Gifford Pinchot's 1914 Campaign

Gifford Pinchot three times sought the office of governor of Pennsylvania. Following spectacular campaigns throughout the state he was twice successful, in 1922 and 1930. On the third occasion, in 1938, he was defeated in the primary.

Another major ambition of Pinchot's, however, never was fulfilled. In a choice between the positions of governor and United States Senator, he probably would have preferred the latter. The Washington atmosphere was more alluring to him than the small state capital of Harrisburg. After all, he had enjoyed national prominence at the feet of Theodore Roosevelt in the Federal government, and at the turn of the century had built in the center of Washington a luxurious home which he continued to occupy intermittently for the rest of his life. He was fond of his inherited home in Milford, Pennsylvania, but he also loved to be in his Washington mansion and to participate in the, to him, more exciting politics of the nation’s capital. On three occasions, in 1914, 1926, and 1934, Pinchot attempted to gain a position of political prominence in Washington by appealing, unsuccessfully, to the voters of Pennsylvania for support as Senator.

To many American citizens in 1914 Gifford Pinchot was a white knight; to others he was a misguided zealot. Certainly his career had been controversial. As head of the United States Forest Service he had forged a governmental bureau of almost unparalleled efficiency and esprit de corps, and to Theodore Roosevelt was far more than an ordinary bureau chief. As a close and admired friend and companion of the President, Pinchot had been kept busy, in addition to his Forest Service work, supplying material for presidential speeches, serving on a myriad of commissions to study national and governmental problems, acting as emissary for Roosevelt, and performing a host of other chores for the restless President. Pinchot was proud of Roosevelt's acknowledgment that “among the many, many public officials who under my administration rendered literally in-
valuable service to the people of the United States, he [Pinchot], on the whole, stood first.”

Although Pinchot had risen to national prominence under Roosevelt, his greatest publicity came as a result of the famed Ballinger-Pinchot feud under President Taft. After Taft assumed the Presidency in 1909, Pinchot was painfully aware of a change in the Washington climate. Conservation of national resources no longer seemed to be one of the primary aims of the man at the helm; the zeal for the preservation of natural resources for the use of the many appeared to have subsided. Pinchot directed his chief criticism at Richard A. Ballinger, who, as soon as he succeeded Pinchot’s close friend James R. Garfield as Secretary of the Interior, began to retract some of the steps that Garfield had taken toward the promotion of conservation. Alarmed at the turn that conservation matters had taken, Pinchot raised such a fuss that President Taft finally felt obliged to order his dismissal for insubordination.

The majority of the members of an ensuing Congressional investigating committee found against Pinchot, but the minority vigorously defended his actions. Most observers agreed that although Pinchot lost before the committee, he won before the bar of public opinion. Although, as in much of his later life, he gained by his actions both stanch friends and bitter enemies, he probably came out of the Ballinger-Pinchot controversy more a martyred hero than anything else. Some of the “fan” letters that he received suggested his name as President of the United States.

It was perhaps natural that at this time of national prominence he should have given serious consideration to entering politics. He had never before sought office, but he had shown some susceptibility to the political virus. Back in 1897 he had written his mother from South Dakota that he hated being away from home and missing the election campaign. After a long talk with Roosevelt in 1904 he had noted in his diary that he was “greatly pleased when he said I didn’t show at all a lack of political training in dealing with men.” And a year later he threw light on his feelings about politics by expressing
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a hope: "The time is not long past when it was not considered respectable to go into politics. I hope the time is not far distant when it will not be respectable not to go into politics." 

Although Pinchot was brought up in a dominantly Republican atmosphere, by 1910 it was clear that his sympathies were not with the old-guard Republicans. In the course of his wide travels of that year he made ringing speeches in their home states for three candidates, all of whom became major leaders of the Progressive Party—Robert LaFollette in Wisconsin, Frank Kent in California, and Albert Beveridge in Indiana.

