

## Expert Report of Dr. Lisa J. Disch and Dr. Kelly Goodman

### Declaration

Plaintiffs in the case of *Michigan Common Sense Party v. Jocelyn Benson* have challenged the statutory ban in the state of Michigan on what is commonly known as “fusion voting” in partisan general elections. The complaint filed in the case contests MCL 168.691 to 168.695, which prevent a candidate’s name from appearing in more than one ballot column or on more than one ticket, as a violation of the Michigan Constitution.

Fusion voting is the practice of allowing a candidate for public office to be listed on the ballot as the endorsed nominee of more than one political party. In its contemporary practice, the votes cast for the political parties who cross-nominate the same candidate are typically tabulated separately for each nominating party, then “fused” together to create a combined vote total for that person. Throughout the nineteenth-century, Michigan’s third political parties forged cross-party coalitions. Before the Civil War, these alliances often took the form of cross-party mergers to represent Michigan’s antislavery interests. Beginning in the 1870s dual (or cross-) nominations became widespread nationwide and in Michigan, where third political parties partnered with each other, with Democrats, and occasionally Republicans, to represent the state’s agricultural interests. From the 1880s to 1890s, the fusion strategy enabled Democrats and third political parties to achieve significant pro-democracy reforms alongside electoral victories; Republican party members publicly denounced both as a threat to their power. In 1893, after regaining the majority, Michigan Republicans proposed what would have been the “first explicitly antifusion law” in the US had it succeeded.<sup>1</sup> In 1895, having swept all but one House seat, Michigan Republicans banned fusion by law.<sup>2</sup> The form of fusion desired by plaintiffs in this case remains legal elsewhere and is regularly used in Connecticut and New York.

For this report, we have been asked to review the historical record, outline in detail fusion politics in Michigan history and answer: 1) whether the historical record suggests that fusion nominations were a well-established practice of Michigan politics; 2) whether the historical record suggests that Michigan’s fusion ban was motivated by partisan animus.

To preview our expert conclusions, our first opinion is that Michigan’s political parties engaged in cross-party coalition-building throughout the nineteenth century and that practice took many different forms, including fusion nominations. In contrast to the shifting interest- group coalitions of pluralist politics, *cross-party* coalitions were forged by organized parties who joined together to support partisan or principled goals. These alliances could support individual candidates and appear as nominations on multiple party tickets or multiple ballot lines, or they could forge a new party organization, which involved political parties willingly sacrificing their distinct ballot lines to merge onto a single ballot line with a new name. Our second opinion is that fusion nominations, a form of cross-party alliance that was a permitted practice, understood and used by Michigan political parties and voters, became firmly established as a practice during the last three decades of the nineteenth century. Once established, fusion nominations made cross-party coalition-building a more cooperative and democratically representative practice that,

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter H. Argersinger, “A Place on the Ballot: Fusion Politics and Antifusion Laws,” *American Historical Review* 85, no. 2 (1980): 287-306, at 297

<sup>2</sup> Michigan’s Public Acts, 1895, No. 271.

under some conditions, enabled third political parties to challenge the dominant parties of the moment. Our third opinion is that fusion nominations became a more frequent, established practice in Michigan, as in other states, in the 1870s. Our fourth opinion is that in Michigan, relative to other states where electoral fusion was practiced, political parties and voters made exceptionally consistent use of fusion nominations to effect cross-party alliances that, in the 1891-1892 legislative session, secured the passage of ground-breaking democratic reforms, including the secret ballot and proportional representation. Our fifth opinion is that Michigan's 1893 failed attempt to ban fusion and its 1895 fusion ban, like those in other states, was not only motivated by partisan animus against challenger parties but involved an exceptionally blatant act of "ballot manipulation."<sup>3</sup>

### **Qualifications--Disch**

I, Lisa Disch, am a Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, where I have been a faculty member since 2008. I earned my Ph.D. at Rutgers University in 1988. From 1988 to 1990 I held a postdoctoral position as a Mellon Instructor in the Collegiate Division of the Social Sciences at the University of Chicago. From 1990 to 2008 I was a faculty member in the Department of Political Science at the University of Minnesota. A copy of my curriculum vitae is attached.

I am a political theorist whose expertise lies in the study of democratic politics and institutions. My research focuses on representation, third political parties, feminist political theory, and environmental thought. I published a book on electoral fusion, *The Tyranny of the Two-Party System* (Columbia University Press). In addition, I am the author of *Making Constituencies* (University of Chicago Press) and *Hannah Arendt and the Limits of Philosophy* (Cornell University Press), co-editor of *The Constructivist Turn in Political Representation* (Edinburgh University Press), co-editor of and contributor to *The Feminist Political Theory Handbook* (Oxford University Press), and editor of and contributor to *1970s Feminisms*, a special issue of *South Atlantic Quarterly*. I have also published articles in respected scholarly peer-reviewed journals such as the *American Political Science Review* and *Political Theory*. I serve on the editorial board of the *American Political Science Review* and am a member of the American Political Science Association. I am professionally active and give presentations at many national and international conferences.

My opinions in this case draw from my own knowledge of the history of fusion in the United States as well as a variety of sources including academic research, newspaper archives, and legal cases. I am being compensated by plaintiffs' counsel at the rate of \$150 per hour for my work in this case. The opinions I express in this report reflect my independent judgment, and my fees do not depend on the opinion or conclusions I reach. I reserve the right to modify my opinions as new information becomes available.

### **Qualifications--Goodman**

---

<sup>3</sup> Argersinger, "Place," 296.

I, Kelly Goodman, am a Faculty Fellow at Harvard University's Warren Center for Studies in American History and an Adjunct Professor of Educational Foundations at West Chester University of Pennsylvania, where I have been a faculty member since 2021. I earned my Ph.D. in History at Yale University in 2021. Before graduate school, I worked as a data analyst at a Detroit nonprofit and earned my B.A. from the University of Michigan. A copy of my curriculum vitae is attached.

I am a political historian whose expertise lies in the study of grassroots labor and education politics as well as the social history of institutions. My research focuses on legal and fiscal governance, state politics, education policymaking, and teacher unionism in the United States from the late nineteenth century to the present. My book manuscript *Tax the Rich: A History of Teachers, Unions, and School Finance in the Modern United States* (University of Pennsylvania Press) looks particularly closely at Michigan and California. I have published book reviews in respected scholarly peer-reviewed journals such as the *History of Education Quarterly*. My article manuscripts are under consideration at *Law and History Review* and *Modern Intellectual History* where editors asked me to revise and resubmit. I am professionally active and give presentations at many regional and national conferences.

My opinions in this case draw from my own knowledge of United States political history as well as extensive reading in secondary sources and research in primary sources including dissertations, periodicals, daily newspapers, quantitative data, and archival collections. I am being compensated by plaintiffs' counsel at the rate of \$75 per hour for my work in this case. The opinions I express in this report reflect my independent judgment, and my fees do not depend on the opinion or conclusions I reach. I reserve the right to modify my opinions as new information becomes available.

I had one graduate student and two undergraduate students assist me in gathering material for this report:

Jayson Otto, Ph. D. Student, History, Michigan State University

Mina Hinton, B. A. Student, History, West Chester University of Pennsylvania

Julien Levesque, B. A. Student, History, West Chester University of Pennsylvania

## **Executive Summary**

Third party politics in nineteenth-century America was characterized by cross-party coalition-building among third political parties and between these challenger parties and one (typically the second place) major political party. Cross-party coalitions differ from the shifting interest-group coalitions of pluralist politics: they were alliances forged by organized parties to support partisan or principled goals. These alliances could form in support of individual candidates and appear as nominations on multiple party tickets or multiple ballot lines, or they could involve cross-party mergers where political parties willingly sacrificed their distinct ballot lines to inaugurate a single party organization with a shared ballot line and a new name.

The Free Soil Party (1848) and the Republican Party (1854) are products of such cross-party mergers, which were then called “fusions.”<sup>4</sup> Leaders of Michigan’s anti-slavery third political parties played a key role in both mergers but were especially significant to the founding of the Republican Party, which got its start in a “fusion movement” that anti-slavery third parties and major party factions in Michigan (and Wisconsin) were the first to embrace prior to 1855.<sup>5</sup> Michigan anti-slavery forces convened to found an “anti-Nebraska fusion” party in Jackson on February 22, 1854 (six days before the celebrated meeting in Ripon, Wisconsin, where anti-Nebraska forces committed to call themselves “Republicans”) and “inaugurated the Republican Party’s first formal state organization” in July.<sup>6</sup>

After a lull in the 1860s, the 1870’s saw an upsurge in third political party activity and a jump to 250 fusion candidacies in congressional and gubernatorial races, across more than 20 states.<sup>7</sup> Fusion candidacies, which involved candidates receiving multiple nominations and appearing on the ticket of more than one political party, allowed political parties to form alliances without giving up their distinct ballot lines and identities, which could make cross-party coalition-building more cooperative and representative of the interests of political minorities. Fusion politics took two forms in addition to dual nominations: 1) *non-compete alliances*, where all cooperating parties maintained distinct tickets but refrained from contesting a particular office so as not to split the vote against the candidate of a coalition partner; 2) *party confederations*, where the co-operating parties hyphenated their names to signal a cooperative nomination of a single candidate or slate of candidates. Historian Peter H. Argersinger, a leading expert on nineteenth-century fusion and the antifusion movement, suggests that Michigan stood out during this period of fusion’s heyday: “By 1893, Michigan had perhaps experienced more consistent fusion politics than any other state.”<sup>8</sup>

Republicans claimed the majority in the Michigan legislature in the lead up to the Civil War and held it, “if often by only a plurality,” to the end of the nineteenth-century for all but one legislative session (1891-1892).<sup>9</sup> Democrats remained competitive statewide up to the 1892 election by using the various forms of fusion to forge alliances with third political parties that (in the Midwest) were largely made up of former Republican party members. In 1882, the Democrats and the Greenbackers made a non-compete alliance over state, congressional, legislative, and county offices, apportioning nominations for these offices and ratifying the other party’s nominations at their conventions.<sup>10</sup> That alliance enabled former Republican Josiah W. Begole, running on the Democratic-Greenback Labor Party fusion ticket, to seize the governorship from the Republican incumbent. Begole won by fewer than 5,000 votes while the

---

<sup>4</sup> Corey M. Brooks, *Liberty Power: Antislavery Third Parties and the Transformation of American Politics* (University of Chicago Press, 2016), 196.

<sup>5</sup> William E. Gienapp, *The Origins of the Republican Party 1852-1856* (Oxford University Press, 1987), 104.

<sup>6</sup> Brooks, *Liberty Power*, 196-197.

<sup>7</sup> Howard A. Scarrow, “Duverger’s Law, Fusion, and the Decline of American ‘Third’ Parties,” *Western Political Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (1986): 634-647 at 636.

<sup>8</sup> Argersinger, “Place,” 295.

