

Northwest Ohio Quarterly

Volume 26

Issue 2

The President's Page

WE THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, IN ORDER TO FORM A MORE PERFECT UNION, ESTABLISH JUSTICE, INSURE DOMESTIC TRANQUILITY, PROVIDE FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE, PROMOTE THE GENERAL WELFARE, AND SECURE THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY TO OURSELVES AND OUR POSTERITY, DO ORDAIN AND ESTABLISH THIS CONSTITUTION FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

"WE THE PEOPLE of the United States" describes the political body, who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the "sovereign people," and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty.¹

- (1) *Dred Scott v. Sanford* (1857), 19 How. 404, 15 L. Ed. 691. It seems strange that in this landmark of judicial decisions a century ago the Supreme Court held that a negro was not a citizen and not one of the People of the United States.

But the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established not by the states in their sovereign capacities, but emphatically, as the preamble declares, by "the People of the United States."²

- (2) "There can be no doubt that it was competent to the people to invest the general government with all the powers which they might deem proper and necessary; to extend or restrain these powers according to their own good pleasure, and to give them a paramount and supreme authority. As little doubt can there be that the people had a right to prohibit to the states the exercise of any powers which were, in their judgment, incompatible with

the objects of the general compact; to make the powers of the state governments, in given cases, subordinate to those of the nation, or to reserve to themselves those sovereign authorities which they might not choose to delegate to either. The Constitution was not, therefore, necessarily carved out of existing state sovereignties, nor a surrender of powers already existing in state institutions, for the powers of the states depend on their own constitutions; and the people of every state had the right to modify and restrain them, according to their own views of policy or principle. On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that the sovereign powers vested in the state governments, by their respective constitutions, remained unaltered and unimpaired, except so far as they were granted to the government of the United States. *Martin v. Hunter*, Va. 1816, 1 Wheat. 324, 4 L. Ed. 97.

Although from time to time throughout our history, powers not specifically granted by the Constitution are sought to be exercised under the broad provisions of the Preamble, such as, for example, "to promote the general welfare," nevertheless the preamble merely indicates the reason or purpose for which the people established the Constitution. The preamble must never be regarded as the source of any substantive power conferred upon the government. Such substantive powers embrace only those expressly granted in the body of the Constitution and such as may be implied from those so granted. No power can be exerted unless, apart from the preamble, it be found in some express delegation of power or in some power to be properly implied therefrom.

Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while the people have delegated sovereign powers to the Congress and the Executive, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom the government exists and acts. And the fundamental rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of

The President's Page

happiness, as individual personal possessions, are secured by those maxims of constitutional law which are the monuments of the victorious progress of the human race in securing to all men the blessings of civilization under the reign of just and equal law, to the end that our government "may be a government of laws, and not of men."

Lehr Fess

The Director's Page

A Call For New Members

The individual membership of our Society is not quite 300. Including institutions it is 350. I feel that we should have more popular support than this. I should like to see our total membership rise this year to at least 500.

To achieve this goal we must spread the news of our Society's work. I hope that you have caught the spirit of the new history that we are writing. We are doing a very vital thing in two respects: (1) enabling our people to know the larger importance of our local history; (2) preparing the groundwork for a greater and more grass roots type of general American History.

We are doing this through the following publications:

1. The Quarterly.
2. The Junior Cues (for school children).
3. The History of Lucas County (Volume 4 will be out this summer).
4. The Tourist Guides.
5. Our forthcoming school textbook.

This new local-in-national history must be locally supported. By the very nature of our situation we cannot get national or even statewide support. Therefore we must do the job ourselves.

Help us to get new members. Fill out the attached membership application on behalf of a friend, or get him to do so. I think our program is worth this extra boost. We certainly feel encouraged when new members join our ranks.

Randolph C. Downes.

The Toledo Literary Scene, 1875-1900

By G. Harrison Orians

It is almost impossible to arrive at a fair estimate of the reading habits of a generation over a half-century removed. Even if one were to interview all the octogenarians he knew or heard of and assumed that their memories were sound and their cases representative, he still would not have evidence enough for valid generalization. All that one can do is to present a composite picture of the reading habits of our grandfathers and great-grandfathers, and to discover, if possible, what part of this general picture applies to a given area. When one raises the question of what people actually read, he means, of course, what was read by those who did read—in any generation a small percentage and in modern days one becoming increasingly smaller. We can never know, even when people eschew speaking of books they have not read, what popular favorites they have actually perused. We cannot honestly assume that a book widely acclaimed in Philadelphia, or New York or Boston was therefore popular in Toledo. These reservations aside, we may go ahead to speak of books and periodicals in the last quarter of the nineteenth century with which readers of Lucas County had some acquaintance.

In late nineteenth century Toledo the generalized registers now on hand to record popular literary enthusiasms did not exist. The chief bookshops of that time—Brown, Eager, and Hull, and H. P. Plessner Company (to name only two)—are no longer in existence, nor seemingly are their records. The library monthly reports, so fruitful in establishing the popularity of recent books in present-day Toledo, were not only scanty, but dealt with classes of books rather than with individual titles. For the query we have raised, therefore, of what the literary record was in late nineteenth-century Lucas County, we are restricted to private holdings, old correspondence, interviews with persons of dimming memories, library accessions, and literary notices. Toledo

did not have its own literary magazine, but it did have newspapers that attempted to mould the literary taste, and it had a fair number of subscribers to national literary magazines. Unfortunately, book notices for the first half of the period were sporadic, and, for all the quarter-century covered, represented individual judgments, not community reactions nor community standards. As for the library accessions, there was the Alphabetical Catalogue published in 1886 (there was no card catalogue) and occasional bulletins listing accessions after the last catalogue. Even so, these at best show availability of titles, not reading habits. They do not tell us what people read, nor what books they owned. They do give us some measure of what they probably talked about and may possibly have read.

The late nineteenth century was not a period of book-of-the-month clubs and weekly review magazines, but it had its facilities for the dissemination of knowledge about books and creative efforts. Such matters then were local rather than national. Toledo newspapers, especially after 1885, provided extensive weekly review columns and had literary corners for items of local authorship. National periodicals were sufficiently few in number to produce individual impacts, and their contents were digested each week or month in the daily papers. One only had to look in the news-sheets to find a list of articles appearing in national weeklies and monthlies. Book notices were equally generous, but reviews of books made available through local outlets are only a part of the story. Many books were sold by traveling agents who pounded the sidewalks and rang doorbells, and these persuasive salesmen (now no more) introduced books into homes otherwise innocent of literary items. There were other forces. The more popular authors made speaking tours on which they capitalized on their newly-won honors. The Lyceum as an institution brought authors and readers together and evoked new readers. Toledo shared in these ways with other cities of the Middle West in what may be called the main currents of the literary scene.

1. The Local-Color Movement

The dominant literary manifestation of the period after 1880 until World War I was the local-color movement. Readers of Toledo and environs were by the mid-eighties fully conscious of the regional movement then sweeping into its full glory. Local-color was in general an honest attempt to view American life with its loyalty and neighborliness before the modern distrust of honesty and community sympathy arose. To writers and readers alike environment was an important factor, as noted by an anonymous critic in 1883: "Local-color counts for much with us; our stories might all be called studies of phases of human nature, of types of humanity . . . He who can truthfully describe the human being of any special environment, either as to his inner character or his external diction, appearance, manner, he is our successful novelist." This critic might, with regard to the literary form most in vogue, have added "and short story writer."

Local-color came first to Lucasites from three sources. First, there was the Hoosier writer, Edward Eggleston. His realistic novels, which were virtually studies in social conditions, embodied the life and areas which had been familiar to the author during his boyhood and on his travels through southern Indiana as a circuit rider. His pictures of Western life, presented with seriousness and fidelity to its patterns, awakened readers to the possibilities of local material and aided materially not only in the development of provincial literature but in the creation of an audience for such work. Eggleston's *The Hoosier Schoolmaster* was, in the author's own words, the "file-leader of the procession of American dialect novels" and the "first of the dialect stories that depict a life quite beyond New England influence." This effort was no flash in the pan. He made his influence solid with *Roxy* and *The Circuit Rider*. Because Indiana materials were similar to those of Northwest Ohio, Eggleston enjoyed great favor among Toledo readers.

The second large force in the popularization of the new

local-color material was Bret Harte. His discovery of a literary bonanza in California was so loudly proclaimed throughout the nation that even the occasional reader knew his name and sometimes his works. His earliest success was followed with *Mrs. Skagg's Husbands* (1874), *Tales of the Argonauts* (1875), *Drift from Two Shores* (1878), and *The Twins of Table Mountain* (1879). This succession of works kept his name before the public and increased the sale of his books. The casual reader who missed the earlier furor about Harte was likely to become acquainted with him during the nineties when he was again producing a volume a year. While there were those who preferred the earlier works, distinctive later narratives such as "Colonel Starbottle's Client," "A Protege of Jack Hamlin's," "An Ingenue of the Sierras," etc., possessed such merits as to enlist and retain readers. Toledo was conscious of his work to the last. For example, his "Knight Errant of the Foot-hills" and "A Secret of Telegraph Hill," appeared in the *Blade* in the Spring of 1889; his three-part "The Conspiracy of Mrs. Bunker" ran in the February, 1892, *Sunday Commercial*, and his novel, *Three Partners*, appeared in the spring of 1897 in the *Blade* prior to book publication.

The third force in the local-color movement was George Washington Cable and his southern colleagues. Cable carefully assigned melodramatic occurrences in New Orleans to the years before 1850; and because this material was exotic and strange, it had an appeal in the North. Beginning in 1875 Cable by short stories, novels, and platform appearances became for a time almost "Mr. Local Color" himself. His *Grandissimes* (1880) and *Dr. Sevier* (1884) prepared northwestern Ohio readers for his appearance on a lecture tour, which in turn led to a renewed demand for his fiction.

These forces were soon aided by the work of other Southern novelists and short-story writers all freely noticed in Toledo papers, Joel Chandler Harris, Mary Murfree, Octave Thanet, and others. Harris was the subject of a program for the New Century Club in April, 1889, and Octave Thanet was given extended literary notices through the nineties, including

one as early as April 6, 1889. By 1886 Toledo's library had made available three of Harris' most famous collections, **Nights with Uncle Remus** (1883), **Uncle Remus, His Songs and Sayings**, and **Mingo and Other Sketches** which contained "At Teague Poteet's," one of his best "cracker stories."

Mary Murfree's works, widely heralded as they were through the files of the **Atlantic Monthly**, were well-known to Toledo readers and to borrowers from the Library. Critical notices were written in a vein which implied considerable reader knowledge about the author and her works and her every literary skirmish was taken cognizance of in the public press. Constance Fenimore Woolson, though addicted to more than one literary region, was another of the writers to further the literary cause of the South. **Lake-Country Sketches** (1875) was followed with **Rodman the Keeper, Southern Sketches** (1880), **For the Major** (1883) and **East Angels** (1886). To precise geographical descriptions she added romantic action, often concerning newcomers to an area, the natives serving as colorful background. That Constance Woolson was known as an Ohio author gave her an added claim to the attention of local readers.

Thomas Nelson Page was among the later southern regionalists to be accepted, though his first success antedated that of Matt Crim, Will Harben, and Harry Stillwell Edwards. The Toledo Library acquired his works as fast as they were published, but most readers were already conversant with him through the periodicals. His reputation mounted steadily during the nineties as is apparent in the December 30, 1898 **Blade** notice: Emily Bouton speaks of his "exquisite short stories for which he has been warmly appreciated. That he has won success in Red Rock, no one will deny. He has put into it, so far as is possible, most of the qualities which made the charm of the short stories, and it has a vitality which must make it endure."

It was not long before Toledo readers were examining local-color materials from the Northeast as well as from the South. From New England two writers became well-established.

lished in the hearts of Lucas County readers: Mary Wilkins Freeman and Sarah Orne Jewett. The latter's activities spanned the period of the present volume. She began with *Deephaven* in 1877 and followed with **Country By-Ways** and **The Mate of the Daylight**. But her first general collection, **Tales of New England** (1879), and **A White Heron** really brought her fame. These volumes were purchased by those who had made a cursory acquaintanceship with her stories in the **Atlantic Monthly**.

Mary Wilkins Freeman was as steady a source of reading material as Jewett, though her manner was grimmer and her tales less essay-like in character. In more recent years almost every college student has made the acquaintance of "The Revolt of Mother," but in the nineties, her period of greatest popularity, there were no special favorites. All were esteemed, especially the stories in **A Humble Romance** and in **A New England Nun**. Isolated stories were printed during the nineties in the **Toledo Blade** and the **Evening Bee**, and she was proclaimed in 1897 as "one of the best delineators of New-England character who has ever attempted to show it through story-telling."

Local-colorists, however, were an ubiquitous lot, and they celebrated most regions of the United States. Their numbers included Gertrude Atherton, W. A. White, W. H. Bishop, C. W. Chesnutt, Frederick Remington, Sarah Greene, P. V. Mighels, Alice Brown, etc. etc., and the subject matter extended from Cape Cod to the sagebrush desert. Two may be singled out for notice. Mary H. Catherwood, after 1889 a celebrator of Canadian local-color, had quite a Toledo following, partly because of her Buckeye residence, partly because the setting of her earlier stories was mostly the Northwest Territory, and partly because of the critical acclaim of her "brilliance."

While Catherwood was championing northern scenes, Mary Halleck Foote was writing of Colorado, Idaho, and California and winning attention from rocking-chair travelers of the Lucas County area. **Led-Horse Claim** was early in the library and an 1884 issues of the **Toledo Evening Bee** recommended

to its readers her contributions to the new literature of the West.

Of the other local-colorists of general reputation, Rowland Robinson, Lillie Chase Wyman, Philander Deming, Esther Bernon Carpenter, Rose Terry Cooke, and Katherine MacDowell, we find little or no mention in the newspapers or correspondence of the period, and of this group only MacDowell was represented in the Library.

Toledo, however, fully succumbed to the local-color movement. Its magazines were full of local-color offerings, the daily and weekly press drew for feature contributions from this source, and the book notices never passed over either magazine or book creations in this field. Toledo followed, of course, the national taste in these matters, and though no local-color works sprang from this region, readers were enthusiastic in the main about regional stories and regional authors; they were ready to acclaim the dictum that he who would be truly national must be truly local.

2. Popular Novels and Novelists

But the books that most Toledoans read were in a class which we may call popular or entertaining. Universal favorite was Francis Marion Crawford, a story-telling artist with an aim to entertain. Almost once a year he greeted readers with a new title, sometimes in the *Saracinesca* series, and these, real in setting and presentation, displayed a great worldly knowledge, a powerful imagination plus a full measure of sentiment and dramatic movement. In consequence, Crawford, through his cosmopolitan experience and narrative power, was rated as second among American international novelists. If Toledoans did not get out their yardsticks to measure relative merits, they did consume Crawford in more than reasonable quantities.

Among the genuine entertainers was Frances Hodgson Burnett. Her *Little Lord Fauntelroy* (1886), highly popular,

proved even more famous as a tailor's model and mother's ideal than as an object of youthful emulation. Mrs. Burnett moved to London for a while and from that eminence offered two historical novels of Queen Anne's time, *A Lady of Quality* and *His Grace of Osmonds*. Her return to America and to her earlier manner in *In Connection with the De Willoughby Claim* was enthusiastically heralded. The story was "constructed with the most wonderful skill," so says a reviewer, and the only weak thing about it was the title.

Even more popular was Frank Stockton whose novels and short stories found their way into Toledo in the eighties. In 1884 the Toledo *Bee* (October 6) favorably reviewed "A Tale of Negative Gravity," and by 1891 the Library had four of his books. Of Stockton's novel, *The Great Stone of Sardis*, Emily Bouton remarked in late 1897: "There is but one Stockton, but one whose imagination can play such strange and always delightful pranks, and it has not failed this time." A year later she speaks of his "annual contribution for the entertainment of his world of admirers."

The novelists of entertainment were varied, of course. Some of them like Helen Hunt Jackson wrote novels of reform that proved so romantic as to permit the readers to forget their basic reforming zeal. *Ramona* is a case in point. Others like E. P. Roe gained thousands of readers with stories of love in which heroes, and especially heroines, were endowed with only enough body to house soul. His greatest fictional feat was perhaps utilizing the great Chicago fire as an agency to remove barriers to romance and marriage. His popularity continued down to 1910 and even later. Roe's and Burnett's romantic tales fed the same readers that European romanticists were also catering to—Ouida, Marie Corelli, M. E. Bradden, etc.

Scottish novelists of the kailyard school also proved great favorites in the nineties. The school was established with Barrie's popular *Window in Thrums* (1889). *The Little Minister* (1891) marked him as a successful novelist and a fifty-cent edition of 80,000 copies was disposed of shortly after the

book appeared. Early in 1893, Emily Bouton in a *Blade* column headed "Who is James Barrie" was remarking, "His name has become a familiar one only within the last five years." Three months later another reviewer remarked, "James M. Barrie has won for himself a name and fame that are lasting." Fellow Scotsman Ian Maclaren published in 1894 *Beside the Bonnie Briar Bush*, a volume which in the first year of publication was more widely sold than *The Prisoner of Zenda* of Anthony Hope. A New York publisher remarked wistfully: "We'd all be glad to have a good 'Kailyard' writer on our list."

The readers of Toledo were many times called impressionable, a characteristic held responsible for the strong impression which Maurier's *Trilby* and *Marcella* (1894) made upon the city and for the American popularity of Mrs. Humphrey Ward (whose fame was increased by her cisAtlantic tour) and Hall Caine, author of *The Manxman* and *A Son of Hagar*, both of whom were later referred to by Toledo reviewers as old favorites. The Sherlock Holmes stories of Arthur Conan Doyle, published first in 1891, brought his name to the attention of many readers, and the popular *Sign of the Four*, two years later, kept the public alert to his merits. A *Blade* list of the most successful novelists (January 2, 1897) included Mrs. Humphrey Ward, Conan Doyle, Harold Frederick, Samuel Crockett, Ian MacLaren, and Mrs. Steele. To this group a subsequent reviewer added the names of Elizabeth Phelps (on the strength of *A Singular Life*) and James Barrie (especially after *Sentimental Tommy*).

The end of the century saw two great outbursts of popular fiction. The first we may call the "B'Gosh" school and was representative of the rural areas. Opie Reid's *Jucklins*, a rustic piece, in a sense inaugurated the class, but two slightly disparate novels, read more as humor than fiction, really brought the provincial novel into its own. Westcott's *David Harum* (1898) and Bacheller's *Eben Holden* both introduced home-spun types of character. David was a small-town banker with a passion for horse trading. Eben was a genial philosopher, shrewd but good-natured, also with a love for hors-

es. Both books were highly conventional in plot and sentiment, factors which augmented rather than decreased their popular appeal.