Pinchot's name was mentioned in some quarters as a candidate for governor of Pennsylvania in the 1910 election, but any steps in this direction were quickly halted when it became generally known that he could not meet the constitutional requirement of seven years' residence in the state. At the time he maintained homes in New York City, in Washington, D. C., and in Milford, Pennsylvania, though his voting residence had always been New York. But the "half-baked boom" for governor was enticing enough to induce Pinchot to prepare for the future by wiring a Milford lawyer at the end of the year: "Please have my name entered on tax list as resident. Immediate action desirable if practicable."

By 1911 Pinchot had become absorbed in the Progressive movement. His growing liberalism was such that as late as October of that year his mother, who was very close to him, was not certain whether he would assist on the "Progressive side or the Democratic" in the 1912 campaign. After Theodore Roosevelt decided to be a candidate, however, there was no question where Pinchot's loyalty lay, and he conducted a vigorous campaign for the Bull Moose Party and his old-time friend. "The mooses," he wrote, "are mooing in plenty these days with loud and attractive sounds."

Pinchot campaigned for the Progressives in 1912 in many parts of the nation, but he was especially eager to become better acquainted with his newly adopted state. Offering himself as a stump speaker in Pennsylvania, he was afforded an excellent opportunity to become
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known by the voters. Nor did this phase of his speaking cease with the close of the campaign. At the end of the year he was writing to a Progressive leader explaining that he had refused an invitation to speak elsewhere on Washington’s Birthday on the grounds that he was going to speak that day in Pennsylvania. “Will you,” he pleaded, “make my word good by giving me the chance?”

The Progressives, or Washington Party as they were listed in Pennsylvania, were spectacularly successful in the state in 1912. Roosevelt polled 445,000 votes to Wilson’s 396,000, leaving Taft a poor third with 273,000. Small wonder, then, that some Pennsylvania Progressives were looking ahead to the 1914 elections for governor and United States Senator with anticipation and optimism.

But the greatest obstacle in the path of any group which hoped to win Pennsylvania was Boies Penrose, that physical and political Goliath. Penrose was just completing his third term as United States Senator and his thirtieth year as a state or national legislator. As acknowledged boss of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania, he was certain to run for a fourth term in 1914.

Nineteen-thirteen was a year of decision for Gifford Pinchot. He was obviously interested in running for office, but he sensed the deleterious effect it might have on his professional forestry career, and was hesitant to take the plunge. He clearly did not wish to enter the contest if he had important opposition in the primary.

Popular among many of the Progressives of Pennsylvania, and likely to be designated by the Washington Party as a candidate for some office was William Draper Lewis, dean of the law school of the University of Pennsylvania. In the middle of 1913 there was talk of running Lewis for Senator and Pinchot for governor. Pinchot, who had come to admire Lewis, “agreed heartily” concerning the senatorship, but had to remind some of the leaders of his own ineligibility for the governorship because of his brief residence in Pennsylvania.

At this point the influence of William Flinn, Washington Party boss from Pittsburgh, became increasingly evident. Flinn, a former partner in the old Matthew Quay Republican machine, had done much toward putting Pennsylvania in the Roosevelt column in 1912. Flinn’s interest in progressivism was limited, but he was a bitter opponent of Penrose. It was Flinn’s conclusion that Lewis and

---

9 Pinchot to E. A. Van Valkenberg, Dec. 30, 1912.
Pinchot were the two strongest candidates that the Progressives could muster, and that Pinchot should seek the senatorial seat.

Although Lewis was still generally considered as a possibility for the Senate race, Pinchot apparently was given some indication by Flinn and other leaders that he could expect to be chosen. But, because he considered himself committed to Lewis, Pinchot scrupulously avoided doing "anything that in any way would look like acquiescing in the suggestion that the nomination might ultimately come to me." By the middle of December, 1913, however, he was asking advice from some of his closest friends on whether to run. Explaining that "practically everyone" he consulted, including his family, felt he "should accept the nomination," he confided to a British friend that "The decision I must make on this question involves the general direction of my work for the rest of my life. . . . there would be . . . no other excuse for refusing this call than a determination to stay out of politics for good, and give myself up on non-political lines to the Country Life and Conservation work."

To former Governor George C. Pardee of California he admitted that he was "pretty hungry" to get into the fight with Penrose, but that his "one objection" was he "might lose what little chance I have to be effective in Conservation if I were badly beaten." But he became convinced that serious defeat was unlikely; "I have been to Philadelphia," he wrote his sister, "talking with the leaders there, and find that apparently there is a fair chance to win."