<sup>9</sup> Peter H. Argersinger, “Electoral Reform and Partisan Jugglery,” *Political Science Quarterly* 119, no. 3 (2004): 499-520 at 504.

<sup>10</sup> Paul A. Lovchuk, “Michigan Gold Democrats in the Campaign of 1896” (Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1937), 5.

Republican ticket swept the remaining executive offices by margins of 8,500 to 14,000.<sup>11</sup> As the line graphs in Appendix A show, Democrats remained competitive up to the 1892 election, when Republicans regained control of the legislature. Fusion helped Michigan's nineteenth-century third political parties win office, which strengthened democracy because it improved political representation for political minorities and because those candidates often pioneered significant democratic reforms. In 1882, Democratic-Greenback Labor governor Josiah Begole established a Bureau of Labor Statistics, advanced women's suffrage, and reduced both interest and railroad rates—all high priority reforms for Greenbackers. In 1885, Democrat-Greenback state Representative George W. Walthew (Wayne County), also an officer in the Knights of Labor, proposed legislation that might have made Michigan the first state in the US to adopt Australian-style ballot reform.<sup>12</sup> Instead, the bill was defeated on the House floor, and it required six years, plus a (brief) Democratic takeover of the majority, to get the job done.

In 1891, the Democratic-majority legislature succeeded in passing the Miner Electoral Law, which provided for presidential electors to be selected by district rather than winner-take-all.<sup>13</sup> An ingenious alternative to proportional representation that states could enact without Congressional approval, the reform infuriated Michigan Republicans and set off an “unprecedented legal challenge to overturn it.”<sup>14</sup> Although fusion was not directly implicated in the Miner Electoral Law, Democrats “exulted” and Republicans feared that “Democratic fusion with Populists might leave Michigan Republicans with only one electoral vote” under the new law's provisions.<sup>15</sup> In 1892, Michigan Attorney General Adolphus A. Ellis, who was elected to the post by a Patrons of Industry-Democratic Party fusion, successfully defended the Miner Electoral Law in the Michigan Supreme Court, which helped ensure its use in one presidential contest before its repeal by Michigan Republicans, one week into the 1893 legislative session.<sup>16</sup>

Fusionists' democratic entrepreneurship—from the short lived but radical Miner Electoral Law to women's suffrage and financial reform—catalyzed Republicans' first attempt to ban fusion upon regaining control of the state legislature in 1893. That year, Michigan and South Dakota were the first two states in the US to see a deliberate attempt to ban the nominating strategy.<sup>17</sup> They were also the only two states where the “Industrial” party was active in building a socially transformative coalition of farmers and workers and running candidates for county, state, and federal offices, prior to the rise of the Populist Party.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Henry M. Utley and Byron M. Cutcheon, *Michigan as a Province, Territory and State*, vol. IV (The Publishing Society of Michigan, 1906), 151.

<sup>12</sup> Lionel Edward “L. E.” Fredman, *The Australian Ballot: The Story of an American Reform* (Michigan State University Press, 1968): 35.

<sup>13</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 503.

<sup>14</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 509. Argersinger explained that the legal challenge to the law was unprecedented both in scale and intensity, provoking heated attacks from President Benjamin Harrison, and with respect to the involvement of U.S. attorney general William H.H. Miller (formerly Harrison's law partner) in litigating the case. Miller's participation was “highly unusual,” even though he “acted as private counsel and not in his official capacity” quoted at 513.

<sup>15</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 515.

<sup>16</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 517.

<sup>17</sup> Argersinger judged an 1891 Oregon election reform that prohibited a candidate's name from appearing on the ballot more than once to have banned fusion inadvertently. Oregon Republican passed a formal antifusion law in 1895. Argersinger, “Place,” 297-298.

<sup>18</sup> “Many Entries for the Race,” *Washington Post*, November 4, 1890, 4.

House Republicans broke with their party leadership and sank the 1893 antifusion bill, with six voting no and fifteen abstaining in a testimony to the salience, familiarity, and taken-for-grantedness of fusion alliances in the state. The 1895 Michigan legislature that banned fusion also shrank the electorate by requiring would-be voters to take an educational test and restricting voter registration in big cities such as Detroit, where election outcomes were close and disfranchisement of ethnic Democrats could eliminate as many as a quarter of the party's voters.<sup>19</sup> Michigan's antifusion law was more than a response to agrarian radicalism: it formed part of a sweeping rollback of democratic reforms that shut down majority-party opposition from Democrats in state politics for decades.

This memo focuses on third parties' use of electoral fusion from the 1870s through the state's ban on fusion in 1895 and the immediate aftermath of that ban. It demonstrates that during the heyday of electoral fusion, Michigan's third political parties engaged in fusion nominations with each other and sometimes with one of the dominant political parties. Third Party-dominant party fusions occurred primarily with Democrats and rarely with Republicans, the stronger of the two dominant parties. From 1870 onward, Michigan fusionists championed reforms to achieve both good government and improved representation for diverse political interests and ideologies. The memo also demonstrates that Michigan's antifusion law was motivated not only (or even principally) by the desire to prevent third-party electoral fusions with the Democrats, but also by the aim to rollback the broader package of pro-democracy policies that fusionists enacted from the 1870s through the Democratic-controlled legislature of 1891-1892. Fusion proved to be so deeply embedded in Michigan's electoral institutions and political culture, enjoying broad support among voters, third political parties, Democrats, and even some Republicans, that antifusion Republicans took extraordinary steps to ban it. Following the second, successful antifusion law of 1895, political parties continued to forge the cross-party alliances that had been so consequential throughout the century; having lost the crucial electoral foothold of an independent ballot line, those attempts soon died out.

### **Fusion in the 19<sup>th</sup>-century: Terminology and Significance**

Today, political scientists define *fusion* as a practice of "jointly sponsored candidacies," where candidates receive nominations from and run on the ballot lines of multiple political parties.<sup>20</sup> Provided the votes are first tallied separately, then added (or fused) together, the practice allows each nominating party to "maintain its own autonomous identity."<sup>21</sup>

This definition is noteworthy for narrowing the range of meanings once associated with the word *fusion*, which newspapers and party leaders used before the Civil War as an umbrella term for various forms of multiple-party cooperation. By the final third of the nineteenth Century, fusion nominations were "commonplace," and typically took the form of

---

<sup>19</sup> Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 519.

<sup>20</sup> Scarrow, "Duverger's Law."

<sup>21</sup> Scarrow, "Duverger's Law," 637.

“cooperation between a minor party and a major one,”<sup>22</sup> although major parties used them on occasion to lock out third party challengers.<sup>23</sup>

Scholars recognize the importance of fusion nominations to U. S. democracy for “help(ing) to sustain” a “more complex party system,” and increasing the competitiveness of the electoral system.<sup>24</sup> In the 1850s, roughly fifty fusion candidacies took place in congressional and gubernatorial races in five states.<sup>25</sup> Although scarcely any occurred in the 1860s, the 1870’s saw a jump to two-hundred and fifty fusion candidacies in congressional and gubernatorial races, across more than twenty states,<sup>26</sup> including Josiah W. Begole’s gubernatorial breakthrough on a Democratic-Greenback Labor Party fusion ticket in 1882. Although the number of fusion candidacies declined to 210 in the 1890s, the practice spread to over thirty states.<sup>27</sup> From 1874 to 1892, third political parties received at least twenty percent of the vote in one or more elections in more than half of the non-southern states.<sup>28</sup> Even when third political parties won a smaller vote share, they continued to play a critical role because this was a period when the two major political parties were fairly closely matched.<sup>29</sup> “Between 1878 and 1892 minor parties held the balance of power at least once in every state but Vermont, and from the mid-1880s they held that power in a majority of states in nearly every election.”<sup>30</sup>

### **A Word about Ballots and Australian Ballot Reform**

Fusion nominations were decided at party conventions but implemented on the face of the ballot. Fights over banning the practice centered on ballot format. For most of the nineteenth Century, states with paper ballots used the “party ticket, a strip of paper on which were printed the names of the candidates of only the party that issued it.”<sup>31</sup> These tickets made fusion nominations practical because they “could easily include the name of one or more candidates whose names also appeared on one or more other party tickets.”<sup>32</sup> In an era of fierce partisan loyalties, the party ticket also made such nominations palatable to “partisans of fusing parties [who] could cast their votes without explicitly acknowledging their shared behavior or its significance.”<sup>33</sup> States in the U.S. began adopting the Australian Ballot—a secret ballot,

---

<sup>22</sup> Scarrow, “Duverger’s Law,” 634.

<sup>23</sup> Wisconsin’s Democratic and Republicans joined forces in 1895 in local races in Iowa County to shut out the People’s Party. *Iowa County democrat. (Mineral Point, WI) 28 Mar. 1895, p. 4. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, [www.loc.gov/item/sn86086852/1895-03-28/ed-1/](http://www.loc.gov/item/sn86086852/1895-03-28/ed-1/).*

<sup>24</sup> Scarrow, “Duverger’s Law,” 634.

<sup>25</sup> Scarrow, “Duverger’s Law,” 636. Scarrow noted that “only fragmentary data are available relating to fusion candidates at the local level” at 635, note 3.

<sup>26</sup> Scarrow, “Duverger’s Law,” 636.

<sup>27</sup> Scarrow, “Duverger’s Law.”

<sup>28</sup> Argersinger, “Place.”

<sup>29</sup> Argersinger, “Place.”

<sup>30</sup> Argersinger, “Place.”

<sup>31</sup> Peter H. Argersinger, *The Limits of Agrarian Radicalism: Western Populism and American Politics* (University Press of Kansas, 1995), 17.

<sup>32</sup> Scarrow, “Duverger’s Law,” 637.

<sup>33</sup> Argersinger, *The Limits of Agrarian Radicalism*, 17.

printed and distributed by the state, that listed the candidates of all parties on a single form—in the late 1880s.<sup>34</sup>

Adoption of Australian electoral reforms transformed voting behavior by changing the ways the ballot invited people to vote.<sup>35</sup> Exchanging the party ticket for the official ballot gave states the opportunity to determine to what degree the new system would be as party-centric as the one it replaced. Political Scientist Jerrold G. Rusk documented an increase in split-ticket voting, which the Australian Ballot made easy and straightforward.<sup>36</sup> States could choose to offset that tendency by adopting features (such as a single checkbox) to facilitate straight-ticket voting and choosing the party column over the “objective, nonpartisan” office-group format.<sup>37</sup> Adoption of the Australian Ballot also made it possible for states to ban—but in no way required them to ban—fusion nominations, by allowing them to regulate ballot access.