The second outburst was the great and almost universal popularity of the costume romance, especially after 1896. Why was it that from the middle of the nineties for ten years there was so strong a romantic revival? There are many theories. One is the war with Spain with its staunch nationalism. In many circles its idealism made the romance of other heroic days extremely palatable. There was the journey to free a land. But all at once the bottom dropped out of the heightened war emotion. In a sense the generation was thwarted, for after a hundred days of fighting hostilities ceased and the great crusade was terminated. Readers, especially women, turned to historical romance to supply what the earthly scene could no longer furnish.

Equally important was the literary importation from overseas: the success of **Lorna Doone** ushered in a series of works that sought to bring their readers to an equally romantic elevation. Then the rise of sentimental romance (after the manner of the Scottish *Barrie*), the swashbuckling romance of *Crockett and Weyman*, and the ultra-romantic fiction of *Anthony Hope (Prisoner of Zenda)* prepared the way for the temporary reaction from realism in fiction. Then there was the advent of *Stevenson* who became the cynosure of all eyes. He was incurably romantic, strikingly popular—everywhere in America—and gave direction and stimulus to American writers and thrills and excitement to American readers. The American popularity of *Quo Vadis* and other favorites from the pen of *Sienkiewicz* was also a potent force in the romantic upheaval.

On the American scene there was one outstanding literary success that stimulated the production of more and more historical pieces. This was the *Ben Hur* of *Lew Wallace*. The thumping success of *Wallace's* novel did much to create a public demand for pieces in the romantic and historical mood, and as far as Ohio readers were concerned, his tour of the

area with his lecture, "How I came to Write Ben Hur" (in 1895) helped lift the previous 290,000 sale to new heights. His *Prince of India*, widely read, appeared after the movement was in full career.

The searchers for romance had a wide choice. Among the best sellers were S. Weir Mitchell's *Hugh Wynne*, a novel which bids fair to prove the only novel of the half-decade to survive, and Charles Major's *When Knighthood was in Flower* (not only the best seller of 1899, but also the model for swashbuckling romance). Other choices could be made from Morgan's *John Littlejohn of J.*, Mary Johnson's *Prisoners of Hope*, Chambers' *Lorraine and Ashes of Empire*, Anthony Hope's *The King's Mirror*, Max Pemberton's *The Garden of Swords*, L. Cope Cornford's *Sons of Adversity*, Hewlett's *The Forest Lovers*, and Crockett's *The Standard Bearer and Lockinvar*, of which Emily Bouton remarked, ". . . it is not a great story, but will not diminish his admirers, especially those who like the clash of arms mingled with the romance of love affairs." Crawford's *Via Crucis* came also into the historical category and was thus greeted in the *Blade*: "There is something more than strength in this story and this it has in abundance; but it is also polished in diction and with that article finish which gives one the impression of a perfect picture that needs nothing to make it complete." Certainly beyond this enthusiasm cannot go.

Not all the romantic materials were of recent origin, either American or English. The popular favorites of an older time were still before the public and were read by many who eschewed the modern offerings as weak, effete, or vulgar. Thus it was that people were reading Scott, Cooper, Dickens, George Eliot, and Thackeray; and the prevalence of sets of these writers in the older Toledo homes indicates a wide and eager reading class. The Toledo *Blade* even reprinted Scott's *Talisman* in the spring of 1889. There were not a few gentlemen and ladies of the old school who regarded any American fiction after Hawthorne and any English fiction after 1875, as trashy and unliterary. The greatest index of the persistence and reputation of these nineteenth-century fictional

giants was the regular announcement of new and popular editions of the authors. The extended references to the new edition of Thackeray in the late nineties is a good illustration of the public notice accorded these reissues.

Critical essays, in fact, were periodically written about the Victorians, early and late, even apart from club programs and special lectures. Two rival editions of Eliot's *Romola* appeared in 1891 and as late as 1894 parallels between George Eliot and William Shakespeare were being made, just as comparable comparisons between Scott and Shakespeare had been made fifty years before. By 1897, however, George Eliot's reputation was in a temporary decline in Toledo, though if one judge by magazine and other references there was no lessening of esteem for Victorian novelists in general. As Eliot's popularity waned somewhat, that of George Meredith mounted, or so we are to judge by the praise and wide notices given his *Lord Ormond* and his *Aminta* (1894) and *The Amazing Marriage* (1896). The naturalistic Victorian, Thomas Hardy, was not so enthusiastically received as his predecessors, especially after *Life's Little Ironies* (1894) and *Jude the Obscure* (1895). That his novels did not create an uproar was owing solely to the fact that they were read almost in a cultic sense, and their flagrant violations of decorum did not come to the attention of those who might have been most outraged. But even of the popular Victorians it cannot be said that they could vie in sales with Mrs. Alexander, and Mrs. Steele, or Marie Corelli; and Meredith's readers were outnumbered by the admirers of S. Baring-Gould.

3. The Realists.

The magazine readers of Lucas County, especially readers of the *Atlantic Monthly*, the *Century*, the *Critic*, etc., could not fail to be aware of the critical debate of the period, a debate which was a natural consequence of forces of conflict and change. Apart from the ferment of sectionalism and the disillusionment left by the Civil War there were other factors perceptible in almost every community which led to a rising

realism. There was the conflict for instance between a strict idealism, almost archetypal in character, and science. It created fine examples of its kind in the popular novels of William Dean Howells and the little-read novels of Henry James, in whose works there was a fusion of native material with the methods found in English and French novelists. Realism as an American movement began in an insistence upon verity, marked more by the assertion of what was not truth rather than a striking affirmation of what was. But as far as the literary scene was concerned the realistic movement, considered in its strictest sense, declined somewhat after 1887, when it split into two directions, the one toward an increasing subjectivity or impressionism, the other toward social protest. But whether readers took sides on the controversy or not, or even cared about the synthesis which it brought about of critical and scientific methods with the older ethical idealism, they were happy about the considerable number of near-great novels which it provided them.

Of the ebullient realists of the time, William Dean Howells won the greatest local and national acclaim. He was one of few novelists to be directly advertised in Toledo papers. In a page-ad in the *Commercial* (June 29, 1880) the publishers, Houghton-Mifflin, promoted all the Howells books, and a complete list, plus the 1880-1885 additions, was in the Toledo Library of 1886. *The Rise of Silas Lapham*, *A Modern Instance*, *Indian Summer*, *April Hopes*, *a Chance Acquaintance*, and others were briskly circulated. By 1891 *The Albany Depot*, *An Imperative Duty*, *Annie Kilburn*, *A Hazard of New Fortunes*, and *Criticism and Fiction* had been added. Howells was the period's most admired realist, although there were occasional critics who longed for excitement and romance instead of the analysis and case-study work which they found in his volumes.

Henry James was talked about in the public press and his stories were read by a handful of intellectual readers, but it is doubtful if any considerable number of James enthusiasts existed in the entire country. He was just on the eve of being more widely accepted when the appearance of his *The Awk-*

ward Age in the *Atlantic Monthly* drove readers the other way. References to him here and there indicate that he was regarded as strictly "for the elect."

Other realists (especially when primarily regionalists) enjoyed public favor. Hamlin Garland, local-colorist and veritist, was known through periodical and volume publication. Many who read his *Main-Traveled Roads* and *Other Main-Traveled Roads* did so with interest, but rejected his pictures as representative of farm life, at least farm life as it was known in the home-owned areas of Northwestern Ohio. Still, in announcing Garland's *Prairie Folks* (1893) the *Blade* could declare: "The name of the author . . . will assure readers of the interest of the stories and also that they mean something besides the mere narratives. Mr. Garland is always at home with the farmers of the great West, and he knows of what he is speaking."

As for the other intenser realists of the period, it is doubtful if they made much of a stir here. Occasionally Zola was attacked for his gutter pictures, but there was a generality in the abuse that suggests that the originals had not been read. Zola came to notice chiefly through the Zolaesque methods of Hardy or through association in 1898 with the notorious Dreyfus case. Even where there is suspicion of knowledge of his works, the critic was disposed to call Zola a sectarian: a figure of weariness and the pursuer of a fruitless philosophy. Comparably Lucasites were not ready to accept the impressionistic naturalism of Stephen Crane nor the amoral determinism of Norris (in McTeague).

The second phase of the realistic outlook was that of social protest. Toledo was introduced, in this vein, to such authors as Henry George, champion of the single tax, T. B. Aldrich, a staunch enemy of monopolies, John Hay, and Henry F. Keenan. In the late eighties Toledo also became aware of A. W. Tourgee, who was to apply "muscular Christianity" to economic problems. Tourgee's *An Appeal to Caesar* received a favorable review from the *Toledo Evening Bee* in 1884, and two years later the Library held seven of his books. In 1888

came the most famous of the social works, the famed **Looking Backward** of Edward Bellamy, which sold nearly a million copies within a decade. Brown, Eager, and Hull ran ads for it in 1889, and at least three reading clubs devoted programs to Bellamy's book in that year. Emily Bouton, speaking of the author five years later remarked: "His name became familiar in almost every household in his own country," and he "aroused a world of interest and discussion." His **Equality** was extensively reviewed in July, 1897.

The tremendous success of Bellamy directed the social novelists toward the Utopian reconstruction of society. At least some of the thirty-eight Utopian novels in America during the 1890's were known in Toledo; copies of Donnelly's **Caesar's Column**, Chauncey's **The Crystal Button**, Howells' **Traveler from Altruria** (1894) and Fuller's **A.D. 2000** have turned up with Toledo bookplates. The Toledo **Blade** of 1893 made available for ten cents a reprint of Bulwer-Lytton's **The Coming Age** and readers of the Saturday edition of the **Blade** in early 1895 made the acquaintance of one of the minor American novels in the Utopian category, W. H. Bishop's **The Garden of Eden, U.S.A.**, whose purpose was thus avowed by the author: I have "tried to show how a true Christianity and perfect frankness can exist side by side . . . Christian principles must be at the very foundation of any genuine social reform."

Social novels of big city life began to make their appearance in the same decade, a fact which has been lost sight of in the more recent concern with the small town. These assumed three approaches: severe criticism of the urban social climber, as in Boyesen's **Mammon of Unrighteousness** (1891) and Robert Grant's **Unleavened Bread**, criticism of blunted social consciences among the predatory women and men of Chicago, and attacks on the general callousness of the rising city plutocracy, illustrated in Fuller's **The Cliff-Dwellers** and Warner's **The Golden House**. The last named was characterized by Emily Bouton as a "charming story, marked with the usual excellence of the author's literary work." The theme of the industrial baron and of the in-

equalities of wealth was to receive more extended treatment after the century's end.

4. The Poetic Scene.

In poetry there was an above-average audience, and the Household and Cambridge editions of verse kept the established romantic poets, English and American, in considerable demand. Walter Scott, Cowper, Lord Byron, Tennyson, Browning, and Shelley were among the unquestioned overseas favorites along with the lesser voices of Felicia Hemans and Adelaide Proctor. Members of the New England School, from Whittier to Lowell, were highly popular, and the usual choice of friends who clung to the "flowers, bon-bons, or books" rule in gifts. This school was passing from the stage during this period, and the death of Holmes in the fall of 1894, following shortly after the deaths of Whittier, Parkman and Lowell, really marked the close of an epoch. The period of literature which these Concord and Cambridge authors made illustrious was over, though the volumes of reminiscences which followed helped to establish the sanctity of their reputations.

Longfellow died in 1882, the same year as his last published volume, though posthumous items were to spread over many succeeding years. Longfellow was popular enough in Toledo to have thirty-five different works in the Library of 1886, including his latest, *In the Harbor* (1882). February 27th, Longfellow's birthday, was frequently made the basis of special celebration. In 1888 that date occasioned a joint meeting of the Simpson and the Bryant Chautauqua Circles at which quotations from his works were recited and other tributes to his fame were offered. In 1894 a six-volume edition of his poems was added to the library. By that time his poetry had settled down to quiet acceptance, was excerpted in the school readers, sorted into standard quotation books and it provided stock material for study groups. He was praised as a masterly artist with a delicate ear and a sure sense of form.

Whittier also had adequate library representation and his name turned up frequently. The aura of his Civil War reputation still hung over him. This, combined with the notes of quiet piety and idyllic grace, made his fame secure for a generation. Despite his narrow technical range, readers found in his poetry a spiritual democracy and a sympathy with common life and all things human, that made it attractive. The appearance of Pickard's *Life* and the Cambridge edition of the *Complete Poetical Works* at the same time (1894) gave several years of increased vitality to his work. Oliver Wendell Holmes was represented by sixteen books in the library, including *The Iron Gate*, *The Life of R. W. Emerson*, and *Poems*. One of the Holmes' latest published poems was printed in the June 1, 1893 *Blade*, accompanied by an etching of the author and the comment: "His intellect is undimmed by passing years." All the New England authors were frequent subjects for lecture series and papers in the various literary organizations (especially after 1885). This was markedly true of Lowell, whose political pronouncements, public lectures, and literary criticism afforded a broad base for examination in political science as well as in strictly literary clubs.

Majors and Minors:



::: POEMS :::

BY

PAUL LAWRENCE DUNBAR

The best of the older poets were brought almost daily to the casual attention of Toledo newspaper readers through selected exchanges from a dozen cities. In addition, special columns called *Jewels of Thought*, *Scrap Basket*, *Brilliants*, *Poets' Corner*, etc., served up for the most inattentive choice passages from Shelley, E. B. Browning, Keats, Waller, Alice Cary, William Morris, Whittier, N. P. Willis, Low-

Title-page of Dunbar's second volume of verse published in Toledo in 1895 by Hadley and Hadley.

ell, Bryant, Longfellow, Shakespeare, Tennyson, Suckling, Dante, etc., besides minor and transitory verses printed from local contributors "by request." Local poetesses included among others, Mrs. M. A. Noteman (Maud Mirror), Elizabeth Blackwell, Margaret H. Lawless, Jeannie Paul, Mrs. Luella Smith, and Gertrude Clark.

A special local enthusiasm was that for the neighboring Michigan poet, Will Carleton. He seems to have been highly regarded in Toledo, at least in certain circles. One columnist wrote of him: "Will Carleton claims an attention which would be enthusiastic if half expressed, for Michigan people are justly proud of the poet of their state." Carleton's appeal, however, was of more than local dimensions: F. L. Pattee states that by 1912 more than six hundred thousand copies of Carleton's works had been sold. Explanation for this wide popularity may be found in the following *Blade* comment upon a new edition of the *Farm Ballads* (1898): "The tears lie very near the surface even today, when one reads over the familiar lines of 'Betsy and I are Out,' and 'How Betsy and I Made Up.'"

Another of the down-to-earth and non-academic poets popular in Toledo was James Whitcomb Riley. The fact that he came from a neighboring state and that his verses were simple and sentimental helped materially in evoking a wide audience. His vogue was national, but Lucas County reflected admirably the national judgment in Riley's case. His popularity was noticeable shortly after *The Old Swimmin' Hole* and *'Leven More Poems* (1883) appeared. Successive volumes were not only eagerly greeted but eagerly awaited. His great following can be accounted for, not only because he hit the intellectual level of his readers, but also because he furthered the sentimentality of Longfellow and the dialect of John Hay and Will Carleton.

Of certain poets, Whitman, Timrod, Crane, there was scant mention in Lucas County. (It is doubtful that Mayor Samuel Jones propensity for quoting Whitman enhanced the latter's popularity locally). Several Ohio authors received wide no-

tice, chiefly through local or state pride. This was true of Coates Kinney (author of "Rain on the Roof"), especially after his "Ohio Centennial Ode" (1888). Praised during the eighties was John James Piatt, self-styled poet of Ohio, who won attention with his "Idyls and Lyrics of the Ohio Valley," and "Western Windows." Almost universally acclaimed was Edith Thomas, once resident of Bowling Green. She was regarded locally and nationally as America's most famous woman poet, a title she retained beyond 1920; though she is not so highly esteemed today as then, she did not lose out to her erstwhile rivals, such as Emma Lazarus, Ina Coolbrith, Anna Botta, Emily Veeder, or Louise Moulton.

5. The Humorists.

By 1890 America's geographical frontier was practically at an end. But this did not end an interest in the West and things western. It actually added a nostalgic note to the zestful one earlier sounded. What constituted the West and its literary appeal is a broad topic. There were the western poems of Joaquin Miller with his "Kit Carson," "Last of the Taschatas," "The Missouri" and "Sunrise at San Diego." There were the later stories of Bret Harte, melodramatic and Dickensian, vivid but formula-ridden. There were the California and Nevada stories of Josephine Clifford and Jim Gally, of H. R. Mighels, genius of the sage-brush school. There were the southwestern stories of A. H. Lewis and Charles F. Lummis and the northwestern stories of Ella Higginson and Frank Wilson. But, in the main, these simply represented the local-color tradition. The West, especially in the eighties, was more graphically represented in the work of Mark Twain. *Roughing It* had supplied this Western atmosphere with broad humor, and *Life on the Mississippi*, both in serial and book form, had celebrated the heartland of the Old West. The first of these was Mark Twain's literary capitalization of the Nevada mining areas and a social study of the days of the Argonauts and the Overland Trail. To the recording of these interesting features in the life of the West he brought a discursive, hilarious, expansive spirit, represen-

tative of Western optimism, self-indulgence and breadth of speech. In "Old Times on the Mississippi" published in the **Atlantic Monthly** during the seventies, Twain gave a chronicle of an odd chapter in the history of American development. He portrayed with beauty the multi-colored life of the stately Mississippi from St. Louis to the Gulf. Further portrayal of the Mississippi appeared in **The Adventures of Tom Sawyer** and in **Huckleberry Finn**. These presented the river towns of Twain's own days and the river rascals who preyed upon gullible village residents of midstream America.

But if Mark Twain was read for his western materials, he was by his own generation more especially regarded as a humorist, one who, after Artemus Ward, had no peer in America. In the multiple devices of his first humorous success, **Innocents Abroad**, the vagrom exaggeration of **Roughing it**, the drollery of **A Tramp Abroad**, the faithfulness and at the same time the satire of his **Sketches Old and New**, Mark Twain had provided the means for setting his contemporaries laughing. Though he knew little of the modern short-story and of fictional construction in general, his greatness is not affected by such ignorance. He is a humorist in the large sense, as are Cervantes, Moliere, and Rabelais.

There was no period, however, when Twain's reputation was as high in Toledo as in the years immediately after his lecture appearance at the Wheeler House in 1884. On December 9th of that year Toledoans were notified by the **Evening Bee** of a coming appearance of Mark Twain:

The names of the distinguished humorists, Mark Twain and George W. Cable are familiar in every family throughout the land, and as writers and lecturers, in their original specialties, they stand at the head of their profession. On Monday next [December 15, 1884] they will appear at Wheeler's Opera House, and their many admirers in Toledo and vicinity will gladly embrace the opportunity of listening to them as they give their perfect rendering of some of their original characters.