The advice from his friends was mixed. Senator Beveridge, for example, thought he should run. Henry L. Stimson and Henry Wallace felt it would be a mistake to do so. Although Pinchot's inclination was to make the race, and he may have been hoping for advice which would support this feeling, he seems to have thoroughly wrestled with himself in an effort to reach the final decision.

Undoubtedly, word that Theodore Roosevelt was willing to come into the state in support of the Washington ticket helped to tip the scales. Pinchot had wondered whether such aid would be forth-
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coming. The bond of friendship between the two had been somewhat strained after the election of 1912 when Pinchot, and others, had vigorously protested the considerable influence exercised by steel magnate George W. Perkins as chairman of the National Executive Committee of the Progressive Party. Roosevelt had supported Perkins and had expressed annoyance at Pinchot’s attitude. But when Pinchot was assured by a party leader in Pennsylvania (E. A. Van Valkenberg) that Roosevelt had agreed to come into the state during the campaign, he joyfully wrote the former President that this was “One of the strongest arguments in favor of going in. . . . If I do go in, I shall of course bank on your support. . . .”

When on February 5, 1914, the leaders of the Washington Party met in Harrisburg to choose a slate to run in the primary—the first direct primary ever held in Pennsylvania for governor and Senator—they quickly endorsed Gifford Pinchot for Senator. Unable to agree on a candidate from among the half dozen aspirants for governor, they adjourned until the 25th, at which time, by a vote of 22 to 17, they supported Flinn’s other favorite, Dean Lewis, for the post. At about the same time the Democratic Party announced as its candidates Congressman A. Mitchell Palmer for Senator and Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg publisher, for governor.

Although some lesser Republican aspirants had already stated their intentions of entering the primary, Senator Penrose made no formal announcement of his candidacy until March 8. He had approached the Vare brothers in Philadelphia to learn the price of support from their powerful city machine. Unfriendly both to the Vares and the candidate whom they proposed for governor, Martin Brumbaugh, Penrose nevertheless came to terms with the Philadelphia bosses and agreed to accept Brumbaugh. As he announced his candidacy, Penrose piously criticized the Democratic and Washington Party leaders for “making slates and issuing their orders to the electors as though the popular primary were a mere formality unworthy of consideration.” Brumbaugh, superintendent of the public
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schools of Philadelphia, stressed in his announcement that he was bound by no entangling alliances.

The opening blast in Pinchot's campaign was fired in a letter to the state chairman of the Washington Party, who had formally notified Pinchot that he was the unanimous choice of the party leaders and that no other name than his had been mentioned at the party meeting where the choice was made. "This is a clear call to action," wrote Pinchot, "which I have no right and no desire to refuse." The "first great task now before the citizens of Pennsylvania," intoned the candidate, "is to drive out of power and destroy the bi-partisan political machine which has so long dominated and exploited the State in the interest of the privileged few and private monopoly." Pinchot's statement that Penrose's political machine was bipartisan was not an exaggeration. Democratic Party members were at this time woefully few in Pennsylvania; in the years before Woodrow Wilson captured the Presidency, the Democrats had to some extent been a kept party in Pennsylvania—existing with the help of crumbs of patronage and other favors which Republican bosses were willing to throw their way.

Pinchot's letter of acceptance ended with several phrases which in later years were to become familiar to Pennsylvanians as standard weapons used by Pinchot in political battles: "Private monopoly [of natural resources] is the backbone of all our troubles. . . . the public good comes before private profit. . . . the object of government is not great riches for the magnates, but human welfare and justice between man and man."

In a personal letter to E. W. Scripps, Pinchot indicated that his opinions concerning "magnates" were not merely catch phrases used as political slogans, but sprang from sincere feelings. He believed, he wrote, that "there can be by no possibility any great amount of wealth held by one man, without that man's power to accumulate and hold the wealth having rested on special privilege." Then he added an interesting reservation, "with exception, perhaps, of a man who earns it as Henry Ford has done. I am not clear about his case." Before closing his letter he admitted to getting "some consolation out of the fact that I am already being called a demagogue with assorted
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trimmings by the newspaper representatives of the boiled-shirt class in this State.”