States typically crafted access requirements to favor established parties by requiring third-party candidates to qualify for the ballot by petition, unless their party received “a certain percentage of the popular vote in the preceding election.”<sup>38</sup> Antifusion laws took advantage of the access requirements by prohibiting a candidate’s name from being listed on the ballot more than once. If two or more parties supported the same candidate, only one of them could claim the votes; the other(s) would lose their autonomous ballot line in the current election and forfeit their ballot status for the next one.<sup>39</sup>

### **A Note on Sources and Methods**

We found records of fusion nominations in Michigan in multiple sources. Party tickets such as those from 1890 attached in Appendix C were occasionally collected in personal papers and described in finding aids by archivists. Newspaper election notices containing sample ballots also document fusion nominations. Newspaper editors as well as the politicians who wrote letters to them reported on events such as party conventions and election returns and recounted fusion negotiations in these reports. This memo presents direct evidence of fusion nominations based on sample ballots, articles, editorials, and letters published in newspapers in addition to sample ballots included in legal proceedings from 1890 to 1896.

Electoral statistics and the State of Michigan Red Book or Michigan Manual are a second valued source for information on electoral outcomes. The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research based at the University of Michigan preserves longitudinal datasets about state politics while Wikipedia.org presents select election results. Here, too, the record is incomplete because the Michigan Manual inconsistently reports successful instances of fusion nominations. For example, in 1882, a Democrat-Greenback Labor Party fusion

---

<sup>34</sup> Michigan saw the first attempt to pass Australian-style ballot reforms in 1885. The first state to succeed was Kentucky, which adopted the reform exclusively for the city of Louisville early in 1888. Eldon Cobb Evans, *A History of the Australian Ballot System in the United States* (University of Chicago Press, 1917), 18-19.

<sup>35</sup> Jerrold G. Rusk, “The Effect of the Australian Ballot Reform on Split Ticket Voting: 1876–1908,” *American Political Science Review* 64, no. 4 (1970): 1220-1238 at 1220, 1237.

<sup>36</sup> Rusk, “Split Ticket,” 1222–1223.

<sup>37</sup> Rusk, “Split Ticket,” 1221.

<sup>38</sup> Argersinger, *The Limits of Agrarian Radicalism*, 19.

<sup>39</sup> Argersinger, *The Limits of Agrarian Radicalism*, 20–21.

candidate won a key statewide victory in the race for Governor of Michigan (Josiah W. Begole). The Michigan Manual listed Begole as a “Fusionist” in multiple summary tables at the front of the 574-page volume.<sup>40</sup> However, Begole’s biographical sketch at the back of the volume described him as “the candidate of both the Greenback and Democratic parties.”<sup>41</sup> By the 1890s, the Michigan Manual often listed state legislators under multiple parties in summary tables yet biographical sketches revealed additional cross-nominations and endorsements. Researchers must cross-check multiple sources and parts of sources to account for fusion.

Legislative history recorded in Michigan House and Senate journals can be reconstructed from published proceedings of parliamentary maneuvers, bill sponsors, roll call votes, and floor speeches.<sup>42</sup> Researchers must carefully track bills within and across legislative sessions because bills are frequently mentioned without descriptive keywords and sometimes renumbered during session. For example, the attempted fusion ban of 1893 was numbered 718 in the House and 20 in the Senate. Published proceedings cross-referenced with digitized newspapers tell a fuller story. Contemporary newspaper accounts described the content of numbered bills with reference to bill sponsors. For example, editors and reporters frequently referred to the proposed antifusion law as “McKinlay’s bill” after its 1893 House sponsor or “the Shaw bill” after its 1895 Senate sponsor. McKinlay and Shaw described their intent to end fusion in letters to the editor published in newspapers. Many “party papers” were published by partisan newspaper editors whose accounts can be checked against each other as well as national reporting in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. Newspapers.com, a subscription service, provides access to hundreds of nineteenth-century newspapers from all parts of Michigan. Digitized newspapers are keyword searchable for the names, places, dates, and events from which this history of fusion voting in Michigan is constructed. Reference materials such as county chronicles published by the Chapman Brothers as well as Henry M. Utley and Byron M. Cutcheon’s multivolume *Michigan as a Province, Territory and State* have also been digitized and are freely available through platforms such as Google Books. This research would have been prohibitively time-consuming and costly thirty years ago when scholars consulted newspapers and reference materials with incomplete indexes one by one for information.

There exists a wealth of secondary sources on fusion in Michigan as its rich history inspired scholarly attention from several generations of Michigan historians. Journal articles such as Sidney Glazer’s “Patrons of Industry in Michigan” published in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (now the *Journal of American History*) and dissertations such as Paul A. Lovchuk’s “Michigan Gold Democrats in the Campaign of 1896” did not influence wider scholarship but are available through university libraries.<sup>43</sup> A more recent and widely cited group of scholars including Peter H. Argersinger wrote about Michigan’s political parties from 1837 to the present. Political historian Ronald Formisano graduated from Wayne State University in 1966 and

---

<sup>40</sup> *Legislative Manual of the State of Michigan for the Year 1883* (W. S. George & Co., 1883), 206, 216, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/011677992> hereafter *Michigan Manual 1883*.

<sup>41</sup> *Michigan Manual 1883*, 458-459.

<sup>42</sup> *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan*, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/009953864> and *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan*, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100730762>.

<sup>43</sup> Sidney Glazer, “Patrons of Industry in Michigan,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 24, no. 2 (1937): 185-194. Lovchuk, “Michigan Gold Democrats.”

published his book on the state's antebellum political parties in 1971.<sup>44</sup> Formisano found Antimasons, Whigs, Libertyites, Democrats, Free Soilers, Independents, Know-Nothings, and Republicans in Michigan during the first half of the nineteenth century. These antebellum minority parties used fusion to provoke majority parties to represent a variety of ideas and interests. Between the long depression of the 1870s and the Panic of 1893, workers and their labor organizations fused with and founded political parties. Labor historian Richard Oestreicher graduated from Michigan State University in 1979 and published a 1986 book on Nationals, Independent Labor Party members, Greenbackers, Patrons of Industry, and Industrials who won local, state, and national elections on fusion tickets.<sup>45</sup>

Combining secondary sources with recently digitized or carefully archived primary sources, this memo reveals Michigan's vibrant and robust nineteenth-century practice of minority political party influence through fusion voting.

### **Limitations of Single-Office Fusion Victories during the Greenback Era**

The rise of the Greenbackers in Michigan illustrates the "fluidity" of party loyalties and impermanence of all nineteenth-century political parties.<sup>46</sup> Even the Democrats and Republicans were mutable coalitions of partisan organizations whose values and strategies varied geographically and across local, state, and national political arenas.<sup>47</sup> Fusion sometimes contributed to party longevity during that period, not just third-party longevity, as exemplified by Michigan Democrats remaining competitive statewide up to the 1892 election by using various forms of the practice to forge alliances with third political parties that (in the Midwest) were largely made up of former Republican party members.

The Greenback Party was founded in November 1874 on one central platform plank: the U.S. federal government should print paper currency and decide its value. The party drew momentum from the legislative compromises over monetary policy that split parties internally.<sup>48</sup> In the Midwest, Greenbackers formed a coalition among formerly Republican voters, farmers, workers, and their middle-class allies who wanted to raise crop prices and lower debtors' burdens, and manufacturers who wanted to expand their investment funds.<sup>49</sup> These voters were disaffected with Republican monetary policy that phased out "greenbacks" (paper currency backed by government bonds and printed to finance the U.S. Civil War) in favor of "hard money" currency backed with gold.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Ronald P. Formisano, *The Birth of Mass Political Parties: Michigan, 1827-1861* (Princeton University Press, 1971).

<sup>45</sup> Richard Jules Oestreicher, *Solidarity and Fragmentation: Working People and Class Consciousness in Detroit, 1875-1900* (University of Illinois Press, 1986).

<sup>46</sup> Rachel A. Shelden and Erik B. Alexander, "Dismantling the Party System: Party Fluidity and the Mechanisms of Nineteenth-Century U.S. Politics," *Journal of American History* 110, no. 3 (2023): 419-448.

<sup>47</sup> Shelden and Alexander, "Dismantling the Party System," 425. Following the Civil War, the Democratic Party that "survived into the 1860s and 1870s was a completely different organization from its earlier iteration, in both its constituency and ideological commitments" at 435.

<sup>48</sup> David Montgomery, *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans, 1862-1872* (Vintage Books, 1967).

<sup>49</sup> Montgomery, *Beyond Equality*, 87-88.

<sup>50</sup> Montgomery, *Beyond Equality*.

In the throes of those currency wars and before they had formed as a party, Greenbackers received a boost from U. S. Representative Josiah W. Begole (R-MI), a founding member of the Republican Party, who was elected to the U.S. House in 1872, served from 1873-1875, and sat on the Committee on Agriculture and Public Expenditures. In April 1874, Begole voted with majorities in the U. S. House and Senate for the “Currency Bill” or Inflation Act of 1874 to increase the money supply by remonetizing silver.<sup>51</sup> The support of so prominent a Republican lent legitimacy to the Greenbacker concern. President Ulysses Grant accelerated the Greenbackers’ entry into partisan politics by vetoing the “Currency Bill.”<sup>52</sup>

Greenbackers’ influence in the agricultural Midwest grew steadily from the mid-1870s to the mid-1880s as the long depression dragged on and labor parties fused with major and minor parties on monetary policy. The Michigan gubernatorial candidate running solely on the Greenback ticket sharply increased their vote share from just under three percent (8,297 votes) in 1876 to nearly twenty-six percent (73,313 votes) in 1878.<sup>53</sup> Greenbackers nearly became the second major party as the Democratic gubernatorial candidate decreased their vote share from nearly forty-five percent in 1876 to just under twenty-eight percent in 1878.<sup>54</sup> Also in 1878, a group of Michigan Greenbackers who desired a more explicit alliance with workers joined labor leaders, including Detroit’s Richard F. Trelvellick, to launch the Greenback Labor Party.<sup>55</sup>

Two years later, the party learned a hard lesson about the dangers of factionalism and benefits of fusion when two factions of the Michigan Greenbackers each nominated candidates in the 1880 gubernatorial race. The statewide party nominated Paw Paw farmer David Woodman, brother of a leader of farmers’ fraternal organization the Grange, while Greenbackers in the sixth congressional district chose former congressman Josiah W. Begole, who had become a prominent businessman.<sup>56</sup> The internal divide may have split the Greenbacker vote, depressed Greenbacker turnout, or deflected Greenbacker voters back to the dominant parties; it had a measurable effect on the outcome.<sup>57</sup> Woodman received barely nine percent of the vote, the Democrats re-established their position as the second largest party with just over thirty-nine percent of the vote, and Republican David H. Jerome won the governorship with fifty-one percent.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> “Sketch of the Life and Public Services of Josiah W. Begole,” *Alpena Argus* (Alpena, MI), October 15, 1884, 5.

<sup>52</sup> William D. Mallam, “The Grant-Butler Relationship,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 41, no. 2: 259-276.