According to the newspaper review the readings were quite successful:

These gentlemen [Twain and Cable] gave selections from their own works at the Opera House last evening before an appreciative audience, and the entertainment was thoroughly enjoyable throughout. Twain's quaint humor was irresistibly laughable while Cable's remarkable delineation of character was simply wonderful. His "Mary's Ride" was given with fine effect. Both gentlemen responded to encores.

It was probably because of his sustained reputation in the Toledo area that the Toledo Sunday **Commercial** ran Mark Twain's **The American Claimant** through issues of the winter and spring of 1892.

If the area was invariably amused by the sallies of Mark Twain, there were other professional humorists who produced uproarious effects. Prominent among these was Josh Billings. In 1870 the first of the famed **Farmers' Allminax** was published and it was issued annually for nine succeeding years. It sold 100,000 copies in the first two years. The **Allminax** contained a great variety of material, from prognostications and columns of dates to little essays and homely sayings. Simplified spelling undoubtedly contributed to Shaw's popularity, but the raciness of his lines and the homely wit were the real source of his appeal. Most of his volume publications were completed in the seventies, but **Josh Billings' Spice-Box** was issued as late as 1881. Those who disdained humor in volume form still absorbed the wisdom of his humorous aphorisms from the pages of the **Century Magazine** where he wrote under the name of Uncle Esek.

Bill Nye was known in Toledo in the mid-eighties, especially after his lecture appearance with James Whitcomb Riley. Among his book titles, despite the wide popularity of his **Forty Liars and Other Lies** (1882), Bill Nye was chiefly known in Toledo for his **Comic History of the United States** (1894). But long before its appearance the lecture platform and the

daily press had brought Nye home to a large class of readers. Take the Toledo papers, for example. In 1881 (July 7), the **Blade** carried an eleven-paragraph article by the humorist on the inconvenience of being bald-headed. Again in 1884 there was a humorous sketch on Archimedes by Nye. By 1890, Bill Nye's humorous articles, along with their equally humorous illustrations, appeared on the first page of many issues of the Toledo **Daily Commercial**. On July 13th that Journal published his adventures while visiting Jay Gould's farm. The humorous climax of the article is reached when Nye writes:

He [Jay Gould] said that he was glad to see me, for he wanted to tell me about a kind act which he did a year ago in secret, hoping that it would get into the papers before this, but had not.

David Ross Locke (one-time editor and publisher of the **Blade**) won fame as a Civil War satirist, but in the peaceful days that followed he lent effective aid to other causes as well, for he had a gift for ridicule that made him a real propagandic force. His satire took the form of letters by "Petroleum Vesuvius Nasby," a dissolute, illiterate, slavery-loving, political office-seeker, "Lait Paster uv the Church uv the Noo Dispensashun," whose career as a political jackal began in 1861, proceeded through a term as postmaster at "Confedrit X roads," and carried on as a Democratic camp-follower into the 1880's, when Locke finally sent him to Europe. His later books include **Eastern Fruit in Western Dishes** (1875), **A Paper City** (1878), and **Nasby in Exile** (1882). All his life Nasby was a newspaperman and it was in the press that he found his greatest number of readers. After 1878 he returned to the corners with an 1879-80 series in the **Saturday and Weekly Blade**, letters largely concerned with Pendleton's Greenback theory in Kentucky.

The Toledo **Blade** of 1881 carried a Nasby letter once a week, but the objects of humor and satire in this series were discovered in Europe. A July 2nd letter was on Englishwomen's big feet; two weeks later he was writing about London

lawyers, and still later on London advertising and street vendors. There were sixteen English essays in all. From October to December he had transferred his humor to Ireland and Scotland. The work appeared in book form in 1882. In the winter of 1887 the *Daily Blade* advertised reprints of *A Paper City* and *Hannah Jane* (originally 1882), and republished his *Parisian Sketches*. After Locke's death on Feb. 15, 1888, the posthumous printings included the novelette *Elsey Farm* and his *Strong Heart and Steady Hand*. In 1889 portions of the earlier "Abou Ben Adam" were reprinted, and Locke's political novel, *The Demagogue*, appeared during the autumn in Saturday issues. In late 1893 the *Blade* undertook a collection of all the earlier Nasby Letters still of interest to the general public, a volume containing over 500 pages and tendered it as a bonus for subscribers to the *Toledo Weekly Blade*. The staff announced that it was prepared to distribute 150,000 copies. The selections included the original Civil War series plus "Swing Round the Circle, the Greenback Theory, the Temperance Movement, and the Electoral Commission."

Other humorists may be mentioned in passing. There were several years of enthusiasm for the works of Jerome K. Jerome, the English writer, and in consequence there was ready market for his recollections (*Commercial* January, February, 1892). Most entertainers, however, were American and may be briefly glanced at. James M. Bailey and Robert J. Burdette were constantly referred to in private correspondence, and they had here and there very appreciative readers. Burdette was frequently quoted in Saturday or Sunday editions of the Toledo papers and made his second appearance on a Toledo platform on November 19, 1898. The "Samantha" books were offered by most booksellers, as were the writings of Alexander Sweet and J. A. Knox. The latter was liberally printed in the *Toledo Commercial* for 1891, Sunday editions. As well known as any of the foregoing was George W. Peck, with his immensely popular *Peck's Bad Boy and his Pa* (1885) which in popular editions was sold by mail-order houses and other vendors of reprint literature. By the mid-nineties new humorists appeared, including the Old Cattleman (A. H. Lewis), Stanley Huntley, and John Kendrick

Bangs, author of amusing magazine pieces, whose name upon the title-page "gave to all admirers of *The Cheerful Idiot* sufficient warrant that the book was funny." These men were popular in their periodical performances, which, incidentally, is the way humor should be enjoyed, for humor is at its best when diversified by other matters of literary concern, not when bulked by itself.

Consumption of humor was widely expanded in the late nineties. The death of Bill Nye in 1896 brought renewed attention to his works. A few months later the *Toledo Blade* stimulated humorous reading with four stories by Charles Bertrand Lewis and a little later printed his "Squan Creek Folks" (under the name of M. Quad), illustrated with drawings by E. W. Kemble. The series extended through the summer of 1897. The Spanish-American War the next year made possible a national audience for Mr. Dooley (Finley Peter Dunne), and not only provided one of the best fields for his observations, but mushroomed his reputation as well. He was quoted for a quarter of a century on topics which ranged from imperialism to women's rights and the vagaries of political parties. George Ade came into his own during the same period, though his *Fables in Slang* were satirical pieces as well as well-poised humor. These writers, laying no claims to literary form or standards, were appreciated by the man on the street.

6. History and Travel Literature.

In addition to humor, marked features of late nineteenth century literature were numerous excursions into the past and the distant. "Patience Prim" remarked in the *Toledo Bee* for July 19, 1890, that "at present, history, biography and travels are much more entertaining than all the fiction and poetry published, unless it be something especially good." This judgment may only record a lull in these other fields, but it certainly highlights the extensive body of history and travel which readers of the nineties consumed. Let us pay heed to the history first. Historical impact came from the

Personal Memoirs of U.S. Grant (1886) [which sold some 300,000 sets], from the writings of John Fiske (three titles), from Green's **Short History of the English People** and Howard Payson Arnold's **Historical Sidelights**. Historical research and investigation occupied, in fact, the minds of many scholars. Between 1889 and 1895 three scholars, Justin Winsor, Henry Adams, James Schouler, either completed or began bulky histories of the United States, and their joint products constituted major achievements in American historical writing. The death of Francis Parkman on November 7th, 1893, brought renewed attention to his works, especially to his later volumes such as **Montcalm and Wolfe** (1884) and **A Half-Century of Conflict** (1892). Woodrow Wilson, who arrived with **Division and Reunion** (1893), expressed his political philosophy in **An Old Master and Other Political Essays** (1893). More popular material was apparent in Theodore Roosevelt's **The Winning of the West** (1889-96). The publication of two books—**Influence of Sea Power upon History** (1890) and **Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire** (1892), by A. T. Mahan, an American naval officer, created a stir in naval circles and brought acclaim to their author in European circles as well as at home.

Patience Prim's comments previously quoted applied with even greater force to travel literature. The **Scribner's Magazine** of 1893 spoke of the national "fashion for novelty and remoteness" and noted the effect which the ideal of the exotic was having even on fiction itself: "the only sure proof of original genius in a novel or a poem is that it gets from home at least as far as Kurdistan." The writer went on to predict the rapid exhaustion of such materials: "With travelers pure and simple, historians, scientists, philosophers, merchants, missionaries, all working at it, as well as novelists and poets, the freshness must get rubbed off of every foot of the globe by a day not inconsiderably remote. Within the last three or four years it has got pretty well removed from Japan, upper India, southern Africa, and the islands of the South Sea."

But the magazine and book readers of 1890-1895 would

not have joined in these forebodings: in the great quartet of magazines, **Scribner's**, the **Century**, the **Atlantic Monthly**, and **Harper's**, travel essays were all the vogue. Every issue had to supply an article or two. A few titles will suggest the volume and the range: Josiah Royce, "Impressions of Australia;" G. M. Grant, "New Zealand;" Bigelow and Millet, "From the Black Forest to the Black Sea;" E. H. and E. W. Blasefield, "Afloat on the Nile;" Percival Lowell, "Noto: an Unexplored Corner of Japan"; Harriet Preston, "A Provencal Pilgrimage;" Joseph and E. R. Pennell, "Play and Work in the Alps"; Gilbert Gaul, "Personal Impressions in Nicaragua;" George Woodberry, "The Taormina Note-book;" Alfred Weston, "From Spanish Light to Moorish Shadow;" and J. W. White, "A Summer in the Scillies."

The newspapers in their Saturday or Sunday editions also tried to supply their quota of travel material in the same half-decade. The **Toledo Commercial**, for instance, purchased considerable syndicated travel material in the year 1892. One series of articles by Frank G. Carpenter on Mexico extended over several weeks. The **Wanderings** of Edgar L. Wakeman, which began in July, 1891, ran the greater part of a year and covered the British Isles along with selected areas of Western Europe. A syndicated Paris letter by Paul de Barsac appeared from time to time during the same season, and sections of a later book by Lafcadio Hearn also were columnized: "My First Day in the Orient," and "A Pilgrimage to Enoshima." Robinson Locke's "Days and Nights in Old Japan" ran through the 1893 Saturday issues of the **Blade**; and in the summer of 1893, William H. Maher's "A Winter Trip to Mexico" was running in the columns of the **Toledo Bee**.

Many of the travel accounts came out directly as books. In Toledo, H. Plessner and Company printed as a subscription book, William M. Thayer's **Marvels of the New West**, and were seeking in 1890 for agents for this and other releases. The same year from Eastern presses came Thomas Steven's **Africa** and Robert Stanton's **Through the Grand Canyon of the Colorado**. Sir Edwin Arnold's famous **Japonica** (Scrib-

ner's) went into book form in 1891 and was widely read. Two years later R. H. Davis's book of travels in the Levant made its appearance in New York, and stay-at-home travelers were consuming Edwin Lord Week's narrative of his journey across Persia and Henry M. Field's **The Barbary Coast**. In 1894 John Muir collected from the periodicals his **Mountains of California**, which, though no travel-book, technically appealed to the same class of readers. Japan came back into view with Henry Norman's **The Real Japan** (1894) and with two publications of Lafcadio Hearn which stirred the hearts of romantic readers: **Glimpses of Unfamiliar Japan** (1894) and **Out of the East** (1895). In 1897 came Ira Morris's **With the Trade Winds**, F. Hopkinson Smith's **Gondola Days**, and Dr. Nansen's **Farthest North**, portions of which were extensively summarized in the **Blade**. Later travel books included, among others, Henry Landor's **In the Forbidden Land** (Tibet—1898), and Captain Guy Burrow's **The Land of the Pygmies** (1899).

Locally, apart from the newspapers, there was special stimulus for the reading of travels. In the winter of 1892 Major H. C. Dane lectured on "London, the Marvelous." Frank G. Carpenter, brilliant writer on geographical subjects, lectured in 1895 in Memorial Hall on Japan and Korea. Two years later Superintendent of Toledo Schools, H. W. Compton, graphically described from the same platform Switzerland and the Alps. The same year Louise Ransom delivered a series of travel lectures in the city, the success of which led to a Jamestown, N. Y., engagement the following summer. The inimitable Burton Holmes began by 1897 his half-century program of travelogues. The last five years of the nineteenth century saw local clubs exclusively devoted to travel old and new: the Travel Club, the Tourist Club of Lower Town, the West End Tourist Club, the Ramblers, the Columbian Reading Club (studied Scotland in 1896; Germany, 1897), and the Ramblelist Club. Last to be organized was the Americans Aboard Club which had fortnightly meetings in 1898 and after.

7. Literary Clubs and Study Groups.

A picture of literature in Northwestern Ohio would be incomplete without some notice of literary clubs and study groups. A writer in 1897 with vigorous local pride declared that Toledo had more cultural clubs than any other city in the United States. Whatever be the truth of the statement, there were in that year fifty literary clubs, with forty of these carrying on work in the fields of art, travel, political science, literature, history, and theosophy, without counting debating societies, Y.W.C.A. classes, King's daughters circles, Business Women's Clubs, and Chautauqua circles. The last named continued beyond the end of the century. The movement of adult education known as the Chautauqua circle was inaugurated in 1878 by Dr. J. H. Vincent, and by 1889 there were at one time 60,000 persons in classes in the United States. The first Toledo circle, the Bryant, was organized in 1881. Three others, the Simpson, St. John's and Washington Irving were organized in 1887 and the Vincent in the year following. The four-year study program was largely based on outline plans in the Chautauquan magazine. Meanwhile independent literary clubs made their appearance. The oldest, the New Century Club, went back to 1879. Others, the Monday Night Reading Club, the West End Reading Club, the Holley Circle, the Englewood Reading Circle, the H.D.'s and the Ladies' Shakespeare Club all appeared in the last half of the eighties, but only the last named continued without reorganization into the nineties.

The fifty-odd clubs of 1897 had some 1800 members. Two, Philalethian and Desmothenian, were high school clubs; the rest, except one, were for adults. The exception was the Eight O'clock Club for young people outside high school. An informal group, Friends in Counsel (1889), devoted to the reading of Shakespeare, became in 1894 the Eight O'Clock Club, under which name it continued its activities. After reorganization the club devoted itself to the study of American authors from Edwards to Longfellow, with an occasional evening devoted to British authors of the eighteenth and

nineteenth centuries. The 1898-99 season was primarily on American history.

Among the earliest clubs in the field was the Columbian Reading Club, organized in 1892. Antedating it (and in second place after the New Century) was the Emerson Club organized in 1888. While the main purpose of the club was expressed in the name and the fortnightly meetings were usually devoted to one of Emerson's works, parallel subjects, such as Goethe, Schiller, Carlyle, Thoreau, and Browning came into course of study. A second Emerson Club, because of Wednesday morning sessions called the Morning E. Club, followed the same aims and purposes as its predecessor (thereafter called the First Emerson Club), though going as far afield as Swineburne, Rossetti, and apposite nineteenth century figures. The Ladies' Literary League, or the Jolly Twelve, was also early in the field, since they were celebrating their sixth anniversary in October of 1898. The 1896 Literary Club in the main studied prominent romantic literary figures like Hugo, Irving, Bryant, Stowe, Taylor, Lowell, etc., but devoted the winter of 1899 to the Elizabethan Age. Other clubs of a literary character included the Tuesday Reading Circle, the Shakespeare Club, the Philomathean (East side), the Review and Topic Club (with occasional literary interests), Beacon Light Reading Club, and elocution classes devoted to Shakespeare and Dickens. In the late decade two new clubs appeared, the Studious Sixteen, devoted in the 1898 season to the study of American authors, and the Clionian Club which followed the standard program of English and American Victorian authors, Browning, Longfellow, etc.

Study classes also included [Miss] Bigelow's Travel classes and those of Miss Dickinson who conducted sporadic literary sessions for the decade beginning in October, 1889. Esther Jennings scheduled after 1894 a series of lectures each year called **An Hour with Authors**. The repertoire included Victorian poets (especially Tennyson), Victorian prose masters (Ruskin, Carlyle), the Concord School, etc. In late 1898 she appeared before other clubs, the Unity, the Wo-

men's Educational, etc., and gave an abbreviated series of her own (Spring, 1899) on the life, works, and philosophy of Robert Browning.

8. Literary Events.

Of literary events of the Toledo area during the quarter century only a chance item here and there can be noticed or given space. Beginning should be made, however, with notice of the establishment, by vote of Council, June 24th, 1873, of the Toledo Public Library with property transferred from the Toledo Library Association, including 4878 books. Located in the King Block, corner of Summit and Madison, the Library occupied its second-floor quarters until June 23, 1890. In 1877 one of the earliest Toledo literary clubs, the Essay Club, made its appearance and flourished for a half decade. In 1879 the first important history of American Literature (to 1765), by an Ann Arbor professor, Moses Coit Tyler, was extensively reviewed in the Toledo *Blade* and a week later Chambers' *Cyclopaedia of English Literature* was given equal notice. These should jointly have served to call reader attention to the immense literary riches in the English language. Early the same year Huneker's Bookstore, 127 Summit Street, advertised Best Books at Half-Price, and the *Blade* in February and March was selling 50,000 copies of publisher's remainders at one-half price, joint offerings which should materially have increased private library holdings. Also in 1879 the dramatization of Frances Whicher's *Widow Bedott Papers* was completed by Toledoan David R. Locke and had a premiere performance in Providence, Rhode Island, which Locke attended. The leading role was taken by Neil Burgess, impersonator of female parts. The play was taken into the Mid-West in the following autumn, and was produced in Toledo with the same cast before going on to New York in March, 1880. Locke thus appeared for the sole time in his career as a successful dramatist.

In 1880 the *Blade* Publishing Company was offering as a subscription book *Andersonville*, by John McElroy, which had

run in the **Blade** the year before. It was vended from house to house by brisk young canvassers and sold 600,000 copies. In 1883 the Critic took a vote among its readers, which included some Toledo subscribers, for nominations of living authors to a mythical American Academy and tallied votes of the highest forty. Among the living authors (Longfellow was dead the year before) the readers rated the first thirteen as follows: Holmes, Lowell, Whittier, Bancroft, Howells, Curtis, Aldrich, Harte, Cable, James, Mark Twain, C. D. Warner, and Henry Ward Beecher.

Meanwhile literary men made visits to the city, either to the platform of Memorial Hall, to the Music Hall, to Ashland Baptist Church, or to Wheeler Opera House. Take the 1882-83 season as representative. S. S. Hammil, author of a speech text gave literary readings on August 15, 1882 at the G.A.R. Hall. Robert Ingersoll appeared the same year on November 7th, in Music Hall, and George R. Wendling followed two months later with a lecture on Voltaire. Professor R. L. Cumnock, teacher of rhetoric and elocution at Northwestern University gave readings, dramatic and humorous, on February 14, 1883.