Primary day on May 19 brought no surprises. Candidates endorsed by the machines were victorious on all three major tickets. Penrose polled a vote of 220,000. Pinchot, who had no opposition, was high man on his ticket but polled only 47,000 votes; the total vote of the Washington Party was forebodingly light.

A fortnight after the primary, the state committee of the Washington Party adopted a platform which echoed many of the Progressive planks on which Theodore Roosevelt had stood in the 1912 Presidential campaign. But the “paramount issue in Pennsylvania,” insisted the platform, was Penroseism. This issue was not only a political, but a “moral” one. And the Senator was castigated for playing a leading role in the “crime of 1912” when Taft was nominated for President by the Republicans over Roosevelt. Much of the sentiment of the party platform was similar to that in Pinchot’s own briefer platform which he had published in a booklet before the primary. His personal declaration, later printed in still shorter form on a small card, was circulated widely and served to call attention to a degree of independence of the candidate from the rest of the party ticket, a feature of his campaigning which recurred in various later elections.

Pinchot was able to coast along in his unopposed primary, but by May, with the November race against Penrose in mind, he began campaigning in deadly earnest and with unbounded vigor. This tall, wiry bachelor of forty-nine years, handsome in a rugged way, made a striking appearance. The core of his campaign was a series of trips over bumpy roads throughout the state in a Ford touring car, usually with the top down. Most of the driving was done by his mother’s chauffeur. Pinchot’s graying, bushy moustache fluttered in the breeze in sharp contrast to his proper black bow tie set on a stiff winged collar. A kind of dignity and impressiveness pervaded the automobile and its occupant. Some months later, after his marriage, his bride persuaded him to give up the bow tie by chiding him for looking the part of an undertaker.

These trips through the cities and villages were carefully planned by Stephen Stahlnecker, who managed this and later Pinchot cam-
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campaigns. Each day about 1,000 post cards were mailed to voters in sections that Pinchot was to visit. Printed on one side of the card, along with a fighting picture of the candidate, were three brief statements: a portion of his acceptance letter under the heading "The time has come to clean house"; a strong statement in favor of the protective tariff, which was a must in Pennsylvania, but which emphasized that it should help workers as well as employers; and one of the pro-Pinchot statements from Theodore Roosevelt's autobiography. Printed on the address side of the card was the candidate's itinerary and the words, "I want to meet you personally." Pinchot lost few opportunities while en route to stop his car between towns and meet gatherings which might be along the highway. All speeches—sometimes as many as twenty or thirty a day—were held to a maximum of five minutes. Personal contact was the prime objective. The jubilant candidate wrote to his brother in May that he was working out a method whereby he could shake hands "with upwards of a thousand a day."\(^23\) To Theodore Roosevelt he wrote of his "new plan [which] has not been tried before" of meeting the men outside of their factories at noontime or as they went to or from work.\(^24\)

Although Pinchot had hoped to cover the entire state in his "machine," he was unable to meet his goal, partly because of the illness and death of his mother in the middle of the campaign. Mrs. Mary Eno Pinchot had leaned toward Gifford as the favorite of her three children. From the death of her husband in 1908, she had acted as hostess for Gifford in the spacious home where they lived together in Washington, D. C. For years, presidents, senators, foreign dignitaries, and other persons high in Washington society had been entertained there. Gifford had a deep attachment and admiration for his mother. Early in the year, Pinchot and the other members of the family had become concerned about "Mamee's" health, and he had made frequent trips to Washington to see her. In July he wrote that there was no hope for her recovery, but that she was very comfortable and cheerful.\(^25\)

It was at about this time that Pinchot and Cornelia Bryce, wealthy descendant of Peter Cooper, decided to advance the date of their
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marriage. Although no exact time had been set for the wedding, the couple decided that the event should take place while Mrs. Pinchot was still able to know of her son’s happiness. Pinchot, after talking with his fiancee’s mother, noted in his diary, “The day of the final yes,” and on August 15 the couple were quietly married in the presence of the family and a few close friends, including Theodore Roosevelt, at the Bryce home on Long Island. Immediately after the wedding, the couple crossed Long Island Sound by boat to be at “Mamee’s” bedside in the home of her brother in Saugutuck, Connecticut. Ten days later, on August 25, Mrs. Pinchot died.