<sup>53</sup> “1876 Michigan gubernatorial election,” Wikimedia Foundation, last modified June 27, 2025, 05:39 (UTC), [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1876\\_Michigan\\_gubernatorial\\_election](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1876_Michigan_gubernatorial_election). “1878 Michigan gubernatorial election,” Wikimedia Foundation, last modified February 1, 2026, 22:36 (UTC), [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1878\\_Michigan\\_gubernatorial\\_election](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1878_Michigan_gubernatorial_election).

<sup>54</sup> Utley and Cutcheon, *Michigan*, vol. IV, 131.

<sup>55</sup> See Montgomery, *Beyond Equality*, 222-223 on Trelvellick.

<sup>56</sup> “The Michigan Canvass,” *Washington Post*, August 13, 1880, 1. In the early 1880s Begole founded the Flint Wagon Works, which later bought the Buick Motor Company and made Flint a hub of the automotive industry. Genesee County Historical Society, “Josiah W. Begole,” accessed May 8, 2026 at <https://www.geneseehistory.org/governor-josiah-begole.html>. Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, accessed May 9, 2026 at <https://bioguide.congress.gov/search/bio/B000316>.

<sup>57</sup> Begole did not compete in the 1880 gubernatorial race. Woodman received 925/39,219 votes or 2.36 percent in Begole’s home county of Genesee that year. *Legislative Manual of the State of Michigan* (W. S. George & Co., 1881): 208, 228. In 1878, Greenback gubernatorial candidate Henry S. Smith received 1,982/34,568 votes or 5.73 percent in Genesee. *Michigan Manual 1879*, 131.

<sup>58</sup> “1880 Michigan gubernatorial election,” Wikimedia Foundation.

The next election cycle handed Michigan Greenbackers their most significant victory when they fused with the Democrats to run Josiah W. Begole for governor on a Democratic-Greenback Labor Party ticket in 1882. The two parties opted for a non-compete alliance over state, congressional, legislative, and county offices, apportioning nominations for these offices and ratifying the other party's nominations at their conventions.<sup>59</sup> Begole took the governorship from Republican incumbent David Jerome by fewer than 5,000 votes while the Republican ticket swept the remaining executive offices by margins of 8,500 to 14,000.<sup>60</sup> The totals illustrate the power of fusion in the nineteenth-century when races were decided by extremely small margins and a dual nomination could decide the outcome even if it increased the vote share of the winning candidate by as little as one percent.<sup>61</sup>

Governor Begole's legislative achievements cast his election as an ambiguous victory for the Greenbackers and for the fusion strategy that produced it. He struggled to pass legislation through a Republican majority state legislature, a possible caution regarding the limits of fusion when it claimed victory in an executive race but could not capture seats in the legislature. Still, Begole secured two pro-democracy reforms that Greenback Labor Party members valued. First, he established a Bureau of Labor Statistics, which was a fusionist priority because it collected information about working conditions that labor leaders aimed to improve. Second, he enfranchised women to vote in local elections such as school board.<sup>62</sup>

In 1885, Greenback-Democrat Congressman James B. Weaver introduced these Michigan victories into the Iowa Greenbackers' debate over the merits of fusion, at their state convention, held July 7 in Des Moines.<sup>63</sup> Weaver cited Michigan in an effort to galvanize the Iowans and persuade them to continue fusing with Democrats over the objections of the party's antifusion section, which was robust enough to hold regular "anti-fusion" conventions of its own.<sup>64</sup> Weaver, who had just been elected to the U. S. Congress for the second time as a fusion candidate (after an unsuccessful run for President on the Greenback Party line in 1880), declared that he "favored cooperation with the Democrats to overthrow the Republicans, and was not afraid of fusion; for if the Democrats absorbed them (the Greenback Party) they would have to become Greenbackers to do it."<sup>65</sup> Weaver invoked Michigan as proof of his preferred strategy, describing the "Michigan method" where "all of our (Greenback) principles are adopted by the

---

<sup>59</sup> Lovchuk, "Michigan Gold Democrats," 5.

<sup>60</sup> Utley and Cutcheon, *Michigan*, vol. IV, 151.

<sup>61</sup> In 1882, Begole drew 49.4% of the vote running as a Democrat-Greenback candidate, an increase of 1.1% (3,121 votes) over the combined total of the Democratic and Greenback vote shares in 1880, when the parties ran separate candidacies. The vote share of Republican incumbent Jerome declined by only 3%. "1880 Michigan gubernatorial election" and "1882 Michigan gubernatorial election," Wikimedia Foundation.

<sup>62</sup> Justin Corfield, "Michigan" in *U. S. Campaigns, Elections, and Electoral Behavior* (SAGE Publications, Inc., 2008). Suffrage rights were a longstanding interest of Begole's, who joined the Flint Woman's Suffrage Association as a Republican in 1870 and served as vice president of the Michigan Equal Suffrage Association during his governorship as a Greenbacker. Genesee County Historical Society, "Josiah W. Begole."

<sup>63</sup> "Political," *The Democratic Sentinel*, June 26, 1885, 2, <https://newspapers.library.in.gov/?a=d&d=DMST18850626.2.10>.

<sup>64</sup> Fred E. Haynes, *Third Party Movements since the Civil War* (1916): 191, 194.

<sup>65</sup> Haynes, *Third Party Movements*, 192.

democrats and you cannot today tell a greenbacker audience from a democratic audience.”<sup>66</sup> Weaver persuaded Iowa Greenbackers to fuse with Democrats in 1885. Although Republicans took the governorship anyway, they prevailed by a plurality of “only 5,216” votes, which suggested that “fusion almost wiped out the Republican margin.”<sup>67</sup>

Between 1884 and 1888, a period of gradually waning influence for state-level Greenback parties, sociologist Fred E. Haynes described the project “to organize the radical element of the country under labor leadership” persisting alongside the emergence of a new wave of parties aspiring to be the vehicle of that amalgamation.<sup>68</sup> Haynes described various radical parties fearful of being merged “into a single party” on the Populist line, a reduced “coherence of the general radical movement” due to new analyses of capitalism, and an ongoing debate over whether fusion advanced radical politics or coopted it.<sup>69</sup> The founding of the Patrons of Industry perpetuated and intensified those debates in Michigan.

### **Democrats Win the Trifecta of State Power by Fusing with Patrons of Industry**

As the national Greenback Party folded in the late 1880s, Fusionists, Democrats, and Republicans in Michigan, New York, Ohio, Indiana, and Wisconsin found a new home in the Patrons of Industry.<sup>70</sup> Short-lived but consequential, the Patrons of Industry made Michigan a leader in the movement to organize a farmer-industrial worker coalition at a crucial turning point in nationwide debates over the future of capitalism. The Patrons of Industry began as a “non-partisan farm order” that was launched in 1887 in Port Huron, MI by F. W. Vertican, a retired minister and founder of rural churches.<sup>71</sup> Structured as a confederation of local chapters, county organizations, and state associations, the Patrons were presided over by a “Supreme Association” headed by Vertican and headquartered at Port Huron.<sup>72</sup> Farmers established the first local chapter in Elmer Township, Sanilac County, MI in Fall, 1887.<sup>73</sup> Others followed rapidly and the organization grew to 200,000 members in 3,000 chapters in the U. S. and Canada by 1891.<sup>74</sup>

The association initially aimed to serve its members as a “social agency,” a vaguely-defined mission that Michigan Patrons realized as a purchasing cooperative or “Patron store system” comprising local merchants, who agreed to sell goods “at a price not in excess of ten or twelve per cent” above wholesale, and exclusive purchase agreements with Patrons members.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Weaver quoted in Haynes, *Third Party Movements*, 192. By contrast, Weaver cited the example of Maine, where he alluded somewhat cryptically either to corruption or co-optation (or both) on the part of Greenback founder Solon Chase whom Weaver claimed “ran the (Greenback) party so near to the republicans that the distance was short enough so that he could reach out his hand and receive the money into his palm”.

<sup>67</sup> Haynes, *Third Party Movements*, 193.

<sup>68</sup> Haynes, *Third Party Movements*, 206.

<sup>69</sup> Haynes, *Third Party Movements*, 202-203, 205.

<sup>70</sup> Patrons of Industry (Siloam, N.Y.) Records, Special Collections Research Center, Syracuse University Libraries, accessed January 25, 2026 at [https://library.syracuse.edu/digital/guides/print/patrons\\_ind\\_prt.htm](https://library.syracuse.edu/digital/guides/print/patrons_ind_prt.htm).

<sup>71</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry.”

<sup>72</sup> Local chapters could be formed by “any group of ten,” without respect to sex, and members remained “in good standing” so long as they paid “the nominal dues.” Glazer, “Patrons of Industry,” 186; citing *Detroit Evening News*, October 26, 1889.

<sup>73</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry,” 189; citing *Detroit Evening News*, October 26, 1889.

<sup>74</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry.”

<sup>75</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry,” 187.

Formulating the cooperative program occupied the organization for its first two years and “daily strengthen(ed)” its growth.<sup>76</sup> By April 1889, Michigan Patrons founded a state association at a convention at Port Huron, which sparked a rapid increase in membership—from 5,000 members in May to 75,000 by October—and fueled the Michiganders’ emergent interest in both partisan politics and fusion.<sup>77</sup> The association confronted both these issues head-on during its 1890 state convention held in Lansing on July 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>.

Michigan’s Bay County Patrons made an early start on the topic by convening a county a meeting two weeks prior to the statewide event. At that meeting, one hundred delegates from Bay City, Arenac, Tuscola, and Saginaw unanimously approved a resolution in favor of political action but committed to “steer clear of both old political parties and to support first and last a free and independent labor ticket.”<sup>78</sup> They voted to “fuse with all the unions, knights of labor assemblies and lodges of the Farmers’ alliance,” reckoning that their numerical strength would give them leverage to negotiate for their rights with the “two old parties” regardless whether they won at the polls. And to “prove to the world that there is no collusion,” Frank Osborn, leader of the Bay County committee of the Union Labor party (soon to take the name “Industrialists”), proposed nominating a county ticket before the Republicans or Democrats did.<sup>79</sup>

The strategy for the state convention in Lansing seemed clear: “Plans had been made to hold the Industrialist and Prohibitionist conventions...immediately after the Patrons had assembled,” an arrangement that was “assumed” to “pave the way for the endorsement of the same candidates by the three bodies and thus make possible one powerful farmer-labor fusion party.”<sup>80</sup> Michigan’s Patrons of Industry, with approximately 100,000 members in 1,800 local chapters and county organizations, would be the largest group in the electoral alliance.<sup>81</sup> If the Patrons membership, most of whom “were either Republicans or Democrats,”<sup>82</sup> would stick with such a fusion, their numbers alone would likely win not only seats but also displace one or both major parties. Fusion between the Industrials (formerly Union Labor) and Patrons of Industry seemed almost natural, as each prioritized democratic reforms alongside pro-worker and pro-farmer financial policies. The Industrials’ platform invited the relationship by incorporating several Patrons’ policy priorities.<sup>83</sup> As for an official three-way nomination of a single candidate: improbable. The Industrials refused to fuse with Prohibitionists who wanted to ban alcohol, and Michigan Prohibitionists would “not join any party unless the latter adopt the main plank in our platform and that is no license and no whisky.”<sup>84</sup> Fusion allowed for fluid politics except when it came to temperance.

