in the states to make its recognition in the national platform practicable. His intention in bolting, it was claimed, had been to place himself in an attitude to be nominated for president by the prohibition convention. There was some alarm lest his independent candidacy might accomplish the defeat of Blaine, for it was conceded that most of the Kansan's strength would be drawn from republican ranks where the majority of temperance voters were found. Should the Democrats come into power, it was said, the temperance cause would be set back from ten to twenty years. Most republicans, however, regarded the candidacy of St. John with contempt

and thought he would not harm Blaine's chances of election and, in fact, that he would do little beyond destroying his own political future. The majority of temperance people in Kansas disapproved his nomination and supported the republican party; the Kansas W.C.T.U., however, although it indorsed the state republican party, was liberal enough to commend him personally. Only those belonging to the small and weak state prohibition party fully approved of his candidacy. The democrats, of course, welcomed his defection and said that he at least had the virtue of being consistent. There were even a few fair-minded republicans who, while deplored the ex-governor's step, in justice stated that there were many other republicans who had refused to support the nominee of their party for less reasons than he and conceded that he had a right to follow his own conscience. This was the position assumed by the Olathe Mirror which was owned, by St. John and two friends but editorial charge of which had been leased to a man named T. W. Eckert until December, 1864. As the recognized republican organ of Johnson county, the Mirror deprecated St. John's candidacy although defending his motives and insisted that there was no reason why the citizens of Johnson county "should jeopardize the chances of success of the Republican party, because one of our citizens, distinguished and honored though he be, has received the nomination for an office that there is no prospect of his being elected to fill."(38)

When he was nominated St. John was engaged in speaking

at a series of thirty temperance camp meetings in the state of New York. These engagements having been made a year previously, he felt it his duty to keep them, but he offered as soon as they were completed, about the first of September, to give his services unreservedly to the campaign. He and Daniel were formally notified of their nominations on August 25 at the St. John camp meeting circuit grounds two miles from Cuba, New York, where a temperance camp meeting was in progress. In his speech of acceptance St. John maintained that both the democratic and republican parties were united in favor of making the liquor traffic permanent and declared: "The home will have nothing to fear if the people will vote as they pray."(39) He amplified his views in a formal letter of acceptance which he wrote at Olathe on September 26. This letter spoke of the passing of the Civil War issues and of the necessity of abandoning old prejudices and sectional strife. The democratic and republican parties, beyond personal abuse, he said, devoted themselves mainly to the discussion of the tariff question. He then pointed out the enormous cost of the liquor traffic to the people and added that if this sum were saved by prohibition "a protection would be given to the industries of this country that would enable us successfully to throw our doors open wide to the competition of the world."(40)

After his engagements in New York had been fulfilled St. John plunged into the campaign. Lacking the incisive logic of a man like John E. Finch, he was a better campaigner.

Finch was a scholar, but St. John understood the common man. As a popular stump speaker he was probably the peer of any of his opponents. He had the happy knack of capturing his audience and few cared to accept the challenge of a public debate with him. In the struggle of 1884 he was in the prime of his life and could travel almost continually, talk every night in the week before large audiences, and seldom seem tired. Only once during the campaign, at a meeting in New York City, did his nerves seem to fail him. But the next night he had regained complete control of himself and was ready to give and take as circumstances required. When he arose--gaunt and military-looking--to address an audience, he was slow of speech; but after he had "warmed up" he seemed to forget everything except his subject. George R. Scott, who was with him during six weeks of his canvass and heard him speak every day, referred to his speeches in these words: "With an intensity that sometimes seemed as though it must be using up all the force that he had for the future as well as for the present, he raked the enemies of the homes of America in a way that made me feel as though the day of the reckoning of the saloon power must be close at hand."(41) Most of the principal cities of the East were included in his itinerary. During the last thirty days of the canvass he delivered fifty-four speeches--a gigantic effort. According to George R. Scott, at some meetings twenty-five thousand persons were present and an audience of ten thousand was not infrequent. In some places St. John's audiences were said

to be larger than those that attended the meetings of any other political candidate.(42)

His speeches were devoted to a discussion of the evils of the traffic in intoxicating drinks and to an arraignment of the old parties, particularly the republican which he claimed was not as honest and straight forward as the democratic.(43) During twenty-four years of republican misrule, he said, the number of saloons had increased to 175,000 in the United States and at the time there were saloons in the capital city of Washington and enough liquor in the White House to start half a dozen dram shops.(44) He made a withering review of Blaine's record and said: "He is an able man but a politician. He has dodged everything for the past twenty years."(45) As for the democratic candidate for president, he said that in Governor Cleveland's home state of New York no one was convinced that he was "dishonest, corrupt or a bad man."(46) Speaking of the tariff he said that it protected the monopolies ten times more than it did the working-men and that it had not brought the good times promised.(47) "Democratic whiskey is no worse than Republican whiskey," he declared, "and the quicker we get rid of both the better it will be for our country. There is really no difference between the Democratic and Republican platforms. Cut off that portion from each devoted to abuse of the other, and I defy a committee of old line Democrats and old line Republicans to tell which is the Democratic and which the Republican platform." When it was said that a vote for the

prohibition party was a vote thrown away because it had no chance of winning the election, he exclaimed: "Remember that no vote was ever lost that was cast for a principle. Let it not be forgotten that the party or individual that dies battling for the right goes down with the blessed promise of a glorious resurrection. Prohibition is right, God is just, and victory is sure to come."(48)

John B. Finch as chairman of the national central committee developed great executive talent, tact and foresight. He determined to make the presidential campaign one of awakening and to give the party a strategic position by making it a force which should be felt by the old political organizations. The value of concentrating forces in certain pivotal states having a large electoral vote was apparent and so Finch, in cooperation with the rest of his committee and with St. John and Daniel, set about the task of securing the balance of power in the important state of New York. The speeches delivered by St. John during August had already helped to build up a prohibition sentiment in the Empire state; this sentiment was increased by the eleven additional speeches given in the state by the prohibition presidential candidate during the campaign. It was for the purpose of increasing the force of the canvass in the East and especially in New York that St. John's plan to spend about a week stumping in Kansas was changed. This altered schedule was a disappointment to many Kansas republicans who had hoped to divert a part of his force to Kansas where he could do less damage.

Daniel campaigned in Wisconsin, Illinois, New England and several southern states. In spite of the fact that the prohibitionist campaign fund was small, thousands of prohibition meetings were held and tons of temperance and prohibition literature sent out. St. John clubs were organized extensively and were especially numerous in the western part of New York, in which section there were about eighteen thousand pledged St. John voters.(49) The founding by Funk and Wagnalls of the Voice (New York), a weekly newspaper which for many years remained the vigorous fighting organ of the party, was an important occurrence during the canvass. Other newspapers advocating the prohibition party's cause with good effect were the Lever and National Liberator (Chicago), the National Reformer (New York), and the Witness (New York). The party was also strengthened by cooperation from Miss Willard and the national W.C.T.U., from many of the state Unions, from many churches, from several independent newspapers and from a number of prominent men who could not conscientiously support either Blaine or Cleveland.(50) Among the foremost champions of the temperance reform the sentiment in favor of St. John seemed to be overwhelming, although a few, including Dr. Daniel Dorchester, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster and Neal Dow, were antagonistic to him. Many temperance organizations assumed a neutral ground, leaving their members free to vote as they chose.

An incident of some interest in the canvass occurred in August when S. C. Pomeroy, who had been nominated for

president by the American or Anti-Secret Society party, withdrew in favor of St. John. It will be remembered that St. John had strenuously opposed the election of Pomeroy to the United States senate in 1874 on the ground that Pomeroy was dishonest, but the two men had been on amicable terms for a number of years.

The republican press was very bitter about St. John's candidacy. The most frequent argument used to hurt the prohibition campaign was that it was endangering the temperance cause. Said the Chicago Tribune:

"We think there is not one of them (the prohibitionists) who will not admit that Democratic influences in the government will be more detrimental to temperance in any form than republican influences . . . But nothing is more certain than that nine-tenths of all the votes that shall be cast for St. John will be at Blaine's expense and to that extent will increase the chances of Democratic success. How, then, will the prohibition cause be promoted by that result?"(51)

Prohibitionists were said to be not only forsaking their friends but aiding their enemies, and their action was called impolitic as well as ungrateful. Every vote for St. John, it was said, was a vote for the democracy and for free whiskey. The prohibitionists were doing more to help the democrats than they could if they declared themselves openly for the democratic party; and even if an angel were leading the prohibition hosts, that would not make the democratic organization any better. Democrats who could not say too much against St. John while he was a republican were now enthusiastically supporting him as the prohibition candidate, hoping that he would draw a large republican vote and thus elect

Cleveland. They were even managing his campaign in the state of New York, and in Ohio were taking money donated by the liquor interests to defray the expenses of the prohibition canvass. St. John had expressed himself as favoring a protective tariff even after his nomination for president, but a little later he had "flunked to the democracy" and come out for free trade. Even the ex-governor's old friend, the Topeka Capital, called him a traitor on this score. The deposed republican leader in Kansas was only seeking revenge; he was suffering from "a dose of sour grapes" for he had thought the republican party a very good one so long as it kept him in power. He was interested mainly in the fame that was accruing to him as the prohibition candidate and in the fifty dollars per night which he was receiving for advocating his own cause. The preceding allegations formed the chief ammunition for St. John's enemies. There were other miscellaneous charges such as that he desired to divert a large amount of the funds of the republican national committee to the state of Kansas and to use this fund for the election of a prohibition legislature which would send him to Washington as United States senator. There were also sneers at the loss of his prestige in his home state, although it could not be denied that in Olathe he retained enough personal popularity to elicit a large public reception on the occasion of a brief visit there in September.

The statement made by republicans that St. John did not represent the full temperance sentiment of the country was

apparently corroborated by a request early in October from the New York State Temperance Assembly that the Kansas ex-governor withdraw from the canvass. It was written by ex-Governor John Evans, of Colorado, then president of the board of trustees of Northwestern University at Evanston, and signed by several prominent republicans. The reply made by St. John was one of the prohibition party's important campaign circulars. It is perhaps the most logical document to which he ever signed his name as well as an excellent statement of the prohibition side of the controversy in 1884 and for these reasons is here reproduced in full. Its character indicates that Finch probably had a hand in its composition.

"Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,
"October 11.

"Professor Theodore D. Woolsey, New Haven Connecticut; the Honorable Thomas Talbot, North Bellmore, Massachusetts....

"Gentlemen: In the New York Tribune of this date I find your names appended to a request that I withdraw from the canvass as the Prohibition nominee for the Presidency, together with an elaborate statement of reasons why, in your judgment, I should take this course. Permit me to reply that I have given your statement and request such careful and candid consideration as, coming from men of your high character, they merit, and that I can neither agree with the one nor comply with the other. In justice to myself and courtesy to you I must refer specifically to some of the leading reasons which you urge. Bear with me while I do this in the briefest possible way:

"First. You desire Prohibition submitted to the people 'separate from other issues, and distinct from party politics.' I desired the Republican party, at its National Convention, to favor such submission; the same desire was expressed through petitions by hundreds of thousands of others, and our very modest wish was there denied. Believing Prohibition a national need to blot out a national curse, we could not ask, and the Republican party not with fairness grant, any less. Refusing that slightest possible recognition, the party could not longer have the least possible claim upon my vote; because

"Second-- The policy of National Prohibition has already been clearly defined and approved by 'the great body of the

friends of the cause in the United States;' more clearly defined and more generally approved by these than was a national policy concerning Slavery, when that had common recognition as a national issue and arrayed parties in open contest. This national policy may be summed up in one phrase: national sovereignty over the liquor traffic to suppress it, instead of to legalize, protect and perpetuate it.

"Third. Out of the widespread approval which this policy had attained, and because of it came the Pittsburgh Convention, with its more than 600 delegates, representing 31 States, and, as I believe, more representative of the 'great body of Prohibitionists throughout the country' than any other body ever assembled. It was a convention regularly called, with an unusual interim for temperance people to consider it and to plan for it. Its delegates were citizens of representative character, many of whom had recently been active workers in, or sympathizers with, one or the other of the old parties. They went there, under a plain call, to nominate a Presidential ticket, and for no other purpose; and your assertion that 'a large part of that convention opposed placing a ticket in the field' has never before been made to my knowledge, is not justified by the detailed reports of proceedings printed in leading journals at the time, and is emphatically contradicted by leading witnesses, delegates and spectators who sat in the convention and are familiar with all that was there done and said. On your third point, therefore, you have surely been misinformed as to the facts.

"Fourth. I see nothing more 'confusing' in the Prohibition movement than in any other, unless you mean that it is confusing the politicians. Had prohibition alone been referred to in the platform you might have objected to it as a 'one-idea' party. Woman's suffrage it relegates to the States, and condemning the policy of both the old parties with regard to the Chinese, it but speaks in the old Republican spirit, the old Republican doctrine, which that party in its greed to catch the vote of the Pacific States now repudiates. As to 'imputations upon the Republican candidates,' I find only such as appeal to facts, and that appeal you can make as well. They should serve every occasion of truth.

"Fifth. I believe the quotations considered in the Prohibition platform were as carefully considered and as authoritatively adopted as any that have this year been presented to the American people, and I am satisfied that they embody, in a higher degree and far more comprehensively, the well-being and prosperity of our country than do those which have recognition in both Democratic and Republican platforms.

"Sixth. 'It is true,' you say, 'that the Republican party declined to make Prohibition an issue in its platform.' The party was not asked to make Prohibition an issue. For the principle it was not requested to declare; it was merely asked to favor submitting the question to the people. If

for it to have done this, as you assert, 'would have been political suicide,' then I see no hope or possibility of the Republican party ever granting even so slight a concession to temperance men, and I am amazed that you should urge my longer loyalty to that party.

"Seventh, and Eighth. If that party which you call 'the party of fair play' and of 'majority rule' cannot now nationally declare in favor of both without political suicide, what hope have we that in any State it will longer favor either; or that as a national body it will ever support the national policy for which I stand and in behalf of which the National Prohibition party has declared? Uncompromising hostility to that policy cannot so surely and fatally delay its success as can covert enmity cloaked in friendly disguise.

"Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh. You are not Republicans, I may assume, simply because you expect to elect your ticket. We cannot forego being Prohibitionists simply because we have no sure promise of immediately electing ours; and while it may be unreasonable, as you insist, 'to favor a change from bad to worse simply for a change,' it is always reasonable to favor right and stand by principle regardless of what change may be brought about as a result. I have loved my country well enough to carry a musket in its defense and to risk life in its service; I hold its obligation to every brave defender, or those now representing such, as forever sacred; the national credit and the material resources of the Nation I would not see impaired, and all that was gained for God and humanity by years of war I would see preserved through years of peace; but 175,000 legalized dram-shops imperil our national credit and impair our national resources to an extent more alarming than any other danger which now threatens us; a protective tariff on the liquor traffic loses to labor \$10 for every dollar which labor gains by a protective tariff on imports; the education and elevation of our entire people, white and black, are more dependent upon the prohibition of the saloon than upon the perpetuity of any party in power, and as a patriot, and a humble defender of my country in its former need, I cannot now let old party attachments hold me silent while a more deadly enemy than rebellion bids us wait and work his will.

"Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth. As to parties and candidates: If 'it is wrong,' as you affirm, 'to elect a party to power that ignores its principles and evades discussing the policy it intends to pursue,' it must be radically wrong for either of us to help elect the Republican party, since, if it has any temperance policy, it evades discussing it. Indeed, that party's chief aim now is to hold both the liquor and the temperance vote, which purpose utterly forbids any positive temperance principles and encourages only a practical temperance policy. In the very same issue of the Tribune which contains your "Appeal to Republican Prohibitionists," and your request to me, I

find a letter of a 'Republican Brewer,' telling why 'brewers should support Blaine'--- 'A protest against the attempt to use their association for Cleveland,' and in which occurs this frank avowal: "Our national organization is twenty-four years old. During all those years the Republicans have been in power in national affairs, and I submit to every candid brewer, be he Democrat or be he Republican, if the brewing interests of our country have not grown to immense proportions, if our rights and our interests have not been protected, fostered and encouraged by our government.' In the same letter I read also the following: 'Mr. Blaine was correct when he said Prohibition was not a national question or issue. This being the case, let us not do anything to antagonize a party that has always treated the brewing interests fairly, whose policy is to foster, protect and encourage homes industries, and which should not be held responsible for the opinions and acts of a few men who claim membership in the party; and in proof that this 'Republican Brewer' has full authority for his statement of what the Republican party's policy is, let me remind you that said party has declared for 'largest diversity of industries,' which clearly includes the manufacture and sale on intoxicating liquors, and that Mr. Blaine has recently enunciated as the third 'doctrine' in the Republican party's creed 'encouragement of every form of American industry;' which declaration, together with his revenue letter to the Philadelphia Press, proposing to make the tax on spirituous and malt liquors a permanent resource to all the States, fully justifies the expectation of 'encouragement' and 'protection' which the Republican brewer proclaims to his friends.

"With regard to candidates, intellectually and morally, I have not a word to say. I prefer to leave personal abuse and vilification to those who have nothing better to uphold their cause. But when you speak of Mr. Cleveland's 'gross blunder while dodging the tariff question,' common fairness should forbid you excusing Mr. Blaine for his equally gross neglect of duty in dodging a vote on the Prohibition amendment in his own State. For the slightest analysis of the situation would show you that it was only as to the submission of such an amendment that his party's national convention laid any 'authority' upon him, while the long-time policy of the party in his State, submission being granted, should have commanded him to vote on and for the principle. If Prohibition were not, as Mr. Blaine said, a national issue, he surely was not justified because of any action or failure to act on the part of his National Convention, in dodging it when presented as a State issue purely.

"I have been many years a humble worker in the temperance cause, am considerably familiar with the several temperance organizations of New York, and until three days ago had never heard of the New York State Temperance Assembly, from which your request purports to emanate; and as I observe that only three of your members reside in New York State, I am compelled to believe that its organization is only for

campaign purposes, and its membership so small that those who control it were forced to go outside the State for co-operation.

"In conclusion, gentlemen, permit me to say that so long as the Government is the open partner of the liquor business to the extent of ninety cents for every gallon of whiskey made and sold; so long as men may and do illicitly sell liquor in violation of State law under a United States tax receipt, which makes the Government particeps criminis in such illicit sale; so long as in the District of Columbia and the Territories Congress may and does permit that which it should forbid, just so long this issue of the liquor traffic will remain a national issue, and just so long the Prohibition party will be a national necessity. In view of the fact that said party presents the only Presidential nominee standing on a temperance platform, would it not be more consistent for 'steadfast temperance men' at once to demand the immediate withdrawal of your own candidate, and thus avoid all possible calamities to which you refer, including, as you term it, 'a thing of such doubtful property as to put Governor Cleveland into the White House?' For you may rest assured that, so far as I am concerned, I shall neither withdraw from the canvass nor assume a neutral position, but, with God's help, I shall continue this warfare on the liquor traffic as long as I live and the flag of our country waves its protecting folds over a legalized dram-shop. And while a vote for any candidate, simply as such, may be lost, a vote for principle is never thrown away. I, therefore, appeal to all lovers of God, and country, and home, to burst asunder the party shackles that have bound them, and, rising above mere partisan considerations, cast their ballots for principle, leaving to "od the results.

"JOHN P. ST. JOHN."(52)

As republicans became convinced that St. John would not withdraw and as they perceived the strategy being employed by the prohibitionists in concentrating their forces in New York and other close states, they became more acrimonious than ever. St. John's life was threatened and on October 1 he narrowly escaped being struck by a bullet fired at him while he was on a train near Terre Haute, Indiana. He took this attempt on his life in the same cool manner that he did the threats against him.(53)

Just before the election the New York Tribune published

the affidavits, which were referred to in the opening chapter, in regard to St. John's first marriage and divorce. It was claimed that the affidavits had been made at the request of some one in the employ of the republican national committee, and that the persons who signed them had been well paid for the use of their names.(54) St. John later said of the matter that if in all the years of his republicanism his private life had been above reproach it was too late to find fault now.(55) The publication of the affidavits at a time when it would be difficult if not impossible for St. John to reply before the election took place was in line with the general mud-slinging characteristics of the campaign and probably helped to decrease his vote in certain quarters.

Benjamin F. Butler, the presidential candidate of the mugwumps or independent republicans, conducted, like St. John, a personal canvass throughout the northern states. Governor Cleveland continued the performance of his official duties at Albany but attended about a half dozen political demonstrations in nearby cities during October. Blaine spent the summer in Maine, attending a few political meetings and receiving some visitors. On September 17 he left Augusta for an extended trip to the west and delivered a number of brief addresses on his way through New York state and in Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and West Virginia. On his return from this trip he received a delegation of clergymen in New York City and listened to a complimentary speech from the

spokesman who in the course of his remarks said: "We are Republicans, and don't propose to leave our party and identify ourselves with the party whose antecedents have been run, Romanism and rebellion." Perhaps Blaine did not hear the Reverend Burchard's words or perhaps he misunderstood them. At any rate he did not rebuke a sentiment which was certain to alienate many voters particularly among the Irish, who were numerous in eastern cities. The expression was seized upon by the opposition and played up for all it was worth. The story is told by Colvin in his "Prohibition in the United States" that John B. Finch happened to be present at the reception and immediately perceiving the political effect of Reverend Burchard's words, copied them down. Daniel Manning, subsequently secretary of the treasury in Cleveland's cabinet, was standing behind him. He reached over, seized the paper from Finch's hand, hastened to the telegraph office and the conflagration was started.(56)

While it is of no significance it is of interest to find that the expression, "He's all right," which became a rallying cry of each political party in the presidential campaign of 1888 and later came into popular usage, had its origin in 1884 as a term of derision applied to St. John. The republicans in the West started the cry, "What's the matter with St. John?" The answer was, "Oh, he's all right!" This was accompanied by a significant shake of the head which was meant to imply that the democratic barrel had been tapped for St. John and that he was abundantly supplied with

lucre and liquid refreshments. The prohibitionists adopted the cry and used it during the canvass during 1884 and it still remains a popular expression after the passage of nearly fifty years.(59)

The statements by republicans as to the probable prohibition vote were naturally under-statements while those by prohibitionists were the reverse. The estimate by the prohibitionsists of their total vote ranged between 500,000 and 1,000,000, St. John favoring the latter figure. In New York he expected about 50,000 votes and in Kansas around 15,000 or 20,000; he felt that the prohibition party held the balance of power in New York, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Kansas, Wisconsin, Illinois, Maryland, and probably Massachusetts. Many prohibitionists were sanguine of carrying Maryland and Kansas and of throwing the election into Congress. Naturally, St. John had no expectation of being elected.

The excitement of the canvass continued several days after the election for the result was in great doubt. In New York state the result was so close that both sides claimed its electoral vote for several days. The final count showed that Cleveland had 219 electoral votes and Blaine had 182. In New York Cleveland's plurality was 1,149 yet this gave him 36 electoral votes. If the republicans had carried New York the vote would have stood 218 for Blaine and 183 for Cleveland. St. John secured 25,016 votes in New York, the largest number that he received in any state, and it

was accepted by both the major parties that his vote was drawn almost wholly from republican ranks. Any one of a number of factors might have been influential in producing the result in New York but the prohibition vote and the allusion by Reverend Burchard to "rum, Romanism and rebellion" are mentioned most prominently by the historians. Contemporaneously, however, St. John received most of the blame for the republican defeat; and, in view of the narrow margin by which Cleveland carried the state, there is every reason to believe that if St. John had withdrawn from the canvass as requested the republicans might have been able to wipe out the 1,149 plurality of the democrats and thus to secure the election of Blaine.

St. John's largest vote after New York came from Michigan (18,403), Pennsylvania (15,283), Illinois (12,074), Ohio (11,069), Massachusetts (10,026), Wisconsin (7,656), and New Jersey (6,159). It is interesting to note that in the three states where constitutional prohibition had been adopted by the people St. John received the following vote: Kansas, 4,495; Maine, 2,160; Iowa, 1,472. This would seem to indicate that the prohibition party was a minor factor in making prohibition a part of the fundamental law of these states.

The national prohibition vote in 1872 had totaled only 5,608, polled from 6 states; in 1876 it reached 9,759, from 17 states; and in 1880, with Neal Dow as standard-bearer, it had risen only to 11,640, from 19 states. In 1884, under

St. John's leadership, it leaped to 150,369, from 33 states. This number was enlarged by another 100,000 in 1888 but after that the prohibition vote did not make any spectacular gains and a number of times fell below the level set in 1888, although the aggregate vote cast by all parties greatly increased.(58)

CHAPTER X

AFTERMATH: BLAMED FOR OVERTHROW OF REPUBLICAN RULE.

The astounded republican party, ousted from national control after having been in power for twenty-four years, looked about for the cause of its discomfiture. Republicans everywhere agreed in placing responsibility for the defeat upon St. John and the prohibition party. "In the sacred name of temperance," said one republican paper in solemn tones, "this man, who should have been christened Judas Iscariot instead of the saintly name he has so deeply dishonored, has labored with a zeal and persistency worthy of a better cause to hand over the State of New York and with it the national government to a party whose main motive power for forty years has been whiskey." Cleveland, according to this reasoning, was not the choice of the people but of John P. St. John.(1) "The ultra and insatiable prohibitionists," wrote Senator John J. Ingalls. "with an ingratitude equalled only by their fatuity, made Glick Governor of Kansas, and Cleveland President of the United States."(2) Eugene F. Ware, the Kansas poet and politician, held St. John responsible for giving Kansas a democratic governor and the nation a democratic president and alleged that he was now working up some scheme to beat Christ and give the world a democratic Redeemer.(3)

Democrats, independents and prohibitionists united with the republicans in holding the prohibition party responsible for the republican disaster although it was recognized that there were other factors in producing the result. The democrats had rather a kindly feeling toward the prohibitionists and in their processions celebrating the election of Cleveland often carried transparencies with the inscription, "St. John Did It." Henry Ward Beecher pointed out that thousands of republicans voted for the prohibition candidate because they could not conscientiously vote for Blaine and could not make up their minds to vote for a democrat. "All through New York state St. John was the city of refuge," he was quoted as saying. "Men who would have otherwise been compelled to vote for Blaine voted for St. John and for this opportune work the Prohibitionists deserve thanks. A vote for St. John was a vote taken from Blaine. For this we should always thank God for St. John."(4)

The wrath of the leaders of the defeated party was intensified by a telegram sent by John B. Finch from New York to the Chicago Daily News immediately after the election. In this telegram which was widely copied, he said that the prohibition party had beaten the republicans and made prohibition a national issue and would now bend its efforts to defeat the democratic party in 1888. Some prohibitionists regretted the publishing of the exasperating message at a time when the republicans were so enraged over the result of the election. Finch indicated his purpose in the following letter dated November 24, 1884:

"The Republicans are terribly mad, but their anger will cool when they realize that they could not win this time without us, and certainly cannot in 1888.

"I disliked to send out the telegram, and yet it was necessary. If it had not been done they would have denied in less than two years that we were of any importance in settling the election. By provoking their attack on us now I have compelled them to admit and put on record that we are a political power. The only thing for us to do is to keep a 'stiff upper lip' and say: 'We offered you our votes at your Chicago convention, but you would not take them.'"(5)

The size of the prohibition vote, which was fifteen times what it had been four years previously, would have been a tremendous shock to the republican leaders even if they had not felt that it defeated them, but under the circumstances their anger knew no bounds. They were far more bitter than they had been during the campaign. Their abuse of the prohibitionists resembled that heaped on the abolitionists forty years before when their action in the state of New York deprived Henry Clay of the presidency. A few days after the election the New York Tribune published an editorial entitled "Intemperate Temperance Men," arraigning the partizans of St. John. Bitter persecutions followed. The republican pulpit, press and platform reviled and denounced the prohibitionists and accused them of having set back the cause of temperance twenty years. In the estimation of republicans, St. John's action was like sinning against the Holy Ghost. His very name became anathema. He was called a traitor, a crank, and a conscienceless liar, a vain creature, an aspiring nothing, and was put in a class with Jefferson Davis. The temper of a large element of republicans was characteristically expressed by the Cincinnati Commercial Gazette:

"The Republicans have made a mistake in not fighting the St. John frauds with fire and brimstone, clubs, pitchforks and butcher knifes."(6) Another quotation indicative of the general tone of the republican press comes from the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Banner which suggested the following epitaph for St. John's tombstone:

"Here Lies
J. P. St. John.