Cable and Twain were here in 1884 (see above), Bill Nye and James Whitcomb Riley in 1886, Burdette in 1887. On March 26, 1888 T. J. Sheppard (chaplain of Andersonville) spoke on "What I Saw at Andersonville," and one week later, Dr. J. H. Vincent, originator of the Chautauqua movement, lectured on "The After Boy and his Friends." In 1881 the Toledo Press Club inaugurated an evening of varied entertainment (including humorous or political speeches) which continued annually to the end of the century. The special attraction for 1888 was ex-President R. B. Hayes. The winter of 1889 brought famed inspiration speakers to the city. On February 6, 1889 Russell Conwell made his first appearance in the city with his "Acres of Diamonds," a lecture which made such an impression on the reporter that a full-column reproduction in fine print was accorded it. On April 10, 1889, T. DeWitt Talmadge, whose sermons had been running once a week in the **Blade**, lectured to an overflow house at the

Wheeler on "Big Blunders," a speech at once inspirational and humorous.

Other speakers came to Toledo under the auspices of the Eight O'Clock Club, special subscription groups, or the Y.M.C.A. (the Star Course). The latter agency was responsible for the appearance of Edwin Arnold, author of *Light of Asia* and *Japonica*, who was regarded as the literary sensation of 1891, and was advertised in the press as "one of the greatest poets of the century."

In 1889 Emily S. Bouton contributed a number of weekly literary sketches to the *Blade* both in and out of her department called Literary Patchwork. These were usually a column in length and included, among others, Louisa Alcott, J. D. Buck, Margaret Sangster, Miss Booth, Ella Wheeler Wilcox, Constance Fenimore Woolson, J. A. Froude, F. Marion Crawford, Julia Ward Howe, Louise M. Alcott, Frances E. Willard, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, Ouida, Frances Burnett, Susan B. Anthony, and Harriet Beecher Stowe. In 1890 the Toledo Library, costing \$85,000, was opened at Madison and Ontario, directly on the site of the old Miami-Erie Canal which had been abandoned two years before. The library housed in its first year in the new quarters 29,838 books, a number which grew to 50,552 in 1903. Its circulation was high, too. Three years before, with a collection of 22,777, it was 452 percent. In the years 1889-91, the Centennial (of Marietta) edition of Howe's *Historical Collections* was published at Columbus, with extensive copies going to Toledo purchasers. In the winter of 1891-92 a dozen merchants through a purchase-coupon system were making available for their customers the latest edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. In the autumn of 1893, Emily Bouton presented in the *Blade* a series of biographical sketches of literary personalities, sketches which included, in part, Miriam Coles (famed author of *Rutledge*), Mary Mapes Dodge, Mrs. Margaret Oliphant, General Lew Wallace, Margaret Deland, Amelia Rives, Mrs. A. D. T. Whitney, etc.

In the first four years of the decade Shakespeare was a

recurrent subject of study and lecture, both in Ladies' Shakespeare Clubs and in special classes and programs. Frances Carter, instructor in Delsarte elocution at Smead school, gave frequent Shakespeare readings throughout the city. From 1891 to 1893, Dr. Craven conducted Shakespeare classes, and in November of 1893 Professor Demmon of Ann Arbor gave a series of lectures at the High School on Shakespearean topics. Lectures on Shakespeare had occurred frequently in the preceding fifteen years, but the interest seems to have culminated in a special outburst in the first half of the nineties.

In 1893 the **Blade** made arrangements for a series of reprints of modern classics, to be distributed with three coupons and a slight mailing charge. These paper-backs included mostly English and American works and ran to a total of twenty: There were two works by Donald Grant Mitchell (*Ik Marvel*), four by Hawthorne, and striking single offerings like Barrie's *Tillyrose Scandal*, Aytown's *Lay of the Scottish Cavaliers*, Owen Meredith's *Lucille*, Ann Sewell's *Black Beauty*, de Saint Pierre's *Paul and Virginia*. Oliver Schreiner was represented by both *The Story of an African Farm* and *Dreams*. Also in 1893 the **Blade** contracted for a series of famous short stories, at the rate of one a week, a program continued sporadically through the rest of the decade. That year a Spring Poetry contest was held which brought numerous entries but unearthed no Wordsworths. The paper was not encouraged to repeat the experiment in subsequent years.

Meanwhile the lecture schedule continued at a normal pace. John Fisk was at Memorial Hall, Feb. 22, 1892, and a year later reappeared for a week's series which included "Alexander Hamilton, the boy," and "Jackson's Administration." On March 2nd, 1893, James Whitcomb Riley, proclaimed "the sweetest of all American singers," made a return trip to Toledo under the auspices of the Press Club. He was here (and in Ann Arbor) again in October, 1898, on which occasion the **Blade** (October 22nd) printed an extensive interview. Lew Wallace was in town (February 2, 1895) and

lectured to a crowded hall. His *Ben Hur* had by that time already reached a sale of 290,000, a number augmented day by day. From 1894 to 1898 Leon H. Vincent (author of *American Literary Masters*) appeared each May at the Smead School for a series of literary lectures, that in 1897 being devoted to the study of the Victorian Novel from Reade to Gissing.

Through much of the decade the Toledo *Blade* conducted a regular review column digesting and criticising new magazines and books. This column was ably conducted by Emily Bouton who was equally at home in the field of poetry, essays, short stories, and novels. She was the best known woman journalist of her time. The *Bee* and the *Blade* vied with each other, especially as the decade went on, in furnishing full-length novels in weekly Saturday installments. Novels in this medium (not elsewhere mentioned) appeared at the rate of about four a year for each publication and included among others, *A Dazzling Scheme* by Will Lisenbee, *The Fair Virginian* by David Lowry, *The Emigrant Ship* by Clark Russell, *Easy Nat* by A. L. Stimson, *Golden Rock*, by Ernest Glenville, *The Stolen Stradivarius*, by Mrs. Burton Harrison, *The Clock Struck One* by Fergus Hume, *The Day of Temptation*, by William Le Queux, *Lost Man's Lane*, by Anna Green, *Found in the Philippines*, by G. Charles King, etc., etc.

During the quarter century we have reviewed, it has been apparent that the reading tastes of Toledoans reflected the national pattern, partly because Toledo was no teeming center of independent creative activity but chiefly because Toledoans as ardent magazine readers were subjecting themselves to one of the greatest forces for cultural integration in the nation. This force, moreover, became more potent as the century advanced, for in the decade from 1890 to 1900 the number of magazine readers expanded nationally from 250,000 to two million. Toledo shared in this expansion.

One other representative aspect the local scene afforded: the addiction of the mass of readers to newspapers. These, in turn, sought to guide and satisfy reader demands. The

Weekly Blade, a national publication with thousands of readers was a kind of literary miscellany, furnishing essays, beauty and success hints, travel sketches, short stories, humor and full-length novels; and after 1885 the daily papers incorporated more and more of such materials. The weekend editions of the **Commercial** and the **Blade** jumped from eight pages to sixteen and twenty in the attempt to supply advice on fashions, culinary art, and literary tendencies as well as a liberal offering of modern creative work. Thus the taste for magazine materials was in part supplied by the newspaper publishers.

Toledo produced very few important writers during the quarter century, though local printers were active as publishers: The Blade Publishing Company; H. Plessner and Company; Brown, Eager and Hull; and Hadley and Hadley (printers of Dunbar's **Majors** and **Minors**). David R. Locke was Toledo's unquestionably national figure, but there was a small number of short-story writers (Elizabeth Ayres, Florence Huntley, Horace N. Allen, and Alfred Roy Trader) and versifiers like Kate Brownlee Sherwood who satisfied their own ambitions, aroused considerable local interest, and were sometimes known beyond the boundaries of Northwestern Ohio.

Thus literary matters stood when the century came to a close. We pause at 1900 in our story only because this is a convenient date to stop. Literature with its strong organic bonds does not halt with round numbers. The story will be resumed later in recognition that life and the criticism of life is one continual progress.

Hannah Jane

PETROLEUM V. NASBY

She isn't half so handsome as when, twenty years ago,
At her old home in Piketon, Parson Avery made us one;
The great house crowded full of guests of every degree,
The girls all envying Hannah Jane, the boys all envying me.

Her fingers then were taper, and her skin as white as milk,
Her brown hair—what a mess it was! and soft and fine as silk;
No wind-moved willow by a brook had ever such a grace,
The form of Aphrodite, with a pure Madonna face.

She had but meagre schooling; her little notes to me
Were full of crooked pot-hooks, and the worst orthography:
Her "dear" she spelled with double *e*, and "kiss" with but one *s*;
But when one's crazed with passion, what's a letter more or less?

She blundered in her writing, and she blundered when she spoke,
And every rule of syntax, that old Murray made, she broke;
But she was beautiful and fresh, and I—well, I was young;
Her form and face o'erbalanced all the blunders of her tongue.

I was but little better. True, I'd longer been at school;
My tongue and pen were run, perhaps, a little more by rule;
But that was all. The neighbors round, who both of us well knew,
Said—which I believe—she was the better of the two.

All's changed: the light of seventeen's no longer in her eyes;
Her wavy hair is gone—that loss the coiffeur's art supplies;
Her form is thin and angular; she slightly forward bends;
Her fingers, once so shapely, now are stumpy at the ends.

She knows but very little, and in little are we one;
The beauty rare, that more than hid that great defect, is gone.
My *parvenu* relations now deride my homely wife,
And pity me that I am tied to such a clod for life.

I know there is a difference; at reception and levee,
The brightest, wittiest and most famed of women smile on me;
And everywhere I hold my place among the greatest men;
And sometimes sigh, with Whittier's Judge, "Alas! it might have been."

When they all crowd around me, stately dames and brilliant belles,
And yield to me the homage that all great success compels,
Discussing art and state-craft, and literature as well,
From Homer down to Thackeray, and Swedenborg on "Hell,"

I can't forget that from these streams my wife has never quaffed,
Has never with Ophelia wept, nor with Jack Falstaff laughed;
Of authors, actors, artists—why, she hardly knows the names;
She slept while I was speaking on the *Alabama* claims.

The Toledo Literary Scene, 1875-1900

I can't forget—just at this point another form appears—
The wife I wedded as she was before my prosperous years;
I travel o'er the dreary road we travelled side by side,
And wonder what my share would be, if Justice should divide.

She had four hundred dollars left her from the old estate;
On that we married, and, thus poorly armored, faced our fate.
I wrestled with my books; her task was harder far than mine—
'Twas how to make two hundred dollars do the work of nine.

At last I was admitted; then I had my legal lore,
An office with a stove and desk, of books perhaps a score;
She had her beauty and her youth, and some housewifely skill,
And love for me and faith in me, and back of that a will.

I had no friends behind me—no influence to aid;
I worked and fought for every little inch of ground I made,
And how she fought beside me! never woman lived on less;
In two long years she never spent a single cent for dress.

Ah! how she cried for joy when my first legal fight was won,
When our eclipse passed partly by, and we stood in the sun!
The fee was fifty dollars—'twas the work of half a year—
First captive, lean and scraggy, of my legal bow and spear.

I well remember when my coat (the only one I had)
Was seedy grown and threadbare, and, in fact, most shocking bad;
The tailor's stern remark when I a modest order made:
"Cash is the basis, sir, on which we tailors do our trade."

Her winter cloak was in his shop by noon that very day;
She wrought on hickory shirts at night that tailor's skill to pay;
I got a coat, and wore it; but alas! poor Hannah Jane
Ne'er went to church or lecture till warm weather came again.

Our second season she refused a cloak of any sort,
That I might have a decent suit in which t' appear in court;
She made her last year's bonnet do, that I might have a hat:
Talk of the old-time, flame-enveloped martyrs after that!

No negro ever worked so hard; a servant's pay to save,
She made herself most willingly a household drudge and slave.
What wonder that she never read a magazine or book,
Combining as she did in one nurse, housemaid, seamstress, cook.

What wonder that the beauty fled, that I once so adored!
Her beautiful complexion my fierce kitchen fire devoured;
Her plump, soft, rounded arm was once too fair to be concealed;
Hard work for me that softness into sinewy strength congealed.

I was her altar, and her love the sacrificial flame:
Ah! with what pure devotion she to that altar came,
And, tearful, flung thereon—alas! I did not know it then—
All that she was, and more than that, all that she might have been!

The Belated Advocate of Ottawa Rights

Cha-no: Charloe the Speaker

By Robert F. Bauman

Cha-no, a Maumee Valley Ottawa Chief, often referred to as **Charloe the Speaker**, apparently represents the only Ottawa who could be distinguished primarily as an expert and noted spokesman for that nation. At least that is the only position for which this chief is remembered, and no other Ottawa is noted solely for that particular activity. In fact, it was because of a lack of individuals capable of matching wits with negotiators, orators, and advocates of the British, American and the provident Huron-Wyandot Nation that the Ottawas of northwestern Ohio, whose lands extended into Michigan and Ontario, suffered great losses throughout the land-cession era. The period giving birth to the great wave of Indian treaties aimed at securing cessions of land, following the Treaty of Greenville of 1795, was an era for which an efficient and aggressive intercessor was a dire need for each Indian Nation. The very nature of these treaties, oft times following an Indian setback and generally seeking the participation of tribes most favorable to the Government's desires, demanded that the tribes be always alert and capable of forcibly stating their position and their rights in respect to the particular tract of land then within the eager sights of the surveyor's instrument.

The Ottawa and the Huron-Wyandot of Ohio provide the sharpest contrast of tribal treaty participation for this region. The Huron-Wyandot were generally a party to the earliest pre-treaty negotiations; the Ottawa seldom concerning themselves until the actual treaty days. The Huron-Wyandot were often favorable to the proposed treaty, or at least strategically willing to negotiate; the Ottawa seldom being more than mere passive participants. The Huron-Wyandot utilized their

own interpreters and often spokesmen who required none; the Ottawa consistently had to depend upon interpreters supplied by the Government. And, most important, the Huron-Wyandot always able to come forth with extremely aggressive and capable advocates, while the Ottawas would send various unqualified and uninformed war and village chiefs.

It is only natural that under such circumstances the Ottawa would have fared very poorly when unknowingly thrust into competition with the Huron-Wyandot in treaties to secure the relinquishment of the "Indian's land", as the government would designate it. But to add to this situation, the Ottawa were basically attached to the Canadian interest, and apparently were either incapable, or unwilling to exercise political expediency in the white man's contest involving war, treaty and cessions of land, as were their neighbors the Huron-Wyandot. An examination of the various 19th century treaties concerning the northwestern Ohio lands, as well as treaties in respect to the Ontario area, well illustrates the outcome of the Ottawa disadvantage of inadequate representation at the treaties in which they were indirectly forced to match abilities with the masterful proponents of the Huron-Wyandot.

It is not contended that the Ottawa absolutely lacked good leadership, for one need not search far to uncover excellent examples of war and village chiefs of outstanding abilities. Such individuals as Mickinak (Mickinac) of the early 18th century, Pontiac of the middle of that century, Augoosh-away (E Gouch-eouay) prominent during the last quarter; and, numerous 19th century chiefs such as Little Otter, Ogonse, Kin-jo-i-no, Ottokee, Wauseon and Pe-ton-i-quet, all represent Ottawa chiefs from the Maumee Valley tribe possessing outstanding qualities and abilities for leadership.¹ However, it can not be said that any one of these chiefs could be properly classed as outstanding orators, as capable advocates of Ottawa rights in respect to inter-tribal relations and land claims; or, as the designated spokesman or dedicated Ottawa representative. The great diversity in Ottawa signatories for the various treaties emphasizes this

fact. The Ottawa failed to produce a counterpart to Tarhe of the Wyandot, or Logan of the Mingo until too late to protect their rights. This was brought to light by the enlightened, although belated, protests and complaints of Cha-no.

1. Charlo the Speaker

The only Ottawa chief who could be rightfully designated as a true tribal advocate was one appearing too late to do his nation much good, and his protests generally went unheralded. This was Cha-no, a young chief living on the Auglaize River, and becoming prominent during the late 1820's and the 1830's. Cha-no has not been selected as the subject of this article because of his biographical possibilities, but rather because of his leadership among the Maumee Valley Ottawa in that tribe's last and most forceful attempt to present their rights and claims to lands which had been purchased by the Government at gross injustice to his people. Cha-no was the source of several memorials in behalf of the Ottawa protesting the unjust claims and cessions by the Huron-Wyandot of land, both in Canada and in the United States, which traditionally belonged to either the Ottawa, or the Lake Confederacy consisting of the Ottawa, Chippewa and Pottawatomi. One of these memorials written in 1829, provides the basis of this article, and will subsequently be presented in entirety since it very capably, although somewhat dramatically, presents the Ottawa and Lake Confederacy position; and, at the same time, provides an excellent example of the abilities of Cha-no. Prior to presenting the memorial, however, a brief sketch of the Ottawa Chief Cha-no will perhaps prove of interest.

2. Treaty Participation and Local Significance.

As has been mentioned, Cha-no appeared as a leader too late to have participated in the numerous inter-tribal and Indian-white wars; and, consequently too late to have been active in the major treaties between the Indians and the Gov-

ernment. As a result, little information in the biographical sense is available.

Cha-no participated in only two treaties, both being based upon the Removal Act of 1830,² and involving only a few small reservations in Ohio. In the Treaty of 1831 he was designated as **Os-cha-no, or Charle**; and, in the Treaty of 1833, his name appeared as **She-no and Che-no**.³ He was also a signator to Ottawa annuity receipts of 1819, 1820, 1829 and 1830, on which his name appeared as **Cha-no, Shano and Chano**.⁴ Such is apparently the extent to which this chief participated in official government transactions.