---

<sup>76</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry,” 187.

<sup>77</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry,” 186-187.

<sup>78</sup> “Political Patrons,” *The Bay City Times*, July 15, 1890, 5.

<sup>79</sup> “Political Patrons,” *The Bay City Times*, July 15, 1890, 5.

<sup>80</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry in Michigan,” 189.

<sup>81</sup> “Organization Notes,” *National Stockman and Farmer*, August 21, 1890, 14.

<sup>82</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry,” 187.

<sup>83</sup> These included: easing access to credit; shifting the tax burden from property to income; lowering transportation and communication costs; electing the U. S. president and U. S. senators by popular vote; plus adopting the eight-hour day and “the Australian ballot system.” See, “Four Parties in One,” *Washington Post*, August 2, 1890, 1.

<sup>84</sup> “Two New Parties,” *The Bay City Times*, August 1, 1890, 1.

Temperance was not the focus of conflict at the Patrons of Industry convention in Lansing. At a “closed session” on the first day, Michigan’s Patrons made the momentous decision “to become a political party”<sup>85</sup> and planned to nominate a slate for the executive branch of state government that would result in Republicans’ “almost certain defeat.”<sup>86</sup> On the second day, Republican Party leaders scuttled that project, working in coordination with Patron members whom the Democratic *Detroit Free Press* reported were the “trustiest henchmen” of Republican gubernatorial candidate James “Jim” Turner, who “could rely on them to do everything possible to head off an independent ticket.”<sup>87</sup> And so they did, by delaying debate on the independent slate until GOP loyalists outnumbered the third party faithful during a late-night vote, and passing resolutions written by Turner that changed the Patrons’ position from pro-political party on day one to anti-political party on day two.<sup>88</sup>

The “Politics in Michigan” columnist described the Republicans’ “joke” as “too good to keep” and shared it in a Pittsburgh, PA newspaper:

Our salvation depended on spiking the guns of the Patrons of Industry and we knew it. Had the Democrats been fully alive to the situation, they could have prevented our people from getting control of the convention. They made the mistake of going to sleep at the wrong time.<sup>89</sup>

Asleep at the wrong time or not, the Democrats won control of both houses of the legislature and the governorship in 1890.

Even without fielding a ticket of their own, the Patrons played a significant role in Democrats’ taking the House and Senate in 1890. The Patrons coordinated with Industrials at the state and local levels, with workers and farmers in Eaton and nearby counties joining together in an “Industrial Union” to promote “a better understanding and more fraternal feeling” among Michigan labor organizations as well as to pass legislation.<sup>90</sup> On the strength of that union, Eaton County elected two Millers to the state legislature—senator William and representative Samuel—who were locally known as Patrons of Industry, and who would see that body pass key Patron policy priorities. These priorities included lowering interest rates “from 8 and 10 to 7 and 6 percent,” revising the general tax law, and enacting local bills.<sup>91</sup>

Democrat Edwin B. Winans, a former state and congressional representative, ran successfully for governor. The Patrons did not contribute to Democrats’ winning the governor’s race, but they may have contributed to the Republicans’ losing. The day after the convention, most of Patrons members attended the Prohibitionist convention in Lansing, which nominated Azariah Partridge to run for governor. Partridge, a former Republican and temperance movement leader who had been active in the Grange and served as president of the Michigan Patrons of Industry since

---

<sup>85</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry,” 189.

<sup>86</sup> “Politics in Michigan,” *The Pittsburgh Press*, September 2, 1890, 1.

<sup>87</sup> “The Patrons,” *Detroit Free Press*, July 30, 1890, 4.

<sup>88</sup> “Politics in Michigan,” *The Pittsburgh Press*, September 2, 1890, 1.

<sup>89</sup> “Politics in Michigan,” *The Pittsburgh Press*, September 2, 1890, 1.

<sup>90</sup> A statewide meeting was scheduled for December 19, 1890, in Lansing. Chas Hasse, “To Patrons of Industry, Alliance, Grangers, Knights of Labor...,” *Michigan Farmer*, December 13, 1890, 4.

<sup>91</sup> Arthur S. White, “Coalition Legislature of 1891,” *Michigan History* 10, no. 4 (1926): 574-581 at 575.

winter 1890, accepted the nomination. To secure his participation, the Prohibition Party expanded its platform to include “the tariff reform and anti-monopoly plank” as well as “service pensions” for U. S. Civil War veterans.<sup>92</sup> The Patrons’ active campaigning on behalf of Partridge mobilized a “larger-than-usual vote” for the Prohibition Party.<sup>93</sup> The outcome demonstrated the threat of fusion: Prohibitionists may have split the vote against Republican Jim Turner by delivering Partridge more than double the margin by which Winans beat him.<sup>94</sup>

Electoral success, achieved with or without fusion, did nothing to halt the decline of the Patrons as an organization due to a loss of dues-paying members, disputes over “cooperation with other farm bodies,” and “fatal dissension” over the question of political action.<sup>95</sup> The decision to “remain non-partisan and non-political,” which Patron members reached at the organization’s first (and only) “world session” in March 1891, “after many hours of unfriendly debate,” sealed its fate.<sup>96</sup> Many of its dues-paying members left to join the Farmers’ Alliance “and other bodies committed to a definite program of radical political action.”<sup>97</sup> Michigan Patron leaders aligned with the Alliance at the end of 1891 and created a party by January 1892. Two-hundred delegates from the Patrons of Industry, Farmer’s Alliance, Knights of Labor, and National Citizens’ Alliance as well as the Prohibition, Industrial, and People’s parties met in Lansing to organize a “State People’s Party.”<sup>98</sup> They acted in time to contest the 1892 election, which proved a decisive turning-point for pro-democracy reform in Michigan.

### **“The Coalition Legislature of 1891”<sup>99</sup>**

The composition of Michigan’s 36<sup>th</sup> state legislature testified to the threat and the power of the alliance politics that Michigan Patrons had fought so hard to practice. In the 1890 election, various political parties practiced fusion in its various forms and counted at least eleven fusionists. The result—dubbed “The Coalition Legislature of 1891”—was a politically diverse body that pioneered significant pro-democracy reforms under Democratic leadership.

---

<sup>92</sup> Civil War pensions were also a priority of Greenbacker Josiah W. Begole. “The P. of I. Mountain,” *Lansing State Journal*, July 30, 1890, 1. “Dividing Michigan’s Vote,” *New York Times*, July 31, 1890.

<sup>93</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry in Michigan,” 190.

<sup>94</sup> “Michigan Politics,” *The Quarterly Register of Current History* vol. I (Evening News Association, 1892): 47-48.

<sup>95</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry in Michigan,” 191.

<sup>96</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry in Michigan,” 191.

<sup>97</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry in Michigan,” 190.

<sup>98</sup> “Suffrage Straws,” *The Woman’s Column*, January 23, 1892, 4.

<sup>99</sup> Arthur S. White, “Coalition Legislature of 1891,” *Michigan History* 10, no. 4 (1926): 574-581 at 575.

It was an unstable coalition at the start, due to the composition of the Senate which included fourteen Democrats, fourteen Republicans, and four<sup>100</sup> Patrons of Industry.<sup>101</sup> These numbers gave senate Democrats “only the most tenuous control” of the body, which depended on the cooperation of the Patrons, only “one of whom regarded himself as a Democrat, and two of whom had been fusion candidates of the Democrats but who refused to be affiliated with them.”<sup>102</sup> To improve their odds, senate Democrats “ruthlessly” took advantage of their Republicans colleagues’ absence at the Republican state convention in late February to unseat two Republican senators who had run contested elections and replace them with their Democratic opponents.<sup>103</sup> The election delivered Democrats outright control of the House, where Republicans held thirty-four seats, Democrats secured fifty-nine seats on the Democratic ticket, and won four through cross-nominations with Patrons of Industry, while Industrials took three seats on their own ballot.<sup>104</sup>

Even hyphenated party labels could not do justice to the dizzying array of joint nominations and cross-party endorsements that *helped seat many* members of this political unicorn: the first and last Democratic-majority legislature in Michigan after the U. S. Civil War.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 504. Michigan voters elected a “famous trio” of state senators “the three B’s” John Bastone of Tuscola County, John R. Benson of Genesee County, and Aaron B. Brown of Montcalm County that the *Michigan Manual*’s directory credited to the Patrons of Industry ticket in 1890. The biographical sketch for Bastone, a farmer and Mason whom the directory listed as “PI” for Patron of Industry, noted that he was nominated by the Industrials and endorsed by the Democrats. Benson, a teacher, soldier, and, farmer, gave up his Republican party affiliation when he joined the Patrons of Industry and served as president of his local chapter. He was nominated by the Patrons in one county, the Industrials in another, and endorsed by the Democrats in both. Brown, a farmer and teacher, was previously a Republican and Greenbacker who ran on the fusion ticket in 1884. *Michigan Manual 1891-2*, 530-539, 565, 566, 567 quote at 566. Glazer, “Patrons of Industry in Michigan.”

<sup>101</sup> Marcus Wilcox of Shiawassee County voted with the Patrons of Industry but called himself a Democrat according to the *Michigan Manual* directory. Wilcox listed as “P. of I.” in “Democrats’ Day,” *Weekly Expositor* (Brockway Centre), November 14, 1890, 2 and “Political Notes,” *The Times Herald* (Port Huron Daily Times), December 6, 1890, 4. Wilcox voted Republican from 1856 to 1884 and ran as a Democratic and Industrial candidate in 1890. *Michigan Manual 1891-2*, 577.

<sup>102</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 504.

<sup>103</sup> Utley and McCutcheon, *Michigan*, vol. IV, 180. See Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 504 for the full story of the Democrats’ maneuver.

<sup>104</sup> Representatives Chisholm, Curtiss, Richardson, and Seeley were listed in the *Michigan Manual* directory as Patrons of Industry because they won on the “PI” ticket. Yet, Hugh Chisholm of Gratiot County was a “staunch Prohibitionist” nominated by the Patrons of Industry and endorsed by Prohibitionists and Democrats. John W. Curtiss of Isabella County was elected on the “Democratic and Patrons of Industry ticket” quote at 585. George F. Richardson of Ottawa County served in the Michigan House as a Greenbacker from 1885-1886 and was elected on the “Patrons of Industry and Democratic tickets” in 1890 quote at 604. Marvin L. Seeley of Genesee County, candidate on the “P. of I. and Democratic tickets,” won by only five votes; fusion delivered his slim margin of victory quote at 605. *Michigan Manual 1891-2*, 582-3, 585, 598, 604, 605. “Convention Day. The Work of the State Greenback Labor Convention Yesterday,” *Detroit Free Press*, August 20, 1894, 1.