"He deserted his wife and unborn babe in early manhood. She died broken-hearted. In middle life he betrayed his country and handed over its destiny to the rebellion and rum party. He finally died, loaded more heavily than was Benedict Arnold with the contempt of the American people."(7)

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat felt that the press of the country was slandering the memory of Judas Iscariot by calling St. John the Judas of American politics, and said: "We have not a very exalted opinion of Judas, but there were some good points about him, and he was in every respect superior to the brainless and mercenary sneak from Kansas. The cause of prohibition is about as dear to the heart of St. John as the morals of Oliver Twist were to the heart of Fagin, the Jew."(8) Another republican writer went so far as to say that the treachery of the prohibitionists to their friends was so deep and so damnable "that when compared to it the crime of Judas becomes a virtue" and that the only excuse that could be given for them was that "the leaders are monomaniacs and the followers imbeciles."(9) Albert Griffin's Manhattan Nationalist had this to say: "It is true that St. John is hated . . . The dramsellers, distillers and brewers of the

land do not generally join in the chorus of denunciation. A vast majority of the anathemas now hurled at his head go forth from the churches and homes he has betrayed."(10)

The preceding quotations demonstrate the republican hatred of St. John as it was expressed through representative republican journals and by republican writers. This hatred also found vent in the thousands of letters which St. John received from all parts of the United States following the campaign and which often threatened him with death. Almost without exception they were anonymous and many of them were unprintable on account of the offensive epithets which they contained. Many expressed their meaning through pictures. One, for instance, made its purport clear through the picture of a tree with a rope and noose, a casket with name plate on which was inscribed "St. John," and a grave and tombstone.

One of the milder letters from Albina, Oregon, dated November 17, 1884, read:

"John Peter St. John, Olathe, Kansas:--Dear Sir: We, the Republicans of Albina, have burned you in effigy. The event occurred on the tenth of this month near the residence of your only supporter in this precinct. John Peter St. John, you can depend on one thing, that there are a few feather beds in this part of the country and if we haven't any tar perhaps we can get a substitute in the sap of the Oregon fir tree that will answer the same purpose and we will try and make it entertaining for ourselves if not for you. You can count also on forever having the enmity--you and your cause--of nine out of every ten Republicans in the United States. Go hang yourself.

(JAMES GERRINGS.)(11)

A postal card from Tiffin, Kansas, November 12, 1884, said:

"No condemnation can be severe enough and no damnation too hot to fully pay you for the distress your morbid desire for notoriety has brought upon the country."(12)

Another letter, received about the same time, with nothing to indicate where it came from, follows:

"Mr. St. John: Arnold, the traitor, was a grateful, patriotic and true American citizen compared to you!

"... You have made a nice record for the Democratic party. Within twenty years you have given the loyal state of Kansas a Democratic governor and brought about a national disgrace and calamity by electing Cleveland.

"SHILOH."(13)

During the month of November, 1884, St. John was burned and hanged in effigy in more than a hundred towns and cities in the United States. The attempt on his life during the campaign has already been mentioned. On his lecture trips following the election he was several times offered physical violence but he was a vigorous man, able to take care of himself, and he never suffered harm from such attempts. The prohibitionists, however, furnished several martyrs to the cause during 1884. St. John noted that there was no disposition to hang or burn in effigy Benjamin F. Butler, the mugwump or independent republican candidate in 1884, and added that at this time he began to realize what it costs a man to be on the unpopular side of a great question.

The censure and malice which St. John met in Kansas was greater than that which he encountered anywhere else. The intolerant and venomous attitude of a certain section of the republican press of the state is illustrated by the following quotation: "Hereafter no self-respecting citizen of Kansas can ever afford to speak to him. He should be avoided like a pestilence."(14) Reports of his being hung and burned in effigy came from various parts of the state. One of these "effigy picnics," as St. John termed them,

occurred on Kansas avenue in the capital of the state and was illustrated in the Police Gazette for November 27, 1884. The illustration showed him suspended by the neck to a telegraph pole. Mounted on a large dry goods box, addressing a mob of three thousand people, was a prominent republican who was reported as saying: "The just indignation of the righteous and loyal people of Kansas is here expressed by the public execration and final destruction of the carpet-bagger, John P. St. John. He has violated every trust and confidence and deserves no consideration. Burn him, hang him, parade him, but be sure and clear Kansas of his disgraceful name." This speech was attributed to Captain Patrick H. Coney, who was formerly one of St. John's friends, and responsibility for the event was placed on the republicans of Topeka.(15) At Olathe an effigy of St. John, with a whiskey bottle protruding from one pocket and a democratic bribe from another and a placard bearing the words, "Traitor and Hypocrite," on its back, was exhibited on the day following the election, and there were rumors of a plan to tar and feather St. John. These rumors were probably exaggerated, for personally he was held in high esteem at Olathe. Such was the odium attaching to him at Lawrence, however, that, according to his own statement, none of the white ministers was willing to open his meeting with prayer when he spoke there and he had to call upon a colored preacher.(16)

There was a good deal of speculation as to whether or

not St. John would attend the meeting of the Kansas State Temperance Union at Topeka on November 19, 1884, and many surmises as to what treatment would be accorded him if he did. Some persons thought he would not dare to go to Topeka, but they were mistaken. According to the account in the Topeka Capital, St. John and his wife, accompanied by their friend, I.O. Pickering, of Olathe, one of the Blaine electors, entered the hall a few minutes before the opening of the session. Soon after his entrance a number of former acquaintances came forward and greeted him cordially.(17) The Union, which was represented by about 170 delegates and about 50 members who were not delegates, proceeded to adopt resolutions which declared that the republican party of Kansas had done all that reasonable prohibitionists should demand and was at the time entitled to the cordial support of temperance men. Another resolution expressed unalterable opposition to an independent prohibition party so long as the attitude of the two parties in the state remained unchanged. These resolutions called forth an animated debate. St. John, amid much confusion, made a speech in opposition to them, maintaining that they were the equivalent of saying that no man could be prohibitionist who was not a republican and that the Union had not been organized and should not be maintained in the interest of any political party. His words were met with sneers, taunts, and hisses, and apparently without his intending it his speech became under these

provocations a heated and rather indeliberate and undignified defense of himself and the third party. The resolutions were adopted practically unchanged after the chairman had rebuked St. John for his attack on the convention.(18) This ended St. John's connection with the State Temperance Union for many years.

When Martin Van Buren, in 1884, allowed his name to head the ticket of the Free Soil and Liberty party, the democrats of Missouri changed the name of Van Buren county to Cass county. This bit of history had its counterpart in Kansas following the campaign of 1884. Several bills providing for the change of the name of St. John county were introduced in the legislative session of 1885 but none of them became law. In 1887 another measure, which gave the name of Logan to St. John county, passed both houses and was signed by Governor John A. Martin. The debate over it was characterized by the most malignant utterances. One representative said that "the name of St. John ought to be wiped off the map of the state." Another declared: "I have a dog that I call St. John and the dog sucks eggs. If you will change the name of St. John county to Logan, I will shoot the dog." A remark which the Philadelphia Times characterized as an unparalleled example of hayseed invective. The speaker of the house, who lobbied for the bill, attacked St. John violently as the man who was responsible for Cleveland's being in the White House, and said: "I would to God that the name of St. John could be

obliterated from Kansas history."(19) The desire to efface the ex-governor's name from the map of Kansas was not entirely fulfilled, however, since nothing was done to change the name of the town of St. John in Stafford county.

There was a small number of republican journals which recognized St. John's personal virtues and regretted the unjust treatment he received. The Olathe Mirror, for instance, said of him: "He has been a citizen of Johnson county for the past eighteen years, and, in all that time, he has never been known to do a mean act... He is a kind neighbor and a generous, upright man."(20) The Svenska Harolden observed that if the republicans had not abused the prohibitionists, the republican party probably would not have been defeated in 1884 and that in this "land of liberty" a man was certainly free to act politically as his conscience dictated. Even-tempered republican papers outside of Kansas regretted the attacks on St. John both because they felt such attacks were disgraceful and because they thought the popularity of the prohibition party was enhanced by senseless and brutal insults.

I.O. Pickering, of Olathe, a close friend of St. John, defended the ex-governor with warmth. He maintained that knowing St. John intimately as he did he was sure that the prohibitionist presidential candidate was perfectly honest and conscientious in advocating the cause of prohibition. Other personal friends felt the same about St. John's motives.

St. John was, of course, upheld by the prohibition papers.

Any defense of him, by prohibitionists or others, usually asserted the purity of his motives and conduct and stated that in 1882 after being fairly nominated by the republicans of Kansas he had been beaten by republican votes because of his temperance principles and because certain federal office holders feared his influence. "They are the traitors," said one editorial. "St. John, forced out of State politics by his envious rivals, naturally drifted into the national Prohibition organization, where his ability made him its leader. The Federal office holders sought to crush him, and they have been crushed. It is the most swift and complete revenge ever enjoyed by a man in political life."(21) Democratic papers defended St. John with a good deal of pleasure because of the republican disappointment. At Olathe and at Topeka the democratic organs were quick to resent the displaying of effigies of St. John as a disgrace to the town and to assure St. John that he would be amply protected in both places if he wished to deliver a speech.

St. John suffered keenly from the condemnation he received, partly because Mrs. St. John was pained by it. Yet he bore it all cheerfully, even good-humoredly, and delighted in maintaining a magnanimous attitude towards his enemies. In reply to the argument that if all who voted for him had voted for Blaine the republican would have been elected, he said that if all who voted for Blaine had voted for him he would have been elected. But because Blaine defeated him, he said in his vigorous way, he had not been

"whining about it...like a sick kitten by a hot jamb."(22) Years after he had been burned in effigy at Topeka he and Captain Coney, who delivered a speech of denunciation on that occasion, were good friends. "I never allow a little matter like hanging and burning myself in effigy to disturb my friendly relations with any one," he said.(23) "If being burned at that stake," he said again, "would have blotted out the liquor traffic, I would have gone there without a tremor."(24) He spoke of the members of the legislature which changed the name of St. John county as being afflicted with political hydrophobia from imagining they had been bitten by St. John and of the speech of the man who said he would kill his dog if the name of the county were altered as being filled with "irresistable pathos and unanswerable logic."(25) Later, in 1898, he reminded the people of Kansas that no memorial to Governor Martin, who advocated and signed the bill making St. John county into Logan county, had been erected and led the movement to create a fund to provide for honoring the memory of Martin. He took not a little pride in this fact and said: "I could not let an act committed in the heat of partisan politics obscure the obligation which Kansas owed to a great and public spirited citizen."(26)

St. John also attempted to justify his action in 1884. He refuted the charge that he was a political traitor because he left the republican party by indicating that men like S.O. Thacher, John J. Ingalls and Preston B. Plumb were

not branded as traitors when they left their party, and said:

"Charles Sumner, Gerrit Smith, Thaddeus Stevens, Owen Lovejoy, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, James G. Blaine, Lincoln...left the political party to which each belonged and joined the Republican party in its infancy, and if such an act on their part was treason, then it is clear that had it not been for such 'traitors' there never would have been a Republican party.

"General Logan did not leave the Democratic party until after the Republican party had beaten the Democrats..."

"They had a perfect right under our form of government to vote for whatsoever party or individual their conscience approved."(27)

Ever since the beginning of St. John's governorship, but especially after the election of 1884, there had been a few journals which made sneering remarks about one of his sons who was said to have drifted away from his father's precept and example and to have become the victim of strong drink.(28) Such references inflicted their hurt on St. John, but since most newspapers carefully refrained from printing them, he made no attempt to answer. Finally, however, in November, 1889, he was spurred to make a reply. During one of his speeches in an Indianapolis church he drew from his pocket a newspaper clipping and, lifting his somewhat stooping shoulders and looking straight into the eyes of his listeners, he spoke with every appearance of the most intense earnestness as follows:

"In the Journal of Saturday I find the following:

"Strong is the irony of fate. The wife of John P. St. John, Jr., son of the prohibition apostle, has just sued for divorce at Santa Fe, on the ground of her husband's habitual drunkenness. Somebody should hire the Kansas ex-governor at \$50 per night to talk prohibition to his son."

"That will be cheered in every saloon and gambling den in the land. It will be paraded by every republican organ

and received with fiendish delight in the partisan club, beer garden and brothel--not because a suit for divorce has been commenced, for the Journal can find such proceedings in its own political household--but because it is my boy who is the defendant; not because a boy gets drunk, for there are thousands of drunken boys here in Indiana, but...because it is my boy who is charged with being a habitual drunkard, which, although not strictly true, serves as food for the rum power throughout the country--the very purpose for which the Journal intended it.

"Yes, I have a boy who gets drunk, although not a 'habitual' drunkard. I have a dear brother whose greatest enemy is strong drink. I have a kind-hearted, generous father here in this, my native state, who in the very prime of his manhood, right here in this capital city, first fell a victim to the legalized home and soul-destroying rum.

"Seventy-five thousand sons, each one some mother's boy, go down to drunks' graves annually in this boasted land of Christianity, in this government whose duty ought to be protect rather than destroy the manhood upon which its life depends.

"But what matters all this to the Indianapolis Journal? What does it care how many mothers' hearts bleed, if it can only coin political capital by parading before the world the misfortunes of their sons--misfortunes which result from a business it helps to perpetuate and protect. I know something of the sleepless nights myself and faithful wife have spent watching and waiting for the return of our dear boy. There are other fathers and mothers here today who have, or may be now, passing through the same heartache.

"I know of the traps and snares that have been set, especially to catch my son. I know how the government... is in partnership with this infernal business, and today gives its permit to 200,000 of these dens, to tempt and destroy other fathers' and mothers' boys, and I would rather this hour stand with a conscientious, patriotic minority, bravely battling for the absolute suppression of this mightiest curse of the world, than to climb over human wrecks and broken hearts to the highest office in the gift of any people; and, God helping me, no amount of falsehood, vilification and persecution shall ever move me one jot or tittle from this purpose."

When he had finished he sat down, wiping the perspiration from his forehead. For a moment there was silence. Then, according to the newspaper account, there was a buzzing which increased to a roar, and in a moment half the audience was on its feet, cheering, shouting and clapping hands.(29)

During the presidential canvass of 1884 there had been insinuations that St. John had been bribed by the democrats to stay in the race and conduct his campaign so as to hurt the republican and help the democratic party as much as possible. It was also said that he had offered for a money consideration to give up his canvass and come out for Blaine and Logan. These were only unsupported newspaper assertions, however, and not regarded very seriously by anyone. During November and December of 1884 and in the early months of 1885 more specific charges of corruption against St. John were originated and circulated by republican organs, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, edited by J.B. McCullagh, and the Iowa State Register (Des Moines), edited by J.S. Clarkson, assailing the prohibition candidate with particular malignancy. There were many versions of the bribery charge, but, as stated by McCullagh, it was, in brief this: St. John, through his agent, James F. Legate, of Kansas, offered to "sell out" to the republican national central committee for \$35,000 in a lump sum and \$50 for every lecture he gave during the campaign. In return for this he was not to withdraw, for in case of withdrawal some one would have to be substituted in his place, but was to deliver his speeches and in them throw his influence to Blaine.

"We know from positive knowledge," said Mr. Clarkson, who was a member of the republican national committee, "that Mr. John P. St. John is unworthy of his own or any other honorable man's respect, and that he is deserving of nothing

from honest temperance people but loathing and contempt."

(30) Clarkson admitted that he had conducted the negotiations for the republican national committee and told the story of the bribery scandal in this way: In October, while he was in Ohio, he was approached by James F. Legate, who professed himself to be a republican and the authorized agent of St. John. Legate brought with him a letter of introduction from Senator Plumb of Kansas indorsing him and stating that he was able to treat for St. John. Clarkson accepted Legate's statement that the democrats were then paying St. John's expenses and a little more and said: "I have no doubt that it would be right to deprive the democratic party of this false and treacherous means, if it could be done. I have no concealment to make as to my belief that St. John was an element in the campaign to be got rid of altogether, or at least to be controlled by the republicans, if it were going to help either side." He made it clear, however, that all overtures came from St. John's agent and that the republican national committee and its members never made any overtures to the prohibition candidate or his representative. Legate finally agreed that for \$20,000 St. John would withdraw or "feather his speeches" to the benefit of the republicans by saying in them that the choice was between Blaine and Cleveland and as Blaine represented "whiskey and loyalty" and Cleveland "whiskey and disloyalty" he was for whiskey and loyalty every time. Clarkson reported to the other members of the committee who took no action but sent a

wealthy republican, R.C. Kerens, of St. Louis, to confer with Clarkson about the matter. Legate pressed the matter desperately but finally became discouraged because of the procrastination of the committee and returned to Kansas, although he still maintained that he had induced St. John to stop his campaign in Ohio under promise of money from the republicans and that the committee ought to send him this money to give St. John.(31)

Clarkson's version was correct, according to R.C. Kerens, who said that the question of buying off St. John had been fully discussed with Senator Plumb. Both Clarkson and Kerens expressed their full belief that Legate was the authorized representative of St. John and stated that Legate showed them dispatches and letters which St. John had written.(32) Telegrams and letters from Legate to Clarkson and the others involved in the discussion were at first withheld, as well as Legate's name, but after repeated requests from St. John to produce any evidence whatever, the name of the agent was divulged and his communications published.

Legate, who had not been known in Kansas as one of St. John's political friends and who had a record in the state legislature as an anti-prohibitionist, at first maintained that the letters published under his name were wholly or in part forgeries. Moreover, he said that since his communications to Clarkson had been marked confidential that the latter had "violated every principle of honor" in publishing anything. Later he admitted that the letters

were his but tried to explain them, saying that he had acted in everything as the agent of Clarkson in his capacity as a member of the republican national committee.(33) He had sought to obtain twenty-five thousand dollars from this committee, he said, for the purpose of defraying the cost of the republican campaign in Kansas and of securing St. John to speak for John A. Martin, the party's candidate for governor in Kansas, during the latter part of October, and it was for this perfectly legitimate purpose that he had negotiated with Clarkson and tried to secure St. John's withdrawal from the eastern states. He thought that St. John could do the republican cause less harm in Kansas than in Ohio and New York and said that the prohibition candidate had agreed to speak for Martin if the latter would come out unqualifiedly for prohibition. Legate made these statements in a letter dated January 16, 1885.(34) Clarkson replied that the only material difference between his and Legate's version was the statement by Legate that he had attempted to get the money for the benefit of the party in Kansas instead of for St. John's personal use.(35)

So far as St. John was concerned, Legate said that "the Virgin Mary was not purer than he,"(36) In a personal letter to St. John dated December 31, 1884, he said:

"If you ever received money from the democrats it is without my knowledge, and to me or through me or to my knowledge you never offered to sell or asked any consideration contingent or otherwise for any act of yours in the late canvass.

"I never did for you nor was I ever authorized by you to make any arrangement by which you were to abandon the canvass for the Prohibition ticket or to aid directly or

indirectly the Republican canvass and any assertion differing from this is a vile slander and falsehood coming from whatever source it may.

"This statement I feel due you for that marked courtesy you have always shown me and the friendship I have always entertained for you." (37)

Plumb and the other republicans who were involved in the controversy refused to issue any full statement, although there were many insinuations that St. John was corrupt. (38)

Following his failure to sell himself to the republicans, St. John offered and sold his influence to the democrats for an unknown sum, thought to be about \$35,000, according to the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. As additional pay it was said that the democrats bore his campaign expenses. Not all of the promised money had been paid, the Globe-Democrat alleged, and the prohibitionist candidate had been writing letters in regard to it since the election. (39) He at once demanded the publication of any letters and asked that anyone having evidence against him to send it to McCullagh to be printed. (40) Nothing was ever published, and eventually it developed that there were no letters or documents signed by St. John which would implicate him. The facts in regard to the alleged democratic sell-out remained more obscure than those concerning the attempted republican bribery of St. John, but it was said that E.W. Ayers, the Washington correspondent of the Kansas City Times, and Dr. S.F. Neely, major of Leavenworth, made about the same proposition to the democratic national committee that Legate had to the republican and with no better success. (41)

When the first charges were published St. John promptly

denied that he had made or attempted to make, directly or indirectly, any kind of bargain with either the democratic or the republican national committee or that he had done anything to decrease the prohibition vote or to increase the vote of either of the old parties. He denied having received any money or promise of any money in connection with the canvass excepting from the national prohibition committee which paid his campaign expenses, adding that he had contributed his own services to the cause without pay. During the twenty-eight years he had served the republican party, he said, that party had found no evil in him and even the democrats had not charged him with dishonesty, and now he challenged any one to produce competent evidence to prove the present assertions against him.(42) He held that the accusations of bribery were a part of the republican attempt to avenge the defeat and said that it would have been folly for him to accept \$25,000 from the republican committee when he could have had \$100,000 from the distillers.(43) He assured his friends that they could challenge his accusers for proof without fear than any suspicious circumstance in connection with him would be unearthed.(44) He wrote to Senator Plumb protesting that he had written no letter to anyone which would prove him guilty of the bribery charge and asking the senator if he had one purporting to be from him to give it to the public at once and let it be proved a forgery.(45) On January 5, 1885, he issued a long statement, straightforward in character and bearing the internal evidence

of truth in its appeal to figures and dates and men. In it he explained his whereabouts, accounted for his time and named his travelling companions during the canvass, and declared that his appointments had been made by the prohibition national committee and that he had kept all of them, not withdrawing from Ohio or any state until they were completed. He protested that he had not "feathered" his speeches, as any one who had heard him would know, and denounced Clarkson as a dishonest and perfidious politician for entertaining the suggestion of bribery and for being willing to defeat an honest expression of the will of the people at the ballot box.(46) "From a moral standpoint," he said, "I can see no difference between the bribe-giver and the bribe-taker."(47) In all of his statements he treated Legate kindly, because he felt that Legate was in the pay of the republicans and was being made the scapegoat by the rulers of his party who were the really guilty ones. Some time after Legate's death he wrote of him:

"...He was just as good...as were the rulers of his party, and as proof of the fact that no act of his had lowered his standard or lessened his influence in their estimation, he was soon after the election appointed to a government office in Idaho, and that appointment was confirmed by a republican senate, and...when he came back from Idaho, the republicans of Leavenworth county elected him as their representative in the legislature and when that body was organized he was made chairman of the committee on ways and means..."(48)

On January 8, 1885 the national committee of the prohibition party met and adopted resolutions declaring the attacks on St. John to be "inexcusably and manifestly malicious and without a particle of truth" and challenging Clarkson to

produce whatever evidence he claimed to have.(49) John B. Finch, chairman of the committee, pressed the accusers of St. John for proof quite as vigorously as the latter did. "If any of Mr. Clarkson's republican friends told him they could buy St. John off they were simply trying to bleed his committee," he declared. "St. John was under my control from the beginning of the campaign. He filled every appointment made and received \$825 from the committee out of funds subscribed at the Pittsburg convention."(50) On January 19 he wrote to the editor of the Voice: "Clarkson, by introducing Legate, has convicted himself and the Republican National Committee of vile political corruption... of an attempt to bribe, and we must now file a bill of discovery for all letters, telegrams, receipts, and accounts of disbursements of the bribery department of the National Republican Committee."(51) The following day he sent an open letter to Clarkson, a copy of which appeared in the Chicago Daily News and many other papers:

"Clarkson, superintendent of the bribery department of the Republican National Committee, having charged St. John with fraud, the evidence was demanded. He called his witness. The witness vindicated St. John. Clarkson now impeaches his own witness, and wants St. John to sue Clarkson for political libel in the Republican State of Iowa. He had evidently taken Blaine's opinion that a judgement cannot be recovered where party politics are involved, and so, instead of owning that he was played as a sucker by Legate, and that he lied about St. John, tries the game of bluff. By this he admits that he has no evidence to convict St. John, and wants St. John to help convict himself. With your permission I want to ask this head of the bribery department a few questions:

"Legate being your witness are you not either to take his testimony or stand branded as a man who introduced a liar to prove his case?

"Legate having vindicated St. John, are you not bound to take the testimony of your own witness, and as an honest man apologize?

"Have you or your friends a letter or telegram direct from St. John?

"Have you a letter or telegram that purports to be signed by him?

"Do you regard it an honorable thing to attempt to bribe a candidate to betray his followers?

"What honorable men would listen to the propositions of a traitor to betray honest men and women?

"Is not a man who will listen to and help arrange a plot to bribe, as vile and mean as the man who accepts a bribe?

"Is not a man who will enter into a plot to bribe and then betray the confidential communications of his agent, as you did Legate's, a dishonorable man?"(52)

To these sharp interrogations Clarkson and his friends made no reply.

The bribery muddle made lively reading matter and it became a principal news story of the day. The newspapers, even unfriendly ones, were active in pressing the demand for something more definite than vague insinuation and unsupported assertion. One paper in asking for the "cold facts" said: "St. John has no other reputation to preserve but that of an honest fanatic, an unconscious idiot, a conscientious mischief-maker. That ought not to be taken away from him on slight grounds. On the other hand, if he did sell out to the Democrats, it would be curious to know just what such an article was deemed worth in a hot market."(53) Papers of all shades of opinion were skeptical, and made such statements as these:

"If at the critical time at which these negotiations were going on the National Committee, or those of them who were running the campaign, supposed that \$25,000 would buy St. John off, why did they not pay it? It is well understood that at that time, well-informed Republicans all over the country were exceedingly anxious about New York and

especially on account of the Prohibition vote. It is not believed that the active members of the committee were restrained by any scruples. They were not that kind of men. The necessity for something to be done to make that State more safe for Blaine and Logan was acknowledged by all, and the failure to accept Legate's offer must have been either from want of funds or from the suspicion that Mr. Legate could not deliver what he was proposing to sell; which was it?"(54)

The Louisville Times expressed the conviction of many newspapers when it said:

"...Not one scintilla of evidence can be gathered that he (St. John) ever offered to sell out his candidacy or his principles, or authorized anybody else to represent him in such offer. But there is ample proof that the Republican party had a bureau of bribery which Mr. J.S. Clarkson substantially admits, and that Mr. Clarkson, in charge of said bureau, was quite willing to have part in a venal transaction for Mr. Blaine's benefit. Governor St. John shows clearly from the statements made by both Clarkson and Legate that the latter was an authorized agent of the bureau Mr. Clarkson had in charge, and Legate's own assertion that St. John knew nothing of the attempted deal is an worthy of belief as any declarations Clarkson may now make. A man willing to undertake bribery can have small regard for truth..."(55)

Few Kansas newspapers, either democratic or republican, besides D.R. Anthony's Leavenworth Times, gave any credence to the charge of dishonesty against St. John. The prevailing opinion was that Legate, Neely and Ayers, without even the knowledge of the prohibitionist candidate, had tried to sell him with the purpose of keeping for themselves whatever money the democratic or republican committees might pay, and that the republican national committee, or at least one member of it, was quite willing to resort to bribery in an effort to secure victory.(56) St. John was admitted to be free from any moral obliquity in the matter. "Crankers are not natural corruptionists," said one paper,

adding that the attempt to sell St. John's influence had its parallel in the devil's offer of the world to Christ if He would fall down and worship the devil. "As a matter of fact the poor devil did not own a foot of land in the world or out of it. But the devil had as much right to bank on the kingdoms of the world as Legate, Neely and Ayers had to bank on St. John."(57) The Topeka Capital, St. John's chief supporter among newspapers while he was governor of Kansas, spoke truly when it said in an editorial that those who knew him personally and well had never believed the rumors of bribery. "There has never been since the election," it continued, "a responsible statement made upon the subject... Nobody has said more than to repeat rumors and political lies... We should be recreant to the demands of personal friendship and decent journalism not to raise our voice against the continued irresponsible lying in regard to a man whose private and public record is as clean and honorable as any man's."(58)

Gradually the smoke of battle cleared away. Those at first most anxious to hurt St. John ceased to agitate the charge against him when it became apparent that a national scandal, involving names high in republican councils, was being unearthed. When the aggressors became the attacked and it was even said that a man named William Walter Phelps had presented the proposition to bribe St. John to Blaine and that the latter had not seriously disapproved of it (59),

the republicans, in St. John's terms, "drew in their horns," lest something worse might come to the surface and be proved. Party politics were far from clean and the scandal might soon have passed beyond control. In 1888 the exposure of the theft of the mailing list of the Voice, national prohibition paper, threatened to revive the slanders of 1884 and 1885. Two clerks in the subscription department of the Voice stole 108 sheets of the mailing list containing about 50,000 names and sold them for \$250 to J.S. Clarkson, who was then vice-chairman of the republican national committee and who later became chairman of it. Clarkson took the man who engineered the sale to the chairman of the republican committee who gave the thief a job under the republican committee, thus implying that he knew of and approved the purchase of the mailing list.(60) Republican campaign documents were sent to the persons whose names were on the stolen mailing list. Except for isolated instances like this, however, the scandal of 1884-1884 was allowed to slumber peacefully.