Pinchot lost about a month of campaigning as a result of his mother’s illness. But when he returned to the race he had with him his new wife as a helper. While he spoke to a group of workers, she would pass literature through the crowd. Cornelia Pinchot was no shrinking violet. She had received some prominence, at least around New York state, as a champion of the working girl. And more than once she had marched in parades advocating woman’s suffrage. Pinchot always proudly claimed that Theodore Roosevelt had said she knew more about politics than any other woman among his friends.

A new turn of events in the political situation took place in September. Even before the candidates of the various parties had been announced early in the year, the word “fusion” had appeared in a good many political conversations. Some prognosticators, with good reason, saw no possible way of defeating Penrose or the candidates he supported without some joining of the forces of the Democrats and Progressives. Pinchot was one of the main bulwarks against fusion. But Dean Lewis, after a talk with Roosevelt and a conference of Progressive leaders in Philadelphia, withdrew from the race in favor of Vance McCormick, the Democratic nominee.

Although Pinchot had opposed fusion, he was a sincere admirer of McCormick’s, to whom he graciously threw a bouquet by saying that “Lewis could not have withdrawn in favor of a better man.” A few days later, boss Flinn insisted that five sixths of his party members

---

26 Pinchot diary, Aug. 5, 1914.
27 For example, Pinchot to F. D. Roosevelt, Nov. 18, 1942. This information was used in the campaign material prepared for Mrs. Pinchot’s unsuccessful attempt to win a seat in Congress in 1928.
28 The Patriot, Sept. 11, 1914.
were in favor of McCormick and announced that “Pinchot is convinced that it is a good thing.” Pinchot had acquiesced, but the change tended to make him even more a lone wolf than before. Whereas he and Lewis in the early part of the campaign had toured a number of counties together, Pinchot considered it impolitic to appear on the same platform with McCormick, the Democrat.

Pinchot continued up and down the state proclaiming the unfitness of Penrose to represent the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the United States Senate. He spoke with conviction. Brought up in a “proper” home atmosphere, in the main a teetotaler, a believer in the righteousness of many of his causes, he abhorred the moral standards that he believed Penrose stood for, and opposed him as much on spiritual as on political grounds. That the feeling was mutual was evidenced by Penrose’s sneering remarks concerning the virtuous and angelic Pin-shot.29

Meanwhile, Penrose was confounding both his friends and enemies by proving to be an adept campaigner. When the seventeenth amendment to the United States Constitution was passed in 1913, providing for the direct election of senators by the voters rather than by the state legislature, predictions were made that the new system would be a handicap to Penrose. Not a good speechmaker, he tended to be too profound and to talk over the heads of the people. But faced with the necessity of appealing to the voters, he developed the ability to meet them on their own levels. He “boned up,” for example, on cattle and sheep and was able to impress farmers in his friendly discussions with them at county fairs. Pinchot, on the other hand, had not yet fully achieved the easy common touch which was of such political benefit to him in later years.

As a challenger of the champion, Pinchot drew support throughout the nation from liberal-minded citizens. Penrose, as has been noted, had been one of the leaders in the Republican National Convention of 1912 who had engineered the nomination of Taft over Roosevelt. Moreover, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee he was in a strategic spot to favor big business. The breadth of Pinchot’s support was indicated by the thirty-two-page campaign booklet, “What Gifford Pinchot Stands For,” which listed favorable quotations not

only from Theodore Roosevelt, but also from such persons as Judge Ben. B. Lindsey, Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War under Taft, Jane Addams, and Senator Moses Clapp of Minnesota. Other names included as belonging in Pinchot's "column" were those of Albert J. Beveridge, Governor Hiram W. Johnson of California, and Booker T. Washington. For a state election, the list of supporters was strikingly dominated by non-Pennsylvanians who, of course, were unable to help the candidate with their votes.