Colonel Dresden W. H. Howard, one of the Ottawa's most trusted white friends and an interpreter for the Ottawa of the Maumee, recorded the name as **Charlow**, and stated that the Chief lived on the Auglaize and Blanchard Rivers.⁵ And, Rev. Cutting Marsh, a missionary among the Maumee Valley Ottawa in 1829-30, when listing the leading Ottawa chiefs of that era, included the following designation for this chief: **Sha-no, Charles the Speaker**.⁶ In a speech presented in behalf of the Chippewa Indians, Cha-no was referred to as "the principal Speaker."⁷

The significance of Cha-no locally is emphasized by Galbreath, Howe, Slocum and other Ohio historians. In the **History of Ohio**, Charles Galbreath included the following in respect to Paulding County;

The original county seat was Charloe, on the Auglaize River and Maimi extension Canal, twelve miles south of Defiance. It was platted about 1840 and was never more than a mere hamlet. It was named for a very eloquent Indian Chief.⁸

Henry Howe, in the **Historical Collections of Ohio**, furnished a similar description of the chief:

Charloe, the county seat, is on the Auglaize river & Miami Extension canal, 137 miles NW of Columbus, and

12 miles south of Defiance. It was laid out about the year 1840, and contains a few families only. Ockenox's town stood on the site of Charloe—so called from a chief who resided there, and who was reputed an obstinate, cruel man. The village, later, was called Charloe—from an Ottawa chief, distinguished for his eloquence and sprightliness in debate.⁹

Cha-no's village was apparently contiguous to the old village of Oquanoxa, and later within the reservation secured for the Ottawa on the Auglaize. Lewis C. Aldrich, who referred to the chief as Shar-low, stated that his village was of less importance than the others, but governed by "a very wise chief, and a great friend of the white settlers."¹⁰

3. Leader in Indian Resistance to Removal.

Although the Ohio Ottawa had lost the last small parcels of tribal land by the treaties of 1831 and 1833, they remained obstinate to any overtures for their removal to lands west of the Mississippi.¹¹ One of the leading antagonists to Ottawa removal from the Maumee Valley was Cha-no, who had also created considerable opposition to Governor George B. Porter in his negotiations with the Ottawa in 1833 seeking the cession of their remaining reservations. In a report to Lewis Cass, Porter referred to this chief as **Sheno, Charlo**, and the **tribe's speaker**.¹² In the negotiations with Porter, Cha-no presented every argument he could muster in order to barter for better terms. He complained about the nature of earlier treaties, alleged that an agent had retained a sum of money ear-marked for his people, protested that promises made by James B. Gardiner in the Treaty of 1831 had been neglected; and, made demands that the Ottawa be allowed free passage over all roads, and the privilege of going to Malden (in Ontario) to receive the annual issue of presents. Cha-no also had very definite ideas respecting the price the Government should pay for the remaining reservations.

Subsequent to the treaty, Cha-no, Ottokee and Wauseon

became the leading proponents against the tribe's removal from the Maumee Valley. After several years of resistance, the latter chiefs were finally persuaded to take up the trek, and left in 1838 with the last of the Ottawas who went west. Both Ottokee and Wauseon died shortly after their removal to Kansas.¹³ Cha-no, however, eventually found his way, with a number of Maumee Valley Ottawas, to Walpole Island, located in Lake St. Clair; and, consequently, became Canadian subjects. An investigation conducted by the Canadian Government in 1879 concerning the Walpole Island Indians, included the testimony of one Cheega, who stated that he was born in Ohio, and that his father was a Tawa (Ottawa) called She-no.¹⁴

4. Memorials in Behalf of the Ottawa and Lake Confederacy.

With the completion of the Treaty of 1833 there remained little need for the talents of Cha-no other than for activities in removal resistance. The Ottawa had no more land with which to barter. Cha-no's efforts during those years, however, had not been confined to the Ohio area. The Ottawa, and also the Ohio Wyandot, had been in a contest over land in Ontario. Several memorials in behalf of the Ottawa, and at times the Chippewa and Pottawatomi, and generally concerning the land in Ontario, were sent to the Canadian Government during this era. The significance of these memorials is not so much in respect to the small reservations which were the source of contention (the Huron Church lands and the Anderdon Lands in Ontario), but rather in the general nature of the Ottawa and Lake Confederacy claims as opposed to those of the Huron-Wyandot.

The controversy respecting the Ontario lands reserved for the Huron-Wyandot originated in the Canadian Treaty of 1790, at which time the Ottawa Chief E Gouch-eouay, speaking for the Lake Confederacy, allotted this land to the Huron-Wyandot Indians for their use. It was stated at that treaty council that the land reserved for the Huron-Wyandot was the same as that which their ancestors (the Lake Confed-

eracy) had granted to the Huron-Wyandot for their occupation and general good.¹⁵ Colonel Alexander McKee, in reference to the allotment of land for the Huron-Wyandot, stated that "the Hurons had enjoyed many years peaceable and uninterrupted possession by and with the unanimous consent of their confederates the Lake [Confederacy] Indians."¹⁶

The memorials respecting this land in Ontario are of particular interest and historical significance because of statements concerning priority and occupancy claims, which would provide criteria justifiable to both the Ontario and Ohio lands. This is due to the fact that both the Ottawa and the Huron-Wyandot settlements in Ohio were extensions of their earlier holdings in Ontario and southeastern Michigan. As will be seen in one of the memorials, Cha-no specifically refers to the Sandusky area, including those lands in the scope of his protest.¹⁷ It should also be mentioned that the memorials, although pertaining to land in Ontario, were representing Ohio Ottawa in opposition to Ohio Huron-Wyandot efforts to claim and sell the Ontario reserves.¹⁸

In these memorials Cha-no, whose name appears as Charlo, Charloe or Charlot, was generally speaking in behalf of the Lake Confederacy (Ottawa, Chippewa and Pottawatomi). At times signatures of chiefs representing all three tribes were ascribed to the memorials; however, on occasion only Cha-no's name was used, or only names of Ottawa Chiefs. On all occasions, however, the Lake Confederacy was the source of authority.

It is apparent that Cha-no also served at times as spokesman for a Lake Confederacy tribe other than the Ottawa, for in a manuscript dated April 30, 1830 in which Cha-no protested the proposed removal of the Chippewa and advocated an amalgamation of the Lake Confederacy tribes on Canadian soil, it was stated that;

The following is a copy of a speech delivered by Charlo, the principal Speaker in behalf of the Chippewas of the Chenel Ecarte and River St. Clair.¹⁹

Before presenting the principal memorial, the following except of one written on October 30, 1828, and signed by **Charlot** and thirteen other Maumee Valley Ottawa Chiefs most clearly and precisely presents the contentions of the Ottawa and Lake Confederacy; and, illustrates the intra-tribal relationship of both the Huron-Wyandot and the Ottawa to Ohio, Michigan and Ontario lands;

We the subscribers, Chiefs of the Ottawa Nation of Indians in the Miamie of the Lake, wish to say or inform our Father who is now at Sandwich, that the **Wyandot Tribe of Indians came among us formerly as Strangers &c.**, and that the **Ottawas gave them a tract of land where the Roman Catholic Church now stands above Sandwich**, and instead of keeping it and living on it as was intended, they sold it: **We afterwards allowed them to reside at Brown's Town on our Lands**, which they also sold to the United States, and finally they went to the **Sandusky River to live on our Lands**, all of which they have sold, reserving a few Farms for some of them, taking advantage of goodness and generosity and ignorance of the Ottawas and now they wish to take liberty of taking possession of, and renting an Island in Detroit River, known by the English name of Turkey or Fighting Island, and we wish to inform our Father that said Island does not belong to them but is the property of the Ottawas, Chippewas and Potawatemies, and they have no right to it in anyway . . .²⁰

5. The Memorial of 1829

The memorial of September, 1829 contains a rebuttal to a petition of the Huron-Wyandot regarding claims to the Ontario land. The Huron-Wyandot petition had been supported and drawn by Lt. Charles Eliot; however, the Ottawa memorial in behalf of the Lake Confederacy Indians caused Eliot to conclude that he had been mis-informed by the Huron-Wyandot, and he subsequently withdrew his support to their petition.²¹ There is no doubt but that the pro-

tests of the Lake Confederacy tribes were much too tardy to be given proper consideration; nevertheless, for the purpose of the historian they contain tremendous intrigue. It is interesting to note that the majority of the Huron-Wyandot involved in the controversy over the Ontario lands was from the Sandusky area in Ohio.²²

As has been mentioned, the memorial of the Lake Confederacy is quite dramatic; however, the major contentions supported by the paper are not without documentary foundation. In order to provide at least partial support, the important statements will be italicized in the memorial, and will be followed with a brief historical outline of the Ottawa and Lake Confederacy v. Huron-Wyandot claims to this region.

Amherstburg, Upper Canada

Sept. 1829

To His Excellency, Sir John Colborne, K. C. B.
Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Upper Canada,
&c. &c. &c.

Father.

We, the Ottawas, Chippewas, & Potawatomes, your Red Children, again address you to save an act of mistaken equity: & we feel confident that you will rather rejoice, than censure us, for approaching you ere the final seal be affixed to your deed. We come implicitly relying on our Father, assured that he will willingly re-examine our honest claim.

Father, the crafty Huron has vented in your ears a cunningly devised tale; he has abused you with a gross, though specious fable: we have his statement before us. Father, we would implore your attention for a moment. We ask you only for justice; & shall that justice be denied us on account of our skin? Father, the same Great Spirit, which made the White Man, formed the Red. The same passions glow in the breasts of each. Our frames are similarly constructed. We are nourished by the same means; the same

fatal shaft robs each of being. 'Tis true the White Man wields the stronger arm. If, however, the Almighty Spirit has shed upon him a brighter ray of wisdom, it was not to enable him to oppress his weaker brother. If it has pleased the Immortal Architect to bless him with the clear beams of Revelation, it was to teach him that holy & beautiful maxim, to do to others as he would they should do unto him. The Red Man, alas! he has instructed only in the means necessary for his peculiar existence. He has appointed him to range the trackless woods. He has ordained him to gain a precarious sustenance by the sureness of his eye & the swiftness of his foot; perchance to endanger his very life for the mere food of the day. On the White Man, in his lavish bounty, he has bestowed comforts, enjoyments, he has showered down luxuries: on the Red, distresses & severe privations. To the one has been given all the roses of life: to the other all its thorns. Then, Oh! Father, ought the favored White Man to aggravate the others' destiny? Ought he not rather in pity to soften his sorrows? You, Father, we are assured, cannot be unjust to him. We ask you not to deprive the Huron of his right. We received him once with outstretched arms, adopted him, protected, cherished him with all the kind affections of our nature; & not even his coldness, his heartlessness, not even his ingratitude should constrain us to cast him upon the wide world again. You have instilled into him the principles of the Christian Faith, let him remain & profit by its sacred precepts.

Let us however, Father, trace the wily Huron through the tortuous course of his petition. "He journeyed of old from the East"—journeyed, Father? He fled with the deafening, torrent whoop, the maddened yell of triumph at his heels—but, 'tis enough; he admits he came; he had not rested here beyond the traditions of man; he came then, Father an exiled stranger, with the bitter tear of anguish starting to his eye, imploring shelter from us, masters of the soil. Whence then, Father, his title? He claims, Father, because we entertained him; he claims, because we placed him here in security; he claims, because we pitied the wretched outcast & adopted

him as a Brother; the ingrate Huron claims, Father, to repay the debt of gratitude he owes.

But, Father, how is it that he is described, as he asserts, by one single early traveller, while we are unmentioned? And how is it that he has remained here? Note well the operating cause, Father. Man's intercourse with the Huron had been steady; with us it had been partial & broken. Father, the glad halo of Revelation had stayed the Huron's moving steps. He was just emerging from darkness & barbarity. He had thrown aside the bow to study the arts of rural life;—therefore was his habitation fixed, & became a mark for the memory of man.

We, Father, on the other hand, unenlightened, were necessarily wanderers still. We, too, at stated seasons, had been wont to encamp here; yet, dependant on the chase, we shifted with the deer. Here also man had seen our rude & lowly huts; but they were gone, & he had remembered them no more. Like the irregular meteor of the sky we had continued our course; to be spoken of only when described again. The native, unsettled Red Man rarely met the eye of the passing traveller, while the more civilized & stationary Huron could not fail to be observed, & his profession of Christianity to attract especial notice. Nor will it escape you, Father, that these very peculiarities in the character & condition of the Huron, distinguishing him so markedly from all the native tribes of the Western Region, prove him a sojourner amongst us; incontrovertibly show that this is not the primary country of his nation; that therefore he can have no natural, no inherent right in its soil.

Father, it is of importance also to remark, that Carver, the early traveller alluded to, does not fix the Huron's dwelling on the Indian Reserve; his words are, "almost opposite Detroit, on the Eastern shore, is the village of the ancient Hurons"; that is, on the ground now occupied by the town of Sandwich, about a mile & a half below Detroit. We grant the Huron's village to have been on that spot at that time; but this bestows on him no right to the Reserve, which is,

at the least, twelve or thirteen miles lower down the River, with islands intervening, & therefore cannot be said to be "almost opposite." In short, Father, is it in the slightest degree probable, that the grasping Huron would have allowed us to sign with him the deed of sales of these lands on the Eastern bank of the River, had he been the sole proprietor? Nor wonder, Father, that the stationary tenant should, after your usage, afford names to places around him, while the rightful owners were overlooked, because they had been called away by the avocations of human life, to return only when its wants might require them.

Father, the Huron would insinuate that, through cowardice, we deserted him before Fort Miami. We trust our conduct during the last war will confute that. We abandoned him, because he, the youngest among us, would arrogate to himself the command of our army. However, it is only requisite to say, that this was wholly an Indian war; a war waged by the Indian tribes alone against the Americans, & in which, consequently, our Great Father was uninterested. It is, therefore, a matter totally irrelative to the Huron Petition.

Father, the Huron unblushingly tells you, that the sod of the Indian Reserve has been glutted with his blood. He uses a poetical license, Father, & simply means, that he never fired a shot there; such is the fact. He affirms, moreover, that the vigour of his nation was wasted for you: here again he speaks somewhat hypertolically & is to be understood as having lost only eight of his warriors. Verily, verily, Father, the Huron has an imaginative & fertile brain. The absurdity & folly of these statements are too well known to all the actors in the late war on the Western frontier to need any pains to refute them. He would chatter too about his loyalty, he would intimate that he deems you obliged for his fidelity. Father, what urged him to incline to your side? It was the terror of Tecumthai's eye; it was the dread of his uplifted & menacing arm, that cowered these few Huron hearts into your ranks. He even deserted us in our emergency at the River Thames, & rejoined us only, because

scorned by the Americans, who tied up & flogged his Chief, "Walk in the Water." The star-spangled banners of the enemy fluttered over the heads of the great bulk of his nation. We, on the other hand, Father, had maintained the country for upwards of six weeks previous to the arrival of even Tecumthai himself; for there were, at that time, not above fifty Regulars at Amherstburgh, & it cannot be well imagined that so inconsiderable a body alone could have kept General Hull's army in check.

Father, the Huron trusts his claim to length of possession. By the Indian custom, no occupancy, however extended the period of it, will confirm a title. Yet, Father, to set aside the Indian law in this respect, & rest us upon that of your Country, will length of possession hold against a subsequent deed, expressly executed by the Huron himself, conjointly with us, & which disannuls it? A copy of that very deed from the Register's Office has been, we understand, transmitted to you, Father, by the Superintendent of Amherstburgh. We have never divested ourselves of the right & possession of this disputed tract; using it always as a camping ground in our visits to you. Nay, let not, Father, the present state of this Reserve, in regard to its permanent occupiers, be overlooked. If there are eleven families of the Huron tribe (& that is, we believe, assuming the very highest number) resident on it, there are eight of ourselves, who, like the former, have built houses for their families, cultivated their little spots of land, & been established there for several years. We wish not, Father, we have never wished to dispossess either of their homes; but with the same semblance of right might these few of our own kindred set up an exclusive claim to the whole, as this handful of Hurons. The mass of the Huron tribe has long been positively settled within the American territory; & it requires less stretch of the imagination to believe that, in case of a rupture, the smaller body would be attracted into the larger, than the reverse. We, on the other hand, Father, still pursue a roaming life; we have no local ties, & would rest our weary feet on your shores. But, Father, where is the protracted possession on which the Huron grounds his claim?

He has enjoyed the land in question, only since the year eighteen hundred & eleven; & here he has unwittingly testified against himself. He writes to Governor Gore for permission to reside on, & for a deed of the Reserve: the reply he receives is "The Indians"—not, Father, the Hurons; but the Indians, the Ottawa, Chippewa, Potawatomes, & the Hurons; which latter tribe are the last named & the last to sign the aforesaid deed, for they were the younger nation—"The Indians are the original proprietors of the land, & not having sold or otherwise disposed of it, it remains at this moment as much theirs as ever it was. The Wyandots" (ay, Father, the Wyandots, as one of the four signing nations) "may therefore be assured that when it suits their convenience or their inclination to remove" (such is the word) "to the spot known by the name of the Huron Reserve, they will not be disturbed." Now, Father, the single word, "remove," clearly indicated that the Huron was not resident there at the date of Governor Gore's letter, viz. 23rd of March 1811, & it is evidently a word borrowed from the Huron himself. His fire, in fact, was blazing at Sandusky at the time; & he, Indians of his right, demands leave to "remove" to the Reserve. The Huron produced this letter, Father, at the Council of the nations, & will exhibit it again, if he has not discovered how much it militates against him.

Father, it is asked why we have never enforced this claim before? Father, surely few could have supposed that a claim so apparent, so incontestable, could ever have been resisted. Uninterruptly exercising our right as far as our necessities required, we cared for naught else; therefore willingly & generously permitted the profits of the Reserve to be enjoyed by any, who chose to continue upon it. New and pressing events now demand the full sumption of our property; & it is now only, when we were undoubtingly proceeding so to do, that opposition has been first offered. We are in our turn about to be banished from our homes by the Americans; & it is, Father, under these trying circumstances that the Huron, whom in his former exile we commiserated & readily sheltered, would urge our generosity to our disadvantage. These few Hurons would ungratefully & iniqui-

tously exclude us from our own, with this aggravation, Father, that the attempt is made in the spirit of churlish greediness, & not to supply their wants; for which this Reserve would be adequate even were their numbers increased a hundred-fold.

Thus, Father, we have followed the sinuous steps of the insincere Huron, & we trust exposed, satisfactorily exposed his artful sophistry. We should be prodigal of your time to reiterate the nature of our right. You have already been made acquainted with it, & the recorded deed stamps it with two-fold certainty. Upon that Deed, Father, we venture. That deed must be effective, or not, in the whole: it cannot be binding in one part, & not in another. It is the identical document by which you, Father, hold your lands. If hostile to us, it must, perforce, operate against you.

Father, environed as we now are by the Americans, we would seek again the remote & secluded cover of the forest. As the White American advances, we would retire; we would retire to hunt in those recluse woods, whither his erring foot dares not ramble. Father, the Americans propose to us lands, West of the Mississippi, in the stead of those we now occupy within their territory. Here, Father, they betray the usual craftiness of their nation. They would not only profit by the actual exchange, but would also eventually become an impervious obstruction to our intercourse with you. A rupture one day must inevitably take place; & they are silently & rapidly preparing for such an occurrence. It behooves others to be ready also. Father, estimating your nation more highly than the Americans, we would unite ourselves to you in the durable bonds of friendship & affection. Our inclinations, therefore, lead us to your shores. We would exchange our shares of this Indian Reserve & Fighting Island, for wild lands on Lake Huron. We would escape the encroaching presence of the white man. We feel his superiority & could almost sigh to become Christians like himself. Say, Father, will you accept our proposals, or will you spurn the extended hand of your Children, & drive them into closer compact with the Americans? It were needless to point out,

Father, the advantages that would result to you from the exchange. It were needless to endeavour to show you the policy of confederating with the Red nations, & of forming a dense, loyal, British population on a frontier so exposed as the Western.