The sale of the Voice mailing list demonstrated the high importance attached to the prohibition vote by the republicans.

St. John emerged from the campaign of 1884 and the abuse following it unembittered and with his character vindicated and the devotion of his followers increased. After the inauguration he and his wife called at the White House and were graciously received by Mr. Cleveland. It might also be noted that the man indorsed by St. John for postmaster at

Olathe was appointed, and it is not known that he had any other indorsement. "It that reward was treason," said the prohibitionist, "it was the sum total that I ever got or asked."(61)

The purpose of the prohibitionists in 1884 had been to make their party a felt factor in national politics. Chairman Finch believed that if the young party were influential in defeating something it would be recognized, and the vindictiveness of the republican party was a demonstration that it had succeeded. For the democratic party the prohibitionists had no care except in turn to beat it, or assist in beating it,(62) Their hope was that the prohibition question would soon become the dividing issue and that a reconstruction of parties would be accomplished. Many believed that the expected result would come to pass at the presidential contest of 1888.

They were encouraged by the rapid strides made by the prohibition party during the years immediately following 1884. Temperance legislation in the states was also making marked advance during the same period and was even being considered in Congress, and this was regarded as the consequence of the growing political power of the prohibition party. Prohibitionists believed that the old parties feared the loss of the temperance vote and were bidding to keep it

This belief was in part accurate. The prohibition campaign of 1884 had focused the attention of the country upon the prohibition issue and compelled a widespread

agitation and discussion of the subject. At the time the margin of plurality of one of the large parties over the other was so small that the defection of even a comparatively small number of votes was a cause for alarm. Furthermore, the existing political regime feared that the prohibition party was about to start a landslide which would squarely divide the nation on the temperance issue and destroy the old political organizations; hence the desire to quickly take the force out of the movement was keen.

A step toward the realization of this desire was taken in 1885 when the republican prohibitionists of Kansas, headed by Albert Griffin, inaugurated a movement to induce the republican party everywhere to adopt "a platform of uncompromising hostility to the saloon." The "anti-saloon republican movement" was regarded with contempt by St. John as an effort to ensnare prohibitionists. A hen fusses when ducks she has raised take to the water, he said. "Now the prohibition ducks have taken to water and Griffin is the Republican hen trying to cackle them back."(63) Although the movement was pressed with earnestness by individual sympathizers in different parts of the country, it was regarded with but scant favor by the leaders and masses of the party and was practically abandoned after the presidential campaign of 1888.

The fear of the prohibitionists was strong in New York state where their vote in 1887 had grown to 41,850. In 1888 Warner Miller accepted the republican nomination for

governor of this state and made the canvass on the temperance issue in an effort to win temperance votes. While he confined himself to the advocacy of high license, his democratic opponent was opposed to this restrictive policy, and republicans therefore reasonably expected to secure a certain number of the more moderate prohibition voters. After the election Miller was quoted as saying: "I did not expect...that I could win. ...However,...I believed it was possible to keep down the prohibition vote, and thereby save the State for General Harrison. I started in with that object in view." Whether or not it was due to Miller's campaign, Benjamin Harrison, the republican candidate for president, did carry the state of New York and was elected.(64)

During the period 1884-1888 the republican party in several states adopted planks favoring the submission of a prohibitory amendment or the enforcement of the existing temperance laws, but the position taken by the national convention in June, 1888, was far from satisfactory to prohibitionists. While a resolution was adopted declaring cordial sympathy with "all wise and well-directed efforts for the promotion of temperance and morality," the convention also affirmed its "unswerving devotion to...the autonomy reserved to the States under the Constitution; to the personal rights and liberties of the citizens in all the States and Territories in the Union." The latter expression was interpreted by Herman Raster, author of the Raster resolution in the republican platform of 1872, as an implied repetition of that celebrated utterance, which, he

held, was meant to discountenance all temperance laws. Furthermore, a German and an anti-prohibition bureau were harbored in republican headquarters in New York City, but the anti-saloon republican bureau was obliged to carry on its work elsewhere, the chairman of the national committee refusing to assume responsibility for it.(65)

In spite of the fact that the democrats had been suffering some losses to the prohibitionists, especially in the state elections of 1886, and that the prohibitionists were increasing their strength in the south, the state platforms of the democratic party were for the most part silent or hostile on the subject of temperance. The national convention of 1888 failed to speak definitely on the topic but its reaffirmation of the platform of 1884 which contained an anti-sumptuary plank was regarded as unfriendly to the temperance element.

The prohibitionists were successful in 1888 in nearly doubling their vote of 1884 but they failed to make any marked gains in succeeding presidential elections. The old parties ceased to fear the temperance vote when they saw its strength was limited and were even less inclined than they had been in 1888 to make concessions to it. It was more essential that they bend their efforts to retain the liquor vote. The prohibitionists could not hope to gain their ends by frightening the controlling parties. Moreover, their connection with Blaine's defeat in 1884 had alienated the friendship of many temperance republicans who thought

they were working for the democrats. In Kansas, for instance, the republican prohibitionists refused to cooperate with St. John who consequently could work only through the medium of the prohibition party. The fact that the prohibitionists' sphere of influence was thus limited made it a mooted point as to how much the campaign of 1884 had actually aided the prohibition cause.

It can scarcely be doubted, however, that this campaign was useful in another direction--in clearing the political stage of the old issues which had grown out of the Civil War and in preparing the way for new questions. The people were tired of the reconstruction controversies. The time was ripe for a change in political emphasis. Is it possible that the fear that the liquor problem might become the great divisive issue, sweep away the existing political organizations and cause a realignment on the new question was a factor in inducing Cleveland to devote his entire message of 1887 to the tariff-- as a means of making this topic the principal issue in the next presidential election and of thereby protecting the old party divisions? The subject of the tariff could not retain a position as the leading issue indefinitely but it was important enough in 1888 to smother prohibition, and by 1892 the temperance crisis had passed and a whole series of new and salient issues had been brought before the country, chiefly by the populist party. The question of prohibition had been successfully sidetracked for another generation.

PART FOUR

LATER LIFE

CHAPTER XI

LEADING PROHIBITIONIST.--DEVELOPMENT OF OTHER INTERESTS.--

BREAK WITH THE PROHIBITION PARTY.

From 1884 to 1896 no man stood higher in the esteem of the members of the prohibition party in the United States than did St. John and no man's influence was greater than his in this party. Following the election of 1884 he was overwhelmed with invitations to speak in various parts of the country, and after a few weeks of needed rest he started on a four years' campaign for constitutional prohibition, advertising himself as "late of Kansas but now of the United States."(1) At a meeting of the national prohibition committee in January, 1885, it was decided to secure the services of St. John and other able speakers for the current year to herald the cause and proclaim the principles of prohibition throughout the land. In succeeding years he was a popular speaker at state prohibition and W.C.T.U. conventions and at all kinds of temperance conferences and camp meetings, and whenever a campaign for a prohibitory constitutional amendment or for an important temperance law was in progress the state committee of the prohibition party or whoever was in charge was sure to ask for the aid of St. John.

His lectures during these years took him into almost every state in the union although a majority of his speeches were

delivered in the North and East. A notable tour was one which he made in the South in February and March, 1885. He was highly pleased with his reception and after his return to the north frequently made complimentary allusions to the southern people, producing figures to prove that there were more saloons in proportion to population in the republican North than in the democratic South. He went to Texas for a number of lectures in May, 1889, and again in January and February, 1892, and found his welcome no less cordial than it had been in 1885. Other tours of more than ordinary importance were those which he made in Canada in December, 1887, June, 1888, and February, 1889; in California, September-November, 1887; in California and Oregon for four months during 1888; and Hawaii during March, 1888, under the auspices of the W.C.T.U. A letter from Frances E. Willard to St. John, December 9, 1887, said of the invitation to visit Hawaii and to speak on temperance there:

"I have a most interesting letter from my friend Mrs. Mary S. Whitney of Honolulu, S.I., urging me to use any influence I may have with you that you visit them before you return from the Pacific coast. I do greatly desire that this may be, and I am quite of the opinion from what I learn that it would result in their securing prohibition for that island. ...Let me beg you to go if you find it at all compatible with your plans. ...Wherever you go, goes a true man who will represent our sacred cause, and who is in all things sincerely devoted to the highest motives and purposes of life."

(2)

Olathe remained St. John's headquarters during the period when he was engaged as a professional lecturer and he often returned there for a period of rest. He also gave frequent speeches in Olathe and in other Kansas towns and in 1892 made a two months tour of the state.

Everywhere he was greeted with large audiences and great enthusiasm even in bad weather and frequently the hall would not hold all who came to hear him. For this reason he was much sought for in prohibitory amendment campaigns and his work seems always to have pleased those who engaged him. When he lectured in Indiana in the fall of 1889 the Indiana Prohibition League which brought him there not only realized enough money to pay all expenses but had a neat sum left over for their treasury as well. Admission to his lectures was sometimes free but more often a charge was made although it was at times only to cover expenses. When he aided in political campaigns or in campaigns for prohibitory amendments his speeches were free, of course, but a collection was frequently taken. Musical entertainers such as the "Continental Temperance Vocalists," a male quartette in costume, often accompanied St. John on his tours. In a few northern cities difficulty was experienced in obtaining a large hall for St. John's use, when the managers of the halls happened to be republicans who were strongly opposed to the prohibition lecturer. In Springfield, Illinois, the republican members of the state legislature defeated a resolution for which the democratic members voted and which granted the use of the representative hall for a speech by St. John in spite of the fact that it was customary to allow the hall to be used for such public lectures. Many of St. John's addresses were delivered in churches and in college auditoriums.

Between 1884 and 1890 St. John's invitations to speak were far more numerous than he could fulfill. He had in 1880, for example, 62 invitations to deliver a Fourth of July address. In 1892, when he had been devoting his full time to lecturing for years, he was said to have travelled 200,000 miles by rail and to have missed only two appointments.(3) About 1890, however, the demand for his services had begun to decrease and in this year his services as a lecturer are first advertised for sale in the Voice.⁽⁴⁾ The next year the following advertisement appeared in this paper:

"Ex-governor John P. St. John will be in New York from March 1 until April 7. His services can be secured for prohibition addresses on very favorable terms by applying to John Lloyd Thomas,...New York City."⁽⁵⁾

He continued to make intermittent speaking tours after this time, and during 1896 the demand for speeches by him was again fairly heavy, but lecturing no longer furnished him the substantial income that it had at first, and he began to turn more and more to other occupations as a means of making a living.

For a time following 1884 St. John spent a portion of his speeches in replying to the bribery charge and to the misrepresentations he received, but a little later he devoted himself to a discussion of national prohibition and its progress throughout the country. His discussions were mainly but not entirely political in nature. They were always lightened with his homely humor and invariably they had a religious close, usually a reference to God being with the

prohibitionists or a quotation from the Bible. Sometimes he delivered speeches which were entirely religious in nature such as his sermon entitled "Get Right with God." The general topic of the evils of intemperance and of government sanction of the liquor traffic of course colored his utterances. Most frequently he dilated on the subject of the prohibition party which he was always comparing with the old abolition party. He maintained that no reform could be brought about except through a political agency(6) and that if prohibition were to succeed in this country the measure must be placed in the hands of its friends, the members of the prohibition party.(7) He compared the nation to a building, the liquor traffic to a fire which was threatening to demolish the building, and the victims of alcohol to the people trapped in the burning structure. The republican and democratic parties represented firemen who were afraid to rush within the court, attach the hose and turn the water upon the flames and who preferred merely to try to regulate the fire; the prohibition party represented the fireman who attached the hose, put out the flames, saved the structure and rescued the persons within.(8) He was tremendously enthusiastic about the growth of the prohibition party and expected it to hold the balance of power in at least half of the states in 1888 and to be in the same relative position as the republican party was in 1856. In other words, he thought the prohibitionists would parallel the Fremont campaign.(9) He cherished the hope that the

prohibition party might even go beyond this and defeat the republican party in 1888; in which event he thought there would be in 1892 only a powerful prohibition organization arrayed against the democratic party.(10) While the prohibitionists did not accomplish as much in 1888 as he wished, he still said optimistically in 1889 that he had never seen the time when the party had been making votes half so rapidly as then.(11)

Each of the major political parties received from St. John's tongue its share of denunciation for its stand on temperance, but in general the prohibitionist showed himself more friendly to the democrats than to the republicans, crediting the former with less hypocrisy than the latter. At one time he said that the democratic party was "without morals" and the republican a "back number,"(12) but at another he said:

"The truth is both these old parties are thoroughly under the influence of the liquor interests, and while the Democracy is the open ally the Republican party is the secret friend of the traffic. There is really no issue between the old parties touching this question. The Democrats declare against 'sumptuary laws' and the Republicans in favor of 'every form of American industry,' which as clearly includes the manufacture and sale of whiskey and beer as it does sugar and molasses. For all practical purposes the committees of the two old parties might just as well be consolidated and move into the same house and save rent.

"We have no right to expect anything from the Democratic party. It never pretended to be a party of 'great moral ideas,' or any other ideas for that matter except to get office, but we had a right to expect... that the Republican party, so brave in its infancy, should keep step with the progress of the age..."(13)

He freely criticized the republican regime and was reported as saying in 1893 that the government was "little better than

one of organized anarchy."(14)

Criticism of the existing political order of affairs naturally led St. John to a consideration of problems other than temperance. This was true after the election of 1888 but especially about 1892 when the populist party was pressing a number of new issues upon the public. It was about 1892, also, that the interest in prohibition as a national issue began to lessen and the demand for St. John as a temperance lecturer to decrease. Hence it would be expected to happen as it did that the content of his lectures would change and prohibition assume a position of lesser importance in them. St. John was by nature a bold and free thinker, needing rather ballast than canvass; and now that he was free from the restrictions of his former party's policies, he made no attempt to restrain the growth of his liberal ideas. The views on the political and financial issues which he elaborated from the platform were among the most radical and advanced of the day.

When St. John began to turn his attention from prohibition during the late eighties, the first subject that received his consideration was the tariff. His sympathy with the free trade policy which he had indicated during the campaign of 1884 was now fully developed and expounded. While Cleveland's tariff message was not for free trade, ^{much} of what St. John said was in harmony with that message, but he claimed that there was no difference between the tariff policies of the democrats and of the republicans. As proof

of this statement he read, during one of his lectures, from a presidential message recommending a reduction of the revenues and then took a vote of the audience. Those who thought the message patriotic and in the interests of the people were first requested to hold up their hands. The democrats in the audience, thinking it was not only the language but the sentiment of Cleveland, held up their hands. "Now," said St. John, "those who think this is free trade and ruinous to the industries of the country hold up their hands." Whereupon a number of republicans raised their hands. "This, remember," continued the prohibitionist, "is from the message of Garfield."(15)

"I am in favor of every man being able to buy the necessities of life as cheaply as possible," he said in 1890. "...That is my political and common sense belief. The whole tax system is now and has been for years a scheme to enrich the few at the expense of the many."(16) From the census he quoted figures to show that 9 per cent of the population of the United States owned 71 per cent of its wealth and that 64 per cent owned but 9 per cent of this wealth. He made a study of the tariff to prove that in the main it was laid on the necessities of life while luxuries were permitted to enter free and that the people of the United States were producers of that which had no protection and consumers of that which was covered by a high "tariff tax." The whole tariff system was wrong in principle, he said, because it imposed burdens upon what the people con-

sumed instead of upon what they possessed. "Rich and poor thus bear the same burden," he said. "...A poor man with ten children worth \$1,000 pays more to support the government than his neighbor with no children worth \$100,000." This statement was based on his argument that the poor man's family would consume several times as much sugar and similar commodities on which a high tariff was levied than the rich man's family would.(17) After twenty-five years under the high tariff system, he said, labor was in the most demoralized and unsettled condition that the country had ever known; the system gave ten times the protection to capital that it did to labor. "The tariff never protected any man's muscle," he asserted.(18) "We place a tariff on imported goods but imported labor enters free."(19)

Besides the effect of the competition of cheap foreign labor on native labor, St. John also spoke of the relationship of the tariff to the farmers. He referred to the increase of their mortgaged indebtedness, compared this to the growth of the wealth of the railroads, and said: "Who gets the difference between the farmers' prices in the west and in the east? The west is being robbed to satisfy the demands of the railroads, monopolies and trusts."(20)) Again he said:

"It is pretty hard to enthuse Western farmers by talking up our present system of protection just now, when their wheat brings them but fifty cents a bushel. ...The fact that a Vanderbilt accumulates in a life time a fortune of over \$200,000,000 shows that the men whose labor produced this immense increase are counted out when it comes to its distribution. A system of laws which enables a Jay Gould to control the people's highways to the markets of the world is wrong. A system which makes it possible for railway cor-

porations to regulate the market price of the products of the farm and workshop is wrong. A system of laws which protects a business that corrupts politics, makes moral cowards out of otherwise good men, fills our land with widows and orphans, destroys homes and immortal souls, is also wrong."(21)

In December, 1889, he made a speech on "The Injustice of the Present Tariff System" in which he said: "It is humiliating for one of our merchants to go abroad and see English vessels in every port, while he sees few, if any, American ships. Free trade England is buying our distilleries, mines, railroad stock and western lands. She is going to buy us out."(22)

He favored allowing a man to spend a dollar where its purchasing power was greatest, without having to pay tribute to a favored few. In a speech entitled "The Reason and Remedy for Hard Times," he advocated the removal of tariff duties and the raising of revenue by a levy upon the taxable wealth of the nation. If sugar deserved a protection of two cents per pound, he said, that protection should be given as a bounty direct from the government,(23) and the result of this would be the discovery that the American industries were no longer in their infancy, and rich and poor alike would get their sugar two cents per pound cheaper.

Along with reform in the tariff he advocated government ownership and operation of all public means of transportation and communication; direct election of United States senators as a means of making the senate into something besides a hot bed of monopolies and trusts; the Australian ballot system;

prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage; the measuring of all burdens of taxation by the financial ability of the citizen to bear them; the issuance of all money directly by the government and no more interest-bearing government bonds for any purpose in times of peace; a national interest law, limiting the rate to the net annual profits of agriculture and of labor; and woman suffrage.(24)

Woman suffrage was a reform which lay near to his heart, partly because he considered that it would aid in more quickly securing prohibition. As early as 1878 he was openly advocating it in his speeches, and he had favored it privately long before that. His speeches in the eighties and in the nineties were replete with references to women and their usefulness, and he often deplored the fact that "drunken bums and tramps may vote because men, while our wives and mothers are denied the privilege because women." (25)

The way for man to bring about these needed reforms, he said, was to organize and let their power be felt at the ballot box. He added: "I would not give the snap of my finger for all your Farmers' Alliances, labor and other reform organizations that stop short of the ballot box."(26) On another occasion he said: "Young man, you will never accomplish anything in the way of reform by staying with the old parties;"(27) and: "Party slavery has been the curse of this country." As for himself he said: "I belong to no political party. I train with the prohibition party because

it shapes its platform and principles in accordance with my conscience,"(28) "What the world needs is more men who do their own thinking" and "The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is a broad enough platform for any man to stand on," were two of St. John's apothegms.

Outwardly St. John retained his allegiance to the prohibition party until 1896; but the gradually shifting emphasis of his lectures caused many persons to consider him more of a populist than a prohibitionist. Between 1894 and 1896 most of the speeches which he delivered dealt with the financial questions of the day and championed the cause of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of sixteen to one. He was struck with the popularity of the free silver idea, and, being a westerner and financially interested in mining, was certain to feel strongly on the matter. It was said that his views grew out of the fact that he owned some silver mines, but it is not definitely ascertained that he did own any at the time. He denied being a populist, criticizing that party because it refused to favor prohibition and woman suffrage.(29) After he had attended the national populist convention at Cincinnati in May, 1891, he said that no other party convention had ever been more subservient to the liquor interests than it and labeled it a "third whiskey party." He also said: "The only thing which distinguished it from the old party conventions was its visionary sub-treasury scheme which has no foundation either in justice or common sense. It would be the worst species of class legislation." He thought that the sub-treasury plan only made it easy for

the people to get into debt and that it would bankrupt the government.(30) Yet in spite of all this there could be no question as to his agreement with the populists on the silver controversy and a number of the speeches on the subject which he delivered in Kansas were under the auspices of the populist party.(31) Furthermore, he indicated his sympathy with the principles of the people's party by saying that the populists and prohibitionists would unite in 1896 on the issues which were dividing them and would then elect a president.

Enthusiasm for St. John as a speaker, which was decreasing with the waning interest in prohibition, revived when he assumed the role of champion of the rights of the laboring man and of the farmer as against capital and especially when he came out for free silver and for the rights of the west as opposed to the east. During 1895 and more particularly during 1896 he was again a popular speaker and gave lectures in several northern and eastern states as well as in many places in Kansas. His insistence that he was not allied with any political party, was not and would not be a candidate for any office and would accept no political position(32) enabled him to be very free and critical in what he said.

A typical speech was one which he gave following a free silver convention at Topeka on July 16, 1896. In it he referred to the coming election as the most important that ever occurred in the United States and spoke of the "treacherous

demonetization" of the white metal by act of Congress in 1873.

The following paragraphs explain his position:

"The reasons why a gold coin is worth as much after the stamp of the government is defaced, as it was before, are two-fold. First, because the law fixes an arbitrary value on the bullion and second, the holder without expense to himself may have it recoined into money.

"The reason why a silver dollar is worth only fifty cents after it is melted is because there is no arbitrary value fixed upon the bullion, nor can the holder have it recoined into money. Hence it becomes a mere commodity on the market, the same as beef or pork or wheat.

"There is no intrinsic value in money. It has a legal value which is indicated by the stamp of the government without regard to the material upon which the stamp is placed.

"If all the silver coin in the world was dropped into the lap of Uncle Sam and coined into standard dollars it would only give us a circulation of about sixty dollars per capita. While the balance of the world on a gold basis would have but about three dollars per capita. Such conditions would bankrupt gold standard countries and make this the most prosperous nation on earth.

"It is not true that Mexico has a fifty-cent dollar. But it is true that we have a fifty-cent dollar. That is the dollar of Wall Street. The one hundred-cent dollar is the dollar of the common people. That's what they want and that's what they intend to have. Never since the days of Benedict Arnold has there been a more disloyal surrender of American interests than that set forth in the financial plank of the republican platform, adopted at St. Louis June 18.

"To show how Wall Street viewed this matter I call attention to a paragraph in a circular letter from Henry Clews and Company, the great Wall Street bankers, dated June 20, which says: 'No sooner was it known that an agreement had been reached to put a plank in the republican platform in favor of a single gold standard and against free coinage than London ordered largely of our stocks.' This gave the key to the local market and stocks went up from two and one-half to five per cent.

"But western corn still stood at fifteen cents, and oats hustled around hunting for an eight-cent market. When we find out what Wall Street wants, touching money matters, that's just what we don't want.

"We have had a single gold standard for about twenty-five years, and we find it more difficult to retain gold in our own country today than at any time in our history. This system has cost the people two hundred and sixty-two millions of dollars in the past three years for which they are bonded today and have not received one penny's benefit. Under this system an enormous private mortgage debt has been piled upon

the people. Kansas' share of this debt has reached two hundred and forty-three million dollars. . . .

"No people on earth can long struggle under such enormous burdens. Either the conditions must change in their favor or in time they become serfs ruled by a few money kings.

"...It is a battle for freedom from wage slavery; from agricultural depression. In fact from everything that tends to pauperize the masses.

"...Let the battle cry be: free ballot; free silver; free men; and free homes."(33)

These economic doctrines were exactly the opposite of those expounded by St. John in 1876 and 1878 when he was an ardent "hard money" republican, thoroughly against the fiat theory of money.

St. John's resentment of the unfair treatment of workingmen has been mentioned in connection with the discussion of the tariff. During 1895, when he made his residence in New York, he was stirred by a strike in Brooklyn to a severe denunciation of the methods of employers in dealing with the strikers. "I am in the midst of daily cruelties and wrongs that make my blood fairly boil," he said.(34) In a speech in August, 1894, he made the following statements:

"I believe that labor has just as much right to organize as has capital and that the reduction of the laborer's wages to a starvation point is a strike by capital and is a sin against God and ought to be made a crime against man... Whenever labor is well paid and then strikes...it is equally a sin and a crime...I am in favor of strikes, for they are the only means of protecting labor; but the strike should be made on the same day simultaneously along the whole line--at the ballot box."(35)

He said again: "I have no patience with the man who will vote against himself and then cry oppression."(36)

During the time that he was developing his interests in other directions St. John was still making a good many speeches

on prohibition. His utterances were as bold and his prophecies as startling as ever. A statement which was made in the course of one of his lectures and which aroused satirical comment was this:

"I cannot distinguish morally between the saloon-keeper and the law that lets him sell rum, nor between him and those that make the law; between him and the church deacon who votes for men who make such law. They will all be bunched on the great judgment day. The Almighty won't bother to try them separately and they will all be put to the same punishment." (37)

He declared that the saloon existed because of the utter failure of church men to do their duty and that it was no worse to vote directly for a saloon than to vote for a saloon party.(38) "The whiskey man's and the church man's ballot cannot be told apart," he said. "God hasten the day when the vote of the church, when it gets into the ballot box, can be readily distinguished from the vote of the saloon."(39) Conspicuous among his efforts in the nineties in behalf of the temperance reform was a debate which he held with Senator Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina, at Prohibition Park, Port Richmond, New York, in August, 1895. Senator Tillman, who defended the dispensary system, was defeated by the Kansan, who argued for prohibition, by a nine to five vote of the jury. St. John secured the votes of the five prohibitionists and of four of the nine anti-prohibitionists who comprised the jury.(40)

St. John's relationship to Kansas politics was not very close after 1884. The republicans of the state were convinced that his sole purpose was to hurt their party and so they

continued to revile him, to call him a mountebank crank, a moral leper and a blatherskite, to suggest that the name of the fourth book in the New Testament be changed and to advocate his being hanged. Our Kansas newspaper designated the ex-governor as "a cold buck-wheat cake, a sky rocket on its downward trip, a percussion cap after the duck is killed, and a piece of soap after a hard week's washing in a coal miner's family."(41) There were periodic revivals of the bribery allegations of 1884 and it was generally accepted by republicans that he was working in the interest of the democratic party. Particularly irksome was the fact that he was making money as a professional temperance lecturer, and the fifty dollars per lecture which he received came in for its share of sarcastic comment.

For his part St. John did not spare the republican party, although there were some of its candidates whom he cordially indorsed. The administrations of the republican governors, particularly of John A. Martin and of E.N. Morrill, were attacked for failure to enforce prohibition adequately and for other reasons. Martin, he claimed, had been too lax in pardoning convicted saloon-keepers. Even the sight of many former anti-prohibition republicans seated on the mourners bench getting ready for baptism and full admission to the prohibition church failed to placate him; he continued to regard the republican party as hostile to the full effects of the prohibitory amendment. There were times when he felt that prohibition was being enforced

as well as it was possible; and even with lax enforcement he considered its effect on the general welfare of the state was beneficial.