With the exception of the Philadelphia North American, the Progressive organ, Penrose had most of the press in Pennsylvania solidly behind him. The Philadelphia Public Ledger, for example, repeatedly called Pinchot a carpetbagger, a "rank outsider . . . [who] aspires to be United States Senator on the High Moral Ticket." Two days after the primary, the Ledger, although admitting that Pinchot was a "gentleman of high ideals and pure character," branded him as "one-ideaed, a whimsical, erratic, misguided enthusiast, entirely unfitted for legislative functions." The Philadelphia Inquirer was similarly unimpressed: "Mr. Pinchot can mend a sick tree, but there has never been the slightest suspicion that he could tell a tariff schedule if he should happen to see one from a hole in the wall." For his campaign booklet Pinchot used one quotation from the organ of the Pennsylvania Anti-Saloon League, but for additional editorial quotes in favor of his candidacy he had to rely on the Portland (Oregon) Journal, the socialist Milwaukee Leader, and, especially, the Republican New York Tribune which urged citizens of all parties to "unite in support of Mr. Pinchot." The Tribune might have hesitated to offer such advice if they had seen the telegram which Pinchot sent to his brother in March expressing the opinion that "the only hope of getting our policies enacted under conditions that will mean their successful application, is to smash the Republican party."

Although Pinchot kept pounding on the evils of Penroseism as his major plank, he repeatedly tried, without success, to inject another issue into the campaign. Before the campaign began, he toyed with a suggestion of his brother Amos that the United States should buy
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coal lands in Pennsylvania for the purpose of breaking the “anthracite trust.”34 Indeed, Gifford at this time was seeking a guiding philosophy concerning monopolies. In January he went so far along the collectivist trail as to express an opinion in a personal letter that he "look[ed] forward to the time when we shall have Government ownership of railroads in this country, and when certain of the great basic resources, like coal, iron, copper, lead, timber, and water power, will all be held and administered by the public, as will the public utilities of our cities."35 Pinchot receded from this more extreme position, however, and in later years usually preached the gospel of government regulation rather than government ownership.

His anthracite plan received a cool reception from his friends and political leaders in Pennsylvania,36 but he refused to drop the subject completely. In his letter of acceptance of the nomination he had made no mention of coal but, as has been seen, he did stress that “private monopoly [of natural resources] is the backbone of all our troubles” and should be destroyed. And a few weeks later, in writing his close friend George Woodruff, later to be attorney general of Pennsylvania under Pinchot, he expressed his conviction that “there is in Pennsylvania no other monopoly so directly and harmfully felt” as anthracite coal.37

By the time Pinchot had issued his own platform on April 14 he had toned down his brother’s radical idea to a proposal for a national commission with power to limit the wholesale price of anthracite in interstate commerce. An additional paragraph on coal was inserted in the platform as the result of a decision six days later by the Supreme Court of the United States. In the German Alliance Insurance case the court decided that the state of Kansas had the right to regulate the price of insurance. Under this principle, reasoned Pinchot, Pennsylvania had the right to regulate the price of anthracite. “I believe in and will work for such regulation. Thus all who use anthracite can get their coal cheaper.” Later on, when the platform of the Washington Party was approved, it provided that “Prices and services [of coal] should be regulated by law.” That anthracite control
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was not more of a magnet for votes in Pennsylvania tended to show that Pinchot was in reality poorly informed on Pennsylvania voter opinion.

There is no question that Pinchot was relying heavily on the help of his idol, Theodore Roosevelt. All-out support by the former President, he believed, could be the determining factor in the election. Roosevelt, who had spent several months in South America, returned on the very day of the Pennsylvania primary. Within twenty-four hours, Pinchot was at his Oyster Bay home asking for help. He found "the chief" thin and still weakened from a fever contracted in the Brazilian jungle. But he came away with a promise that Roosevelt would take an active part in the fight in Pennsylvania. Enthusiastically Pinchot noted in his diary, "TR just like his old self. . . . Like old times."38 He obviously was not referring to Roosevelt's health, but to his attitude.