Father, once more we proffer to you hearts capable of the generous feelings of the soul, & hands that dare to act in the hour of peril. We would betake ourselves to our beloved solitudes under your paternal sway, ever willing & eager to meet the summons of danger & duty. But we would shun your haunts, for we too plainly perceive the vast & enviable pre-eminence of your cultivated understanding. We would fly your towns, for we dread the potent spell of your intoxicating waters. Alas! why does not the generous Briton infuse into the bosom of the Red Man some portion of his largely gifted wisdom? Why does he not teach him to curb the fiery passions; to discard the gross & sensual pleasures for the nobler enjoyments of an enlightened mind? Thus he would only obey the hallowed dictates of that pure religion, which exalts him to such a conspicuous height among created beings, because revealed to him by his God.

Father, we have done. We have told you a plain, unvarnished tale; a tale that fears not the sternest scrutiny. Enquire, Father, of your aged men in the Western District, & they, we apprehend not, will bear testimony that our words are those of truth. We have not used the studied, insidious, & empassioned language of the Huron. We would not enlist your feelings on our side; we appeal only to your reason; we supplicate you only for justice. It is the White Man's boast that the son of God came down from heaven to guide him to his duty; the holy voice of that Son enjoins him to be just & true in all his ways.

And now, Father, may the Almighty Spirit grant that you may wield the sword, which the Great Father, the King, hath committed to your charge, with justice.

Witness

John Wilson

Charlo	his x mark
Wawassum	his x mark
Shawaner	his x mark
Nante	his x mark
Pershicohr	his x mark
Kishikons	his x mark
Chaminotawa	his x mark
Kibrkishiquiscan	his x mark
Asshowrkisic	his x mark ³²

6. Documentary Support To Ottawa Contentions

The boldface excerpts of the memorial of 1829 express contentions which have a direct bearing upon the general Lake Erie-Lake St. Clair area. The statements were, no doubt, primarily based upon Ottawa and Lake Confederacy tradition; nevertheless, they are not without foundation in history. In essence these sections of the memorial assert that the Huron-Wyandot were received by the Ottawa and Lake Confederacy Indians when in flight from the former's homeland; that the Huron-Wyandot were extended the right to establish settlements as tenants of the Lake Confederacy tribes; that the Huron-Wyandot were protected by the Ottawa from further destruction; and, that the Huron-Wyandot misused this right of tenant-occupancy by claiming and selling as their own the lands allocated to them for their use only. These are strong allegations, even revolutionary in scope when considered in the light of the general assertions and contentions of the majority of historians to date. However, as has been mentioned, they are not groundless.

A thorough study concerning the inter-tribal relations of the Ottawa and the Huron-Wyandot have supported the contention that the latter people, for nearly a century after their dispersal by the Iroquois, were under the direct protection and authority of the Ottawa. Numerous sources establish this fact, although perhaps none so forcibly as the state-

ment made by Jean Le Blanc, head chief of the Ottawa in 1707, that;

Long ago the Hurons would have perished if I would have abandoned their interests. Many a tribe has asked me for this roebuck to tear its flesh, but I would never give it up.²⁴

For the purpose of showing the historical background supporting the contentions presented by the Ottawa in the 1829 memorial, the following brief statements are included at this time. The annotations contain the most important sources of documentation; however, they necessarily represent only a scant sampling of the total sources for any one of the premises.

The Huron-Wyandot were 16th century inhabitants of the lower St. Lawrence area; and, occupants of "Huronía" (a closely confined area between Georgian Bay and Lake Simcoe) during the 1st half of the 17th century.²⁵ These Indians acted as the middlemen in a very lucrative fur-trade empire which proved the source of friction between the Huron-Wyandot and the Iroquois from the southeast.²⁶ As a result of years of devastating diseases, famine, and a massive Iroquoian assault in 1649, the Huron-Wyandot were forced from "Huronía," greatly reduced in population, and driven to seek shelter among their neighbors the Erie, the Petuns (Tobacco Nation), and the Neutrals.²⁷ Subsequent assaults by the Iroquois upon the territory of these nations resulted in a further reduction of the Huron-Wyandot population; and, caused them, in conjunction with some Petuns, to resume their flight into the territory of the Lake Confederacy tribes. The Huron-Wyandot were subsequently settled, from the time of their dispersal until their migration in 1701 to the Detroit River, in villages contiguous to those of the Ottawa, and on land belonging to the Ottawa and/or Lake Confederacy Indians.²⁸ After residing at Michilimackinac from 1670 to 1701 as tenants of the Ottawa, the Huron-Wyandot migrated with a portion of the former tribe to the Detroit River region, and re-established themselves in terri-

tory which was at that time, and which had been for some years previous, utilized by the Ottawa and other Lake Confederacy Indians both for occupancy, and hunting and trapping purposes.²⁹ It may be further stated that the Ottawa and Lake Confederacy tribes exercised control and dominion over the Lake Erie-Lake St. Clair region prior to the establishment of Detroit by Cadillac in 1701, and this in spite of Iroquois efforts to the contrary. In fact, during the entire era from the dispersal of the Huron-Wyandot (1649) until well after the turn of the century, the Ottawa proved to be the chief bulwark to any designs of the Iroquois and English respecting both the lands and fur trade in the Lakes region.³⁰ And finally, the claims of the Huron-Wyandot in Ohio, Michigan and Ontario were subsequent to their migration to the Detroit River from Michilimackinac; and, therefore, would necessarily have had to have been dependent upon the nature and extent of occupancy rights (either original or tenancy) which existed at the turn of the 18th century.

7. Key to the Problem of Huron-Wyandot Usurpation of Ottawa Land

After examining the numerous supporting evidence found in the "Jesuit Relations," "Cadillac Papers," "Paris Documents," and other contemporary manuscripts, one could justifiably say, as did Cha-no, "that surely few could have supposed that a claim so apparent, so incontestable, could ever have been resisted."³¹ More important, however, is the question, "How were the Huron-Wyandot able to gain such a foothold on the land, establish rights thereto; and, subsequently, convey lands which they actually did not own nor even occupy?" The complete answer is not a simple one, and involves inter-tribal activities in all events leading up to and including the various treaties. The key to the answer, however, is not so complex; yet, is a factor which apparently even Cha-no failed to recognize. This is the characteristic superiority of the Huron-Wyandot as compared to the Great Lakes Algonquin peoples, which enabled them,

in spite of their numerical disadvantage, to gain the object of their endeavors. The white men recognized the Huron-Wyandot as being superior to any of the neighboring Great Lakes tribes, and considered them capable of looking out for their own interest. This was emphasized by Bacqueville de la Potherie when he stated that:

This tribe (Huron) is very politic, treacherous in their actions, and proud in their behavior; they have more intellect than all the other savages . . . they are seldom cheated by any person whatsoever in any of their undertakings.³²

Nicholas Perrot, French Commandant in the Northwest, expressed a similar opinion of their abilities;³³ and, Antoine de La Mothe Cadillac, just prior to the founding of Detroit, provided the following in respect to their character and ability:

The Hurons were formerly the most powerful . . . but the Iroquois destroyed them and drove them from their homes; and it is well that it is so. For they are cunning men, intriguing, evil-disposed and capable of great designs; but fortunately, their arm is not long enough to execute them; nevertheless, since they cannot play the part of lions, they act like foxes . . .³⁴

Pierre Francois de Charlevoix, in referring to the Huron character, stated that they possessed "solid, judicious, elevated minds, capable of reflecting," and added that the Hurons were the "most expert in the management of their affairs, and most prudent in their conduct."³⁵ Charlevoix, as did the majority of the whites familiar with the Huron-Wyandot, emphasized their deceitful and treacherous character; and, provided the following general appraisal:

The conduct of this Huron chief portrays well the character of this nation, the ablest of all in Canada . . . They carry dissimulation to an excess not easily believed if it had not been experienced . . . In one word, it is of

all the continent the nation distinguished by most defects and most good qualities.³⁶

Numerous examples could be included; however, the following excerpt from "An Account of the Most Remarkable Occurrences in Canada from 1694 to 1695," found in the "Paris Documents," will suffice for illustration:

... it must be understood that when they (the Huron) are determined to keep a secret, the policy of the most expert Machiavelian would fail against their finesse and deception, daubed over with the whitewash of sincerity and the fairest appearances in the world.³⁷

Thus is provided the key to the strange sequence of events following the dispersal of the Huron-Wyandot from "Huron-ia," and their later migration to the Detroit River locality. The key itself merely provides grounds for speculation; however, a close examination of the period of Anglo-American and Indian politics leaves no doubt but that the Ottawa could never match the skill of the Huron-Wyandot when the criteria for success came to depend more upon expert oration, the ability to artfully participate in treaty negotiations, and political chicanery, rather than upon the old Indian standard of numerical predominance and actual occupancy. As to abilities for entreatment and intercession, the peculiar pawns for the white man's game of land chess, the Huron-Wyandot had no equal.

Perhaps the Ottawa chief Quinousaquy, speaking in behalf of the Lake Confederacy, provided the stepping stone for the then landless Huron-Wyandot when, in a conference at Detroit in 1744, he appointed that Nation the "keeper" of the belts and records for the tribes of the area.³⁸ At any rate, the protests of Cha-no were not imaginary, for the fugitive Huron-Wyandot were subsequently able to realize the profit from the conveyance of considerably more land in both Ohio and southern Ontario than any of the Lake Confederacy tribes; and, on one occasion (in the Treaty of 1817)

even conveyed lands in Ohio exclusively as their own on which were located Ottawa villages.

It is of interest to this matter to note that the statements in the 1829 memorial were supported by the pioneer settlers in that area of Ontario; and also, in the diary of 1829 kept by Rev. Cutting Marsh, a missionary among the Ohio Indians, the following was recorded:

The Wyandots having been sometimes previous in a wandering state and with no fixed habitation had obtained leave of the Ottawa to settle down on their lands, but they had no title whatever to them, either by purchase, conquest or by bequest. And all they asked of the Ottawas or obtained was permission to remain on their Bed as they called it.³⁹

It is, of course, obvious that the protests and memorials of Cha-no and the Lake Confederacy Indians were too late to have operated favorably for these tribes, and the Huron-Wyandot subsequently did realize the benefits from the sale of the Ontario reserves. However, it is more than likely that Cha-no was not striving for any pecuniary or land gains for his nation, but rather searching for some means to prevent the transportation of his people to the barren Kansas plains. Perhaps all of his efforts may be explained by the following statement made by Cha-no in 1828:

But it is needless to ask us to leave the place where the bones of our forefathers are lying.⁴⁰

FOOTNOTES

1. For information concerning the activities of these Ottawa Chiefs consult the following sources: Mickinac: "Cadillac Papers" in *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections*, XXXIII and XXXIV, and "Paris Documents" in *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, Edmund B. O'Callaghan, ed. (Albany, 1853-1887), IX; Pontiac: Howard H. Peckham, *Pontiac and the Indian Uprising*, (Princeton, 1940), and Francis Parkman, *History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac*, (Boston, 1870); Au-goosh-away: Robert F. Bauman, "Pontiac's Successor—The Ottawa Au-goosh-away" in *Northwest Ohio Quarterly*, (Winter, 1953-54), XXVI, No. 1; eighteenth century Ottawa chiefs: *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections*, *The Firelands Pioneer*, and "Howard Papers," unpublished manuscripts of Colonel

The Belated Advocate Of Ottawa Rights—Cha-no: Charloe the Speaker

- Dresden W. H. Howard, in possession of Mrs. Agnes McClarren, Winameg, Ohio. [*The Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections* will subsequently be designated MP&HC; the *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* will be designated N.Y.C.D.; and, the Colonel Dresden W. H. Howard manuscripts will be designated Howard Papers].
- 7 *United States Statutes*, 411. (The Indian Removal Act of May 28, 1830 provided for the exchange of the Indians' eastern holdings for lands beyond the Mississippi River.)
 - Ibid.*, 359 and 420.
 - Ottawa Annuity Receipts, in Records of General Accounting Office, Natural Archives (Washington, D. C.)
 - "Indian Days" and "Wauseon or Wa-se-on and Ottokee or Ot-to-kee", in Howard Papers, *op. cit.*
 - Manuscript diary of Reverend Cutting Marsh, Maumee, Ohio, 1829-1830 (Wisconsin Historical Society Collections, Madison).
 - Manuscript of a speech by Charlo in behalf of the Chippewa of Chenel Ecarte and River St. Clair, April 30, 1830, in George Ironside Papers (Burton Historical Collections, Detroit).
 - Charles Burleigh Galbreath, *History of Ohio*, (Chicago and New York, 1925), I:457.
 - Henry Howe, *Historical Collections of Ohio*, (Cincinnati, 1902), II:381.
 - Lewis C. Aldrich, *History of Henry and Fulton Counties, Ohio*, (Syracuse, 1888), 27. (The spelling "Sharlow" was also used by James Jackson in a letter to Stevens T. Mason, Maumee, July 28, 1834, in MP&HC, XXXVII:295).
 - For accounts of Ottawa resistance to removal see: Randolph C. Downes, *Canal Days*, (Lucas County Historical Series II, 1949), 42-55, and Robert F. Bauman, "The Migration of the Ottawa Indians from the Maumee Valley to Walpole Island", in *Northwest Ohio Quarterly*, (Summer, 1949), XXI, No. 3.
 - Senate Document 512 (23rd Congress, 1st Session), *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration of Indians between the 30th November, 1831 and 27th December, 1833, with Abstracts of Expenditures by Disbursing Agents, in the Removal and Subsistence of Indians, &c., &c., Furnished in Answer to a Resolution of the Senate, of 27th December, 1833, by the Commissary General of Subsistence*, II:472-475.
 - J. P. Simonton to General George Gibson, February 18, 1834, in Records of the Office of Indian Affairs, National Archives, (Washington, D.C.); "Wauseon or Wa-se-on and Ottokee or Ot-to-kee", Howard Papers, *op. cit.*
 - Minutes of Investigation of Walpole Island Indians as to connection with "1827" Treaty, November to December, 1879, Testimonial of Cheega, in Papers Relating to Walpole Island in the Department of Mines and Resources, Indian Affairs, (Ottawa, Canada).
 - Speech of E. Gouche-ou-a-i, in Minutes of Council held with the Indians at Detroit, May 19, 1790, in Canadian Archives, Minutes of Detroit Councils, Vol. 13, Series Two, Indian Records, (Ottawa, Canada).
 - Memorandum Concerning Pottawatomes' Claim to Walpole Island, quoting letter of Colonel Alexander McKee, May 25, 1790, prepared for and in the possession of Mr. A. E. St. Louis, Archivist, Department of Mines and Resources, Indian Affairs, (Ottawa, Canada).
 - Memorial of the Chiefs of the Ottawa Nation of Indians in the Miami of the Lake, October 30, 1828, in George Ironside Papers, (Burton Historical Collections, Detroit).
 - Unsigned memorandum respecting Ottawa claims to "Huron Reserve" in

- Ontario, c. 1829, thought to have been written by Thomas Smith of Sandwich, Ontario, in George Ironside Papers, (Burton Historical Collections, Detroit). (The paper states that approximately 6/7 of the Huron-Wyandot Indians were then living near Sandusky in Ohio).
19. Manuscript of a speech by Charlo in behalf of the Chippewa of Chenel Ecarte and River St. Clair, April 30, 1830, Ironside Papers, *op. cit.*
 20. Memorial of the Chiefs of the Ottawa Nation of Indians in the Miamie of the Lake, October 30, 1828, Ironside Papers, *op. cit.* (Italics are the authors).
 21. Charles Eliot to Captain Z. Mudge, Private Secretary to Lieut. Governor Sir John Colborn, August 20, 1829, (Canadian Archives Series Civil Control, Upper Canada and Canada West, Lieut. Governor's Office, 1829-1830).
 22. See footnote 18.
 23. Memorial of the Ottawas, Chippewas and Potawatomes to Sir John Colborne, Lieut. Governor of the Province of Upper Canada, Amherstburg, September, 1829, (Canadian Public Archives, R. G. 10, Vol. 5). (Italics are the authors). It is not contended that Cha-no drafted the 1829 memorial; it was, in fact, drawn by John Wilson in behalf of the Lake Confederacy. The contents of the memorial, however, are ascribed by the author to this chief. Some of the words and connotations utilized have created the supposition that Cha-no had assistance in selecting the phraseologies and vocabulary. Nevertheless, a comparison of the general nature and composition of this memorial with that of the speech of 1828 definitely ascribed to Cha-no leads the author to conclude that he was the source of the statements found in the memorial of 1829. Also, when considering the descriptions of Cha-no as supplied by Rev. Cutting Marsh, Charles B. Galbreath, Henry Howe, Lewis Aldrich, Lewis Cass, and others, which are included in a previous section of this article, it becomes very probable that Cha-no fathered both the ideas and the form of this memorial.
 24. Speech of the Ottawas to the Governor General of Canada, June 18, 1707, in "Cadillac Papers", *MP&HC*, XXXIII:323. See also the statement of Jesuit Father Antoine Silvy found in W. R. Riddell (ed), "When Detroit Was French." *Michigan History* (1939), XXIII:45.
 25. Henry Sweetser Burrage, ed., *Early English and French Voyages*, 1534-1608, (New York, 1906), 3-102; Henry P. Biggar, ed., *The Works of Samuel de Champlain*, (Toronto, 1922-1936), I:141; Frederick W. Hodge, ed., *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*, (Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 30, Washington, D. C., 1907, 1910), I:585-587; George T. Hunt, *The Wars of the Iroquois*, (Madison, Wisconsin, 1940), 13 and 38; and, William Esley Connelley, *Wyandot Folk-lore*, (Topeka, Kansas, 1899), 18.
 26. For accounts of the Huron fur-trade empire as a source of friction, and accounts of the Iroquois-Huron wars consult the following: George T. Hunt, *op. cit.*; W. Vernon Kintietz, *The Indians of the Western Great Lakes, 1615-1760*, (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1940); and Frederick W. Hodge, *op. cit.*
 27. Paul Ragueneau Relation of 1649, in *Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791*, Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., (Cleveland, 1896-1901), XXXIV:225. Subsequently this will be designated *Jesuit Relations*; Father Hierosme Lalemant to Duke de Richelieu, from the Hurons in New France, March 28, 1640, in *Jesuit Relations, op. cit.*, XVIII: 223; Jerome Lalemant to the Very Reverend Father Mutio Vitellesche, April 1, 1640, in *Jesuit Relations, op. cit.*, XVII:227-231; Jerome Lalemant's Report to Vimont, Huron Country, May 27, 1640, in *Jesuit Relations, op. cit.*, XIX:127; George T. Hunt, *op. cit.*; Frederick W. Hodge, *op. cit.*; and, W. Vernon Kintietz, *op. cit.*
 28. For accounts relating to Huron-Wyandot and Ottawa relations following the