The democrats of Kansas tended to regard in a kindly way the man whom they held responsible for the defeat of Blaine. St. John had no kind words for them, however. He asserted that both they and the republicans favored resubmission of the prohibitory amendment, the former openly, the latter through a constitutional convention.(42)

The people's party resembled the prohibition party in many particulars; but many prohibitionists dissented from some of the populist doctrines, particularly the sub-treasury plan, and the populists did not include a prohibition plank in their platform. St. John's objections to the people's party have already been stated. He was never directly connected with the organization. He was, in fact, quite as free in criticism of it as of the major parties, and W.A. Peffer, the populist senator, and L.D. Lewelling, the populists governor of Kansas, both failed to meet the prohibitionist's approval. Even if the party should "pile prohibition mountain high in their platform and also woman suffrage," he said, he could not support it because of Lewelling's administration.(43) The similarity of his and the populist views on the silver and other economic questions caused him to be generally regarded as a member of the people's party, however, and he was mentioned in June, 1894, as a possible populist candidate for congress in

the second district or for congressman-at-large or as a member of the state ticket. Two years later he received a number of favorable notices as a candidate for the populist nomination for congress in the second district although he repeatedly said that he would accept no nomination. Without his consent his name was presented to the populist congressional convention at Ottawa on June 16, 1896. He had a fair strength in the convention, but the fear that the democrats would not approve his nomination led the populists to name another candidate for congressman.(44)

Beginning with 1884 St. John was in close harmony with the prohibition party in Kansas and for a few years the republicans were extremely apprehensive that he might build up his party at the expense of the republican votes. After one or two state elections, when it became apparent that the vote would not greatly increase, their anxiety died out. During the spring of 1886 St. John aided the state prohibition committee in planning the state convention at Emporia and minor district conventions, in July delivered two speeches at the state convention, and during the last week in October made a speaking campaign for the ticket in Johnson county. He estimated the prohibition vote in the state at 20,000 but it actually amounted to 8,094.(45) He lent his aid to the state committee in making succeeding state conventions successful, often presiding or speaking at them, and he stumped in several campaigns. His influence was paramount in the platforms and under his guidance the

party declared in turn for woman suffrage, government control of the telegraph lines and of the railways, repeal of the tariff laws and free silver, and against national banks.(46) He sternly opposed any deal or fusion with the republican party in Kansas or the withdrawal of any prohibition candidate in favor of a republican. His friend and law partner, I.O. Pickering, who had followed him into the prohibition organization, was twice (in 1892 and in 1894) the candidate of the party for governor. St. John himself was mentioned as a candidate for various offices. In 1886 he was urged to make the race for congressman in the second district (47) and in 1894 he was pushed energetically for the nomination for governor, many prohibitionists maintaining that he would increase the prohibition vote by twenty-five to fifty thousand. (48) St. John positively declined to accept such a nomination and alleged that he could do better work in the ranks.(49)

In 1890 the prohibition vote in Kansas had fallen to 1,230 (50) but four years later it had reached 5,496.(51) In 1896 the state prohibition party split on the silver issue just as the national party did. There were three prohibition candidates for governor in the field. One received 2,347, and the other two 757 and 703 votes respectively, or a total of 3,807 in the state.(52)

Many national issues came in for a share of St John's ready opinions. The return of the confederate battle flags, for instance was an act which won his approval, especially

after Governor Martin of Kansas had sent a protest against it to the president.(53) The man who had earlier waved the 'bloody shirt' exclaimed in 1885: "There is one thing that we have got to come to, namely, a realization that this is the United States, that we are one people, and one country... It is time that the bloody shirt should be dropped."(54)

The "original package" decision of the United States supreme court in 1890, in which it was held that the state had no right to restrict the importation of liquors in the original packages, elicited this comment from him as to its effect in Kansas: "The 'original package' decision is clearly in the interest of criminals, as it will aid them in their business of violating the prohibitory law. ... Morally and politically, the case will stand in history as the twin brother of the Dred Scott decision."(55)

In regard to the dispute between Venezuela and Great Britain over the Venezuela boundary line, St. John said in 1896 that the great hue and cry raised by President Cleveland was intended merely to touch American patriotism and to draw attention from the financial plundering that was going on. He resented all the furore over the British-Venezuela boundary dispute when, as he said, English syndicates owned acreage in the United States equalling more than the total territory of the six New England states, besides controlling a large part of United States bonds, railroads, and industries and dictating our monetary system. Talk of war he called the "veriest bosh."(56)

The prohibition national convention of 1888 met at Indianapolis on May 30 and 31. Besides several thousand visitors, there were present 1,029 regularly-chosen delegates, representing 42 state and territories and the District of Columbia. St. John came unheralded on a train with the Claifornia delegation, which he had joined at Kansas City, and was accorded an ovation. Against his protest the crowd at the depot escorted him in triumph to his hotel and later he was given the most conspicuous honor of the occasion--the permanent chairmanship. On the first day of the convention a Memorial meeting was held at which St. John and other prominent party leaders who had worn the Blue or the Gray spoke. On the next day the convention met in business session. An interesting incident occurred when a member of the Kansas delegation presented to the chairman a gavel made of wood from the telegraph pole in Topeka on which St. John had been burned in effigy. H. Clay Needham, of Arcadia, Kansas, had purchased the pole from the Western Union Telegraph Company for \$76 and, excepting for the gavel, had had it made into canes which were then sold. The proceeds, amounting to about \$1,500, were turned into the treasury of the prohibition party.(57) After the presentation of the gavel St. John made a speech on how it feels to be hanged in effigy. The Kansan's name had been suggested for the nomination for president but he had emphatically refused to make the race and the convention dicided upon General Clinton B. Fisk, of New Jersey,. The usual anti-liquor platform was

adopted, but there was a thorough debate over the woman suffrage plank. To give every side of the question a fair chance taxed the resources of the chairman, but he conducted the debate with marked impartiality and the plank was included in the platform by an overwhelming vote. St. John was active during the canvass that followed the convention. The result of the election showed that the prohibition vote was two-thirds greater than it had been in 1884.

In an editorial April 14, 1892, the Voice suggested St. John for the presidential nomination that year, saying: "He gave us in 1884 a campaign unparalleled in the history of the party for fire and force and aggressive power. That is the sort of campaign we want again in 1892, and he is stronger today in the hearts of the voting millions than he was eight years ago."(58) This editorial struck a responsive chord among prohibitionists throughout the nation and a host of enthusiastic letters indorsing the editorial poured into the Voice office. The paper found it impossible to print more than a small fraction of the responses from prohibition leaders. Frances E. Willard wrote: "He is our strongest eligible political leader. But I have heard so often that he would upon no account be laid upon the altar--for it amounts to 'simply that and nothing more.'"(59) The "prohibition saint" received great praise; his friends called him "fearless and aggressive, unpurchaseable and unmoveable," an indefatigable worker, the "magnetic center of the prohibition forces," and said that he was the man who

would carry the votes of western farmers. One enthusiastic admirer, who saw prophecy in a name and a voice in history, found in the name "John P. St. John" something magical--a talisman of power and an assurance of victory and in a letter to the Voice pointed out that a large proportion of the great reformers of the world had been named John. John the Baptist, the apostle St. John, a host of the historians and great reformers of the middle ages, John Calvin, John Knox, John Wesley, John Robinson, John Kelly and John Brown were cited as examples. "And now," it was affirmed, "has come upon the stage as a leader in the Prohibition reform one bearing the double name of John, with a 'Saint' between to connect them. What the 'P' stands for I do not know--perhaps to indicate more clearly the designs of Providence and the name of the reform to be led!"(60)

The Voice continued to push St. John for the nomination. On May 19 it stated that after a long and candid talk with him the editors were convinced that the unanimity of the call had swept away all of his objections but one. That one he considered to be a clear personal duty and it was not stated.(61) There can be little doubt that but for the belief that he did not desire and would not accept the nomination he would have been named as standard bearer by the convention which met at Cincinnati on June 30.

All but one state was represented at this convention. St. John was temporary chairman. General John Bidwell (a significant name for the democrats, said malicious

republican papers) was chosen for the presidential nominee and the broadest platform yet adopted was decided upon. St. John, who was a member of the committee on platform, was an active participant in the spirited struggle in that committee over the tariff and silver planks and was an exponent of the idea that there should be "no fusion, no deals, no compromise" for the party. He had said earlier that political shackles were resting more lightly on the people than ever before, owing to the farmers' alliance and other industrial movements, and that if the work were pushed vigorously the prohibitionists might secure a victory in 1892. "I, for one," he exclaimed, "am tired of seeing Prohibitionists everlastingly on their knees begging some so-called reform movement to take us in. We have the best party on earth; let us stand by it."(62) The convention made no attempt to fuse with any other party. It finally voted down by a large majority a plank favoring the free coinage of silver, but it declared for woman suffrage and that "tariff should be levied only as defense against foreign governments which levy tariff upon, or bar out our products from their markets, revenue being incidental. The residue of means necessary to an economical administration of the government should be raised by levying the burden on what the people possess, instead of upon what they consume." The last resolution of the platform declared prohibition to be the dominant issue in national politics and the fellowship of all who agreed upon this issue was invited.(63) After the convention

St. John gave practically all of his time until November to speaking in the campaign under the direction of the chairman of the national prohibition committee.(64)

The policy of the prohibition party up to 1896 had been to emphasize the prohibition issue as the most important one and in addition it had in all the campaigns but one proposed a progressive program on other questions. During the populistic wave of the nineties, however, many prohibitionists came to believe like St. John that the party should take a radical position on several other questions besides prohibition. The question was prominent before practically all of the state prohibition conventions held in the first half of the decade as to whether the platform should be one-sided (prohibition) or multi-sided, and many of the state platforms incorporated distinctly populistic doctrines. In the national convention differences had been harmonized but in 1896 the feeling both of the broad gaugers and of the narrow gaugers was intense. The crisis was precipitated by the free silver issue which the populists had brought to the fore and which was championed by the democrats as well as by the populists in 1896. The feeling for free coinage of silver at a ration of sixteen to one was especially strong in the West which was heavily in debt and therefore wished for an increase in the quantity of money in circulation. But the whole silver movement was closely connected with the vehement class feelings against the excessive power of capital. Free silver had become the

slogan around which the protest against the evils of monopolies and trusts centered. Political feeling in 1896 was more intense than it had been at any time since the Civil War.

The controversy over whether the prohibition platform should be broad gauge or single gauge raged through prohibition papers for several weeks preceding the convention. Those championing the single issue argued that the great purpose of the prohibition party was to secure prohibition and that the party could not successfully require adherence at the same time to two or more radical or divisive issues. It was shown that many prohibitionists would be repelled if required to commit themselves to free trade or to free silver. It was also shown that great questions are settled one at a time and attention was called to the fact that the republican party in 1855 dropped all other issues but slavery. Most of the narrow gaugers did not intend to confine the platform to prohibition alone but meant to keep out all divisive issues, incorporating in the platform only those proposals upon which there was substantial agreement.(65)

St. John in 1896 was far more radical in his economic views than he had been in 1892. More than ever he wanted the prohibitionists to adopt a broad gauge platform which would include his views on tariff, silver and woman suffrage. He was thoroughly opposed to the "dominant issue" plank in the platform and said:

"Such a declaration as we always place in our platform..."

leaves no one in doubt as to the position of the Prohibition Party on that question. That the suppressing of the liquor traffic is considered of paramount importance by a very large majority of the Prohibitionists of this country there can be no doubt, and no resolution in that effect is necessary to convince anybody of the fact. Yet there is quite a large element in our party who believe that there are a number of other questions of equal importance, while there are hundreds of thousands of people who are ready to go with us on our declaration against the liquor traffic, but refuse to recognize that question as towering above all others."(66)

To his mind the silver issue was to be the dominant issue in the campaign of 1896 although the prohibition question was actually more important.(67) He believed that the adoption of a free silver plank, together with planks for government ownership of railways and telegraph lines and against monopolies, would add a hundred thousand votes to the party strength if not secure the election of a third party president. "If McKinley is nominated at St. Louis, and if the Democrats adopt a gold standard plank at Chicago, then the prohibition candidate for president will stand a good chance for election, if we adopt a free silver plank," he said.(68) By March, 1896, he recognized that the prohibition party was hopelessly split on the money question and said then that he would never vote for any candidate who was pledged to the single gold standard. He also stated that he would not be a candidate on a gold standard platform, for one reason because he wanted to attend the prohibition convention absolutely free from any selfish motive whatever, (69)

St. John had fought to have the convention held near the center of population of the United States, which would have

been in Indiana, feeling that if it took place where the west could obtain a full representation the party would declare for free silver, but the national committee decided by a small majority that the prohibitionists should assemble at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.(70) The time of meeting was set for May 27.

This convention was probably more exciting and the feeling more strained than at any similar gathering in the party's history. Samuel Dickie, chairman of the national prohibition committee, who had attended every national convention since the prohibition party started, said he had never before seen the lines so sharply drawn upon any question in the party.(71) On May 26 there were three caucuses: the free silver delegates, the women delegates, and the single issue delegates all held their separate meetings. The free silver wing declared that their leader, Reverend Charles H. Bentley, of Nebraska, should run upon a broad gauge platform or not at all; the women decided that unless a suffrage plank was inserted in the platform they would leave the party; the single issue delegates were sure that they would control the convention. Every inch of ground was hotly contested from the opening of the session and at one time it was necessary to call for police as a threat in order to preserve order and quiet.(72)

No real test of strength was reached until the vote was taken on the financial plank, which favored free coinage of silver. St. John and the western delegates made a gallant

fight for the plank. When the Kansan came to the stage during the debate, he was given a hearty reception. Nevertheless the plank was defeated by a vote of 387 to 427. Following this a single issue platform was offered and adopted, 650 delegates voting for it and 150 against. A number of broad gaugers voted for the substitute because this placed the other divisive issues on the same basis as silver. Joshua Levering, who belonged to the gold standard faction, was then nominated for president.(73)

The notion had all the time prevailed with the advocates of free silver that there was a disposition to drive them out of the party. Upon the adoption of the single issue platform the free silver delegates seceded from the party without even presenting the name of their candidate for president. St. John left with them. Eleven state chairmen were among the bolters and some twenty states were represented. Many women delegates, incensed because the plank of woman suffrage, which had been adopted earlier in the day, was lost when the substitute platform was adopted, joined the secessionists. A new organization known as the national party was organized and Reverend Bentley nominated for president. St. John had always said that with him nothing would take precedence over prohibition. At the secessionist convention he made a speech in which he said: "Liquor is a great question; so is monetary oppression. I would rather go down with the minority than stand by the party which will sacrifice the womanhood of the nation. We have the women

and the workingmen of the West with us."(74) The platform of the national party was practically the broad gauge platform rejected at the prohibition convention. It declared for prohibition, woman suffrage, free silver, taxation on the property and on the incomes of the people, import duties as a means of securing equitable commercial relations with other countries, the initiative, referendum, and proportional representation. About two thousand dollars was subscribed to meet the expenses of the campaign. The bolt of the free silver prohibitionists was thought to be the first move of silver men to bolt all the political conventions.(75)

It happened that the democratic convention declared for free silver and nominated William Jennings Bryan, a free silver man, for president. St. John himself, who was present at this convention, was much pleased with the platform and nominations and said: "While it may be important for us to legislate ourselves nothing to drink it is just as important that we legislate ourselves something to eat."(76) Nominally St. John was a member of the national party during the campaign of 1896 and he asserted that he would support no party that did not favor prohibition and woman suffrage.(77) Actually he was considered a Bryan supporter and he gave a number of speeches under democratic auspices.(78)

After the democratic and republican conventions many members of the prohibition party felt that they had done right in rejecting a free silver plank. Their opinion was

that most of the free silver advocates would have voted for Bryan anyway while the gold standard prohibitionists would have refused to vote for a prohibition free silver platform and would have voted the republican ticket, as many of them did.

The prohibition party suffered severe losses in the campaign. It polled only 132,007 votes, or just about half the number in 1892. The national party received a total of only 13,969 votes.(79)

CHAPTER XII

A "FREE LANCE."-- RETURN TO PUBLIC FAVOR.--

RENEWAL OF PROHIBITION ACTIVITY.

During the fifteen years following 1896 St. John gave a comparatively small number of addresses and few of these were concerned with temperance or prohibition. Some of his speeches were delivered on such occasions as old Settlers' conventions, commencement exercises and Sunday school picnics. For a time about 1900 he spoke on free silver and imperialism but soon after that he turned again to the tariff as the subject matter of his lectures.

He held that the conduct of the United States in regard to Cuba, Porto Rico and the Phillipine Islands was criminal and belonged in the same class as the conduct of Great Britain and of George III when they drove the Americans to revolt. He was particularly emphatic about the war in the Phillipines, saying in 1901:

"During the past two years our government, at a cost of over \$200,000,000 and many thousand lives, have been trying to subjugate a people eight thousand miles from our shores, who want to be our friends, and whose only offense was the love of human liberty that actuated our Revolutionary fathers four generations ago. Two Hundred Filipinos bite the dust every week in defense of their homes and freedom, and we call... this a 'Christian government.'"(1)

The policy of absolute free trade was sanctioned by St. John without any reservations after 1900. He said that he

was on this question, as he had been on the slavery issue, about twenty-five years ahead of his time and that within a quarter of a century the people would say: "The tariff must go."(2) Another reform now sanctioned by St. John in his speeches was the establishment of a permanent court of arbitration for the adjustment of all international differences.

Notwithstanding his support of Bryan in 1900, St. John's faith in prohibition as a political issue was still strong in 1905 when he prophesied that the prohibition party would within five years draw to it all "the new political leaders of our day, the men who are working for higher standards in public life. Among these men he named Robert M. LaFollette, of Wisconsin, William Jennings Bryan and Theodore Roosevelt.

He said:

"...Bryan...is a man of faultless habits and splendid personality, and he would be a magnificent leader if he had anything to lead; but you could gather up the fragments of the Democratic party with a carpet sweeper... But Mr. Bryan does not enjoy being lonesome and within half a decade he will be making Prohibition speeches.

"And there's another men whose bravery no one questions, ... when he wakes up to the magnitude of the liquor evil... then Theodore Roosevelt will lead the Prohibition movement."
(3)

The editor of the Atchison Champion sarcastically asked St. John in 1900 how the devil would operate a newspaper and the Olathe man at once replied in a letter which summarizes many of his views:

"...He (the devil) would openly favor bimetallism and secretly work to put the government on a single gold standard basis. He would talk long and loud about the people's

money, but place them at the mercy of the national banks to get it. He would declare that the Cubans were...free, and then refuse to give them their freedom... He would stand quietly by, and without even a protest, see the organized trusts rob the people of hundreds of millions annually, and call it prosperity. He would advocate the levying of a high protective tariff tax on the poor man's food and clothing, and tell him it was protection. He would be quiet...while we were burning negroes at the stake...in our own country, but would...favor...sending our soldiers eight thousand miles from home to shoot our civilization and Milwaukee beer into the Filipinos. In a desperate effort of a powerful monarchy which has ever been a robber and oppressor of weaker nations, to crush by brutal force a brave people in South Africa, who are struggling...for...self-government, the devil would be on the side of monarchy and gloat over the downfall of the republic. He would take his position in his newspaper that by the providence of God, Porto Rico was the property of the United States, and that her people were our people and...by way of 'benevolent assimilation'... put a fifteen per cent. tariff on the products of their labor. He would...stand for McKinley and...denounce Bryan; and finally...would make a will, in which he would provide that, in case of his death or removal from the United States, his newspaper should be turned over to Mark Hanna."(4)

After 1896 St. John was a thorough-going independent in politics, maintaining allegiance to no political organization. His sympathy with populist doctrines, however, led to the renewal in 1898 of the movement which had been started in 1896 to give him the populist nomination for congress in the second district, and he received good notices in several newspapers of the district. When interviewed as to his boom for the nomination he replied that if to be a candidate a man must travel over the district, form combinations, buttonhole delegates, make political promises that he neither knew nor cared whether he could fulfill, and bore editors, then he was not a candidate; but that he would accept if nominated.(5) The populist congressional convention on June 21 proceeded to nominate on the first ballot

Mason S. Peters, of Kansas City, Kansas, St. John receiving 19 votes while Peters secured 85.(6) In 1900 there was talk of St. John for the nomination for congress in the second district on the democratic-populist fusion ticket, but he made no effort to secure such nomination and Mason S. Peters was again named.(7)

St. John made a number of campaign speeches in the interest of the democratic-populist fusion ticket in Kansas between 1899 and 1902. In the latter year he was asked and consented to devote two or three weeks' time to stumping for the fusion state ticket.(8) In 1910 he stumped in favor of his friend, George H. Hodges, the democratic candidate for governor (9), and in 1912 again endorsed his candidacy.(10) At the same time he continued to approve or disapprove individual candidates for the state and local offices without regard to their political affiliations.

Under these circumstances it was not to be expected that the relationship between St. John and the prohibition party would be very close. Nevertheless, he aided in reuniting the party with the national party which had separated from it on the silver issue in 1896, speaking at a state prohibition conference in September, 1899, when the party was reorganized in preparation for the next campaign.(11) He also supported ex-Senator William A. Peffer, prohibition candidate for governor in 1898.(12) Often he was not present at the state prohibition conventions, however, and not all of the prohibition candidates received his approval. During the

years immediately following 1900 he maintained his residence in Missouri for the most part and consequently did not keep in very close contact with Kansas politics.

In summary it may be said of St. John's political allegiance between 1884 and 1916 that through the wreck of reform movements he finally drifted into the democratic party where he remained in a more or less independent attitude toward public questions until death.

As for prohibition in Kansas St. John held that it was a success in the sense that conditions were better than they were prior to 1880 although he freely admitted that enforcement was not all that it might be. He warmly endorsed Mrs. Carrie Nation and her work in Kansas. He said that she was "no more insane than was John Brown" and was not a crank but an "honest, warm-hearted, plain, practical, sensible Kansas woman." While technically guilty of trespass in raiding saloons, he said, she was justified in what she did because the saloons were notoriously kept open in violation of law, and the jailing of her while the jointists went scot free was a disgrace to Kansas.(13) He also said:

"In abating these nuisances, Mrs. Nation destroyed a business prohibited by law. John Brown, by his raid at Harper's Ferry, attempted to destroy an evil sanctioned by law. Now if we are to condemn Mrs. Nation for her acts, then let the statues erected in the parks, halls and other public places in honor of John Brown be removed out of sight, and if both are to be condemned, then let the face of Christ be turned to the wall, for he took the law in his own hands, and scourged the evil-doers, and drove them by force from the temple..."(14)

In 1897 St. John pledged himself to vote for Bryan in

1900.(15) and in the latter year was appointed a member of the committee which notified Bryan at Topeka of the support of the populist party in Kansas.(16) As a young attorney St. John was said to have practiced in the court of Bryan's father. The Kansan not only respected and admired the "Great Commoner" personally but believed in the principles for which he stood. As soon as he had publicly stated that he would support Bryan in 1900 the national committee of the national party replaced him on the committee with another man.(17)

Nevertheless, St. John was at heart a national prohibitionist and he would support no party unless it advocated the principles in which he believed or nominated a candidate whom he admired. Thus in 1904 when Bryan failed to be nominated by the democrats he supported Silas C. Swallow, the candidate of the prohibition party for president, although not until he had seen the party's platform. Under no conditions, he averred, would he vote for Judge Alton B. Parker, the democratic candidate for president, or for Roosevelt, the republican candidate, or for "any other Wall street nominee."(18) He denounced Roosevelt's administration, saying it had brought about the worst labor troubles the country had ever known and had emptied the much-talked-of "full dinner pail" of four years before. He also condemned the violation of the anti-trust laws and what he considered to be the recognition of the right of secession "in the taking of Panama from Columbia, a friendly neighbor, by the

connivance of the administration."(19) He took no part in the national prohibition convention of 1904 but after it was over wrote in a letter dated August 3, 1904: "I most heartily welcome the return of our good friends who at an unfortunate moment at Pittsburg in 1896 bolted the established broad gauge policy of the prohibition party by adopting a single issue platform."(20)

In 1878 St. John had compared the rule of the republican party in Kansas with that of the democratic party in Missouri, much to the disparagement of the latter. He told how the God-fearing, conscientious Puritans landed on the bleak New England coast and, 'mid perils and adversities, helped found and form the moral bone and sinew of America's political manhood whence came the party of Frémont, Lincoln, Grant, and their glorious successors; he told how a band of godless "high-rollers" landed at Jamestown and set up the whiskey-drinking, horse-racing, slave-holding organization of political buccaneers known as the democratic party.(21) In 1884 he spoke of the time when he had lived in the border towns and had lain awake at nights "hating Democrats and Democratic principles" and declared that the democratic party was so soaked in whiskey that an idea of temperance would never be able to penetrate it and that he would not support a democrat for anything.(22) In 1891 he said: "As far as I am personally concerned, two things are settled upon--first, I will never work with any party that refuses to demand the suppression of the American saloon, and, second, no party can

ever take me where it is not willing that my wife shall go, too."(23) Yet in 1900 St. John had supported Bryan and in 1908 he again endorsed him as the democratic candidate for president. In 1912 he announced his preference for Woodrow Wilson over the presidential nominees of the other parties. By this time he was generally regarded as a democrat although the democratic party had never endorsed prohibition or woman suffrage. Few, however, denied the sincerity of his belief in these two principles.(24)

He sent a greeting and a message of advice to the prohibition national convention in 1912, but his main interest was not in the issue of prohibition. After 1904 his dislike of Roosevelt had become greater than ever and he said in an interview in October, 1909:

"Theodore Roosevelt is the sharpest politician in the United States. But for him Mr. Taft would never have been thought of for the presidency. Roosevelt knew Taft, believed him to be an honest man, and so do I, but he knew that Taft is a putty man, soft putty at that. Roosevelt helped to elect Taft. He knew that his administration would be a failure.

"Roosevelt went off to Africa. He is not mixed up in any of the questions before the people today. In the course of eighteen months he will return, covered with rhino hides, elephants tusks and glory. The 'howl and yell' element in politics will raise the cry for Roosevelt. The country will go 'wild' over him. Nothing except his death will prevent his nomination to succeed Taft, and if he is not elected it will be because no Republican can win."(25)

Subsequent events proved that some of the predictions made in this interview were well-founded.

In a letter to the Topeka Capital, dated April 18, 1912, St. John made the following remarks on the political situation:

"What I am going to say in this letter may subject me to all kinds of abuse, but I am used to it, and feel assured that it can't be any worse than it was in 1884.

"Politically I am a Prohibitionist and woman suffragist, and hence cannot consistently support either Mr. Taft or Mr. Roosevelt, but can and do believe in a 'square deal,' and from this standpoint I call attention to the fact that during the two terms Mr. Roosevelt served as President, the trusts, monopolies and special interests were never so prosperous and well-satisfied [as they were then]... During this time the Tennessee Coal and Iron company was absorbed by Morgan and his crowd in open violation of law, but at a profit of about seventy million dollars. The 1907 financial panic was the worst known in this country for a generation past. We have not forgotten the failure of the Bank of Commerce and how the people were compelled to receive Populist warehouse, no, I mean clearing house, certificates as a medium of exchange, and this was under the Republican administration of which he so unblushingly boasts.

"Loyal Kansans have not forgotten that during all the time that Mr. Roosevelt was President, without a single protest from him, government permits were sold to jointests and bootleggers at twenty-five dollars each, allowing them, so far as the government was concerned, to sell intoxicating liquors in Kansas in violation of the constitution and laws of the State. But we don't stop here; during his two terms 250,000 of these home and soul destroying dens of infamy were legalized annually, at a cost to the people over their counters of \$1,600,000,000 which was more than double the cost of all the bread consumed..."

"The opening of Mr. Roosevelt's campaign reminds me of a couple of Indian squaws away back in the fifties at Crescent City, California. One was a large queenly-looking squaw who with bold, elastic step marched down the street pointing to a basket on her head as she cried aloud, 'Fresh clams, fresh clams!' While a poor little squeaky-voiced squaw trotting along close to her heels and pointing to a basket on her head, piped out, 'Me too, me too.' For fifteen years William Jennings Bryan has been crying aloud for the initiative and referendum, government control of monopolies, income tax, election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and at last Roosevelt mounts the rostrum at Columbus, Ohio, and cries aloud, 'Me too, me too.' And tells the people he will accept the nomination for a third term if tendered to him, and then proceeds to put forth strenuous efforts to see that the tender is made.