Pinchot was not the only Progressive candidate, however, seeking assistance from the former President. Pressing appeals came from candidates in a number of states, including New York, Kansas, Illinois and Ohio. Roosevelt was far from physically fit. But, although he apparently realized the futility of the Progressive cause,39 he played the game for his old friends by scheduling more speeches than his physical condition warranted.

In Pennsylvania there was an added incentive to help because Pinchot was trying to topple one of Roosevelt's prime political enemies. Roosevelt's first appearance in the campaign was in company with Pinchot at a Progressive rally in Pittsburgh on the last day of June, where he attacked Penrose and the Wilson Administration with equal vigor. At a later date he spoke, among other places, in Philadelphia. He also agreed to sandwich in during the last week of the campaign, between speeches in West Virginia and New York, a flying tour across the state of Pennsylvania in a private train. When, however, he was presented with the list of appearances that had been arranged for this whirlwind tour—amounting each day to about twenty stops, including brief appearances on the train's platform and two or three longer addresses—he rebelled. It seemed to him an im-
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possible schedule, and he sent wires of protest to Pinchot and other Progressive leaders.

In reply to the chief’s request that the load be lightened, Pinchot wired plaintively: “I have never asked you for anything personal before. I ask you now to keep this schedule.”40 Added to this appeal was an earlier telegram from Mrs. Pinchot insisting that “Gifford . . . needs you desperately for as long as you can possibly be spared.” Roosevelt went through with the tour about as planned, but with some feeling bordering on resentment at the burden which had been loaded on his weary body.41

The prestige of the Roosevelt name was further marshaled in support of Pinchot when 1,200,000 cards were mailed from Oyster Bay containing a facsimile of Roosevelt’s handwriting and signed “Theodore Roosevelt.” “I am writing,” it began, “to ask you personally for your support of Gifford Pinchot against Boies Penrose. . . . They are fighting this year for the same things for which we fought in 1912.” One postmaster was arrested for burning the cards which came to his office.42 Another postmaster, indeed, was dismissed for holding up Pinchot cards.43 On several occasions the Pinchot forces complained that their mailings had been unnecessarily delayed in delivery.

That the Washington Party encountered great difficulty in raising money for their campaign was revealed by a dejected confidential letter written to Pinchot in the middle of September by the state treasurer of the party.44 Pinchot himself reported total personal expenditures for both the primary and election of $49,000.

Like every good politician, Pinchot publicly predicted victory for himself. He honestly believed he had a chance to dethrone Senator Penrose. A few days before the election, for example, he wrote a close friend in Washington, “things look very well in the campaign, and I believe we are going to win.”45

But the crusading forester had failed to capture the public fancy in the campaign. Indeed, some voters showed more interest in the war
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headlines than in the election. Pennsylvania, which had veered from its accustomed Republican path in 1912, swung back to familiar ground and to Boies Penrose in 1914. Brumbaugh, in gaining the governor’s chair, amassed the largest number of votes ever received by a state candidate in Pennsylvania prior to the enfranchisement of women. Penrose polled 520,000 votes, which was almost as many as the total of both Congressman Palmer (266,000) and Pinchot (269,000), who gained second place, aided by 49,000 votes on a Bull Moose ticket and 18,000 on a Roosevelt Progressive ticket. Pinchot carried fourteen rural counties of the total of sixty-seven. Palmer captured Pinchot’s home county of Pike.

The fate of the Progressives was not unique in Pennsylvania. Every prominent candidate of the party except Governor Hiram Johnson in California went down to defeat. In the country as a whole, as well as in Pennsylvania, the Progressives as a party had collapsed.

Gifford Pinchot, by nature an optimist in politics, was not willing to concede the party’s demise. The election, he insisted, was the result of “a frightened vote, blindly hoping to secure prosperity.” And he made it clear that one defeat was not enough to discourage him from further participation in the great game of politics. “I am going ahead with the fight for political and economic freedom in Pennsylvania,” he wrote his supporters. “I propose to keep on, and I count on your help.”

Keep on he did, until 1922 when his chance to run came again—this time for governor, and flying the colors of the Republican Party. The defeat of 1914 was a rout. But it is probably safe to say that without the political experience and the political acquaintanceships gained in the 1914 campaign, Gifford Pinchot would not have won the governorship in 1922.
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