- dispersal of the former, consult the information by Nicolas Perrot and Bacqueville de la Potherie, in *The Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi Valley and Region of the Great Lakes as described by Nicolas Perrot . . . Bacqueville de la Potherie . . . Morrell Marston . . . and Thomas Forsyth . . .*, ed., by Emma Helen Blair, (Cleveland, 1911); W. Vernon Kinitz, *op. cit.*, 231; Louise P. Kellogg ed., *Journal of a Voyage to North America*, trans. from the writings of Pierre Francois C. de Charlevoix, (Chicago, 1923), 6-7; William Renwich Riddell, "When Detroit Was French", in *Michigan History* (1939), XXIII:45 (Father Antoine Silvy memoir); Frederick W. Hodge, *op. cit.*, I:589; Albert Gallatin, A Synopsis of the Indian Tribes within the United States East of the Rocky Mountains . . ., in *Trans. and Coll. of the American Antiquarian Society, Archaeologia Americana*, (Cambridge, 1836), II:26-28; and, Letter of Sr. D'Aigremont denouncing Cadillac Methods, November 14, 1708, in "Cadillac Papers", *MP&HC*, XXXIII:446-47.
29. Paul Ragueneau Relation of 1648, in *Jesuit Relations*, *op. cit.*, XXXIII:151; Edward G. and Annie N. Bourne, ed. and trans., *The Voyages and Explorations of Samuel de Champlain*, (New York, 1906), II:100-103; W. Vernon Kinitz, *op. cit.*, 229; Lewis H. Morgan, "Indian Migrations", in *Indian Miscellany*, ed., by W. W. Beach, (Albany, 1877), 110 and 213; Narrative of the Most Remarkable Occurrences in Canada . . . 1694-1695, in "Paris Documents", *N.Y.C.D.*, *op. cit.*, IX:606 and 645; and, Message of Count de Frontenac to the Ottawas, 1690, in "Paris Documents", *N.Y.C.D.*, *op. cit.*, IX:450.
 30. Blair, *op. cit.*, I:151-2 and 178-81; Andrew J. Blackbird, *History of the Ottawa and Chippewa Indians of Michigan*, (Ypsilanti, 1887), 81-82; Robert F. Bauman, "Pontiac's Successor—The Ottawa Au-goosh-away", *op. cit.*, 10-13; George T. Hunt, *op. cit.*, 103-104; M.M. de Vaudreuil and Raudot Report of the Colonies, Quebec, November 4, 1708, in "Cadillac Papers", *MP&HC*, XXXIII:403; An Account of the Most Remarkable Occurrences in Canada . . . 1694-1695, *N.Y.C.D.*, *op. cit.*, IX:627-645; Narrative of the Most Remarkable Occurrences in Canada, 1696-1697, in "Paris Documents", *N.Y.C.D.*, IX:672-673; and, Narrative of the Most Remarkable Occurrences in Canada, 1697-1698, in "Paris Documents", *N.Y.C.D.*, IX:681.
 31. Memorial of the Ottawas, &c. to Sir John Colborne, September, 1829, *Canadian Public Archives*, *op. cit.*
 32. Emma Helen Blair, *op. cit.*, I:283.
 33. *Ibid.*, 187-88.
 34. W. Vernon Kinitz, *op. cit.*, 8.
 35. Louise P. Kellogg, *op. cit.*, I:287; John G. Shea, trans., *History and General Description of New France*, by the Rev. P. F. X. de Charlevoix, S. J., (New York, 1866), II:64-65.
 36. John G. Shea, *op. cit.*, II:71.
 37. An Account of the Most Remarkable Occurrences in Canada . . . 1694-1695, *op. cit.*, *N.Y.C.D.*, IX:619.
 38. Conference between M. de Longueuil, Commandant at Detroit, and the Indians, 1700, in "Paris Documents", *N.Y.C.D.*, *op. cit.*, IX:707. This document was misdated by the editor. See *Calendar of the Manuscripts in Paris for the History of the Mississippi Valley*. (Carnegie Institution in Washington, Department of Historical Research, 1928), II, 1030.
 39. Rev. Cutting Marsh Diary, *op. cit.*
 40. Manuscript of a speech by Charlo in behalf of the Chippewas of Chenel Ecarte and River St. Clair, April 30, 1830, *op. cit.*

The Rapid Transit and Electric Power Problems in Toledo in the 1890's

By Randolph C. Downes

The Electric Age Brings Problems. As Toledo entered the industrial age the first stages of the age of electricity entered Toledo. Between 1888 and 1900 the people saw the conversion of the control of street-car service from many companies using horse propulsion to a single organization, the Toledo Traction Company, using electricity. A similar transition took place in respect to the method of generating electricity. Out of a collection of scattered power plants, controlled by competing companies and using wasteful dynamos, there evolved a large central plant, owned by the Toledo Consolidated Electric Company, using the latest and most efficient techniques of power generation. Albion E. Lang was president of both Traction Company and the Consolidated Company. The latter company supplied electricity for commercial and public uses: rapid transit, street illumination, supplying of power for telephones and telegraphs, and the lighting of stores and factories. By 1900 a few homes had installed electric lights, but it was not until the 20th century was well under way that the use of electricity for domestic purposes became common.

The Conflict Between Public and Private Interests. This evolution produced a conflict between the Toledo public and the owners of the rapid transit lines and the power plants. Since the rapid transit lines were built on the public streets, it was necessary for the companies to get the permission of the city council to use the streets. This permission took the form of franchises or city ordinances setting down the conditions under which the companies could operate. This meant that the city council had the right to decide where the lines would be located, what fares should be charged, what gauges the tracks should have, what taxes should be paid, what percentage of gross receipts should be paid to the city,

and many other matters that private businesses, operating on private property, are exempt from. In the case of the power companies the city council had the right to decide the numbers and location of the street lights, the location and the manner of installing overhead wires and underground conduits, and, above all, the rate that the city should pay for each street light.

Sources of Animosity: The Three-Cent Fare and Municipal Ownership. In the case of both rapid transit companies and power plants there was a serious disagreement with the public as to these conditions of operation. The city council, which was responsible to the voters, insisted on lower rates and higher standards of performance than the companies were disposed to agree to. The people emphasized the inconveniences and shortcomings of the services and the supposed economies resulting from the great technological improvements. The companies emphasized the difficulties of establishing their services and the costliness of installations that had to be changed so often in response to technological developments. Out of this disagreement grew an animosity that was to divide Toledo for many generations, even down into the 20th century. The two great phases of this disagreement were the demand for the three-cent fare for all riders on the street cars and the movement for municipal ownership of the power plants. Neither of these goals was achieved, although a modified three-cent fare was charged for many years on the so-called Robison lines. Eventually a more amicable relationship was arrived at. This was based on a mutual understanding, by the private companies, of their public responsibilities and, by the public, of its responsibility to private enterprise. However, in the 1890's this understanding had not been worked out.

The Public Suspicious of Monopolies. The misunderstanding was heightened by the touchiness of the Toledoans about monopolies. By 1900 it was obvious that the Toledo Traction Company was a monopoly. Toledoans in general had become very suspicious of certain big businesses. They had

been disappointed in the development of through railroads and their alleged rate discriminations. Many had conceived a bitter hatred of John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil Company for its fight against the municipal natural gas pipe line. Others pointed with scorn to the actions of real estate men in allegedly holding land prices so high that new businesses refused to locate in Toledo.

Overbuilding and Consolidation During the Horse-Car Days—**The Toledo Consolidated Street Railway Company.** The need of consolidation in street-car service appeared in the horse-car days. They had been built piecemeal by independent companies. Often they were part of a real estate speculation. The Toledo **Bee**, an inveterate and militant foe of street-car monopoly, recognized this on February 10, 1897: "In the early days when Toledo was emerging from villagehood to cityhood, the people were glad to offer almost any inducement to capitalists to build. There was at first more of local pride than of need behind the movement. It looked cified to have street cars, and people were willing to pay for a service they did not really need. Later lines were built to attract purchasers to newly plotted lots in the outskirts of the city. The street railway system grew up in sections." The **Blade**, December 12, 1896, had this to say about it, "Competition in the early years doubtless had the effect of developing the different lines to an abnormal extent." In 1885 this overbuilding culminated in the combination of most of the horse-car lines into the Toledo Consolidated Street Railway Company. This brought together the old independent lines: the Summit Street (The Toledo Street Railway Company), the Adams Street line, the Monroe Street line, and the Dorr Street line. (**Blade**, December 31, 1888.) In 1888 and 1889 the two remaining horse-car lines were absorbed: the Central Passenger Station Street Railway Company, extending from North Summit Street to Nebraska Avenue, and the Metropolitan Street Railway running from upper Broadway to Cherry and LaGrange Streets. (**Blade**, December 12, 1896.) Thus by 1889, all the horse-car lines were consolidated under one management in a company which came to be known as the "Big Con." For many years the cars of the

original lines kept their special colors: red for the Summit and Broadway line; olive for the Adams line; white for the Monroe Street line; green for the Dorr Street line; and grey for the LaGrange Street line. (*Blade*, June 5, 1891.)

Other Horse-Car Line Improvements. This horse-car line consolidation represented only one phase of the improvement of this form of street-car service. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent in standardizing track gauges at 4 feet 8½ inches. (The Monroe Street line was originally 3 feet 6 inches, and the Metropolitan and Central Passenger 3 feet.) Double tracks were laid in some streets. As various streets were paved with stone or asphalt, all-iron rails had to be replaced by steel. The companies had to assume their share of paving expenses. Gauge changes led to rebuilding or replacing scores of old "jigger" or "bob-tail" cars with larger models. The Consolidated company set up a central transfer station on Summit Street. In 1889 John J. Shipherd, president of the Metropolitan company, advised "a thorough reorganization of the present horse-car system" instead of a hasty rush into the building of electric lines. Warned Shipherd, "Toledo suffered for nearly twenty years from a few years of boom speculation and overtrading. Now that a new life appears let the foundations be well and wisely laid. The present projectors of electric railways are misguided. The subject is too broad to be grasped at sight, and they do not appreciate the money it requires to build a first class road. Toledo has suffered much from the cheapness of the original building of the roads already there." (*Blade*, January 8, 1889.)

David Robison, Jr., Builds Toledo's First Electric Street Car System Partially Paralleling the Consolidated Horse-Car Lines. In spite of this warning Toledo rushed pell-mell into the electric street car age. "Vive la Rapid Transit," shouted the *Blade*, December 21, 1888, as it called Toledo a "city of magnificent distances" that needed speed to bring it up to date. Instead of building wisely on the street car foundations already laid, the first electric street car system was built by a new company, the Toledo Electric Street Car Company,

whose president was Toledoan David Robison, Jr. Its tracks, in large measure, paralleled those of the Consolidated company in order to get horse-car patrons to become electric-car patrons. In 1896 Albion E. Lang, president of the Consolidated, said "The Robison's paralleled our lines as far as they possibly could, with the idea, no doubt, of buying us out, or having us buy them out." (*Bee*, September 30, 1896.) The Robison lines, as proposed in an ordinance introduced into City Council on February 13, 1889, were as follows: a road out to the new State Hospital for the Insane, which paralleled the Summit Street and Broadway lines as far as Prouty Street; a line to Air Line Junction out Indiana Avenue between the Dorr St. and Nebraska Avenue lines; a line out Huron to the Casino on the Bay, paralleling the lower Summit Street lines; a line out Canton Street to Forest Cemetery which competed with the LaGrange and Cherry Street lines; and a line to Speranza Park, out Vermont Avenue, rather close to the Adams Street line. In December, 1889 Robison got a franchise to build the "Bancroft Belt" system which paralleled both the Adams and the Monroe Street lines of the Consolidated. (*Blade*, January 27, June 5, July 8, 1891.) The June 5, 1891 *Blade* summarized the relation of Robison and the Consolidated lines in these words, "Apparently these lines [the Consolidated] took the cream of the Street railway business of Toledo, and more, but the younger and vigorous . . . Robisons have made out of what was left a truly handsome and valuable system." (See Map.)

Robison Denounces the "Bob-Tail Brigade." In support of his proposal Robison addressed the people with the letter to the *Blade*, February 7, 1889. He denounced the "bob-tail brigade," i.e. the Toledo Consolidated Street Railway Company, for circulating false stories about "ungainly poles and deadly wires." He forecasted "an entire revolution" in the street-car service of the city. "Five miles an hour on the horse-cars against 15 to 25 with the 'electric' will not satisfy the people any longer. The electric car line will bring the working classes, the girl clerks, the toil seeking laborer from Air Line Junction to the heart of the city at a cost of five cents and in ten minutes time against fifteen cents and half

the street railways must dance to the music, and if they keep time to it [it] will be a mighty lively dance for them, rather faster than they have been used to, faster possibly than some of them can stand." When bids were opened one rival underbid Robison by offering to carry children for 2 cents and another offered a four cent fare for adults. "Somewhat staggered" Robison caucussed and came up with a one-cent offer for children and free rides for policemen. Council argued for the payment of a percentage of receipts to the city, citing other cities. When Robison demurred, the meeting was adjourned, after a call for more bids. On March 6, Robison re-bid to carry all over eight years of age for five cents, children under eight years for a cent, children in arms free, 24 tickets or fares for a dollar for adults, and three cents between the hours of six and seven morning and evening. (The three-cent offer was devised to help working men going to and from work.) Eventually, when Robison agreed to pay to the city 1% of his gross receipts starting five years after completing his road, the Council awarded him the franchise. (*Blade*, February 19, 26, March 7, 9, 19, 28, 1889.) Having been forced to grant a 3-cent fare, Robison, of course, made a virtue of it for advertising purposes. He told a *Blade* reporter on March 7, "There is one thing about our electric street railway franchise bid, today, that I think is worthy of special mention. That is the rate we have made for working people. For all laboring classes, shop girls, etc., from 6 to 7 in the morning, we made the fare three cents. That is as low a rate as will be found anywhere, and is something the laboring people will be sure to appreciate."

The Great Street-Car Fight: Robison vs. the Consolidated. It was not until July 8, 1891 that Robison was able to operate the entire system with the use of lines on Summit Street. This was due not to delay in construction, but to delay by injunction suits in what was known as the "great street-car fight." Some of these suits, brought by property owners alleging the lines to be nuisances and unnecessary, were denied. Another was brought by the Consolidated company, alleging that for the Robison company to use Summit Street tracks was confiscatory. This also was denied. Condemna-

tion proceedings were then instituted to determine how much Robison must pay for the use of the Consolidated tracks. The sum of \$17,500 was awarded for Adams Street and \$17,310.-69 for Summit Street. This was denounced as "atrocious robbery" by John H. Doyle, attorney for the Consolidated company. But it was cheap enough for David Robison, Jr., who, himself, mounted the first electric car of his company to traverse Summit Street and clang out the notes of sweet victory. (*Blade*, July 8, 1891.)

The Consolidated Electrifies. The Consolidated company was not far behind in electrifying its lines. The process was begun on October 22, 1890, by the purchase of the Glassboro line constructed by the Thomson-Houston Electric Company of Boston. (*Blade*, January 27, 1891.) This was, in fact, the first electric line to open in Toledo, its final trial trips having been successfully run before hundreds of awe-struck onlookers on July 19, 1889. It ran from downtown Toledo out Michigan Street to Buckeye Street, which was the location of the new Libbey glass works. (*Blade*, July 11, 20, 1889.) On July 30, 1889 the *Blade* announced the purchase of the Toledo Consolidated and Metropolitan line by Norman B. Ream and William E. Hale, Chicago capitalists. According to the *Blade*, "they realize that the day of the horse car is past, and they must face the new ideas in the business and adopt the best." Accordingly, much to the derision of Robison, experiments were conducted in the propulsion of cars by compressed air and by storage batteries. (*Blade*, February 26, 27, March 6, 31, April 24, 1890; September 24, 1891.) These experiments proved to Ream and Hale the superiority of dynamo-produced power. At the time of taking over the Glassboro road in October, 1890, the Consolidated also took over its builder, electrical engineer J. D. Wilkes, who had been in charge of Robison construction after finishing the Glassboro job. Wilkes finished the electrification of the 28 miles of Consolidated lines by 1892 when, according to the *Blade*, December 12, 1896, "the last vestige of horse car tracks disappeared." By April, 1892 five lines of electric cars were running to Union Depot. (*Blade*, April 8, 1892.)

Other Consolidated Improvements. More than mere electrification was involved in the program of the Consolidated Company. Its first task was to standardize all gauges at 4 feet 8½ inches. Important extensions were added to the Consolidated system. By 1895 there was the Western Avenue line as well as the Short Belt line. The latter linked the Adams and Monroe Street lines via Delaware and Detroit Avenue. (*Blade*, March 15, 30, 1895; *Bee*, August 12, 1895.) (See Map.) Finally there was the establishment of free transfers between all the old lines in the Consolidated company. No longer did passengers have to pay an extra fare when they transferred between cars of different colors. (*Bee*, April 3, 1894.) Of course, there were no free transfers between the Consolidated lines and the Robison lines.

The Consolidated Company Unites the Power Plants—The Toledo Traction Company. The next step toward the creation of a more complete Toledo public utilities monopoly was the uniting of the plants producing power. By 1894 the Consolidated had a power plant estimated to be worth \$3,000,000 which its president, Albion E. Lang, said was capable of supplying all the street car lines in the city as well as the street lights. (*Bee*, September 12, November 7, 1894.) There were two other power plants besides Robison's—the Western Electric Company and the Toledo Electric Company. These produced power for street lights and commercial uses. J. S. Rodgers of the latter company was quoted in the *Bee* of November 7, 1894 as saying, "As it is now no one is making any money." Thus on May 12, 13 and 15, 1895 the *Bee* announced a "gigantic deal" by which the various roads in the Consolidated combine united to form the Toledo Traction Company. At the same time the Ream and Hale interests absorbed the other two power companies. This combine came to be known as the Toledo Consolidated Electric Company. The entire combination was financed by Ream and Hale, whose attorney, Barton Smith, announced, "We are going to put up a plant here in Toledo equal to that in Chicago and Boston and they are two of the wonders of the world." The new plant, capable of producing 5,000 horsepower, was to be built by J. D. Sargent, famous electrical de-

signer of the Chicago and Boston plants. Headlined the **Blade**, May 15, 1895, "Toledo To Be A Slow Town No Longer."