"The noise that is being made about his candidacy, indicating that there is a great uprising for him, reminds me of the story of the old farmer who asked the proprietor of a large restaurant in New York City if he wanted to buy some frogs, and when answered in the affirmative, coupled with a question as to how many he could furnish, replied that he could furnish about a car load, 'All right,' said the proprietor, 'I will take them.' Two weeks later the old

farmer entered the restaurant with a little market basket under his arm, and as he approached the proprietor he said, 'Here are your frogs.' 'Why,' said the restaurant man, 'you promised to bring me a car load.' 'That's true,' said the farmer, 'and from the noise they made I thought I could, but when I seined the pool I only got seven. (Little governors.) There were forty-one more, but they were not in the pool...'

"I know of nothing in the constitution which forbids Mr. Roosevelt...a third term... But if treachery to Taft is a fair sample of the Roosevelt "Square Deal," the quicker this country can get rid of it, the better it will be for honesty in politics."(26)

After Wilson's inauguration St. John sent the president a letter expressing his sympathetic interest and good will. That he did not always agree with Wilson is indicated by some of the statements made in the second of the following quotations. Shortly after the World War began in Europe, St. John expressed himself on the situation thus:

"Just now in Europe is being carried on the greatest, most brutal and inexcusable war the world has ever known. In our Country at the present time there are a lot of grafters, ship builders and others, prompted by personal interest, backed by a lot of fossilized politicians, who are out of office and want to get in again, trying to create a prejudice against President Wilson by publishing to the world that our Country is not prepared for war... Smith and Jones get into a bitter quarrel and separate without fighting and a few days later Smith hears Jones has bought a shot gun and revolver, Smith will do the same thing and when they meet, both being prepared, the battle begins and one or both are killed. Had they not been prepared for war there would have been no war."(27)

A little later, in November, 1915, he said:

"...If woman suffrage won, jingoism would die, for the mothers of our land would never consent to sacrifice their boys on the field of battle, that a lot of speculators and grafters...amass immense fortunes and live in luxury. Six months ago no man who ever occupied the presidential chair had so nearly the unanimous endorsement of his countrymen as Woodrow Wilson. About that time the word "preparedness" began to be heard frequently, and the president has used it as a sort of bread and milk poultice to quiet the fears of the people. The word 'preparedness,' when applied to military

affairs, is about as deceptive as is the word protective when applied to the tariff. ...Our government was unprepared for war when the south fired upon our flag at Sumpter, but we possessed something greater than preparedness--we were conscious of the fact that the Union ought to be preserved and the shackles stricken from every slave, and we soon had an efficient army in the field, one-half of the number being composed of boys under 21 years of age--and we won, not because of the preparedness but because we were right... President Wilson's position today reminds me of that of President McKinley when the jingos were crying aloud for war with Spain. McKinley was opposed to it, and so were nine-tenths of the people, for really there was no just cause for war, but something had to happen to arouse a war spirit, so the battleship Maine was blown up. Then the war began in earnest, and did not end until we were 'forced to pay \$20,000,000 for the Philipines,' which have been a dead weight upon this country ever since. When the treaty was made between our government and England, establishing a dividing line between our country and Canada, it was agreed that there should be no more fortifications or military patrol along that line, and it has been lived up to by both parties...

"What country threatens war with the United States? None. Have we any quarrel with any country? No. Are we at peace with all the world? Yes. ...If we want war, prepare for it, and we will get it. Emperor William, of Germany, prepared for war, and he got it, and after losing 2,000,000 men he will be lucky if he gets out with an unbroken country. Should our country become involved in the present almost world-wide war, what would it cost us?..."

"If the jingoes want war, they will find the liquor traffic the worst enemy that ever afflicted mankind, right here in our own country..."(28)

St. John's interest in the prohibition party had revived with his returning interest in prohibition as a national issue, and the latter was, perhaps, largely the result of the renewal of his own personal popularity, which was based on his connection with prohibition. At an earlier place it has been indicated that the abuse of St. John continued with much bitterness for years following the memorable campaign of 1884. Even as late as 1909 uncomplimentary references to him are found in Kansas newspapers, in spite of the fact that

during the first decade of the twentieth century he had practically withdrawn from the lecture platform and lived quietly and unobtrusively.

The prohibition apostle laid the foundation for his return to public favor by his campaign for the woman suffrage amendment which was submitted to the people by the Kansas legislature in 1911. He was now seventy-eight years old, but, he declared, he was sturdy and ready and just waiting for the battle. "My voice is strong and clear," he said in an interview in February, 1911, "When once the campaign is on I shall ask no odds or mercy from the young. I can and will stand as much work as any of them." (29) Thus St. John emerged from his quasi-retirement, and the voice of old age, which a generation previously had thundered fiery if not always logical exhortations to the faithful to rally, was heard again in the school houses of the Kansas prairies. "Protection of life and property is a God given right," he said. "The ballot is as much a proper means of protection as is the bullet, and the State that withholds the use of the ballot from any human being simply on account of sex, is guilty of a sin against God, and an outrage against humanity." (30) The amendment was adopted and the women who worked for it were quick to thank St. John for his share in securing its success.

In May, 1912, St. John became seriously ill from uremic poisoning and at one time it was doubted whether he would recover. With the fighter for prohibition on the verge of

death, a feeling of kindness and regret was aroused in the hearts of Kansans of all political beliefs and they began to pay tardy tribute to him. Said the Olathe Mirror: "The governor is a grand old man and his friends--and he numbers them by the thousands all over the United States--hope for his recovery."(31) Then too, the great reform of prohibition for which St. John stood had become more and more the settled policy of Kansas, and an editorial dated April 23, 1814, made the following observations:

"It is interesting to note the great respect toward Mr. St. John which is shown by the old party press of the state. A quarter of a century ago...the Republican papers villified him scandalously and charged him with committing practically every political crime in the category..."

"During the past year or two the tide has been slowly turning, until, within the last few months, there has hardly been a prominent Republican paper in Kansas that has not said something kind about the ex-governor..."(32)

The effect of the presidential campaign of 1912 and of Roosevelt's bolt from the Republican party was to lessen the odium attaching to a man who ran on an independent ticket in opposition to his old party. In this year many people broke away from party and made no pretense of voting a "yaller dog" ticket. In December following the election the Lawrence Journal declared editorially that St. John was no longer to be decried for his action in 1884 and suggested the celebration of the eighteith birthday of the Kansas prohibitionist. The editorial said in part:

"Kansas needs a baptism of prohibition partiotism. It needs to have state wide attention paid to the movement. No occasion could be better than the birthday of the man who did so much to make the law possible. Also, it would be a fitting recognition of the work this man did and a formal

lifting of the covering of unpopularity. It is time to rally around prohibition and time to give St. John credit for his work."(33)

The Journal pressed the matter in succeeding issues and the result was a celebration at Lawrence under the auspices of the local W.C.T.U., on Tuesday evening, February 25, 1913. The celebration took the form of a temperance rally, attended by all who cared to honor and to greet the apostle of prohibition. During the afternoon several hundred citizens went to the Methodist church to shake hands with him and the school children came in a body to hear him deliver a short address. In the evening St. John made a speech on "What It Costs to Be on the Unpopular Side of a Great Moral Question"-- a dignified and kindly address. While he was not bitter he allowed himself the pleasure of a few thrusts such as this:

"What a wonderful change has taken place in the past thirty years! In 1912 Col. Roosevelt headed a delegation that went to Chicago for the express purpose of defeating Taft, but failed. He then organized a third party and beat Taft (the Republican party) at the polls. But Roosevelt has not been hanged and burned in effigy, nor was anybody assassinated, nor the name of a county changed. Do you know the reason? I will tell you. It was because Roosevelt and his party did not antagonize the liquor traffic. The Republican party has a very large percentage of good and true men in its ranks, but they don't run the party. It is in the hands nationally of the money power, special interests, prompted solely by greed. Whether the Democratic party will be any better is yet to be seen."(34)

Chancellor Frank Strong, of the University of Kansas, introduced St. John at the latter's evening lecture. Seated on the platform with the speaker were several and women of prominence in the state, including Professor W.H. Carruth, a well-known Kansas poet, W.R. Stubbs, formerly republican

governor of Kansas, Mrs. Lillian Mitchner, president of the state W.C.T.U., and C.S. Finch, a Kansas journalist.(35) It was C.S. Finch who had earlier written of St. John and the prohibitionists: "The annals of history furnish no instance so black with treason, so pregnant with villainous hypocrisy, so basely deceitful and so utterly inexcusable as the conduct of the third party prohibitionists towards the Republicans. The cowardly meanness and hypocritical treachery displayed by them in carrying out their schemes for the destruction of the only friend their cause ever had, is worthy the savage instinct of a cannibal of Africa."(36) The remembrance of St. John's birthday thus typified the definite end of the rancor and venom which had followed him for years. He was accepted and honored by all as the grand high priest of temperance.

The eightieth birthday of St. John was also the occasion for numerous letters of praise and of congratulation from the prohibitionists of the country. These temperance workers, however, had long before forgiven him for deserting the party and remembered only his services to the cause. In July, 1908, he received the following telegram from Columbus, Ohio: "The Prohibition Party in National Convention sends loving greetings, by unanimous vote, and regrets your absence."(37) In 1912 the prohibition national committee laid plans for a "Hero Night" at the national convention that year. St. John

and some half-dozen others of the "old wheel horses" of the party were to be present and especially honored and for this purpose the committee sent to the Kansan funds which had been contributed to pay the expenses of himself and of his wife to Atlantic City, New Jersey.(38) Illness prevented St. John from attending the convention.

By 1914 the birthday of St. John had been made a state red letter day in the W.C.T.U. calendar, to be observed every year by the local unions. At Lawrence the W.C.T.U. gave a fitting program in commemoration of it and at Olathe a meeting at the court house paid honor to St. John upon his return from a lecture tour in the East. Each of 81 of his Olathe friends had contributed one dollar--a dollar for every one of his 81 years--and this sum was presented to him as a birthday present. He retained one dollar and gave the rest to the town of Olathe.(39) In 1915 and again in 1916 St. John's birthday was observed at Olathe and by the W.C.T.U. in other Kansas towns. Telegrams and congratulations referring to him as the "foremost living pioneer of temperance," "the grand old governor," and "the old war-horse of prohibition" continued to come to him from religious and temperance organizations. In 1916 he was probably held in higher esteem by the temperance forces of the world than any other living man.

The restoration of St. John to public favor in Kansas was evidenced in such occurrences as his appointment by Governor W.R. Stubbs (republican) in 1911 as a delegate to a national

conference to consider the evils of the interstate liquor traffic and by Governor Arthur Capper (republican) in 1915 as a delegate to the biennial convention of the anti-saloon league.

The house journal of the Kansas legislature of 1913 contains the following resolution, which was adopted unanimously on February 25:

"It is a wonderfully ennobling experience to be an honored citizen of a great state like Kansas, and to have not only been a citizen but a builder, not alone on the lines of material prosperity, but moral uplift and better citizenship as well. Kansas is proud of the men who have been in the forefront of the battle for civic righteousness and a better state during the last decade, and among them there is no name which shines brighter or whose influence is more widely felt than that of ex-Governor St. John, for four years chief executive of this commonwealth. Today marks his eightieth milestone of life's highway, and he has passed beyond the allotted life of man; and as the years have grown longer, his unselfish and patriotic action as a state builder and founder of a better civilization, shines with a brighter luster and will be remembered on the pages of Kansas' history long after the word 'Finis' is written to his life; therefore,

"Be it Resolved, That we, the members of the lower House of the Kansas Legislature, do hereby tender to him our congratulations on his having reached the ripe age of eighty years, and are thankful to the Giver of all good that his life has been spared so that he may see the fruits of his toil, and the fields of his industry develop into a commonwealth second to none in the Union. To these congratulations we add a hope for a life of many years to come, surrounded by all that makes life worth the living, and especially the friends who have touched elbows with him for more than a quarter of a century. To him, this day, we tender, as loyal citizens of the state, none but best wishes and thanks for the efforts he has made and the victories he has won."(40)

A few days later St. John was in Topeka and while there visited the lower house of the legislature. Seeing him in the room the speaker appointed a committee of two to escort him to the chair. One of the members of this committee was

from Leavenworth county, and he promptly said: "I decline to serve in this capacity." The speaker overlooked the affront offered to the aged ex-governor and named another member of the committee. St. John made a short talk. Later it was learned that the member from Leavenworth county held against St. John the part the latter took in affixing to the Kansas constitution the amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor.(41)

St. John had definitely broken his connection with the Kansas State Temperance Union in 1884 but by 1896 he had decided to coöperate with it for the success of prohibition in Kansas. Relations between him and the Union became more amicable with the passage of the years. In 1906 he was one of the speakers at the annual convention at Topeka and in December, 1914, he was elected president of the organization the delegates of which had insulted him and practically ousted him from their ranks thirty years earlier. It will be remembered that the State Temperance Union was organized in 1878 at a meeting in St. John's law office in Olathe and that he was chosen to be its first president, an office which he held for five consecutive years. At the same meeting in December, 1914, at which St. John was again elected president, the Union also voted to affiliate with the Anti-saloon League of America and to be known as the Kansas department of the league.(42) That St. John would accept the presidency of the Union under these circumstances

exemplified his absolute independence politically, for the Anti-Saloon League was in direct opposition to the national prohibition party.

The recognition given to St. John furnished him a very real feeling of pleasure and became a source of pride to him. He sent clippings about the celebrations of his birthday and about his other honors to a number of his newspaper friends. Years before he had ceased to actively resent the slurs he received and in an interview in 1911 he proudly said:

"In my heart there is no ill-will toward any mortal man or woman, and that is saying a good deal; for no man living in America today has been the object of more bitter attack and burning hatred than myself. I believe that I can truly boast that I have been burned in effigy more times than any man who ever lived in this or any country, and I have been offered enough tar and feathers to enable me to corner the market..."

"It is rather a popular thing today to break with your party and become an 'insurgent,' but it was very different when I broke with the Republican party. My very name became anathema. The only wonder is that I am alive today to tell the story and continue the fight. But I have no wish to recall the old bitternesses. Where-ever I go now I am received by friendly crowds, men who reviled me in those days are now my warm personal friends, and those that still hate on make no noise. It is a great thing to have weathered such a storm and still retain your good humor and good nature..."(43)

He liked to quote the words of Christ on the cross: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." He had grown old gracefully and the encomiums now given him seemed the reward for years of patience and kindness. He could afford to laugh over the attacks made upon his character in the strenuous days of the past, for he had lived down some of the bitterest political resentment that ever overtook any American politician.

Interest in prohibition in Kansas and in national laws on the liquor traffic remained strong in St. John. The Kenyon-Shepherd bill, which prohibited the shipping of liquor into prohibition states, and the Hobson national constitutional prohibitory amendment both received his attention. He was glad that the Hobson amendment failed to pass, because, he said, it only prohibited the manufacture, exportation, importation and transportation for sale of liquor but did not prohibit its use.(44) In April, 1915, he and the other four members of National Prohibition Brigade, which was touring the country, sent to President Wilson a message which said in part:

"We...request you to immediately call a special session of Congress for the express purpose of enacting the necessary legislation, forever prohibiting the manufacture, sale and importation of all alcoholic liquors within the bounds of the United States and territories within the jurisdiction of this Government.

"...May we remind you of the important fact that Congress has the power to immediately, by statute, prohibit the manufacture, sale and importation of alcoholic liquor, without violating any fundamental principle of American Government and without establishing any new precedent in American law."(45)

St. John's signature headed the names attached to this request.

St. John never gave up hope of inducing William Jennings Bryan to take a stand for prohibition. A letter from Bryan, September 22, 1915, illustrates St. John's desire and Bryan's position:

"...I am sorry that the position I have taken is a disappointment to you, but I am sure that a man who prizes, as you do, the right to think for himself will concede me the same right. I believe that an attempt to put a pro-

hibition plank in the next democratic national platform, whether it succeeded or failed, would greatly jeopardize the success of the party without advancing the cause of prohibition, and I am not willing that the reforms which we have labored for twenty years to secure shall be laid aside in order to take up a fight which I think the country has not yet reached. Only a small percentage of the states have adopted prohibition, and these are not the larger states so that the percentage of population is smaller than the states. As soon as enough states have adopted prohibition to make national prohibition probable, the amendment will without doubt be submitted. It is not necessary to discuss the relative importance of the various issues. I fully agree with you that the liquor traffic is the greatest evil, whether considered from an economic or moral standpoint."(46)

Proof of St. John's reawakened interest in prohibition as a national issue is found in the lecture tours which the Kansan made in behalf of prohibition during the years 1914, 1915 and 1916. These tours had nothing to do with the various speeches which he gave on miscellaneous subjects such as the tariff. Between February 8 and March 6, 1914, he made a tour through the East, travelling 4,000 miles, delivering 18 speeches in the large cities, and being banqueted 9 times. Between April and November of the same year he spoke nearly 100 times in the principal cities of California under the auspices of the Prohibitory Amendment Association of that state. Fifty-one of these speeches were made in a period of 64 days, during which time he travelled 3,500 miles. On the return trip from California he also made a few speeches in Arizona. Soon afterwards St. John became the leading member of a group of five known as the National Prohibition Brigade. Eugene W. Chafin, prohibition candidate for president in 1908 and 1912, also

lectured; a vocalist and her accompaniest furnished music; and a fifth member made the arrangements for the meetings. This brigade was the first of 12 similar ones which the prohibition National Committee planned to form and to have visit every county seat in America before the election in 1916, for the purpose of enrolling and organizing five million voters who would not support any candidate or party not committed to state and national prohibition. The slogan was: "National Prohibition in 1916." St. John's brigade began work in January, 1915. During this and the following month it held over 50 rallies in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas and Missouri, two meetings frequently being held on the same day. During the months of April, May and June it conducted 90 meetings in Illinois and it was during this tour that it became known as the "Flying Squadron." The month of September saw St. John beginning a long series of speeches, reported to be 150 in number, in Massachusetts under the auspices of the state prohibition committee. By the time they were completed he had agreed to become a member of another "five million committee" which was to be financed by the national prohibition committee for the purpose of enrolling five million voters to support such candidates and parties as stood committed to prohibition. His work on this committee began on February 20, 1916. He spoke at 56 meetings in Kansas and in Illinois between April 27 and June 8, 1916.

St. John celebrated his eighty-first birthday shortly

after entering on this strenuous speaking campaign and at the time he ended his lecture tour in Kansas in June, 1916, he was well into his eighty-fourth year. He enjoyed robust health, however, and had ever maintained his buoyancy of spirit. His mind, too, while not keen, was still vigorous and his fluency of speech but slightly impaired; and although his hair was a little whiter, the fire of his eyes beneath his militant eyebrows was undimmed. The crowds attending his speeches were almost always large, sometimes being estimated at three or four thousand, and his addresses often exceeded an hour in length. But he boasted that he was never tired during the course of any of his trips and that, in fact, he had not a single physical ailment, and the newspaper accounts seldom omitted to mention his age, perfect health, and failure to indicate any signs of fatigue.

The two years of almost continuous lecturing was indeed a remarkable feat for a man so advanced in years and it has rarely been paralleled. Many were the tributes which were called forth at the time. His courage in facing the storms of winter, his familiar and neighborly yet convincing manner of speaking, his humor, his genial presence, and the service he had rendered and was rendering to the prohibition cause formed the basis for many eulogies. Few party prohibitionists ever received the reception St. John did everywhere he went. The amount of space which he commanded in the columns of the newspapers was surprising and almost everywhere he was spoken of in high terms. One veteran prohibitionists wrote: "John P. St. John is not only the

Prohibition party's grand old man, but he is today the greatest asset of which the party can boast...John P. St. John's presence is an inspiration to the old guard, a source of cheer to the rank and file and an encouragement to new recruits flocking to our standard."(47)

Praise of Kansas--its prosperity, morality, christianity and especially its prohibitory law--formed most of the subject matter for St. John's addresses, but he also touched on the cost of the liquor traffic and on his other standard arguments on the temperance question. The following, for instance, has the old familiar ring:

"The liquor traffic is ten-fold worse evil than negro slavery ever was. Slavery fed, clothed, sheltered its victim, paid his doctor bill, and did not destroy his immortal soul, but the liquor traffic robs its victim of food, fuel, clothing and shelter, and pays no doctor bills, and if what the Bible says is true, it destroys his immortal soul, for the liquor traffic makes drunkards, and we are told that 'No drunkard can inherit the kingdom of God.'

"Thus the liquor traffic robs heaven and fills hell with its victims."(48)

He could not refrain also from making a few sallies at the expense of the republicans. He said of the Illinois legislature, for instance, that it was to be defended because it was just as good a legislature as money would buy. At the same time he paid his compliments to the democrats by saying:

"I never was politically a Democrat. I have regarded the Democratic party as a sort of political junk-pile, where stragglers could come and go as they pleased. But since the party has developed such men as Richmond Pierson Hobson, Woodrow Wilson and William Jennings Bryan--who has just declared unequivocally for both woman suffrage and prohibition--there is some hope of political resurrection."(49)

His predilection for prophecy came to the fore in his

predictions concerning national prohibition. At first he said that there would not be a legalized saloon in the United States in twenty years but soon he shortened the time to five years and in April, 1916, he said: "I would not be surprised if national Prohibition would come in 1917."(50) He thought that the proper mode of procedure was for Congress to pass a national prohibitory law instead of submitting a national prohibitory amendment which was likely to require many years for ratification. Congress would have no more power to destroy the liquor traffic after the adoption of such an amendment than it then had, he said.(51)

Startling changes in St. John's political and economic views had taken place in the quarter century which had elapsed following the campaign of 1884. Interesting it is to find the man who had been the candidate of the prohibition party for president on the prohibition issue stating in an interview in 1911 that prohibition would never come through the prohibition party.(52) A change from his position in 1896 when he thought the prohibition party should champion several prominent issues was expressed in 1914. He said: "Prohibition is the great living issue of the hour and you can't carry on a half dozen great propositions at once. When the slavery question was up that attracted the attention of everybody. That question brought about the fight. Now Prohibition is a second emancipation."(53) This was the exact stand taken by the narrow gauge prohibitionists in 1896.

In his lectures during the last three years of his life he had the opportunity to develop his new views and in doing so he fell into inconsistencies. For example: he gave credit to the prohibition party for the adoption of prohibition in several states, saying that the whole country had been vaccinated for prohibition and that it was "taking" beautifully (54); yet two months later he is reported as saying: "In facing an issue of national importance, a party out for a single issue is all right, but when the ballots of that party are counted, there will not be enough votes to make the issue a winner... It is impossible to get old party men away to join a new party."(55) He thought that prohibition would never be secured unless its advocates worked for it through political agencies, but, he said: "Prohibitionists are not caring so much about party as they do about prohibition. They are willing to accept prohibition, come from whatsoever source it may, provided it is sincere and genuine. We know that the time will soon come when no political party can live unless it stands for prohibition." (56) He also said that the party which did not uphold prohibition in 1916 would cease to exist, whether it was the republican, democratic or progressive party.(57) In evaluating these opinions it must be borne in mind that the national prohibition committee was working to secure five million voters pledged to support such parties and candidates as stood committed to prohibition and that St. John was employed a part of the time by this committee to give his

addresses. St. John's age and the fact that his speeches were extemporaneous should also be remembered.

On June 20, 1916, St. John suffered heat prostration at Jetmore, Kansas, where he was scheduled to make a speech as a part of his ninety-day speaking tour of Kansas. He cancelled the remainder of his engagements and returned to Olathe, but recovered sufficiently to attend the national convention of the prohibition party July 18, 19, and 20 at St. Paul, Minnesota. Here he made a speech and was highly honored by the convention. On his way home he stopped at Shelbyville, Illinois, and made an address before a chautauqua audience on July 23 on the subject, "What It Costs a Man to Be on the Unpopular Side of a Great Question." He was expected to begin an engagement to deliver ninety speeches in the seventh district of Kansas about the first of August but the address at Shelbyville proved to be his last. Looking very frail and weak, he returned to Olathe on an early morning interurban from Kansas City and was assisted to his home by a friend. He at once took to his bed, suffering from a complication of heart disease, uremic poisoning and Bright's disease. He died late in the afternoon on August 31. During the last week he was unconscious most of the time. Funeral services were held at the Congregational church in Olathe on Sunday, September 3. Governor Arthur Capper (republican), ex-Governor George H. Hodges (democrat) and H.O. Faris (prohibitionist) delivered eulogies. The body of the deceased prohibitionist was buried in the Olathe cemetery.

CHAPTER XIII

ST. JOHN, THE MAN.--

PLACE IN THE PROHIBITION MOVEMENT.

At the time of his death St. John was practically penniless, and his wife, who lived until 1925, was in straitened circumstances until she was granted a pension of one hundred dollars per month by the Kansas legislature in 1923 as a recognition of one of the state's "greatest governors" and of his services in procuring the enactment of the prohibitory law.(1) St. John had earned a sufficient income during his life-time but his investments had many times been unsound-- a fact which is not surprising in view of certain of his economic doctrines. His savings were for the most part invested in real estate and in mining properties--zinc, lead, coal, gold and silver-- in Kansas, Missouri, Texas and California. He never engaged in the practice of law after his period of service as governor of Kansas was ended. He devoted his time to the real estate business, maintaining an office at various times in Olathe and in Versailles, Missouri, although he was for one year (1894-1895) employed as general manager for the United States and Canada of the total abstinence department of the American Life Insurance Company in New York City. During his last years he had no

permanent home, but he always maintained his citizenship at Olathe. His financial needs were doubtless one factor in inducing him to take up active lecturing for the prohibition cause in 1914, 1915 and 1916. His situation was no secret and it was suggested that the temperance people should give him a pension or do something to relieve his financial worries. "Had St. John done as much for the brewers as he has done for the cause of...righteous living he would now be rated as a millionaire," said the Olathe Mirror. "What will the prohibition forces of Kansas do?"(2) Nothing came of these suggestions beyond the employment of St. John to lecture on the subject of national prohibition.

Another factor in keeping St. John poor was his well-known generosity. He contributed to all sorts of charities and no one who was in distress ever appealed to him in vain so long as he had anything to divide. One winter shortly after 1900 when the weather had continued extremely bad for a long time he left a standing order at one of the Olathe hotels to feed all persons who laid claim to charity. The proprietor told him he would be imposed upon, that only about one out of fifty tramps who asked for aid was worthy. St. John replied: "I would rather feed fifty professional tramps than turn one deserving man away hungry."(3)

He was thoroughly democratic and always the friend of the underdog. One of his friends was a mulatto named Berry Sublette, a former slave who had escaped to Olathe during the Civil War, and who later lived with the St. Johns and was

married in their house. St. John was like a father to him, Sublette says, arranging for his schooling and always treating him as an equal and eating at the same table with him. Sublette was one of the friends who was at St. John's bedside when he died. Mrs. St. John was equally kind to the colored man and to his wife, being present when each of their four children was born and naming two of these children after her own son and daughter. St. John had no more loyal friend than Berry Sublette.(4)

Never did St. John cease to do what he could to help the unfortunates of society. A typical incident occurred a few months before his death when he assumed the guardianship of a young girl whose father had been paroled to him from the penitentiary.(5) Many incidents are related of men who were induced by St. John's appeals, in public and in private, to quit drunken habits and to lead sober lives. The humblest citizen or the smallest child could approach him and always be sure of being received in the most kindly and attentive manner. His friends often bore witness to the fact that he and his wife were always willing to forsake their repose and attend the sick and said that the face of the venerable ex-governor reflected only kindness and goodness.

St. John's beneficence was most conspicuous in his family life. He was especially considerate of his wife and of his daughter, Lulu, and he seldom denied anything for which either of his sons asked and which it was within his power to grant. The fact that a good deal of sorrow and trouble

came to St. John as the result of the intemperate habits of his sons has already been indicated.(6) He had done everything possible to aid both of his sons in getting a start in life and in becoming good and useful citizens. Another blow to St. John fell in 1903 when Lulu, who had married Henry L. Page, of Fort Scott, Kansas, died. Lulu had always been a kind and helpful daughter and both St. John and his wife felt her loss deeply.