<sup>105</sup> Local newspapers labeled additional Democratic state senators as Patrons of Industry: William Miller of Eaton County, and Enoch T. Mugford of Manistee County. “Democrats’ Day,” *Weekly Expositor* (Brockway Centre), November 14, 1890, 2. “Political Notes,” *The Times Herald* (Port Huron Daily Times), December 6, 1890, 4. Three state representatives won election on the Industrial ticket that cooperated in a non-compete alliance with the Patrons: Travis Leach of Tuscola County, John C. Rowden of Bay County who was also endorsed by Democrats, and Samuel Miller of Eaton County who was endorsed by Democrats and Prohibitionists and allied with the Patrons. Democrat William F. Lewis of Oceana County, who was endorsed by the Patrons of Industry, won on the Democratic ticket, and was listed as a Democrat. *Michigan Manual 1891-2*, 598. The Patrons of Industry themselves counted thirty-two members in the 1891 legislature according to “The Michigan Statesmen,” *Ann Arbor Argus*, January 23, 1891, 7.

## *Policy Achievements*

Representative Arthur S. White (D) of Kent County reflected with pride on the financial relief that coalitional body achieved by lowering interest rates “from 8 and 10 to 7 and 6 percent,” revising the general tax law, and enacting local bills such as municipal boundary changes.<sup>106</sup> Legislators also reduced railroad rates and raised railroad property taxes, although this latter measure was ruled unconstitutional.<sup>107</sup> Patrons of Industry asked to abolish inspection of oil used for lighting to lower its cost, block state subsidies for the Grand Army of the Republic encampment in Detroit, and provide free textbooks to public school students.<sup>108</sup> The fate of these modest measures is unclear but Patrons’ sweeping proposal for economic change by reducing the value of debt was defeated.<sup>109</sup> The body accomplished institutional change by making two long-awaited reforms to the electoral process.

The first of these concluded the story that started in 1885 with the Knights of Labor’s Greenback-Democrat George Walthew.<sup>110</sup> On July 3, 1891, the legislature enacted Australian-style ballot reform in full.<sup>111</sup> Act No. 190 of the public acts of 1891 provided “in the main for the Australian system of voting with a secret ballot” and the “blanket ballot,” a single form listing all candidates in one place.<sup>112</sup> Representative Frank E. Doremus of Ionia County (D), later Mayor of Detroit, drafted that ballot form, which would be used for decades.<sup>113</sup>

Patrons of Industry introduced petitions from across the state asking for Australian-style ballot reforms in February 1891.<sup>114</sup> Patrons from Clinton County described these reforms using the language of individual autonomy and democratic freedom<sup>115</sup>:

---

<sup>106</sup> White, “Coalition Legislature of 1891,” 575. The cross-party alliance lost ground on these victories when the legislature was forced to cut appropriations after failing to pass its preferred taxes. Utley and Cutcheon, *Michigan*, vol. IV, 219.

<sup>107</sup> Glazer, “Patrons of Industry in Michigan” on railroad rates. White, “Coalition Legislature of 1891” on railroad taxes.

<sup>108</sup> *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan 1891*, vol. 1, 121, 143, 176, 192, 194, 219, 240, 337 (GAR), 185, 193, 194, 287 (textbooks), 194, 221 (oil), against highway tax (220).

<sup>109</sup> Patrons proposed “that the farmer be allowed to deduct the amount of the mortgage covering his property from his tax assessment or, in lieu thereof, that he be allowed to pay the whole tax assessed on his property and that the tax receipt for the amount of his assessment be a legal tender for the principal or interest on said mortgage, thereby ‘catching’ non-resident as well as resident money loaners.” White, “Coalition Legislature of 1891,” 574.

<sup>110</sup> Fred A. Maynard, Respondent’s Brief in Fred Maynard, Report of the Attorney General of the State of Michigan for the Year Ending June 30, A.D. 1895 (Robert Smith & Co., 1895): 156-157.

<sup>111</sup> *Public Acts and Joint and Concurrent Resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Michigan Passed at the Regular Session of 1891* (Robert Smith & Co., 1891): 256-271.

<sup>112</sup> “Michigan,” *Appletons’ Annual Cyclopaedia and Register of Important Events* vol. 31 (D. Appleton and Company, 1891): 527.

<sup>113</sup> White, “Coalition Legislature of 1891,” 576-577.

<sup>114</sup> Patrons petitioned after the election law passed by the prior legislature was overturned in court due to its inclusion of cumulative voting. Senator Porter introduced a petition by one-hundred and twenty-three residents of Muskegon County, MI “asking for the Australian ballot system of voting” on February 12<sup>th</sup>. Senator Withington introduced a petition by eighty-nine electors from Jackson County, MI “asking that the present voting law be so amended as to provide for the full Australian voting system” on February 17<sup>th</sup>. *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan 1891*, vol. I, 193, 221.

<sup>115</sup> *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan 1891*, vol. I, 337-338.

WHEREAS, The Australian ballot has been a standard around which all friends of ballot reform and good government unite, and, without regard to political opinions have rallied, and whenever applied has made voting decent and respectable and given dignity to the freeman's ballot by protecting him from the vicious interference of men, and making him absolute controller of his convictions; therefore

*Resolved*, That we, the Patrons of Industry of Clinton county, in association 2217, as friends of good government and decent elections, recognize in the Australian ballot the most efficient means ever yet devised by man of securing the secrecy of the ballot and freeing elections from bribery and corruption and the control of machine politics, and most urgently urge its consideration, should any changes be deemed expedient with our present election laws;

The Australian ballot bill that the legislature unanimously passed in its last days of session was watered down and some Patrons of Industry abstained. In the Senate, fifteen of sixteen Democrats, two of four Patrons, and seven of twelve Republicans voted yea on June 30<sup>th</sup> while the remainder abstained.<sup>116</sup> In the House, fifty-five of fifty-eight Democrats, three of three Industrials, four of four Patrons, and twenty-five of thirty-five Republicans vote yea on June 30<sup>th</sup> while the remainder abstained.<sup>117</sup>

The second institutional reform dared to touch the third rail of U. S. politics, the electoral college. Representative John Miner of Detroit (D), a former tailor, lawyer, and police justice, brought to the coalitional legislature a bill that “provided for the election of the state’s presidential electors by districts instead of at large.”<sup>118</sup> It afforded a state-level remedy for the anti-democratic effects of winner-take-all voting and plurality rule, a combination that systematically disfranchises “political minorities” and can seat candidates in the White House despite their having lost the popular vote.<sup>119</sup> Miner’s bill was the “most successful and influential” reform effort to capitalize on the public response to the 1888 presidential election.<sup>120</sup> Republican challenger Benjamin Harrison unseated Democratic incumbent Grover Cleveland on a “minority vote”—that toxic combination of electoral college victory and popular vote loss.<sup>121</sup> The outcome sparked “popular outrage” when the press revealed that Republicans secured the victory not only by pursuing a shrewd campaign strategy but thanks to “flagrant electoral corruption”: the press “exposed the treasurer of the Republican national committee urging Indiana party officials to undertake vote buying and other illegal electoral practices.”<sup>122</sup> Corruption could well have made a difference in the outcome, as Harrison carried both states by margins that were slim enough to purchase and/or strongarm—14,373 votes in New York and just 2,376 in Indiana.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> Analysis of votes in Appendix H, Fig. 1 table “History of Fusion Voting in Michigan.” *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan 1891*, vol. II, 1517-1518.

<sup>117</sup> Analysis of votes in Appendix H, Fig. 2 table “History of Fusion Voting in Michigan.” *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan 1891*, vol. III, 2184-2189.

<sup>118</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 505.

<sup>119</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 503.

<sup>120</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 504.

<sup>121</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 517.

<sup>122</sup> As for the strategy, Republicans devoted “their campaign resources to the competitive swing states of New York and Indiana.” Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 502.

<sup>123</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 502.

The 1888 election unleashed a wave of Australian-style ballot reform and a wave of constitutional amendments in the U. S. Congress to divide each state's electoral votes proportionally. The amendment proposals, which could go nowhere without Congressional approval, went nowhere because "Republicans recognized that the electoral college system operated to their advantage."<sup>124</sup> Proportional voting for presidential electors was a more comprehensive reform of greater benefit to third political parties. Thus, the Miner Electoral Law provided an ingenious alternative: a corrective to winner-take-all victories that states could enact without Congressional approval.<sup>125</sup>

If the Miner Electoral Law promised clear partisan benefits to Michigan Democrats who would "be assured of nearly half the state's electoral votes,"<sup>126</sup> it also achieved a democratic victory of "obvious" national importance.<sup>127</sup> If broadly adopted, it "would prevent the election of minority presidents, move toward equalizing the value of the vote, and elimination political sectionalism and the unwarranted influence" accorded to swing states.<sup>128</sup> It would also "eliminate the systematic bias" that enabled Republicans to take the White House despite being the minority party in the electorate.<sup>129</sup> When the bill passed the Michigan legislature on a party line vote, Republicans recognized that they would confront the expense of competitive elections in Michigan and perhaps other "formerly safe" states; more importantly, they knew that the "whole calculus of national politics had been dramatically changed."<sup>130</sup>

Infuriated, Republicans nationwide campaigned to sway public opinion against the reform, while those in Michigan initiated an "unprecedented legal challenge to overturn it."<sup>131</sup> Politicians turned the Wolverine state into a verb: to "Michiganize" meant to select presidential electors by district rather than winner-take-all at-large elections.<sup>132</sup> President Harrison became the Miner Electoral Law's "most insistent opponent," publicly denouncing the law and allowing U.S. attorney general William H.H. Miller, formerly Harrison's law partner, to litigate the case at the

---

<sup>124</sup> Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 503.

<sup>125</sup> Selecting presidential electors by district was a return to the method that prevailed before the U. S. Civil War. Michigan added a twist: twelve electors would be elected by the voters of congressional districts and two would be elected by the voters of an eastern and western Michigan district. Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 517, 505.

<sup>126</sup> Miner drew up the bill out of "anger that all of Michigan's electoral votes in 1888 had gone to the Republicans, whose popular vote was less than a majority and scarcely greater than that of the Democrats" Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 505.

<sup>127</sup> Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 505.

<sup>128</sup> Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 505.

<sup>129</sup> Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 505. Whereas the Republican Party advantage with respect to the presidency derived from the structure of the winner-take-all rule (which exaggerates the vote strength of the victor in closely divided states), the Democrats' "edge on the popular vote" was based on white supremacy, which permitted their unconstitutional "suppression of the votes of African American Republicans in the southern states" quote at 507-508, note 20.

<sup>130</sup> Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 506.