The Traction Company Absorbs the Robison Lines. With the new combination effecting such economies, it was almost inevitable that the Robison lines should be brought into the monopoly. The Traction Company's new power plant was fully capable of supplying the Robison lines. This union took place in the spring of 1896 with the usual prophecy from "a reliable source" by the **Bee** on December 27, 1895. The first step was the purchase of the Robison lines, by James A. Blair and Company of New York. According to the **Blade**, April 27, 1896, "Mr. Blair is one of the three richest men in America, John D. Rockefeller and John Jacob Astor being the other two." "Perhaps never in the history of Toledo," said the **Blade**, "has there been a deal consummated that means so much for Toledo." Blair assumed all the Robison mortgages and other debts which amounted to nearly \$5,000,000. An entire re-tracking of the Robison line was necessary in the form of a substitution of 75-pound rails or heavier for the original unsubstantial 40 to 55-pound tracks. (**Bee**, April 27, 1896.) The next step in the merger was an agreement by which Ream and Hale of the Traction Company bought into the Robison lines, and Blair of the Robison lines bought into the Traction Company. As Ream told a **Bee** reporter, "Mr. Hale and myself have purchased an interest in the Robison lines and Messrs. Blair and Dennis have taken an equal interest in our company." (**Bee**, May 24, 1896.)

The Revival of the Fear of Monopoly. Now that Toledo had a traction monopoly it also had had a political problem. As in the natural gas contest days when the public was against the Standard Oil Company, now it was the public against the Toledo Traction Company. The chip was on the public shoulder again. The best evidence of it was in the **Bee's** April 27, 1896 notice of the Blair purchase of the Robison lines when the paper indulged in its usual prophecies of monopolies to come: "It will be a misfortune when any one company controls the street car service of this city . . . Of

course there will be an agitation for lower fares and this will come. Toledo will not continue to pay a half more for similar service than Detroit and other cities. If the Toledo Traction Company would anticipate the inevitable and inaugurate the consolidation with a three cent fare, or say eight tickets for 25 cents, the same as Detroit, it would establish itself in the hearts of the people."

The Three-Cent Fare Fight Again. So the fight for a general three-cent fare was on. This popular demand had first appeared in 1889 when the City Council forced Robison to adopt the three-cent fare during the hours of six to seven in the morning and evening, when workingmen were coming from and returning to their homes. It bobbed up in 1893 when Robison wanted a new ordinance to put the three-cent fare on a ticket basis, the tickets to be bought at the office of the railway company if the conductor did not have any. "TOLEDO FLIMFLAMMED," roared the **Bee**, December 15, 1893. Mayor Guy Major vetoed the ordinance, but Council overrode the veto. (**Bee**, December 26, 1893; January 9, 15, 1894.) In his campaign for re-election in 1895, Major cited the Toronto three-cent fare arrangement, and advised that all future franchises be granted on condition that the company pay the city a percentage of gross receipts. (**Blade**, March 11, 1895.) On December 23, 1895, the **Bee** wanted to know why street-car fares were not reduced as a result of "the reduction of the cost of operating street railway lines. Increased profits . . . go to the payment of dividends on very largely watered stocks, or to increased salaries to company officers elected by the 'controlling interests.'" Even the **Blade**, on December 24, 1895 cautiously expressed a preference for reduced fares over a tax on street cars: "The majority of the people of Toledo would rather see a reduction in fares than to see a tax placed on street cars."

The Traction Company Proposes a Continuation of the Five-Cent Fare. The three-cent fare fight became a political issue in the 1897 spring election which elected Samuel M. Jones to the mayor's office and brought about an "anti-Traction" majority in City Council. The Traction Company opened

the battle on December 4, 1896 by presenting to Council a new ordinance to govern the entire Toledo street-car situation for 25 years. It proposed a complete consolidation of all the lines with a continuation of the five-cent fare. The long-term five-cent franchises of the old companies were still in force and would continue even if the proposal was rejected by Council. None of these would expire until after 1900. Under the franchise, there would be free transfers and children under five years of age were to be carried free. The company was to pay one third of one per cent of its gross earnings to the city. About 20 sections of track were to be taken out, mostly from the old Robison lines, which were subject to the three-cent fare for an hour in the mornings and evenings. (Bee, December 5, 1896.) The main idea of the Traction proposal was to get rid of the alleged losses from the parallel Robison lines and the losses of the three-cent fare.

The Traction Company Defends the Five-Cent Fare. In several Council sessions and at a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, President Lang gave the reasons for the Traction Company's proposal. He spoke of the tremendous expenses in the past and described the experimentation with "storage batteries, compressed air and naphtha [sic] motors." The first motors used had to be replaced with heavier and more powerful ones. This required heavier track. "So there was a destruction of property within five or six years, the natural life of which was 20 or 25 years. Since 1885 almost a million dollars had been spent by the company for street paving. The result was that "those who thought that electric power would be cheaper than horse cars were disappointed." Not a dollar of dividends had been paid on the stock since electrification. (Practically all of the securities of the company were bonds.) By absorbing the Robison tracks "there was more track than was profitable to the company or the people." The thing to do was to drop the useless lines and run the cars more frequently. As for the three-cent fare on the Robison lines, it was a dead loss. To this he attributed the failure of the Robison lines: "The Robison company had been misled by the electrical engineers in regard to the cost of operating a line,

and thus assumed the burden of cheap fares and a tax on gross earnings under which it could not stand." He told Samuel M. Jones, in a public meeting, that "if the Robisons hadn't failed under them [three-cent fares] they would be owning their roads yet." As for the idea that more people would ride for three cents than for five, Lang said, "If any plan could be suggested whereby more people could be carried at 3c than at 5 the company was willing to try it." He actually proposed to adopt a 3½ cent fare "if the city will agree to take care of all accidents occurring on the lines or any changes to be made thereafter." As for the poor workingman who had bought homes on the Robison three-cent lines, Lang said, "Three miles was not a long walk if a man had no money." (*Blade*, December 31, 1896, January 20, 1897; *Bee*, December 6, 7, 1896, January 20, 1897.) There was more than met the eye in Lang's remark because the relatively short distances involved made street-car riding something of a luxury for many people. Moreover, asphalt paving and bicycle riding provided some competition for the street cars. (*Bee*, May 24, 1896.)

The Bee Claims the Three-Cent Fare Will Pay For Itself With More Traffic. However, a large section of the public was not impressed. To the *Bee*, which was the tribune of the people in the contest, tying Toledo to the Traction proposals for 25 years was "absurd and preposterous" because of the economies to be expected from the rapid growth of the city and new inventions and improvements. (December 7, 1896.) The *Bee* alleged "a hidden purpose" of the company of getting the public so discontented that it would settle for more than the company deserved. In its more rational moments the *Bee* hit upon what it claimed to be the crux of the problem: that the greater volume of traffic and increased profits would be the result of lower fares. (December 30, 1896.) The *Bee* believed that it had the Traction Company "up a tree" when it was pointed out that the bond sale advertisements asserted a track mileage of 120 miles and the payment of taxes on only 66.87 miles. Moreover, the advertisements asserted the company owned real estate worth \$1,000,000 yet paid only \$2,156 taxes on it. With a tax rate of 2.9 mills the tax should

have been \$29,000. It was also misleading, the **Bee** said, for the company to boast to its bond holders of gross earnings of nearly a million dollars. Under the circumstances, it was alleged that the "while of poverty by the Traction company was belied by cold facts." (January 12, February 21, 1897.) The **Bee** also said that it was bad logic to blame bad service on low fares. "Good service, so far from being incompatible with cheap fares, largely depends upon them." (January 27, 1897.) Finally, the **Bee** argued that, since municipal ownership of the street cars was "inevitable," it would be "folly" to extend the franchise to 25 years. (January 14, 1897.)

The Bee's Program. The **Bee** had its own 9-point program for the solution of the problem:

1. 8 tickets for a quarter. Tickets to be sold by conductors at all times.
2. Children 7 or over the regular fare, under 7, free.
3. Universal transfers.
4. Single fare for those with no tickets, 5 cents.
5. The existing franchise was to be limited to the duration of the average of all the original franchises so that a single new franchise could be arranged in the future.
6. 6-minute service on all main lines.
7. Abandoning of lines only by consent of property owners and City Council.
8. A tax on each car and pole instead of a percentage payment on gross receipts.
9. Continuation of the payment by the company of paving costs within the tracks.

The Blade Collects Statistics and Avoids Traction Politics. The **Blade** was more restrained in its columns. "The question is one of supreme importance, and a decision need not be arrived at in a day, a week or a month," it announced on De-

cember 7, 1896. "What the people want is information." Accordingly, letters were addressed to the mayors of all large American cities, asking for information about fares, tickets, taxes, number of miles, power of council, method of paying for pavement, and so on. The answers, published in full on December 28, gave a mass of information indicating every variety of franchise. Baltimore was the most radical with the company paying the city 7% of the gross receipts, sufficient to maintain the city park system. Indianapolis was the most conservative—the only condition being that the company pay its share of the general property tax. The prevailing fare was 5 cents. Most of the letters showed some degree of dissatisfaction with management. The *Blade* had no conclusion except to decry "grandstand plays" by demagogues. (January 19, 1897.) In the political campaign that followed, the *Blade* declined to recognize the street-car problem as an issue.

Jones Campaigns For The Three-Cent Fare and Municipal Ownership. But it was a political issue just the same. The Democrats, whose candidate for mayor was Parks Hone, adopted a platform in their nominating convention, demanded reduced charges, improved service and "municipal control." They called for forfeiture of the franchise if the Traction Company did not improve services, and condemned it for reducing the wages of its employes. (*Bee*, March 11, 1897.) The Republicans voted down any reference to the issue, (*Bee*, February 25, 1897) but its candidate, Samuel M. Jones, was solidly committed. In a letter to the *Bee*, January 7, 1897, Jones described his trip to Glasgow, Scotland where he found everybody from street-car conductors to bankers enthusiastically in favor of their plan of municipal ownership. Jones, who was a native of Scotland, was lavish in praising the success of the Glasgow plan. He said, "That there are those now living who will see the time when it will be difficult to obtain a franchise for private ownership of street railways in Toledo as it is now in Glasgow, there is hardly room for a question. It is much more difficult to do now than it was twenty years ago, and it is because the people are waking up to the fact that they are giving away their most precious heritage." He

called upon the City Council to provide for 8 tickets for a quarter, universal transfers and "other conditions that will result in municipal ownership of the entire plant after a term of years." After his election as mayor, Jones wired to Reverend Washington Gladden of Columbus, "Am elected in spite of 600 saloons, the Traction company and the devil. Thanks to the people." (Bee, April 6, 1897.)

Anti-Traction Majority in Council in 1897. The street-car issue was injected into the election of members of City Council. From January 20 to April 4, 1897 (the day before election day) the **Bee** almost daily printed a table showing whether the candidates were "Traction," "Anti-Traction," "non-committal" or "not placed." At the beginning most of them were "non-committal" or "not placed." By April 4 all but six were "anti-Traction." Of these six, three were defeated and three were elected. Twenty of the candidates had taken the pledge of a reform organization called the Municipal League. This was a declaration that the candidate had no direct or indirect interest in the Traction Company or any other company asking favors of the city. They pledged that they would vote for no franchise that would not increase the benefits granted to the city. (Bee, February 17, 1897.) There were at least 48 candidates in all for 24 positions on the Board of Aldermen and Council. On April 6, 1897 the **Bee** made the following statement on the "Anti-Traction" victory: "Almost all of the men whose conduct has been such as to indicate that they might be in league with the Toledo Traction Company were defeated, and those who slipped through will find themselves so hopelessly in the minority that they will be harmless."

Anti-Traction Sentiment. Other organizations entered into the fracas. In many wards Democratic organizations, called Jackson Leagues, demanded the three-cent fare. The central Jackson League did likewise, and appointed delegates to attend City Council hearings to argue the matter. (Bee, January 6, 8, 20, 30, February 13, 18, March 9, 1897.) Twice the Central Labor Union officially acted in the matter. On December 10, 1896 it requested City Council "to consider the

right of people who have invested in small houses on the strength of the [three-cent fare] agreement between the city and the Robison company." They resolved to support no man at election who did not agree to require the Traction Company to pay to the city its fair share of taxes and a royalty on its gross receipts. (**Bee**, December 11, 1896.) On February 5, 1897 the Central Labor Union committed itself to a general fare of six tickets for a quarter. The **Bee**, February 6, said the majority favored the three-cent fare, but others argued that since it would be impossible to get this, it was best to seek what could be gotten. At a meeting of the street railway committee of City Council on January 9, 1897, Peter J. Mettler, speaking for the German Central Bund "representing 10,000 voters," demanded 8 tickets for a quarter. While the audience applauded, Mettler warned councilmen, "The feeling was general throughout the city that councilmen should be very careful what they did about this ordinance." (**Bee**, January 10, 1897.)

Traction Company Cuts Wages. One further development added much heat to the contest. On January 10, 1897 it was announced in the **Bee** that a petition was being circulated by the Traction Company, among its workingmen, asking City Council to pass the five-cent ordinance. The **Bee** said that this was regarded by the workingmen as a coercive measure because there were rumors of a wage reduction. On January 31 the **Bee** announced President Lang's order to reduce wages by 10% because of a "material falling in the earnings of the company." Most of the men had been getting \$1.80 cents a day. The **Bee** was furious at what it called "bulldozing," at using the workingmen to bring pressure on the City Council. "It looks," said the editor on February 5, "as if reduction of wages was part of the company's game to force council to give what it asks. Circumstances point to a plot to hold up the people of Toledo and inflict misery on hundreds of men in order to fatten on the prosperity of the city." Earlier the **Bee** had even suggested a popular boycott of the street cars. (January 10, 1897.) The **Blade**, February 4, 1897 bore the headlines, "May Be A Strike," "Council Should Act—Toledo Cannot Afford To Go Through A Strike." The next

day the editor advised that Council adopt the five-cent fare, require five-minute service and insist on living wages for the men. But the local union of the American Association of Street Railway Employees did not strike. Meetings were held in which the company's actions were called "a trap." They decided to play for public sympathy by asking for arbitration. President Lang replied that there was nothing to arbitrate. Thereupon, on February 13, they appealed to the Central Labor Union, as well as to both political parties, to go on record in favor of municipal ownership, since the "Toledo Traction Company has shown the inability of a private corporation to own and operate street railways and public lighting plants with justice to the public and to employees." The Union denied that the company was not making profits. It was resolved not to strike "because of the great injury to the business of Toledo." (Bee, January 10, 30, 31, February 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 1897; Blade, February 4, 5, 1897.)

The Traction Company Obligated to Keep the Robison Lines and the Workingman's Three-Cent Fare On Them. The upshot of this contest was a rejection of the Traction Company's proposal for the new franchise. The old franchises, which would not expire until after 1900, must continue. Although this meant a continuation of the five-cent fare, the Traction Company was prevented from dropping the parallel Robison lines, and must continue the workingman's three-cent fare on Robison lines. A temporary truce ensued which was to last until the old franchises expired in the early 1900's. Then the old fight was to be resumed and to be continued for two decades of hectic struggle. It was to take the people of Toledo a long time to get the three-cent fare idea out of their thinking.

The Traction Company Seeks An Extension of Its Franchise to Supply Electricity For Street Lights. Traction politics flared up briefly in 1899 when Mayor Jones chose to conduct his campaign for reelection largely on the basis of the municipal ownership of Toledo's electric power generation. On December 1, 1899 the Traction Company asked for a renewal of its contract for supplying street-lights with elec-

tricity. The company offered to furnish light at the rate of \$83 per lamp per year instead of the prevailing \$90. It was pointed out that the company had just spent \$200,000 putting the wires underground—the “conduit system” in the downtown Toledo section. It was also pointed out that new glass-enclosed lamps were being installed in place of the exposed sputtering arcs which threw their sparks in all directions. This improvement would reduce the number of “dark hours” when the lights went out as a result of the exposure of the electrodes to the weather—they had to be changed frequently, sometimes daily. (*Bee*, December 2, 1899.)

Failure of Mayor Jones' Campaign for Municipally Owned Power Plant. Mayor Jones' plan for a municipally owned plant was badly conducted. Not until December 11, over a week after the Traction Company had presented its offer to Council, did the mayor push hard for his plan. This was a proposal that the Arbuckle-Ryan Company, dealers in machinery and supplies, should build a power plant for \$250,000 on city-furnished land and buildings. The city would pay the company \$35,000 a year for ten years at the end of which time the city would own the plant. In the meantime, the Arbuckle company would supply the city with light at \$83 a lamp. (*Blade*, December 12, 1899.) Jones' worst error in this was in failing to prepare for a referendum, which the law required should precede the granting of any franchise to a company desiring to use the city streets with its facilities. This forced him to have to admit that there would be an interim between January 1, 1900 and the spring election, when there would be no franchise at all unless a temporary one were granted to the Traction Company. He also erred in failing to provide guarantees that the Arbuckle company would turn over to the city, at the end of ten years, an up-to-date plant. Critics were able to claim that the company might make an exorbitant profit by failing to keep the plant in good condition. (*Bee*, December 15, 1899.) Finally, the Mayor was said to have erred in his political tactics. He made no effort to influence councilmen and aldermen. Prior to the spring election of 1899, he had asked Council to arrange for a referendum, but the aldermen rejected his plan by a vote of 8 to

7. (**Bee**, December 27, 1899.) In the election campaign no candidates for council committed themselves on the issue. He got himself elected mayor, but did not seek to get commitments from candidates for Council. He spent much time in the summer and fall in his campaign to be governor of Ohio. In December he held a mass meeting to push the Arbuckle plan. (**Bee**, December 16, 1899.) Politically speaking, he had no "organization" to support him. As one councilman told him, "Mr. Mayor, if you want to gain anything here, you must frame up some sort of combination in council, as I advised you months ago." He said that a man who wants something like that "cannot accomplish anything by a lot of drivel", referring to Jones' quotations from poets and general preachments about morality. Jones replied that he had never controlled any man's vote and would never try to. (**Bee and Blade**, December 25, 27, 1899.) In the course of his talks to the people, Jones had made dark hints that the best way to get Council to pass measures was to bribe them. Jones, of course, denied that he meant anything so crude, but his remarks angered most councilmen and aldermen. (**Bee**, December 11-13, 1899.) The **Blade**, December 12 also pointed out that Jones' bungling prevented the city from getting a better deal from the Traction Company.

The result was a failure of Jones effort to obtain municipal ownership of a power plant. Both branches of City Council accepted the Traction Company's \$83 offer for five years. When Jones vetoed the measure he was defeated by a unanimous vote of Council. (**Blade**, January 9, 16, 1900.) Jones solaced himself by blaming the people for their lack of interest. "No power on earth," he wrote to his friend, Henry D. Lloyd, on January 2, 1900, ". . . can save the people of Toledo from being 'despoiled' but the people themselves . . . the people have every day just about as good a government and just about as bad a government as they deserve."