Mrs. St. John, a woman of forceful although somewhat restless character, had always been helpful to her husband in his work. She was active in the woman suffrage movement and in the W.C.T.U. and in 1897 was appointed by the governor to serve as one of the regents of the state agricultural college.

The militant optimism which had sustained St. John through the years of his trials never deserted him. There is very little complaining in the few private letters which were written in his declining years and which have been preserved; but there is an air of loneliness and melancholy in them. He loved the delights of home and yet he lived most of the time in a hotel. The pressure of finances kept him constantly in the harness. While on his last lecture tours he often wrote to Miss Zoe Thomas, a dear friend at Olathe, letters in which he expressed the desire to be once more at home with her or to have her and other friends with him and Mrs. St. John.

Such qualities as his charitable nature, his affection for children and for young persons, his modesty and never-failing

kindness and his perfect honesty and conscientiousness endeared him to his friends. By his relatives and intimate friends he was called by the quaint and charming name of "Uncle Saint" while his wife was affectionately called "Aunt Jennie." Nowhere was he held in higher esteem than at Olathe where he lived more or less continuously until 1916.

He was always intensely loyal to Olathe, to Kansas and to all the West. He even spoke of his old enemies, ex-Governors Charles Robinson and George W. Glick as being "grand," and in 1904 wrote from his home in Versailles, Missouri, a letter in which he defended this state--formerly attacked by him--and said: "Missouri is all right. Come over and get religion and be baptized."(8)

The nature of the newspaper items pasted in St. John's scrap books indicate the wide range of his interests and show that he did not hesitate to investigate and inquire into the new. If an idea came along he invited it in, asked it to have a seat and cross-examined it, and if he found in it anything good he invited it to stay. Clippings concerned with the progressive ideas of Senator Robert M. La Follette, prize-fighting, the divorce rate, the lives of prominent national politicians, taxation, problems of population, of state and national politics and of foreign relations fill the pages of his scrap books and one whole volume is devoted to moral, religious and philosophical quotations.

There is more about temperance in the scrap books than about any other one subject, however, for in spite of everything the fundamental belief of his life was prohibition.

There were always a few who maintained that St. John had at one time been a drinker himself, but he said that in his whole life he had never drunk more than about a quart of liquor(9) and that he had been true to the promise made to his mother at the age of eleven years not to touch any intoxicating drink.(10) There is no reason to doubt these statements. Mixing drinks with his scriptural quotations was not one of St. John's faults.

During and for several years after his governorship St. John had little time for purely social pursuits. He had at one time been a member of the Masonic order but after leaving Independence, Missouri, he dropped his connection with this organization although he had been transferred from the Independence lodge as a member in good standing. It was understood that he had nothing against Masonry but that his wife opposed his membership in the lodge.(11) He said, however, that he felt that every good work could and should be conducted openly.(12) St. John also belonged, among other temperance organizations, to the Independent Order of Good Templars and to the United Order of Ancient Templars.

It became a favorite pastime in his closing years to spend the evening playing cards with his wife and some close friends at Olathe. He was a good card player and enjoyed the game, oftentimes cheating for the fun of it and then telling about it immediately, but he refused to learn to play any game besides pitch. He enjoyed playing largely because of the opportunity for chatting and for telling stories which it

afforded. Outdoor sports failed to secure his interest.

All his tastes were simple. He was always much opposed to formal occasions and to "dress parade," and the stove-pipe hat, badly brushed against the grain, which he donned at times seemed inharmonious with his free and easy manner. His taste in music and in literature was good but not classical. His favorite song was "Sweet Genevieve" and he always asked first for it when anyone sang. He liked old songs best.

When he first came to Olathe St. John joined the Congregational church which at the time had no church building and less than a hundred members. He contributed liberally to its support and for a period was active in its Sunday School but after he became governor he had little time for church work. His religious faith was expressed in a letter written in December, 1879:

"...If having a full faith in the divinity of Christ and believing that if saved, it will be through him, and..acknowledging him as our saviour, constitutes a Christian, then...I am earnestly endeavoring to be one.

* * *

"I accord to you a perfect right to entertain such views as you, in your own conscience, may deem best for yourself. I don't undertake to erect a standard in that respect for anyone. You know and I know, that there will be a time, that will overtake each of us, when the truth or falsity of your faith, and my faith, will be put to the test whether we would have it so or not, and while my faith in the Christian religion is unshaken and has been to me for many years a source of great comfort, and power and strength, to guide me..., yet supposing after all that it is a mere superstition or myth, that there is no reality whatever in it, I submit to you is it not safe? and at the end what harm will it have done me? I would not today exchange my faith in God and hope for the life beyond this world, for all earthly things."(13)

While he believed in the complete separation of church and state yet he said: "I am in favor of the Bible everywhere, and never have yet been able to see any reason why it should

be excluded from the public schools."(14)

After the death of their beloved Lulu both Mr. and Mrs. St. John became greatly interested in spiritualism as a means of communicating with their dead daughter and they are said to have believed that they did communicate with her.(15) In 1912 St. John was convinced that he experienced a marvelous cure from a serious illness at the hands of a christian science healer after regular medical aid had failed and no hopes were held out for his recovery.(16) Thereafter he was a christian scientist until his final illness when he again summoned the family doctor. The pastor who preached his funeral sermon chose as his text, "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John," and declared that St. John, after skirmishing around in the world of thought, had in his last days returned to Jesus, the Nazarene, realizing there was but one savior.(17)

Vigorous good health was enjoyed by St. John during the greater part of his life. When asked to explain his years and his health he would reply:

"I eat when I am hungry and whatever I like. I stay at home...at nights. I never cross a bridge until I reach it. Most trouble never happens. Worry and not work kills. A clear conscience, enthusiasm for work and trust in God add years to the mind and body."(18)

An estimate of the importance of St. John in the prohibition movement must take into consideration the fact that his greatest power lay in his gift of oratory. Without possessing a formal education and without being a great writer or even an original thinker, he was yet a great orator; and his remark-

able vitality and wonderful memory, his abounding energy and industry and his tenacious perseverance and personal courage, all combined with his power to see the viewpoint of the common people and the fervor of his utterances to make him, as Frances E. Willard said, the prohibition giant.(19) His speeches were not brilliant or keenly reasoned and their strength lay in the fact that he showed that he came from the people, was one of them, and sympathized with them fully. His understanding of the character of his audience seemed almost instinctive and he was adept in changing the drift of his remarks to suit his listeners. He dealt alike in sledge-hammer blows and rapier-thrusts, in pathos and ridicule, in eloquent appeal and biting sarcasm, but he indulged in no wituperation. He knew the value of illustration to add to the weight of his argument and while his illustrations were sometimes a little rough they were always apt and decidedly original. Most important of all, he had the courage to speak his convictions. Lou J. Beauchamp, a prohibitionist himself, wrote of St. John's addresses in these words: "When a speech was over, people did not come up and say, as they did to others, 'That was a magnificent speech.' They came up with wet eyes, trembling and shaking, and said: 'God bless you!' And women and children came likewise."(20) George R. Scott tells the story that at one meeting Miss Willard wept as St. John related the terrors of the liquor traffic and, after he had finished, said: "Brother Scott, don't forget that speech, but treasure it up and repeat its truths to those who read

what you have to say."(21)

It was this marvelous ability to win an audience coupled with the fact that he was motivated to a large extent by a deep desire to benefit humanity which made St. John, a man of ordinary intellectual qualifications, into a hero of the prohibition movement. His mental powers seemed stronger than they really were by reason of his moral courage. Under his leadership Kansas--that always experimental state--had adopted and put into effect the first constitutional prohibitory amendment known to history. Upon the entrance of the United States into the World War Major-General Leonard Wood commented on the effect of prohibition in Kansas. He said that Kansas produced "the finest, the cleanest, the healthiest and the most vigorous soldiers in point of endurance that we have ever known. The official records show this. We attribute this to Kansas prohibition. Kansas boys were brought up in a clean atmosphere. They started right."(22)

In 1882 St. John risked his whole political future upon a single plank--prohibition. With this one plank he sailed away upon a rough political sea but although he was a bold navigator his political ambitions, so far as the republican party were concerned, were wrecked. Under St. John's influence the prohibition party, however, drew in 1884 fifteen times as many votes as its presidential candidate had received four years before and was credited contemporaneously with defeating James G. Blaine and electing Grover Cleveland to the presidency. Until that time the prohibition party had never achieved any

result of note in a political campaign and it has never since produced any effect other than to increase its vote somewhat from one presidential campaign to another.

From the days of John Brown through those of Carrie Nation and of William Allen White, the sunflower state has furnished a full quota of disturbing elements in state and national affairs. St. John, who was pictured in 1884 as the latest crazy product of Kansas and as one of the professional reformers, devoted to all sorts of political and social vagaries, with which the state was afflicted, was another of these disturbing elements. For leaving the republican party and contributing to the election of Cleveland he was abused like a common criminal. People threw rocks at him through car windows, they burned him in effigy and the Kansas legislature changed the name of a county that had been christened in his honor. For years he was followed by malice and surrounded by venom, yet his reputation for honesty, integrity, personal honor and moral courage not only survived but shone brighter and better as the years went by. Time tempered the animosities of 1884 and the years immediately succeeding and St. John in the closing years of his life knew only love and respect. From 1884 to 1896 he was the bright particular star in the cold water firmament and at the time of his death in 1916 he was probably the best-loved prohibitionist in the world. He had the solace of knowing before he died that public sentiment in Kansas was strongly for him and his cause and that the principle of prohibition was gaining strength in the nation.

Several years before his death plans had been formulated for the erection of a carved monument or marker carrying local significance to honor the name of St. John. The plan grew until it provided for the raising of a fund of \$250,000 of which \$150,000 was to be used to erect and equip a memorial temperance library at Olathe and \$100,000 invested as a permanent upkeep fund. The committee in charge of this ambitious plan was incorporated by the state of Kansas as a charitable institution and a small fund was collected. At present (1930) the work of carrying out the proposed memorial is not progressing very rapidly. Except for the new Olathe high school building which has been called the St. John Memorial High School, no memorial of any kind has been set up to honor the greatest of Kansas prohibitionists and one of the greatest in the world.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

YOUTH.-- INCEPTION OF TEMPERANCE PRINCIPLES.--

YEARS OF VARIED EXPERIENCE.

1. Kansas Chief (Troy, Kansas), January 20, 1881.
2. Correspondence of the Governors of Kansas, Vol. 33, p. 489. Letter to J.P. Root, Wyandot, Kansas, December 15, 1880. Letters written by St. John during his two administrations as governor comprise volumes 14-46 of the valuable collection of letters written by the Kansas governors (letter press copies) in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Kansas. Letters to the Kansas governors are likewise filed in this library, and are classified according to the year in which they are written. Hereafter these collections are referred to in abbreviated form as C.G.K. The incoming letters are listed as I.L. and the outgoing letters as O.L.
3. Not much information about the ancestry of St. John is available. His mother, who is supposed to have been the daughter of a captain in the War of 1812, was born in Oneida county, New York, in 1799. She is reported as a woman of education and christian character and of more than ordinary intelligence. His father was born in Orange county, New York, in 1801, and belonged to the Connecticut St. John stock, being a descendant of the Huguenots of that name who came to this country from France. Some interest attaches to the person of Daniel St. John, grandfather of John Pierce. He was a native of Luzerne county, Pennsylvania, but spent some of his life in New York, from which state, with his wife, Mercy (Gardher) St. John, and family, he removed to Brockfield during the early settlement of Indiana. Entering the ministry at an early age he preached the doctrines of the Universalist denomination for sixty years. Tradition numbers him with Murray, Ballou, Streeter and Thomas-- his contemporaries and friends-- as one of the American fathers of that sect. He was also a Freemason and at the time of his death was reputed to be the oldest member of the order in the hoosier state. Like his grandson, he appears to have been a man of superb physique, for he lived to be eighty-eight years of age, dying in 1863 at Broad Ripple, Indiana. It is not improbable that from him St. John received his oratorical inspiration and

acquired the religious bent which led to the embellishment of many of his speeches with biblical references. The best account of the ancestry of St. John is given in William G. Cutler's History of the State of Kansas (Chicago, 1883), p. 240. This article has furnished most of the facts for the preceding discussion although it has been supplemented by other sources, chief of which is a letter dated November 4, 1881, from John P. St. John to Eron St. John, of Rockford, Illinois. This letter is found in the C.G.K.: O.L., vol. 40, p. 211.

4. Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 1, pp. 182a-182b. Clipping dated September 8, 1881, copied from the Indianapolis Review. (Scrap books of newspaper clippings in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.) Interview with Miss May Parker, of Olathe, Kansas, June 13, 1929. She is the niece of St. John and was his friend for many years.
5. Demorest's Magazine, December, 1895, quoted in the Olathe Mirror (Olathe, Kansas), December 5, 1895.
6. The dignity of the term "biography" should perhaps not be given to the few short sketches of the life of St. John which have been written.
7. For instance, the Liberal Advocate (Topeka, Kansas), a newspaper opposed to St. John and published in the interest of the liquor element, was fond of making quotations such as the following in the issue of October 28, 1879: "'We don't do nothing by halves.'--St. John, at Neosho Falls." While this quotation from St. John probably is exaggerated, it shows St. John's ungrammatical tendencies which are all too frequently illustrated in his letters and to a lesser extent in his messages and speeches. The author regrets the frequent misuse of English which occurs in quotations from St. John, but for the sake of accuracy could not make corrections.
8. Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 1, p. 134. Clipping from the Christian Herald and Signs of Our Times (New York), about October, 1884.
9. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 32, p. 216. Letter to J.N. Stearns, New York, October 4, 1880.
10. Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 1, p. 182a. Clipping dated September 8, 1861, copied from the Indianapolis Review.
11. Ibid., p. 235. Clipping from the Christian Herald and Signs of Our Times, about October, 1884.

12. Temperance Banner (Osage Mission, Kansas), February 28, 1880.
13. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 22, p. 357. Letter to L.E.A. Chapman, Norwalk, Connecticut, January 19, 1880. St. John here states that 1847 was the date when the family moved to Illinois although most accounts give 1848 as the year. In the same letter he says that his father died in 1856. An anonymous sketch of St. John's life in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society states that Samuel St. John died July 19, 1855. The facts in this sketch are accurate in other respects and indicate that they probably were obtained from St. John himself. The sketch, however, was written in 1898 and St. John's memory may not have been as clear at that time as it was in 1880 when the letter was written. Sophia St. John died in 1851.
14. Ibid., Vol. 46, p. 189. Letter to D.C. Ambler, Elk City, Kansas, March 9, 1882.
15. Interview with Dr. Jessie Thomas Orr, of Olathe, Kansas, June 13, 1929. She was St. John's physician and for years a close friend of the St. John family.
 Interview with Mrs. J.J. Parker, of Lawrence, Kansas, June 15, 1929. She was St. John's niece by marriage. Her husband lived in the St. John home for several years.
16. The facts about the first marriage remained obscure until the bitter presidential campaign of 1884 when the New York Tribune secured and printed in its issue of October 30 a certified copy of the bill for divorce together with affidavits from J.H. and Margaret A. Brewer, step-parents of Mary Jane. The Brewers charged St. John with non-support of his wife before he left her, with a cruel and inexcusable desertion which caused her premature death in 1873, and with failure to care for his son when the latter was ill. The statement by Mrs. Brewer asserted that her step-daughter often said that St. John wrecked her life. Harry St. John immediately gave to the press several statements which denied the allegations in the affidavits, denounced the authors of the scandal and accused them of receiving pay for their perfidy. (These statements of Harry St. John are included in clippings in St. John's Scrap Books, which are in possession of Miss May Parker, Olathe, Kansas. The scrap books also contain several other references to the first marriage. They will be discussed in detail later.) St. John himself made no public reply to his accusers; but a private letter to George R. Scott, November 7, 1884, found its way into print. In it he said: "Of course you read the infamous affidavits published in the Tribune, just before election. So far as they charge me with neglect of duty or other wrong-doing,

they are absolutely false in every particular. My first wife was married to a Mr. Henderson, shortly after being divorced, with whom she lived for about twelve or fifteen years, when she died. She had several children by Henderson. And the idea that I ever neglected any duty to her or to my boy, was never thought of nor intimated before; even the liquor men have not been so mean as to intimate such a thing. The man and woman that made the affidavits have invited me to their house, time and again, but I declined to go. I have often in response to invitations, from the best citizens of Richland county, Illinois, (my boyhood home, where all these things are alleged to have occurred), delivered public addresses to thousands of citizens, and if I have an enemy there, unless it be Brewer and wife, I do not know it. The boy they say I neglected was educated by me, studied law with me, and has always been helped by me when he needed it, and holds a position in Washington at \$3,000 a year which I procured for him. He is very indignant over the infamous lies... Of course you knew all about the divorce, but I ... wanted to tell you how utterly cruel, false and outrageous were the other charges against me." -- New York Witness (New York City), quoted in the Topeka Capital, November 18, 1884.

Such was the reputation for personal integrity which St. John enjoyed in Kansas that in spite of the malevolent denunciation of him for his desertion of the republican party the state press refrained from printing the charges brought out in the Tribune.

17. Central, January 14, 1914, p. 12. Magazine clipping in possession of Miss Zoe Thomas, Olathe, Kansas.
18. In 1873 the Modocs were removed by the United States government to a reservation in the Indian Territory, south of Kansas, and during his administration as governor of Kansas St. John met and greeted the chief, Scar-faced Charley.
19. Voice (New York City), December 27, 1894.
20. Voice. Undated clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
21. Johnson County Democrat (Olathe, Kansas), October 5, 1882. Letter from Adjutant General of Illinois, Springfield, September 7, 1882, to J.G. Linsey, Garnett, Kansas, reprinted in the Democrat from the Junction City Union (Junction City, Kansas). The letter states that St. John's period of service in the Civil War extended from June 30 to September 26, 1882, and from June 11 to September 26, 1864. The

- printing of the letter was a part of the aggressive campaign being carried on by the function City Union in 1882 to defeat St. John for a third term as governor. The letter was accompanied by slurring inquiries as to St. John's whereabouts during that part of the Civil War when he was not in the army.
22. Anonymous Biographical Sketch of St. John, dated September 20, 1898, in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society, p. 1.
23. Olathe Mirror, September 5, 1878.
24. Original letter from Slough, dated at Alexandria, Virginia, September 16, 1862, in St. John's Scrap Books.
25. Report of Adjutant-General of Illinois, 1861-1866, pp. 191, 673, quoted by I.O. Pickering, Administrations of John P. St. John, in Collections of the Kansas State Historical Society (Topeka, 1881--), Vol. IX, p. 380.
26. Cutler, p. 240.
27. Newspaper clipping dated May 10, 1906, containing excerpts from a letter from St. John, in St. John's Scrap Books.
Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 14. Newspaper clipping dated January 27, 1910, containing a letter from St. John, originally printed in the New York Sun and later reprinted in the Topeka Daily Journal (Topeka, Kansas), August 14, 1884.
28. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
29. Leavenworth Times (Leavenworth, Kansas), June 18, 1880.
30. Interview with Frank R. Ogg, Olathe, June 13, 1929.
 Mr. Ogg is the recently-retired president of the First National Bank of Olathe, and was a life-time friend and neighbor of St. John.
 Miss Zoe Thomas, one of St. John's intimate friends, verified Ogg's statements in an interview at Olathe, July 6, 1929, saying that she had heard her father and St. John discuss the story several times.
 The Liberal Advocate, the Kansas whiskey organ, in its issue of January 27, 1880, refers sarcastically to St. John's "patriotic motives" in moving to Kansas "to avoid being killed in Missouri."
 According to Mr. Ogg the Crochilda case was dismissed for want of prosecution, there being no way to require the attendance of a witness from outside the state.

CHAPTER II

FIRST YEARS IN KANSAS.-- STATE SENATOR.

1. Unpublished notes of Dr. Jessie Thomas Orr, based on statements made by St. John.
2. Interview with H.L. Burgess, Olathe, Kansas, July 2, 1929. Mr. Burgess, a prominent lawyer of Olathe, studied law in St. John's office for two years, 1874-1876, and was intimately associated with him from that time.
3. Interview with Frank R. Ogg, June 13, 1929.
4. Ibid.
5. Annual Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Kansas, 1872, p. 16. St. John received 1,772 votes while L.F. Greene, his opponent, had 1,245.
6. Annual Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Kansas, 1870, p. 10; 1874, p. 24. In 1870 the winning candidate had a majority of 211; in 1874, of 268.
7. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
8. J.G. Waters, Fifty Days of History, in the Kansas Magazine, July, 1873, p. 15.
9. He was absent a total of two and a half days during the session.
10. Senate Journal, 1873, p. 554.
11. Senate Journal, 1874, p. 34.
12. House Journal, 1874, p. 237.
13. Senate Journal, 1873, pp. 54-60.
14. Kansas City State (Kansas City, Missouri), February 18, 1911. The statement here quoted was repeated in St. John's obituaries in 1916; e.g., in the New York Times (New York City), September 1, 1916.
15. Waters, Fifty Days of History, p. 9.
16. Lawrence Journal (Lawrence, Kansas), September 1, 1916.

17. Senate Journal, 1873, pp. 106-110.
18. Waters, Fifty Days of History, pp. 10-12.
19. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
20. Senate Journal, 1873, pp. 119-121.
21. Ibid., pp. 130-131.
22. Ibid., p. 154.
23. Western Home Journal (Lawrence, Kansas), February 13, 1873.
24. Senate Journal, 1873, pp. 431-432.
25. Senate Journal, 1874, pp. 190-191.
26. Senate Journal, 1873, pp. 94, 248-249.
27. Lawrence Journal, December 21, 1873.
28. Ibid., February 5, 1874.
29. Wellingtonian (Wellington, Kansas), quoted in the Topeka Capital, March 8, 1882.
30. Interview with H.L. Burgess, July 2, 1929.
31. Pickering, p. 381.
The law made every railroad corporation and every assignee and lessee of such corporation liable to pay the owner of any stock killed or injured in the operation of such road the full value of such stock, together with costs and attorney's fees for the claimant in all cases where a recovery against the railroad company was obtained. These corporations could only defend themselves against such action by showing that the railroad was enclosed with a good and lawful fence to prevent the animals from coming on their tracks. --
Session Laws, 1874, pp. 143-144.
32. Senate Journal, 1874, p. 51.
33. Kansas Chief, September 2, 1875.
34. Western Spirit (Paola, Kansas), quoted in the Olathe Mirror, May 18, 1876.
35. Undated clipping from supplement of Topeka Capital in St. John's Scrap Books.
36. American Annual Cyclopedias and Register of Important Events of the Year 1874 (New York, 1875), pp. 436-437.

37. Reverend H.D. Fisher, The Gun and the Gospel (Chicago, 1896), pp. 225-226.

CHAPTER III

TEMPERANCE ACTIVITY.-- GUBERNATORIAL CAMPAIGNS OF 1876 AND 1878.

1. D.W. Wilder, The Annals of Kansas, 1541-1885 (Topeka, 1886), pp. 705-706.
2. Olathe Mirror, May 4, 1876.
D.L. Colvin's Prohibition in the United States (New York, 1926), p. 137, incorrectly states that St. John promised to run in 1878 if the republicans did not espouse prohibition that year.
3. Wilder, pp. 731-736.
4. Leavenworth Times (Leavenworth, Kansas), August 26, 1875.
Kansas Chief, September 2, 1875.
5. Quoted in the Olathe Mirror, May 18, 1876.
6. Olathe Mirror, May 11, 1876.
7. Ibid., May 18, 1876.
8. Western Spirit, quoted in the Olathe Mirror, May 18, 1876.
9. Olathe Mirror, July 13, 1876.
10. Parsons Sun (Parsons, Kansas), quoted in the Olathe Mirror, June 1, 1876.
11. Baxter Springs Republican (Baxter Springs, Kansas), quoted in the Olathe Mirror, June 8, 1876.
12. Olathe Mirror, May 11, 1876.
13. Ibid., August 10, 1876.
14. Wilder, p. 715.
Lawrence Journal, August 17, 1876; September 6, 1876.
15. Lawrence Journal, October 3, 1876.
16. Ibid., September 15, 1876.

17. Letter from George T. Anthony to St. John, dated at Seneca, Kansas, October 18, 1876, original letter in St. John's Scrap Books.
18. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 8, p. 5. Letter from Anthony to E.J. Waldron, Leavenworth, Kansas, dated April 28, 1877.
19. New Century (Fort Scott, Kansas), September 26, 1877-April 27, 1878.
20. Statement by Reynolds, referred to in Topeka Capital, August 28, 1880.
21. Lawrence Tribune (Lawrence, Kansas), April 6, 1878.
22. Western Progress (Olathe, Kansas), October 25, 1877.
23. La Cygne Journal (La Cygne, Kansas), quoted in the Olathe Mirror, January 3, 1878.
24. Miami Republican (Paola, Kansas), May 17 and 24, 1878. Manhattan Nationalist (Manhattan, Kansas), May 24, 1878.
25. Article by Joe Fluffer, of Topeka, in the Kansas City Journal, quoted in the Western Progress, June 20, 1878.
26. Leavenworth Times, April 9, 1878.
27. Article by Joe Fluffer, of Topeka, in the Kansas City Journal, quoted in the Western Progress, June 20, 1878.
28. Lawrence Journal, August 30, 1878.
29. Interview with F.L. Vandegrift, veteran newspaper correspondent, in the Kansas City Journal, August 31, 1905.
30. Marshall County News (Marysville, Kansas), June 19, 1885.
31. Kansas Freie Presse (Leavenworth, Kansas), August 18, 1880.
32. Atchison Champion (Atchison, Kansas) quoted in the Topeka Capital, July 23, 1882.
33. Original letter from Ingalls to St. John, dated November 10, 1878, in St. John's Scrap Books.
34. Temperance Banner (Osage Mission, Kansas), October, 1878.
35. Kansas Chief, August 14, 1879.

36. Temperance Banner, March 27, 1880.
Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
37. Kansas Freie Presse, September 11, 1878.
38. Ibid., September 25, 1878.
39. Lawrence Tribune, quoted in the Temperance Banner,
December, 1878.
40. Kansas Freie Presse, December 25, 1878.

CHAPTER IV

FIRST TERM: PROHIBITION.-- PROTECTION OF BORDER.--

DESTITUTION ON FRONTIER.-- NEGRO EXODUS.

1. Senate Journal, 1879, p. 32.
2. Ibid., p. 19.
3. Senate Journal, 1881, pp. 33-34.
4. Temperance Rural (Cherokee, Kansas), September 26, 1878.
5. Leavenworth Times, April 23, 1878.
6. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 19, pp. 96-99. Letter to George Calderwood, Greenville, Ohio, dated September 17, 1879.
7. Ibid. Vol. 33, p. 88. Letter to Reverend E.D. Dunham, Liberty Center, Ohio, dated November 11, 1880.
8. Kansas Prohibition Pamphlets. Vol. I. J.R. Detwiler: Prohibition in Kansas, or the Battle of the Ballots, pp. 3-6. (Collection of prohibition pamphlets in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.)
9. Senate Journal, 1879, p. 312.
10. Kansas Prohibition Pamphlets. Vol. I. J.R. Detwiler: Prohibition in Kansas, or the Battle of the Ballots, pp. 6.
11. Kansas State Temperance Union Clippings. Vol. I. A Historical Review of Prohibition, Annual Address of A.B. Campbell, President of the Kansas State Temperance Union, delivered in Topeka, September 18, 1883, pp. 4-6. (A collection of temperance pamphlets in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.)
12. Senate Journal, 1879, p. 416.
13. Ibid., p. 432.
14. Interview with St. John in the Kansas City Star, February 18, 1911.
15. Senate Journal, 1879, p. 998.