<sup>131</sup> Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 509. They nominated their presidential electors on a general ticket rather than by district, then asked the Democratic Secretary of State to send the election notice, and, when he refused, applied for a writ of mandamus from the Michigan Supreme Court in May 1891. The case proceeded quickly through both the Michigan and U. S. Supreme Courts due to the upcoming presidential election.

<sup>132</sup> Argersinger, "Partisan Jugglery," 506.

U. S. Supreme Court.<sup>133</sup> Even with Miller’s participation, which was “highly unusual” despite that he “acted as private counsel and not in his official capacity,” the nation’s highest court upheld the Miner Electoral Law in October.<sup>134</sup> Weeks later, Michigan electors gave nine votes to the Republican and five votes to the Democratic presidential candidate, fewer than some Michigan Democrats predicted.<sup>135</sup>

Fusion was not directly implicated in the Miner Electoral Law.<sup>136</sup> But the new law extended the reach of the electoral strategy and intensified its threat to the majority party. By boosting the vote totals of coalition partners in individual races, fusion would now increase its dominant-party partner’s influence over presidential selection. Whenever fusion helped the Democrats or Republicans capture a district, they would also win its electors. Democrats “exulted,” and Republicans feared that “Democratic fusion with Populists might leave Michigan Republicans with only one electoral vote” under its provisions.<sup>137</sup> The prospect of additional electors created additional incentives for the dominant parties (and reluctant alternative parties) to pursue fusion alliances. In combination, fusion and the Miner Electoral Law were self-reinforcing, creating a counterforce to Michigan Republicans’ disproportionate hold on political power.

This proximate historical context makes a strong case for attributing Michigan’s fusion ban to partisan animus.

### **Republican Majority Back in Charge—1893**

#### *The Repeal of the Miner Electoral Law*

In the opening days of the 1893 legislative session, Michigan Senate and House Republicans schemed to set the playing field to amend election law to ban fusion and repeal the Miner Electoral Law that allocated presidential electors based on district rather than winner-take-all elections. Michigan Senators made repealing the Miner Electoral Law their first order of business, passing S. B. 1 on January nineteenth by a straight party line vote of twenty Republicans to eight Democrats and one Populist. Michigan Representatives took until May 24<sup>th</sup> to do the same. Sixty-two Republican representatives voted Yea while twenty-three Democratic and two Populist representatives voted nay. The Michigan House had first considered the fusion ban. The Republicans who voted down the fusion ban (against their party) voted up the Miner Electoral Law, also against their party.<sup>138</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 508, 513. The case went to the Court in late June 1892, after being upheld by the Michigan Supreme Court in view of legislative deference, at 511.

<sup>134</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 513.

<sup>135</sup> Utley and Cutcheon, *Michigan* vol. IV, 183-184 on vote count. Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 505 on vote prediction.

<sup>136</sup> Michigan Attorney General Adolphus A. Ellis, elected to the post by a Patrons of Industry-Democratic Party fusion in 1890, successfully defended the Miner Electoral Law in the Michigan Supreme Court. Michigan Supreme Court Justice Alan B. Morse, who was elected on a fusion ticket in 1885, sat on the Court until 1892, and cast a vote in favor of the Miner Electoral Law. Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 511.

<sup>137</sup> Argersinger, “Partisan Jugglery,” 515.

<sup>138</sup> Analysis of votes in Appendix H, Fig. 2 table “History of Fusion Voting in Michigan.”

The repeal paid off in the next presidential election. When Republican William McKinley was elected U. S. president in 1896, he received all fourteen of Michigan’s electoral votes even though he won only fifty-four percent of the state’s popular vote against William Jennings Bryan, who ran as a Populist in Michigan.<sup>139</sup> If the Miner Electoral Law had remained on the books, Bryan would have carried several Michigan electors. While Michigan’s electors would not have been the margin of victory in 1896 when McKinley won with 271 electoral votes to Bryan’s 176, the state could have influenced other states to pass proportional representation for presidential electors. McKinley received fifty-one percent of the national popular vote and the knowledge that their vote mattered under proportional representation could have motivated voters to change their minds.

### *A Failed Partisan Ban on Electoral Fusion: 1893*

The democratic entrepreneurship of the cross-party coalition—from the short lived but radical Miner Electoral Law to women’s suffrage and financial reform—catalyzed Republicans’ first attempt to ban fusion upon regaining control of the state legislature in 1893. That year, in Michigan and South Dakota, Republicans made the first deliberate attempts at banning fusion nominations, succeeding in South Dakota but failing in Michigan.<sup>140</sup> They were also the only two states where the “Industrial” Party was active in building a socially transformative coalition of farmers and workers in addition to running candidates for county, state, and federal offices, prior to the rise of the People’s or Populist Party.<sup>141</sup>

Disentangling fusion from the warp and woof of Michigan political culture posed a greater challenge. To set the balance of power in their favor, Republican legislators launched a campaign to unseat senators and representatives who had been elected to the body by means of fusion. They first attempted and failed to unseat Senator Enoch Mugford of Manistee County, whose name appeared on the Democratic, Independent Democratic, and People’s tickets, by claiming that fusion was illegal. Republican A. Oren Wheeler, who lost his senate race to Mugford, had appealed the election result to the Michigan Supreme Court, which denied his writ of mandamus. Failing to secure legal remedy, Wheeler asked the twenty-two Republican state senators to use their majority to unseat Mugford.<sup>142</sup> Senate Republicans secretly met and agreed to seat Wheeler but they were blocked by the Michigan Supreme Court on January 18<sup>th</sup>.<sup>143</sup> The court issued an opinion in a related case, *Lindstrom vs. the Board of Canvassers of Manistee County*, affirming the legality of fusion with the claim that “a candidate may legally run on more than one ticket” (as reported by Democratic Senator James Turnbull).<sup>144</sup> Attempting to justify his caucus’ action, an unnamed Republican senator tipped his partisan hand, acknowledging that the legal right to fusion put the Republican Party at a competitive disadvantage in a context of broad public support for democratic reform: “We don’t propose to allow the Democrats to make allies of the

---

<sup>139</sup> “1896 Michigan presidential election,” Wikimedia Foundation, last modified May 4, 2026, 22:45 (UTC), [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1896\\_United\\_States\\_presidential\\_election\\_in\\_Michigan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1896_United_States_presidential_election_in_Michigan).

<sup>140</sup> Argersinger judged an 1891 Oregon election reform that prohibited a candidate’s name from appearing on the ballot more than once to have banned fusion inadvertently. Oregon Republican passed a formal antifusion law in 1895. Argersinger, “A Place on the Ballot,” 297-298.

<sup>141</sup> “Many Entries for the Race,” *Washington Post*, November 4, 1890, 4.

<sup>142</sup> “Tateum Will Be Speaker.” *Detroit Free Press*, January 4, 1893, 1.

<sup>143</sup> “Mugford Will Stay,” *The Lansing Journal*, January 18, 1893, 8.

<sup>144</sup> “A Barefaced Steal,” *Detroit Free Press*, February 15, 1893, 3.

Populists, Prohibitionists or any other party, and get up combination tickets against us. We can whip them singlehanded, but we don't intend to fight all creation."<sup>145</sup>

Next, senators targeted Senator Milton F. Jordan (D) of Barry County, who had voted against the repeal of the Miner Electoral Law on January 19<sup>th</sup>.<sup>146</sup> This time, rather than contest fusion's legality, they alleged that Jordan's votes on the Prohibition line—which delivered the win—were illegal because the Prohibition Party convention that nominated him did not reach quorum.<sup>147</sup> Jordan challenged the evidence for this claim and appealed to his fellow senators to rise above party affiliations and partisanship to breathe the "pure air of right and justice."<sup>148</sup> Two Republicans voted against unseating Jordan, Frank Clapp of Battle Creek and Samuel Hopkins of Mt Pleasant, which left a third, Charles McGinley of Sanilac County, as the deciding vote. McGinley was told "You've got to get into line"<sup>149</sup> and reminded that House Republican leaders threatened consequences for disloyal members: "Unless you stand up to the rack and go with your party no legislation desired by you will ever see the light of day."<sup>150</sup> Republicans would do anything to secure a numerical advantage for the fusion ban, not only tricking Democrats out of their seats but coercing their own party colleagues.

Finally, the House unseated the only Democratic representatives from Detroit. Republican challengers Harlow P. Davock and Bernard F. Schellberg of Wayne County lost their races to incumbent Democratic Representatives William W. Griffin and Otto H. Rusch by a few dozen votes and lodged protests before the House.<sup>151</sup> House Republicans referred the issue to a special committee that held hearings about alleged election fraud in Detroit.<sup>152</sup> Witnesses revealed that Polish and Italian voters in a packed precinct required help with their ballots because they did not speak English and/or were unfamiliar with the new voting process that replaced the party ticket. The majority report called it fraud while the minority report strenuously objected.<sup>153</sup> The *Saginaw Evening News* considered the proceedings in the House and Senate "so revolutionary that a few Republican members and Senators voted with the Democrats or refrained from voting at all, but the Republican party whip was wielded vigorously enough to command the necessary votes and complete the outrage on the franchise."<sup>154</sup> The House swore in Davock and Schellberg on February 17<sup>th</sup> just in time for the vote on a fusion ban two weeks later.<sup>155</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> "Not Much Business Done," *Detroit Free Press*, January 5, 1893, 1.

<sup>146</sup> Analysis of votes in Appendix H, Fig. 2 table "History of Fusion Voting in Michigan" from *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan, 1893*, vol. I (Robert Smith & Co., 1893): 141. Because Republican senators voted him out on February 14<sup>th</sup>, Jordan was not listed in the *Michigan Manual's* directory, although his vote against repeal was tallied.

<sup>147</sup> "A Barefaced Steal," *Detroit Free Press*, February 15, 1893, 3. See *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan, 1893*, vol. I, 13 on the margin of victory. Jordan won by 326 votes, less than the Prohibition votes he received.

<sup>148</sup> "A Barefaced Steal," *Detroit Free Press*, February 15, 1893, 3.

<sup>149</sup> Quoted in "An Emphatic Protest," *Detroit Free Press*, February 16, 1893, 7.

<sup>150</sup> Quoted in "Stole Two Seats," *Detroit Free Press*, February 18, 1893, 8.

<sup>151</sup> "Not Much Business Done," *Detroit Free Press*, January 5, 1893, 1. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, 1893* vol. I (State Printer, 1893): 14-16.

<sup>152</sup> "The Contested Seats," *Detroit Free Press*, January 19, 1893, 5.

<sup>153</sup> "The House," *Detroit Free Press*, February 15, 1893, 3. "Stole Two Seats," *Detroit Free Press*, February 18, 1893, 8.

<sup>154</sup> *Detroit Free Press*, February 25, 1893, 4.

<sup>155</sup> *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, 1893*, vol. I (State Printer, 1893): 607-611. "The House," *Detroit Free Press*, February 21, 1893, 3.