16. Newspaper clipping dated 1909 in St. John's Scrap Books.
17. St. John, How One Quick-Witted Woman Made Kansas Dry, In the Kansas City Star, October 24, 1915.
18. George W. Martin, The Boundary Lines of Kansas, in Collections of the Kansas State Historical Society (Topeka, 1881--). Vol. XI, pp. 73-74.
19. Leavenworth Times, February 2, 1879.
20. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 43, pp. 28-29. Letter to Honorable R.F. Bond, Sterling, Kansas, dated April 3, 1882.
21. Appleton's Annual Cyclopedie and Register of Important Events of the Year 1880 (New York, 1881). N.S., vol. V, p. 417.
22. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 22, pp. 1-6. Letter to Jay Gould, New York City, dated December 29, 1879.
23. Ibid., Vol. 24, p. 94. Letter to H.C. Fitzpatrick, Adel, Kansas, dated February 16, 1880.
24. Topeka Capital, May 12, 1880.
25. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 29, pp. 342-343. Letter to C. Tillotson, Millbrook, Kansas, dated July 8, 1880.
26. Appleton's Annual Cyclopedie and Register of Important Events of the Year 1880. N.S., vol. V, p. 417.
27. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 25, pp. 442-449. Letter to J.M. Cavaness, Chetopa, Kansas, dated March 23, 1880.
28. Lawrence Journal, September 26, 1879.
29. Topeka Commonwealth (Topeka, Kansas), quoted in the Lawrence Journal, October 1, 1879.
30. Quoted in the Kansas City Star, February 4, 1925.
31. New York Times (New York City), September 1, 1916.

CHAPTER V

LEADER OF CAMPAIGN RESULTING IN FIRST PROHIBITION AMENDMENT IN HISTORY.

1. Lawrence Journal, August 15, 19, 21, 26, 1879.
2. Newspaper clipping dated August, 1879, in St. John's Scrap Books.
3. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 31, p. 74. Letter to Dr. H.B. Callahan, Leavenworth, Kansas, dated August 17, 1880.
4. Ibid. Vol. 25, p. 147. Letter to V.C. Welsh, editor Enterprise, Parkerville, Kansas, dated March 12, 1880.
5. Ibid. Vol. 25, p. 32. Letter to E.B. Reynolds, Hiawatha, Kansas, dated March 9, 1880.
6. Lawrence Journal, February 24, 1880. In making this reference St. John did not mean that it was wrong to ask a small fee from ordinary businesses for registration, etc.; he objected to those liquor licensees costing several hundred dollars per year.
7. Topeka Capital, August 26, 1880.
Kansas Temperance Palladium (Lawrence, Kansas), March 4, April 22, and August 26, 1880.
Lawrence Journal, February 24 and August 24, 1880.
8. Temperance Banner, September 3, 1880.
Lawrence Journal, August 31, 1880.
9. Liberal Advocate, October 28, 1879.
10. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 30, p. 21. Letter to J.T. Sexton, Fredonia, Kansas, dated July 19, 1880.
11. Ibid. Vol. 30, p. 312. Letter to J.S. Roberts, Solomon City, Kansas, dated August 3, 1880.
12. Ibid. Vol. 27, p. 114. Letter to N.J. Cogsnell, Silvara, Pennsylvania, dated May 3, 1880.
13. Ibid. Vol. 30, pp. 428-429. Letter to Mrs. G.J. Long, Parsons, Kansas, about August 16, 1880.

14. Ibid. Vol. 33, p. 145. Letter to Neal Dow, Portland, Maine, dated November 16, 1880.
15. Ibid. Vol. 24, pp. 305-306. Letter to William P. Tomlinson, Russel, Kansas, dated February 28, 1880.
16. Manhattan Nationalist, quoted in the Kansas State Journal (Topeka, Kansas), May 29, 1880.
17. Temperance Banner, July 3, 1880.
18. Kansas Freie Presse, August 4, 1880.
19. Kansas Chief, August 5, 1880.
20. Golden Gate (Newton, Kansas), June 30, 1880.
21. Kansas Temperance Palladium, August 12, 1880.
22. Atchison Champion, August 12, 1880.
23. Ibid., August 27, 1880.
24. Kansas City Times (Kansas City, Missouri), quoted in the Temperance Banner, August 13, 1880.
25. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 30, p. 459. Letter to I.O. Pickering, Olathe, Kansas, August 16, 1880.
26. Topeka Capital, August 11, 1880.
27. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 24, p. 366. Letter to Honorable J.F. Knowlton, Geneva, Kansas, dated March 1, 1880.
28. Ibid., p. 348.
29. Topeka Capital, August 18, 1880.
30. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 31, p. 97. Letter to A.A. Talmage, Superintendent Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, St. Louis, Missouri, August 19, 1880.
31. Ibid. Vol. 31, pp. 200, 215, 218-219, 289.
32. Atchison Champion, September 3, 1880.
33. Wilder, p. 895.
34. Topeka Commonwealth, September 2, 1880.
35. I.O. Pickering in his article on The Administrations of John P. St. John, p. 384, made the error of stating that St. John made the fight for governor in 1880 upon a platform pledging the republican party to the policy of prohibition of the liquor traffic. F.W.

Blackmar's Kansas (Chicago, 1912), volume II, page 508, commits the same error. The platforms are printed in full in Wilder, pp. 891-896 and in contemporary newspapers. The democrats, it must be stated, indirectly took a stand against prohibition by endorsing the national platform which opposed sumptuary legislation.

36. Topeka Capital, October 21, 1880.
37. Kansas Freie Presse, October 27, 1880.
38. Cutler, pp. 227, 240.

CHAPTER VI

SECOND TERM: BEGINNINGS OF ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION

1. House Journal, 1881, p. 1140.
2. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 34, pp. 27-28. Letter to Honorable J.W. Ady, Newton, Kansas, dated December 17, 1880.
3. Senate Journal, 1881, pp. 41-43.
4. Ibid., p. 268.
5. House Journal, 1881, p. 609.
6. Topeka Capital, February 22, 1881.
7. Leavenworth Times, February 1, 1881.
Atchison Champion, February 4, 1881.
8. Atchison Champion, February 9, 1881.
9. Topeka Capital, February 10, 1881.
10. Leavenworth Times, February 17, 1881.
11. House Journal, 1881, pp. 642-644.
12. Lawrence Journal, January 21, 1881.
13. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 35, p. 289. Letter to Dr. John Grass, Independence, Kansas, dated February 28, 1881.
14. Atchison Champion, April 15, 1881.
15. Reports of the Supreme Court of Kansas. Vol. 24, 1880-1881, pp. 700-725.
16. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 37, p. 57. Letter to Reverend J.E. McCleery, Lansing, Kansas, dated May 10, 1881.
17. Ibid. Vol. 36, p. 215. Letter to Neal Dow, Portland, Maine, dated April 2, 1881.
18. John P. St. John and A.H. Colquitt, Prohibition in Kansas (New York, 1882), p. 7.

19. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 36. pp. 142-143. Letter to Helen L. Hood, Chicago, Illinois, dated March 29, 1881.
20. Reports of the Supreme Court of Kansas. Vol. 25, 1881, pp. 751-768.
21. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 35, p. 92. Letter to Honorable John H. Landis, Harrisburgh, Pennsylvania, dated March 25, 1881.
22. Topeka Capital, July 19, 1881.
23. Kansas Prohibition Clippings, Vol. 8, pp. 19-20. Undated newspaper clipping. (Miscellaneous newspaper clippings pertaining to prohibition in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.)
24. Seventeenth Annual Report of the National Temperance Society and Publication House (New York, 1882), p. 52.
25. Topeka Capital, July 21, 1881.
26. Ibid., August 15, 1881.
27. Topeka Commonwealth, November 23, 1881.
28. Topeka Capital, August 15, 1881.
29. C.G.K.: I.L. No. 4. Letter from John B. Finch, Lincoln, Nebraska, dated July 20, 1880.
30. James A. Troutman: Prohibition in Kansas (January, 1883), (A single printed page included in the Kansas State Temperance Union collection of pamphlets in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.)
31. Kansas State Gazeteer and Business Directory, 1882-1883 (Chicago). Vol. III, pp. 1196, 1228, 1398-1401, 1419. It is likely that the Gazeteer failed to list all of the liquor establishments.
32. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 1884, (Washington), pp. 59, 62.
33. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 1880 (Washington), pp. 33, 95; 1881, pp. 38, 40; 1882, pp. 28, 52; 1883, pp. 27, 51; 1884, pp. 34, 36.
34. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 37, pp. 249-251. Letter to Honorable Albert Griffin, Manhattan, Kansas, dated May 25, 1881.
35. Ibid. Vol. 33, p. 234. Letter to Honorable Theodore D. Kanouse, Watertown, Wisconsin, dated November 22, 1880.

36. Frances E. Willard, Glimpses of Fifty Years (Chicago, 1889), pp. 393-398.
37. Democratic Standard (Leavenworth, Kansas), July 27, 1881.
38. Leavenworth Press (Leavenworth, Kansas), May 8, 1882.
39. C.G.K.:O.L. Vol. 40, p. 309. Letter to Mrs. A.J. Gordon, Boston, Massachusetts, dated December 9, 1881.
40. Ibid. Vol. 40, pp. 337-338. Letter to George R. Scott, New York City, dated December 13, 1881.
41. Ibid. Vol. 40, p. 220. Letter to George C. Smith, Cambridge, Illinois, dated November 23, 1881.
42. Ibid. Vol. 36, p. 155. Letter to Major Henry Hopkins, Lansing, Kansas, dated March 30, 1881.
43. Ibid. Vol. 40, p. 391. Letter to Wallace Mygott, Kenosha, Wisconsin, dated December 21, 1881.
44. Ibid. Vol. 40, pp. 338-341. Letter to George R. Scott, New York City, dated December 13, 1881.
45. Ibid. Vol. 38, p. 353. Letter to J.A. Dacus, Memphis, Tennessee, dated July 29, 1881.
46. Ibid. Vol. 37, p. 41. Letter to W.L.C. Hunnecut, Canton, Mississippi, dated May 9, 1881.
47. Ibid. Vol. 37, p. 2. Letter to Dr. H.P. Hanson, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, dated May 5, 1881.
48. Ibid. Vol. 37, p. 128. Letter to H.D. Dickson, Neosho Falls, Kansas, dated May 16, 1881.
49. Ibid. Vol. 37, pp. 249-250. Letter to Honorable Albert Griffin, Manhattan, Kansas, dated May 25, 1881.
50. Ibid. Vol. 37, p. 335. Letter to E.H. Campbell, Le Grand, Iowa, dated June 7, 1881.
51. Ibid. Vol. 39, p. 278. Letter to A.J. Bowen, Columbus, Ohio, dated September 28, 1881.
52. Ibid. Vol. 41, p. 304. Letter to Reverend George Scott, Beatrice, Nebraska, dated February 3, 1882.
53. Ibid. Vol. 43, p. 347. Letter to J.D. Miller, Ida Grove, Iowa, dated May 3, 1882.
54. Ibid. Vol. 44, p. 108. Letter to Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Clinton, Iowa, dated May 31, 1882.

55. Ibid. Vol. 45, p. 342. Letter to J.O. Broyman, Chicago, Illinois, dated September 20, 1882.
56. Ibid. p. 341.
57. Ibid. Vol. 45, p. 356. Letter to W.P. Hackney, Winfield, Kansas, dated September 25, 1882.
58. Ibid. Vol. 41, p. 384. Letter to W.C. Howard, Scranton, Kansas, dated February 9, 1882.
59. Olathe Gazette (Olathe, Kansas), July 6, 1882.
60. In this connection it is interesting to note that the earliest typewriter in the state capitol was purchased during the first year of his administrations. He also had the first electrical signal bells installed in the governor's office.

CHAPTER VII

CAMPAIGN OF 1882.--

ST. JOHN DEFEATED.-- HIS PRINCIPLE SUSTAINED.

1. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 39, p. 440. Letter to C.A. Wenngren, Salina, Kansas, dated October 21, 1881, not for publication.
2. Ibid. Vol. 42, p. 94. Letter to Albert Griffin, Manhattan, Kansas, dated March 1, 1881.
3. Topeka Capital, February 27, 1882.
4. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 40, p. 227. Letter to S.D. Houston, Concordia, Kansas, dated November 23, 1881.
5. Ibid. Vol. 42, p. 247. Letter to S.J. Waters, Oswego, Kansas, dated March 14, 1882, confidential.
6. Ibid. Vol. 39, pp. 277-278. Letter to A.J. Bowen, Columbus, Ohio, dated September 28, 1881.
7. Leavenworth Press, May 8, 1882.
8. C.H.K.: O.L. Vol. 42, p. 247. Letter to J.S. Waters, Oswego, Kansas, dated March 14, 1882, confidential.
9. Osage City Free Press, quoted in the Topeka Capital, April 22, 1882.
10. Topeka Capital, June 24, 1882.
Topeka Capital, quoted in the Olathe Gazette, June 22, 1882.
11. Topeka Capital, quoted in the Olathe Gazette, March 16, 1882.
12. Kansas Prohibition Clippings. Vol. 2, pp. 44-49. Undated newspaper clipping: printed copy of letter from Neal Dow, Portland, Maine, April 30, 1882.
13. Olathe Gazette, May 18, 1882.
14. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 40, p. 314. Letter to Mrs. A.J. Gordon, Boston, Massachusetts, dated December 9, 1881. Vol. 40, p. 221. Letter to George C. Smith, Cambridge, Illinois, dated November 23, 1881.

15. Topeka Capital, June 3, 1882.
16. Ibid., July 14, 1882.
17. Winfield Courant (Winfield, Kansas), February 4, 1882.
18. Hutchinson Herald (Hutchinson, Kansas), quoted in the Olathe Mirror, April 27, 1881.
19. Kansas State Journal (Topeka, Kansas), January 26, 1882.
20. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 40, p. 198. Letter to D.A. Millington, Winfield, Kansas, dated November 21, 1881.
21. Topeka Capital, July 23, 1882.
22. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 45, p. 371. Letter to W.T. and C. Yee, Independence, Kansas, dated September 25, 1882.
23. Ibid. Vol. 43, p. 378. Letter to Daniel Votaw, Independence, Kansas, dated May 6, 1882.
24. Ibid. Vol. 23, pp. 212-213. Letter to C.M. Goodsell, New York City, dated February 2, 1880.
25. Ibid. Vol. 42, p. 431. Letter to A.S. Hackney, Walton, Kansas, dated March 29, 1882.
26. Ibid. Vol. 44, p. 488. Letter to E.T. Peck, Clyde, Kansas, dated July 31, 1882.
27. Topeka Capital, quoted in the Olathe Gazette, March 16, 1882.
28. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 43, p. 27. Letter to R.F. Bond, Sterling, Kansas, dated April 3, 1882.
29. Ibid. Vol. 42, p. 497. Letter to J.W. Ady, Newton, Kansas, dated April 1, 1882.
30. Ibid. Vol. 43, pp. 28, 32. Letter to R.F. Bond, Sterling, Kansas, dated April 3, 1882.
31. Ibid. Vol. 43, p. 434. Letter to Colonel M.R. Benton, Effingham, Kansas, dated May 11, 1882.
32. Topeka Capital, June 19, 1882.
33. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 42, p. 497. Letter to J.W. Ady, Newton, Kansas, dated April 1, 1882.
34. Topeka Commonwealth, August 10, 1882.
35. Ibid., August 10 and 11, 1882.
Topeka Capital, August 11, 1882,

36. Olathe Mirror, August 24, 1882.
37. Topeka Commonwealth, August 11, 1882.
38. Garnett Journal (Garnett, Kansas), quoted in the Johnson County Democrat, (Olathe, Kansas), August 31, 1882.
Junction City Union, August 19, 1882.
39. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 42, p. 187. Letter to J.H. McGill, Millbrook, Kansas, dated March 9, 1882.
40. J.R. Detwiler, Prohibition in Kansas, (Topeka, 1890), in Kansas Prohibition Pamphlets. (A collection of prohibition pamphlets in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.)
41. Olathe Mirror, September 7, 1882.
42. Topeka Capital, November 4, 1882.
43. Chicago Times (Chicago, Illinois), quoted in the Johnson County Democrat, September 21, 1882.
44. Topeka Capital, October 7, 1882.
45. Pardee Butler in the Junction City Union, quoted in the Topeka Capital, August 19, 1882.
46. Kansas Chief, October 19, 1882.
47. Johnson County Democrat, October 26, 1882.
48. Junction City Union, November 4, 1882.
49. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 42, p. 15. Letter to Honorable O.S. Munsell, Council Grove, Kansas, February 23, 1882.
50. Ibid. Vol. 41, p. 13. Letter to Colonel W.R. Adams, Larned, Kansas, December 29, 1881.
51. Prohibition Clippings. Clipping from the Kansas City Star, dated 1925. (Collection of clippings in the Kansas State Library, Capitol building, Topeka, Kansas.)
52. Kansas Tribune (Lawrence, Kansas), September 8, 1882.
53. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books; article by George R. Scott.
54. Interview with Frank R. Ogg, Olathe, June 13, 1929.
55. Interview with J.L. Kincaid, Olathe, June 13, 1929. Mr. Kincaid, who is manager of the Grange store at Olathe and a former member of the Kansas house of representatives, says that this story was told to

him at different times by Alexander C. McKeever, Sam Howe, and John R. Burton, all of whom were present at the conference.

56. Olathe Gazette, November 23, 1882.
57. Johnson County Democrat, November 15, 1882.
58. Ibid., October 19, 1882.
59. Lawrence Journal, November 7, 1882.
Olathe Gazette, November 9, 1882.
60. Olathe Gazette, November 16, 1882.
61. John J. Ingalls, The Future Relation of the Republican Party to Prohibition in Kansas, in the Agora, January, 1893, p. 120.
62. Leavenworth Times (Leavenworth, Kansas), quoted in the Lawrence Journal, November 11, 1882.
63. Chicago Times, quoted in the Lawrence Journal, November 12, 1882.
64. Lawrence Journal, November 10, 1882.
Topeka Capital, November 11, 1882.
65. Atchison Globe (Atchison, Kansas), quoted in the Olathe Gazette, November 23, 1882.
66. Topeka Daily Democrat (Topeka, Kansas), quoted in the Olathe Gazette, November 23, 1882.
67. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 46, p. 35. Letter to H.L. Partridge, Parsons, Kansas, November 14, 1882.
68. Topeka Commonwealth, May 3, 1884.
69. Kansas Patron (Olathe, Kansas), November 30, 1882.

CHAPTER VIII

DEVELOPMENT INTO A NATIONAL CHARACTER.

1. C.G.K.: I.L., 1880. Letter from John M. Hering, Grand Worthy Secretary, Independent Order of Good Templars, State of Maryland, Baltimore, dated November 17, 1880.
2. Undated newspaper clipping (probably January 26, 1882) in St. John's Scrap Books.
3. Lawrence Journal, January 13, 1881.
4. C.G.K.: I.L., 1881. Letter from Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Newport, Kentucky, dated July 23, 1881.
5. Ibid. Letter from E.B. Reynolds, Hagerstown, Indiana, dated May 2, 1881.
6. Topeka Capital, May 24, 1881.
Topeka Commonwealth, May 28, 1881.
7. Independent Order of Good Templars, Proceedings of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge, 1882. (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1882), p. 109.
8. New York Times (New York), quoted in the Olathe Mirror, December 16, 1880.
9. Topeka Capital, January 31, 1882.
10. Liberal Advocate, November 25, 1879.
Temperance Banner, January 3, 1880.
11. C.G.K.: I.L., 1882. Letter from George R. Scott, New York City, dated May 2, 1882.
12. Olathe Mirror, February 1, 1883.
13. St. John and Colquitt, p. 12.
14. Ibid., p. 4.
15. Topeka Capital, February 13, 1882.
16. St. John and Colquitt, p. 3.

CHAPTER IX

CLIMAX OF CAREER: PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1884.

1. Eighteenth Annual Report of the National Temperance Society and Publication House (New York, 1883), p. 9.
2. St. Louis Globe-Democrat (St. Louis, Missouri), quoted in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the National Temperance Society and Publication House (New York, 1881), p. 46.
3. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 33, p. 488. Letter to Honorable J.P. Root, Wyandotte, Kansas, dated December 15, 1880.
4. Olathe Mirror, May 3, 1883.
5. Ibid., May 10, 1883.
6. Lawrence Journal, May 6, 1884.
7. Cutler, p. 233.
8. Lawrence Journal, May 6, 1884.
9. Boston Traveller, (Boston, Massachusetts), quoted in the Kansas State Journal, October 31, 1883.
10. Independent Order of Good Templars, Proceedings of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge, 1884 (Lincoln, Nebraska) 1884, pp. 10-11.
11. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 19, p. 97. Letter to George Calderwood, Greenville, Ohio, dated September 17, 1879.
12. Ibid. Vol. 45, p. 189. Letter to Isaac W. Tucker, Columbus, Ohio, dated August 26, 1882.
13. Ibid. Vol. 44, p. 317. Letter to M.H. Endley, Reading, Kansas, dated June 29, 1882, private.
14. Undated newspaper clipping (probably about 1886 or 1887) in St. John's Scrap Books; article by George R. Scott.
15. Lawrence Journal, June 4, 1884.
16. Pickering, p. 393.

17. Lawrence Journal, June 14, 1884.
18. Johnson County Democrat, July 3, 1884.
19. Ibid.
Olathe Mirror, January 28, 1886.
20. Olathe Mirror, January 28, 1886.
21. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 24, pp. 330-331. Letter to G.W. Nimocks, Great Bend, Kansas, dated February 28, 1880.
22. Ibid. Vol. 31, pp. 303-304. Letter to John L. Waller, Lawrence, Kansas, dated September 4, 1880.
23. Beloit Courier (Beloit, Kansas), quoted in the Topeka Capital, July 20, 1884.
24. Wilder, p. 1069.
25. Olathe Mirror, January 15, 1885.
26. Wilder, p. 1072.
27. Lawrence Journal, July 22, 1884.
28. Willard, p. 399.
29. New York Tribune (New York), July 25, 1884.
30. Calvin, pp. 157-159.
31. Original letter from A.A. Hopkins, New York, dated March 23, 1913, to St. John, in St. John's Scrap Books.
32. Original telegram from John B. Finch and M.V.B. Bennett, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, dated July 22, 1884, to St. John, in St. John's Scrap Books.
33. Original telegram from John B. Finch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, dated July 22, 1884, to St. John, in St. John's Scrap Books.
34. Original telegram from St. John, Rochester, New York, dated July 22, 1884, to John B. Finch, in St. John's Scrap Books.
35. Topeka Journal (Topeka, Kansas), July 26, 1884.
St. John carried several personal friends with him into the prohibition party; for instance, H.L. Burgess, of Olathe, resigned as vice-president of the republican club of Olathe and began an active canvass in behalf of the prohibition candidate.

36. Undated newspaper clipping (probably about 1886 or 1887) in St. John's Scrap Books; article by George R. Scott.
37. Lawrence Journal, July 27, 1884.
38. Olathe Mirror, July 31, 1884. As soon as Eckert's lease expired in December, 1884, he was promptly reduced by the owners from editor to local editor and business manager, but in January of the following year he purchased the paper from its owners.
39. Ibid., September 4, 1884.
40. Ibid., October 9, 1884.
41. Undated clipping from the Voice in St. John's Scrap Books; article by George R. Scott.
42. Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 1, pp. 143-145. Clipping from the Philadelphia Press, October 13, 1884.
43. Lawrence Journal, September 9, 1884.
44. Topeka Journal, October 16, 1884.
45. Topeka Capital, September 21, 1884.
46. Lawrence Journal, September 9, 1884.
47. Topeka Capital, October 14, 1884.
48. Topeka Journal, October 29, 1884.
49. Lawrence Journal, August 15, 1884.
50. Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition (New York, 1891), p. 572.
51. Chicago Tribune (Chicago), quoted in the Lawrence Journal, September 6, 1884.
52. Prohibition campaign circular in St. John's Scrap Books.
53. Lawrence Journal, October 3, 1884.
54. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
55. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
56. Colvin, p. 165.
57. Baltimore Sun (Baltimore, Maryland), quoted in the Topeka Capital, July 25, 1884.

58. Edward Stanwood, History of the Presidency (Boston, 1888), p. 410.

CHAPTER X

AFTERMATH: BLAMED FOR OVERTHROW OF REPUBLICAN RULE.

1. Lawrence Journal, November 8, 1884.
2. John J. Ingalls, The Future Relation of the Republican Party to Prohibition in Kansas, p. 120.
3. Johnson County Democrat, November 20, 1884.
4. Lawrence Herald-Tribune (Lawrence, Kansas), March 27, 1885.
5. Frances E. Finch and Frank J. Sibley, John B. Finch (New York, London, 1888), pp. 360-361.
6. Cincinnati Commercial Gazette (Cincinnati, Ohio), July 4, 1887, quoted in undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
7. Undated clipping from the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Banner in St. John's Scrap Books.
8. St. Louis Globe-Democrat, quoted in the Lawrence Herald-Tribune, November 14, 1884.
9. C.S. Finch, The Future Relation of the Republican Party to Prohibition in Kansas, in the Agora, January, 1893, p. 120.
10. Manhattan Nationalist, November 4, 1884.
11. Kansas City Star, December 10, 1911.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Osage City Free Press, (Osage City, Kansas), November 13, 1884.
15. Kansas Patron (Olathe, Kansas), November 13, 1884.
Lawrence Journal, February 26, 1913.
16. Olathe Register (Olathe, Kansas), February 6, 1913.
17. Topeka Capital, November 20, 1884.

18. Topeka Commonwealth, November 20, 1884.
19. Philadelphia Times (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania), quoted in the Voice, April 28, 1887.
20. Olathe Mirror, February 24, 1887.
21. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
22. Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 14, p. 2. Undated clipping from the Topeka Capital.
23. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
24. Undated clipping from the Chanute Tribune and Sun (Chanute, Kansas), in St. John's Scrap Books.
25. Lawrence Journal, February 26, 1913.
26. Kansas City Star, December 10, 1911.
27. Olathe Mirror, January 28, 1886.
28. Kansas State Journal, June 19, 1880; July 25, 1881; January 13, 1882.
Johnson County Democrat, April 12 and June 21, 1883.
Lawrence Tribune (Lawrence, Kansas), December 10, 1887.
29. Clipping from the New Era (Springfield, Ohio), December 8, 1889, in St. John's Scrap Books.
30. Lawrence Herald-Tribune, January 6, 1885.
31. St. Louis Republican (St. Louis, Missouri), quoted in the Topeka Capital, January 10, 1885,
Topeka Capital, January 16 and 27, 1885.
32. Topeka Capital, January 16, 1885.
St. Louis Globe-Democrat, December 20, 1884, quoted in the Topeka Capital, January 28, 1885.
33. Topeka Journal, January 15, 1885.
Topeka Capital, January 27, 1885.
34. Topeka Capital, January 25, 1885.
35. Ibid., January 27, 1885.
36. Topeka Journal, January 15, 1885.
37. Original letter from James F. Legate, Olathe, Kansas, dated December 31, 1884, to St. John, in St. John's Scrap Books.

38. Lawrence Herald-Tribune, January 7, 1885.
39. St. Louis Globe-Democrat, quoted in the Lawrence Herald-Tribune, January 19, 1885.
Topeka Capital, January 2, 1885.
40. Topeka Capital, January 2, 1885.
41. Lawrence Herald-Tribune, January 16, 1885.
Topeka Journal, January 15, 1885.
42. Olathe Mirror, December 18, 1884.
43. New York Tribune, January 10, 1885.
44. Lawrence Herald-Tribune, February 12, 1885.
45. Copy of letter to P.B. Plumb, Washington, D.C., from St. John, January 20, 1885, in St. John's Scrap Books.
46. Topeka Journal, January 20, 1885.
47. Copy of letter to D.R. Anthony, Leavenworth, Kansas, from St. John, August 25, 1902, in St. John's Scrap Books.
48. Ibid.
49. Lawrence Herald-Tribune, January 9, 1885.
50. St. Louis Republican, quoted in the Topeka Capital, January 10, 1885.
51. Finch and Sibley, pp. 362-363.
52. Ibid., p. 363. The author has included in this quotation only a part of the questions asked by Finch in his letter to Clarkson.
53. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
54. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
55. Clipping from the Louisville Times, January 20, 1885, in St. John's Scrap Books.
56. Topeka Journal, January 15 and 20, 1885.
Johnson County Democrat, February 26, 1885.
57. Lawrence Herald-Tribune, January 16, 1885.
58. Topeka Capital, December 14, 1884.
59. George L. Case, The Prohibition Party, in the Magazine of Western History, March, 1889, p. 558.

60. Voice, January 10, 1889.
61. Kansas City Star, December 10, 1911.
62. Sibley and Finch, pp. 355-356.
63. Johnson County Democrat, March 25, 1886.
64. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
Colvin, pp. 180-181.
Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition, p. 577.
65. Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition, pp. 590, 594.

CHAPTER XI

LEADING PROHIBITIONIST.-- DEVELOPMENT OF OTHER INTERESTS.--

BREAK WITH THE PROHIBITION PARTY.

1. Topeka Journal, October 1, 1885.
2. Original letter from Frances E. Willard, Evanston, Illinois, December 9, 1887, in St. John's Scrap Books.
3. Olathe Leader (Olathe, Kansas), March 10, 1892.
4. Voice, January-July, 1890.
5. Ibid., January 22, 1891.
6. Ibid., March 25, 1886.
7. One Hundred Years of Temperance (New York, 1885), p. 56.
8. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
9. Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 1, pp. 185-186.
Clipping from the Chicago Herald (Chicago), November 29, 1887.
10. Undated clipping from the Democrat (Topeka, Kansas) in St. John's Scrap Books.
11. Voice, September 26, 1889.
12. Ibid., July 13, 1893.
13. Newspaper clipping dated September 3, 1886, in St. John's Scrap Books.
14. Olathe Mirror, November 30, 1893.
15. Greensburg, Pennsylvania, Weekly Record, October 9, 1888, quoted in the Johnson County Democrat, October 18, 1888.
16. Lawrence Journal, November 10, 1890.
17. Johnson County Democrat, March 13, 1890.
18. Ibid.

19. Newspaper clipping dated September 3, 1886, in St. John's Scrap Books.
20. Johnson County Democrat, March 13, 1890.
21. Newspaper clipping dated September 3, 1886, in St. John's Scrap Books.
22. Lawrence Tribune, December 14, 1889.
23. Olathe Mirror, March 13, 1890.
24. Johnson County Democrat, March 13, 1890.
Topeka Capital, February 28, 1890.
25. Lawrence Tribune, December 22, 1887.
26. Johnson County Democrat, March 13, 1890.
27. Lawrence Tribune, December 14, 1889.
28. Kansas Prohibition Pamphlets. Vol. 3. Address of ex-Governor John B. St. John at Garnett, Kansas, March 31, 1892 (Ottawa, Kansas), p. 9. (Collection of prohibition pamphlets in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.)
29. Olathe Mirror, November 8, 1894.
30. Lawrence Journal, May 23, 1891
Voice, September 17, 1891.
31. Olathe Tribune, June 15, 1894.
32. Ibid.
33. Topeka Capital, July 17, 1896.
34. Olathe Tribune, March 1, 1895.
35. Ibid., August 24, 1894.
36. Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 1, p. 195. Clipping from the Topeka Journal, February --, 1896.
37. Lawrence Tribune, February 15, 1887.
38. Johnson County Democrat, November 8, 1888.
39. Kansas Prohibition Pamphlets. Vol. 3. Address of ex-Governor John P. St. John at Garnett, Kansas, March 31, 1892, p. 7.
40. Olathe Mirror, August 29, 1895.

41. Parsons Journal (Parsons, Kansas), quoted in the Johnson County Democrat, December 26, 1889.
42. Lawrence Tribune, December 14, 1889.
43. Topeka Capital, June 13, 1894.
44. Olathe Tribune, June 19 and 26, 1896.
45. Fifth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Kansas, 1885-1886, p. 98.
46. Lawrence Journal, July 20, 1888; June 13, 1894.
Topeka Capital, June 13, 1894.
47. Lawrence Tribune, June 22, 1886.
Lawrence Weekly Journal (Lawrence, Kansas), July 1, 1886.
48. Lawrence Journal, May 17, 1894.
49. Ibid., June 12, 1894.
Voice, May 31, 1894.
50. Seventh Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Kansas, 1888-1890, p. 86.
51. Ninth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Kansas, 1893-1894, p. 57.
52. Tenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Kansas, 1895-1896, p. 85.
53. Lawrence Tribune, July 7, 1887.
54. Johnson County Democrat, November 26, 1885.
55. Lawrence Tribune, May 1, 1890.
56. Olathe Mirror, January 3, 1896.
57. Kansas City Star, December 10, 1911.
58. Voice, April 14, 1892.
59. Ibid., April 28, 1892.
60. Ibid., May 12, 1892.
61. Ibid., May 19, 1892.
62. Ibid., March 24, 1892.
63. Lawrence Journal, June 29 and 30, 1892.
Voice, July 7, 1892.

64. Ibid., July 28, 1892.
65. This, at least, is the belief expressed by D.L. Colvin in his Prohibition in the United States, p. 256.
66. Voice, June 29, 1893.
67. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
68. Lawrence Journal, May 26, 1896.
69. Voice, March 19, 1896.
70. Ibid., March 5, 1896.
71. Lawrence Journal, May 26, 1896.
72. Ibid., May 27, 1896.
73. Voice, June 4, 1896.
74. Lawrence Journal, May 29, 1896.
75. Ibid., May 29, 1896.
Voice, June 4, 1896.
76. Olathe Tribune, July 17, 1896.
77. Voice, July 16, 1896.
78. Ibid., October 1, 1896.
79. World Almanac and Cyclopedia (New York, 1897), p. 423.

CHAPTER XII

A "FREE LANCE."-- RETURN TO PUBLIC FAVOR.--

RENEWAL OF PROHIBITION ACTIVITY.

1. Smasher's Mail (Topeka, Kansas), March 30, 1901.
2. Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 14. Newspaper clipping dated January 27, 1910.
3. Topeka Herald (Topeka, Kansas), September 28, 1905.
4. Olathe Tribune, March 30, 1900.
5. Topeka Advocate and News (Topeka, Kansas), quoted in the Olathe Tribune, April 15, 1898.
6. Lawrence Journal, June 22, 1898.
7. Olathe Tribune, June 1 and July 13, 1900.
8. Ibid., August 8, 1902.
Lawrence Journal, October 8th 1902.
9. Lawrence Journal, November 1, 1910.
10. Interview with George H. Hodges, Olathe, Kansas, July 2, 1929.
11. New Voice, (Chicago), October 5, 1899.
12. Olathe Tribune, September 16, 1898.
13. Carrie Nation Scrap Book. Undated newspaper clipping.
(Collection of clippings pertaining to temperance and particularly to Carrie Nation in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.)
14. Undated magazine clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
15. Lawrence Journal, December 7, 1897.
16. Ibid., August 21, 1900.
17. Ibid., February 25, 1898.
18. Olathe Tribune, September 9, 1904.
19. New Voice, August 11, 1904.

20. Ibid.
21. J.S. West, Early Days in Drywood, in Collections of the Kansas State Historical Society (Topeka, 1928), Vol. 17 (1926-1928), p. 355.
22. Topeka Journal, June 17, 1884.
23. Voice, February 12, 1891.
24. Interview with G.A. Roberds, Olathe, Kansas, July 2, 1929. Judge Roberds knew St. John well during the last years of the prohibitionist's life.
Interview with Sam Seaton, Olathe, Kansas, July 2, 1929. Mr. Seaton was a friend of John P. St. John, Jr., and was often in the St. John home.
25. Topeka Capital, October 10, 1909.
26. Olathe Register, April 18, 1912.
27. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
28. Topeka Capital, November 15, 1915.
29. Kansas City Star, February 18, 1911.
30. Clipping dated March, 1912, in St. John's Scrap Books.
31. Olathe Mirror, June 6, 1912.
32. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
33. Lawrence Journal, December 24, 1912.
34. Ibid., February 26, 1913.
35. Ibid., February 25, 1913.
36. C. S. Finch, The Future Relation of the Republican Party to Prohibition in Kansas, p. 120.
37. Original telegram from Charles Scalam, chairman national prohibition convention, Columbus, Ohio, July 16, 1908, to St. John, in St. John's Scrap Books.
38. Original letter from Charles R. Jones, chairman national prohibition committee, Chicago, Illinois, May 27, 1912, to St. John, in St. John's Scrap Books.
39. Topeka Capital, March 5, 1914.
Olathe Mirror, March 26, 1914.
40. Olathe Register, March 6, 1913.

41. Ibid.
Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
42. Topeka Capital, December 10, 1914.
43. Kansas City Star, December 10, 1911.
44. Ibid., July 25, 1915.
45. Newspaper clipping dated April 9, 1915, in St. John's Scrap Books.
46. Original letter from William Jennings Bryan, Washington, D.C., September 22, 1915, to St. John, in St. John's Scrap Books.
47. Article by John McTammany in undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
48. Kansas Chief, April 6, 1916.
49. Clipping from the Intercollegiate Statesman, January, 1915, in possession of Miss Zoe Thomas.
50. Olathe Mirror, April 13, 1916.
51. Olathe Register, July 29, 1915.
52. Kansas City Star, February 18, 1911.
53. Clipping from the American Advance, February 21, 1914, in St. John's Scrap Books.
54. Clipping from the Morning Press (Santa Barbara, California), October 3, 1914, in St. John's Scrap Books.
55. Topeka Capital, December 8, 1914.
56. Clipping from the Intercollegiate Statesman, January, 1915, in possession of Miss Zoe Thomas.
57. Arkansas City Daily News, (Arkansas City, Kansas), January 11, 1915.

CHAPTER XIII

ST. JOHN, THE MAN.--

PLACE IN THE PROHIBITION MOVEMENT.

1. Journal of the Senate of the State of Kansas, 1923,
pp. 121, 158, 173, 248, 260.
2. Olathe Register, February 12, 1914.
3. Ibid., March 25, 1909; September 14, 1916.
4. Interview with Berry Sublette, Olathe, Kansas, July
6, 1929.
5. Interview with Miss Zoe Thomas, Olathe, Kansas, July 6,
1929.
6. Harry, the son of St. John by his first marriage,
was a brilliant, handsome man. He became a lawyer and
in 1895 was serving as a member of the Oklahoma
legislature. He was at this time indicted by a grand
jury for shooting and killing his second wife, whom
he had married after his first wife had obtained a
divorce. It was claimed that that shooting was
accidental and since Harry died before the trial the
charges against him were never proved. This tragedy
greatly increased the burdens St. John was called
upon to bear.
-- Lawrence Journal, April 4 and
15, 1895; October 12, 1896.
Topeka Capital, April 4, 1895.
7. Topeka State Journal, January 25, 1899.
8. Olathe Tribune, December 23, 1904.
9. Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, S. Vol. 1, pp. 190-191.
Undated newspaper clipping.
10. Leavenworth Standard (Leavenworth, Kansas), July 16,
1881.
11. It is said that Mrs. St. John followed her husband to
the lodge one evening and sat on the steps leading
to the lodge room, holding her baby in her arms,
until he came down, and that this incident determined
him to break his connection with the order.
-- Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap
Books.

12. C.G.K.: O.L. Vol. 39, p. 300. Letter to J. Blanchard, President of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, dated September 29, 1881.
13. Ibid. Vol. 21, pp. 69-73. Letter to Dr. R.L. Walston, Decatur, Illinois, December 4, 1879.
14. Ibid. Vol. 45, p. 292. Letter to Charles W. Higgins, Omaha, Nebraska.
15. Interview with Sam Seaton, Olathe, Kansas, July 2, 1929.
16. Interview with Miss Lucie Burgess, who was one of St. John's friends among the younger generation, Olathe, Kansas, June 13, 1929.
Olathe Mirror, June 6, 1912.
17. Olathe Register, September 7, 1916.
18. Undated newspaper clipping in St. John's Scrap Books.
19. Undated clipping from the Voice in St. John's Scrap Books; article by George R. Scott.
20. Clipping from the American Advance, July 6, 1912, in the biographical files of the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society, section on St. John, pp. 5-6.
21. Undated clipping from the Voice in St. John's Scrap Books; article by George R. Scott.
22. Colvin, pp. 442-443.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCE MATERIAL

STATE PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

St. John, John P., Biennial Message to the Legislature of Kansas, 1879.
Biennial Message to the Legislature of Kansas, 1881.

St. John's messages are printed separately in pamphlet form and are also to be found in the senate and house journals and in the bound volumes of state public documents.

Proceedings of the Senate of the State of Kansas, 1873, 1874, 1877, 1879, 1881, 1883, 1913.

Proceedings of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, 1873, 1874, 1877, 1879, 1881, 1883, 1913.

Reports of the Supreme Court of Kansas, vols. 24 and 25 (1880, 1881).

Reports of the Secretary of State of the State of Kansas, 1872, 1879-1896.

Statutes of the State of Kansas.

MANUSCRIPTS

Correspondence of the Governors of Kansas: Letters to the Governor, 1879-1883, 31 letter boxes; Letters from the Governor, 1879-1883, vols. 14-46 (letter press copies). Library of the Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Kansas.

Executive Messages and Proclamations, Book B. Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Executive Proclamations, 1873-1884, pp. 21-90. Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Private Collection of Letters from Governor and Mrs. John P. St. John, in possession of Miss Zoe Thomas, Olathe, Kansas.

Letter from St. John to George W. Martin, June 19, 1898. Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Anonymous Biographical Sketch of St. John, dated September 20, 1898. Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

This sketch, although it consists of only four typed pages, is one of the more complete of the accounts of St. John and contains a number of facts not emphasized elsewhere. It has apparently been written from first-hand sources.

St. John's Scrap Books. These are a miscellaneous collection of notes, letters, telegrams, newspaper and magazine clippings, and pamphlets. 13 vols. In possession of Miss May Parker, Olathe, Kansas.

ADDRESSES

Hodges, George H., Kansas' Great Progress under Prohibition. Address delivered at the Fifteenth national convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America, Columbus, Ohio, November 12, 1913. Topeka, Kansas: State. 1914.

Richardson, Reverend A.M., Prohibition in Kansas. A paper read before the Congregational Association of Kansas, at its annual meeting in Emporia, Kansas, November 11, 1882. Ottawa, Kansas: Newman Waring. 1882.

St. John, John P., and Colquitt, A.H., Prohibition in Kansas. Addresses in Brooklyn Tabernacle, January 22, 1882. New York: National Temperance Society and Publication House. 1882.

St. John, John P., Prohibition a Constitutional Law. An address at Philadelphia, January 20, 1882. Philadelphia: Garrigues Bros., D.C. Babcock. 1882.

Thacher, Honorable S.O., Prohibition in Kansas. An address in the Kansas State Senate, January 29, 1883. Topeka, Kansas: Kansas State Temperance Society. 1884.

REPORTS OF SOCIETIES

Proceedings of the Annual Sessions of the Grand Lodge of Kansas, Independent Order of Good Templars, 1860-1895, nos. I-36. (Broken files.)

Proceedings of the Annual Sessions of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge, Independent Order of Good Templars, 1882, 1884. Lincoln, Nebraska: Journal Co. 1882, 1884.

Annual Reports of the National Temperance Society, 1879-1887, nos. 14-22. New York: National Temperance Society and Publication House, 1879-1887.

Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Annual Convention of the United States Brewers' Association, 1884. New York: New York Economical Printing Co. 1884.

Minutes of the Third, Fourth, and Sixth Annual Meetings of the Woman's Christian Union of Kansas, 1881, 1882, 1884.
Third Meeting, Topeka, Kansas: Kansas Publishing House, 1881; Fourth Meeting, Burlingame, Kansas: Osage County Chronicle, 1882; Sixth Meeting, Fort Scott, Kansas: J.H. Rice and Sons, 1884.

NEWSPAPERS AND PAMPHLETS

Newspapers

Alliance Echo (Published also under title of Olathe Tribune) (Weekly), Olathe, Kansas, 1893-1907.

Atchison, Kansas, Daily Champion. Scattering issues, 1872-1875; complete files, 1876-1885.

Emporia, Kansas, Daily Republican, 1882-1885.

Fanatic (Weekly), Emporia, Kansas, 1887-1888.

Golden Gate (Weekly), Newton, Kansas, 1879-1882.

Johnson County Democrat (Weekly), Olathe, Kansas, 1882-1891.

Kansas Chief (Weekly), Troy, Kansas, 1872-1890.

Kansas Freie Presse (Weekly), Leavenworth, Kansas, 1876-1882.

Kansas Patron and Farmer (Weekly), Olathe, Kansas, 1881-1903.

Kansas Progress (Weekly), Lawrence, Kansas, 1882-1883.

Kansas State Journal (Daily), Topeka, Kansas, 1879-1916; also issue for December 26, 1917.

Kansas Temperance Palladium (Weekly), Lawrence, Kansas, 1879-1880.

Lawrence, Kansas, Daily Gazette, 1893-1895, 1903-1916.

Lawrence, Kansas, Daily Record, 1889-1893.

Lawrence, Kansas, Daily Journal-World (Published under variations of this title), 1869-1916.

Lawrence, Kansas, Tribune (Daily and Weekly), (Published under variations of this title), broken files, 1882-1890.

Leavenworth, Kansas, Evening Standard (Daily), 1881-1885.

- Leavenworth, Kansas, Daily Public Press, 1878-1882.
- Leavenworth, Kansas, Daily Times, 1870-1885.
- Liberal Advocate (Weekly), Topeka, Kansas, 1879-1880.
- Manhattan, Kansas, Nationalist (Weekly), 1877-1890.
- New Century (Weekly), Fort Scott, Kansas, 1877-1878.
- New York Daily Tribune, 1884-1885.
- Olathe, Kansas, Weekly Gazette, 1879-1883.
- Olathe, Kansas, Weekly Leader, 1879-1881, 1891-1893.
- Olathe, Kansas, Weekly Mirror (Published under variations of this title), 1876-1916.
- Olathe, Kansas, Weekly Register, 1898-1910, 1911-1916.
- Smasher's Mail (Weekly and monthly), Topeka, Kansas, 1901.
- Temperance Banner (Weekly, bi-monthly and monthly), Osage Mission, Kansas, 1879-1880.
- Temperance Rural (Weekly), Cherokee, Kansas, 1878-1879.
- Topeka, Kansas, Daily Blade, 1877-1879.
- Topeka, Kansas, Daily Capital, 1879-1916; also issues of January 18, January 22, January 30, and February 23, 1917.
- Topeka, Kansas, Daily Commonwealth, 1876-1878.
- Voice (Weekly), New York, 1886-1898; continued as the New Voice (Weekly), New York, 1898-1899; and as the New Voice and Chicago Lever (Weekly), Chicago, 1899-1906.
- Western Home Journal (Weekly), Lawrence, Kansas, 1869-1885.
- Western Progress (Weekly), Olathe, Kansas, 1876-1880; also scattered numbers, 1875.
- Individual Issues of Newspapers
- Atchison, Kansas, Weekly Champion, July 16, 1881.
- Chetopa, Kansas, Weekly Advance, July 15, 1880.
- Indian Leader (Weekly), Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, March 7, 1913.

Junction City, Kansas, Weekly Union, August 19, 1882.

Kansas City, Missouri, Daily Journal, January 21, 1880;
September 2, 1880; September 1, 1881; August 31, 1905.

Kansas City, Missouri, Daily Star, February 18 and December
10, 1911; February 8, 1914; March 14, 1915; September
28, 1915; January 19, 1919.

Kansas City, Kansas, Daily Sun, September 8, 1916.

Kansas City, Missouri, Daily Times, September 2, 1880,
September 1, 1916.

Kansas Commoner (Weekly), Leavenworth, Kansas, February 13,
1885.

Marshall County Weekly News, Marysville, Kansas, June 19,
1885.

Miami Weekly Republican, Paola, Kansas, May 17 and 24, 1878.

New York Times, February 12, 1914; September 1, 1916.

Osage City, Kansas, Weekly Free Press, November 13, 1884.

Stockton, Kansas, Weekly News, September 6, 1882.

Topeka, Kansas, Daily Herald, September 28, 1905.

Wichita, Kansas, Daily Beacon, January 7, 1915.

Wichita, Kansas, Daily Eagle, January 21, 1915.

Winfield, Kansas, Evening Free Press (Daily), February
21, 1900.

Collections of Newspaper Clippings

Biographical Files, section on St. John, Library of the
Kansas State Historical Society.

Carrie Nation Scrap Books, 2 vols., Library of the Kansas
State Historical Society.

Democratic Party Clippings, 3 vols., Library of the Kansas
State Historical Society.

Independent Order of Good Templar Clippings, 1 vol., Library
of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Johnson County, Kansas, Clippings, 1 vol., Library of the
Kansas State Historical Society.

Kansas Prohibition Clippings, 10 vols., Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Kansas Prohibition Speeches Clippings, 2 vols., Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Kansas Scrap Book: Biography, sections of St. John, S., Vols. 1, 6, 8, 14, Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Kansas State Temperance Union Clippings, 2 vols., Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Prohibition Party Clippings, 1 vol., Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Prohibition and Temperance Clippings, unbound, Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Republican Party Clippings, 10 vols., Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Zoe Thomas collection of newspaper and magazine articles. This collection deals particularly with St. John's national prohibition tours, 1914-1916, and covers many points in his career not otherwise clear. Most of the items were clipped by St. John from newspapers published in cities where he made addresses and sent by him to Miss Thomas.

Pamphlets and Collections of Pamphlets

Johnson County, Kansas, Pamphlets, 1 vol., Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Kansas Prohibition Pamphlets, 4 vols., Library of the Kansas State Historical Society.

Kansas State Temperance Union Pamphlets, 1 vol., Library of the Kansas State Historical Society. Two pamphlets in this collection are deserving of special mention:

Prohibition in Kansas: Statement Issued by the Executive Committee of the Kansas State Temperance Union, 1887.

Prohibition in Kansas: The Result of Twenty Months of Its Operation. By James A. Troutman, Secretary of the of the Kansas State Temperance Union, 1883.

Pickering, I.O.: The Administrations of John P. St. John, reprinted from the Collections of the Kansas State Historical Society, vol. IX, 1906.

Temperance and Prohibition Pamphlets, 2 vols., Kansas State Library, Topeka, Kansas.

SECONDARY MATERIAL

BOOKS

Anti-Saloon League Year Book, 1919. Compiled and edited by Ernest Hurst Cherrington. 1 vol. Westerville, Ohio: Anti-Saloon League of America. 1919.

Appleton's Annual Cyclopedie and Register of Important Events, 1874-1884. New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1876-1885.

Cherrington, Ernest H., The Evolution of Prohibition in the United States of America. 1 vol. Westerville, Ohio: American Issue Press. 1920.

Colvin, David L., Prohibition in the United States. 1 vol. New York: George H. Doran Co. 1926.

Connelley, William Elsey, History of Kansas: State and People. 5 vols. Chicago, New York: American Historical Society, Inc. 1928.

Cyclopedie of Temperance and Prohibition. 1 vol. London, New York, Toronto: Funk and Wagnalls. 1891.

Cyclopedie of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals. Edited by Deets Fickett, Clarence True Wilson, and Ernest Dailey Smith. 1 vol. New York, Cincinnati Methodist Book Concern. 1917.

Doniphan County Supplement to the Weekly Kansas Chief. 1 vol. Troy, Kansas. April 6, 1916.

Dorchester, Daniel, D.D., The Liquor Problem in All Ages. 1 vol. New York, San Francisco: Phillips and Hunt; Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis: Cranston and Stowe. 1888.

Encyclopedie of Social Reform. Edited by William D.P. Bliss. 1 vol. New York, London: Funk and Wagnalls. 1898.

Finch, Frances E., and Sibley, Frank J., John B. Finch, His Life and Work. 1 vol. New York, London: Funk and Wagnalls. 1888.

Fisher, Reverend H.D., The Gun and the Gospel. 1 vol. Chicago: Kenwood Press. 1896.

Gregg, Oliver H., History of Johnson County, Kansas. 1 vol. Wyandot, Kansas: E.F. Heisler and Co. 1874.

Hazelrigg, Clara H., A New History of Kansas. 1 vol.
Topeka, Kansas: Crane and Co. 1895.

Ingalls, Sheffield, History of Atchison County, Kansas.
1 vol. Lawrence, Kansas: Standard Publishing Co. 1916.

Jutkins, A.J., Handbook of Prohibition. 1 vol. Chicago,
1884.

Kansas, A Cyclopedia of State History. Edited by Frank W.
Blackmar. 4 vols. Chicago: Standard Publishing Co.
1912.

Kansas, History of the State of. Edited by William G. Cutler.
1 vol. Chicago: A.T. Andreas. 1883.

Kansas Memorial, A Reprt of the Old Settlers' Meeting Held
at Bismarck Grove, Kansas, September 15 and 16, 1879.

Kansas State Historical Society:
Biennial Reports. Vol. 1 (1879)---. Topeka, Kansas: State.
Collections. Vol. 1 (1881)---. Topeka: State.
Publications. Vol. 1 (1886)---. Topeka: State.

Montgomery County, Kansas, History of, by its Own People.
1 vol. Iola, Kansas: L. Wallace Duncan. 1903.

One Hundred Years of Temperance. (Memorial volume of the
centennial temperance conference, 1885) 1 vol. New
York: National Temperance Society and Publication House.
1886.

Prohibition in the United States. Compiled by T.E. Stephens.
1 vol. Topeka, Kansas: Press of the Kansas Farmer Co.
1902.

Province and the States. Edited by Weston Arthur Goodspeed.
7 vols. Section on State of Kansas, by Frank W. Blackmar,
associate editor, vol 4. Madison, Wisconsin: Western
Historical Association. 1904.

Shawnee County, History of. Edited by James L. King. 1
vol. Chicago: Richmond and Arnold. 1905.

Stanwood, Edward, A History of Presidential Elections.
1 vol. Boston: Tickner and Co. 1888.

Stoke, Will E., Episodes of Early Days in Central and Western
Kansas. 1 vol. Great Bend, Kansas: Will E. Stoke. 1926.

Temperance in All Nations. Edited by J.N. Stearns. 2 vols.
New York: National Temperance Society and Publication
House. 1893.

Wilder, D.W., The Annals of Kansas, 1541-1885. 1 vol.
Topeka, Kansas; Kansas Publishing House. 1886.

Willard, Frances E., Glimpses of Fifty Years. 1 vol.
Chicago, Philadelphia, Kansas City, Oakland, California:
H.J. Smith and Co. 1889.

Willsie, Charles, The Eye-Opener or The Evil Fruits of the Prohibitory Law In Kansas. 1 vol. Wellington, Kansas:
Charles Willsie. 1890.

MAGAZINES

^{or '93}
Agora, A Kansas Magazine, January, 1892, pp. 117-133: The Future Relation of the Republican Party to Prohibition in Kansas, by C.S. Finch, Sol. Miller, H.W. Lewis, J.K. Hudson; January, 1895, pp. 192-209: Shall We Resubmit the Prohibitory Amendment? by Honorable Samuel T. Howe.

Andover Review, May, 1884, pp. 510-516: Prohibition in Kansas, by James G. Dougherty.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November, 1908, pp. 567-573: Prohibition in Kansas, by J.K. Codding and E.W. Hoch.

Collier's, June 27, 1914, p. 16: A Town with a Lid, by Walt Mason.

Collier's, September 2, 1922, pp. 3-4, 18-19: A Dry West Warns the Thirsty East, by William Allen White.

Contemporary Review, April, 1887, pp. 531-546: Prohibition in the United States, by Axel Gustafson.

Forum, August, 1889, pp. 673-682: Prohibition and License, by J.J. Ingalls.

Kansas Magazine, July, 1873, pp. 5-15: Fifty Days of History, by J.G. Waters.

Living Age, June 30, 1917, pp. 803-807: The Spread of Prohibition in the United States, by Cathleyne Saint Nihal Singh.

Magazine of Western History, March, 1889, pp. 555-564;
April, 1889, pp. 705-714: The Prohibition Party: Its Origins, Purpose and Growth, by George L. Case.

Nations June 10, 1886, pp. 482-483: The Prohibition Balance of Power, by J.B. Bishop.
November 18, 1886, p. 407: The Prohibition Party's Vote, by J.B. Bishop.

National Temperance Advocate, September, 1879, entire issue.

North American Review, June, 1885, pp. 509-520: Prohibition in Politics, by Gail Hamilton.

July, 1885, pp. 34-40: Prohibition in Practice, by Gail Hamilton.

August, 1916, pp. 254-266: Prohibition in Kansas, by Albert Jay Nock.