House Bill “H. B.” 718 was “intended to prevent fusion nominations, whereby a candidate who is nominated by two or more parties can have his name printed upon the official ballot in as many columns as there are parties who nominate him.”<sup>156</sup> The bill was introduced by Representative John McKinlay of Detroit, sent to committee, debated, and tabled multiple times during the spring of 1893.<sup>157</sup> To justify the proscription against double listing, Republicans claimed that, “the form of the ticket goes back to pure Australian idea,” positioning the fusion ban as they positioned other election reforms: as a return to an Australian template for electoral reforms that Democrats supported in the 1891-1892 legislature and from which fusion constituted an unfortunate deviation.<sup>158</sup>

The Senate approved its version, S. B. 20, by a straight party line vote of seventeen Republicans to seven Democrats on March 1<sup>st</sup>.<sup>159</sup> That same day, the House sent H. B. 718 to the committee on elections and began the countdown to a vote.<sup>160</sup> Legislators filibustered to slow down the bill in early March as they waited for esteemed Democratic Representative Thomas Barkworth, whom “Democrats summoned...from Jackson by telephone and telegraph to assist them in the contest.”<sup>161</sup> During the March 8<sup>th</sup> evening session, Speaker of the House William A. Tateum of Kent County suspended the rules by a vote of two-thirds of those present. Democrats and Republicans offered a variety of minor amendments as debate stretched late into the night. A representative finally called the question, and the vote proceeded. Even with yes votes from Davoc and Schellberg (the Republicans who took the places of the unseated Democrats from Detroit), the House failed to approve the 1893 antifusion bill with the necessary fifty-one votes. Forty-eight Republicans voted yea while six Republicans and twenty Democrats voted nay.<sup>162</sup>

Thanks to Michigan radicals’ quick action in forming the People’s Party in the throes of the Patrons’ dissolution, several populists won election to the state legislature in 1892 and had a voice in the anti-democratic rollbacks of the 1893 session.<sup>163</sup> Representatives Charles Kellogg of St. Joseph and Sylvester Strong of Jackson in addition to Senator Schuyler Champion of Ingham and Shiawassee counties were the only Populist-Democrats listed in the *Michigan Manual’s* directory for the 1893-1894 session.<sup>164</sup> Although they abstained from voting on the antifusion bill, they voted no on the motions to unseat the two Democratic representatives from Detroit and opposed repealing the Miner Electoral Law. Democratic Representatives John Kirkwood of Cass

---

<sup>156</sup> “Michigan Legislature,” *Jackson Citizen Patriot*, March 2, 1893, 3.

<sup>157</sup> *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, 1893*, vols. I-II, 697, 886, 971-2, 989-992, 1000, 1013-16, 1028-1032, 1575.

<sup>158</sup> In fact, Americans made many adaptations to the Australian system, chief among them provisions for party designations and office designations. Eldon Cobb Evans, *A History of the Australian Ballot System in the United States* (University of Chicago Press, 1917): 30.

<sup>159</sup> *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan, 1893*, vol. I, 537.

<sup>160</sup> *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, 1893* vol. II, 886.

<sup>161</sup> “The State Solons,” *Saginaw Courier-Herald*, March 9, 1893, 5.

<sup>162</sup> The Temporary Speaker who voted no was George Wagner. Roll call vote in *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, 1893*, vol. II, 1028-1032. Party affiliation in *Official Directory and Legislative Manual of the State of Michigan for the Years 1893-1894* (Robert Smith & Co., 1893): 688-693 hereafter *Michigan Manual 1893-1894*.

<sup>163</sup> Analysis of votes in Appendix H, Fig. 1, 2 table “History of Fusion Voting in Michigan.”

<sup>164</sup> *Michigan Manual, 1893-1894*: 592, 602, 567 (bios), 684-693 (directory). Bios confirm Democratic affiliation.

County and Arthur S. White of Kent County claimed to support the People's Party in their legislative biographies.<sup>165</sup> White voted no on the 1893 antifusion bill, while Kirkwood abstained.

Historian Peter H. Argersinger noted that Michigan came within three votes of joining South Dakota as the first state to intentionally ban fusion in 1893.<sup>166</sup> Republicans cast the three deciding votes against their own bill. One of the three, Patrick Hart of Battle Creek, had abstained from the February 17<sup>th</sup> vote to seat Davock and Schellberg. Another, Abram Blakley of Alpena, was the only Republican to vote no on February 17<sup>th</sup>.<sup>167</sup> The third, House Speaker Tateum, cast a strategic "no" because he anticipated the negative result and wanted the right to reconsider the vote and table the bill for future debate, a maneuver permitted only to members who vote on the winning side.

Democratic Representative Barkworth protested keeping the question open:

Nothing we can do during the session will more closely affect the rights supposed to be guaranteed to us by the constitution. Representatives of many hundreds of thousands of freemen desirous of being heard upon a question of supreme import in a republican form of government, are per force silent. When history shall record the acts of the Legislature of 1893, the attempted passage of this bill under such circumstances will attract the attention of observing patriots and not to our credit as a body.<sup>168</sup>

The Senate tabled their version S. B. 20 the next day, March 9<sup>th</sup>.<sup>169</sup> On April 27<sup>th</sup>, the House sent H. B. 718 back to the election committee, where it died.<sup>170</sup>

Editorialists did not wait for history's judgment to discredit William A. Tateum's leadership of the Legislature of 1893. A Democratic newspaper charged that Speaker Tateum's "intense partisan spirit has made his rulings so unfair that his own friends blush at the spectacle."<sup>171</sup> Critics castigated Tateum for high-handed methods such as suppressing minority protest by suspending House rules as well as disrespectful remarks such as insulting a fellow legislator as "a pup."<sup>172</sup> Presumably the first term state legislator lacked the finesse for a bruising floor fight. Republican leaders realized "that the house under his leadership has damaged the chances for Republican success this spring very materially."<sup>173</sup>

Rather than force Tateum out of the party, Michigan Republicans gave him important partisan assignments out of the public eye. Tateum left the legislature and drew a corporate salary at the Allis Pump company in 1894 while continuing to participate in Republican politics in Grand

---

<sup>165</sup> Kirkwood was nominated by Populists and "endorsed" by Democrats. White ran on the "Democratic and People's Party tickets." *Michigan Manual, 1893-1894*: 592-593, 606, 688-693.

<sup>166</sup> Argersinger, "Place," 296.

<sup>167</sup> Blakey, who hailed from a pro-fusion part of the state, resigned rather than finish out his term after the vote. Michigan Legislative Biography, Library of Michigan, accessed January 25, 2025 at <https://mdoe.state.mi.us/legislators/Legislator/LegislatorDetail/1191>.

<sup>168</sup> *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, 1893*, vol. II, 1031-1032.

<sup>169</sup> *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan, 1893*, vol. I (Robert Smith & Co., 1893): 656.

<sup>170</sup> *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, 1893*, 1574-1575.

<sup>171</sup> "Inefficient Officials," *The Saginaw News*, March 9, 1893, 4.

<sup>172</sup> "Inefficient Officials," *The Saginaw News*, March 9, 1893, 4.

<sup>173</sup> "Inefficient Officials," *The Saginaw News*, March 9, 1893, 4.

Rapids and Lansing.<sup>174</sup> Coincidentally, or strategically, Tateum campaigned for U. S. Representative Julius Caesar Burrows to receive the Republican nomination in a race to fill a vacant U. S. Senate seat.<sup>175</sup> Burrows' special election victory led to the fusion ban in spring 1895, as described below.

### *A Partisan Ban on Electoral Fusion: 1895*

In the spring of 1895, Michigan legislators passed the antifusion law on their second try by a vote of twenty-six to one in the Senate on February 28<sup>th</sup> and fifty-two to twenty in the House on March 13<sup>th</sup>.<sup>176</sup> The Senate concurred with the House's substitute version on March 13<sup>th</sup>, and Governor John T. Rich (R) signed it the next day.<sup>177</sup> Act No. 190 of the public acts of 1891, as amended on March 14<sup>th</sup>, 1895 now read "it shall be unlawful for said board of election commissioners to cause to be printed in more than one column on the ballot the name of any candidate who shall have received the nomination by two or more parties or political organizations for the same office."<sup>178</sup> A candidate with multiple nominations had to select which party column to appear in within five days of certification or the board of election commissioners would print their name in the column of the first party to notify the board of its nomination. A western Michigan newspaper summarized the legislation as "prohibiting political fusion upon all nominations for offices down to constable."<sup>179</sup> The state legislature took a few weeks to outlaw township and city candidates' names appearing on more than one ticket, and Attorney General Fred Maynard upheld the total fusion ban after nearly a year.<sup>180</sup>

### **Voting in the Michigan Legislature on Antifusion Legislation**

#### Michigan Senators (32 total)

<b>1891-1892</b>	16 Democrats, 4 Patrons of Industry, 12 Republicans <sup>181</sup>
<b>1893-1894</b>	9 Democrats, 1 Populist, and 22 Republicans
<b>S. B. 20</b>	17 Republicans voted Yea while 7 Democrats voted Nay on committee draft <sup>182</sup>
<b>1895-1896</b>	8 returning members, all of them Republican, 24 new R
<b>S. B. 63</b>	26 Republicans voted Yea while 1 Republican voted Nay

#### Michigan Representatives (100 total)

---

<sup>174</sup> "May All Take Trips. Aldermen Logic and Pearl Are Investigating Pumps, Too," *The Evening Press* (Grand Rapids), June 5, 1894, 1. "Ernest B. Fisher. He Leads the Republican Hosts This Spring," *The Evening Press* (Grand Rapids), March 24, 1894, 1. "It Was A Rouser," *The Evening Press* (Grand Rapids), October 13, 1894, 1.

<sup>175</sup> "Political Chat," *Lansing State Journal*, December 21, 1894, 1. "All Three Confident. Lieutenants of Senatorial Aspirants on the Field." *Detroit Free Press*, December 27, 1894, 3.

<sup>176</sup> Five senators abstained: Frank Clapp, Augustus Jewell, Fred Warner, John Watts, A. O. Wheeler. *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan, 1895*, vol. I (Robert Smith & Co., 1895): 373-374 (text of SB 63), 457-458 (vote). *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, 1895*, vol. II (Robert Smith & Co., 1895): 961.

<sup>177</sup> *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan, 1895*, vol. I, 652-653.

<sup>178</sup> Antifusion amendment listed in Section 12 of Act No. 190 in *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan, 1895*, vol. I, 373-374 and in Section 10 of Act No. 190 in Maynard, Respondents Brief in Maynard Report, 155.

<sup>179</sup> "Michigan Legislature," *The True Northerner*, May 24, 1895, 7.

<sup>180</sup> "New State Laws," *The Diamond Drill*, June 8, 1895, 3. *The Belding Banner*, March 5, 1896, 4.

<sup>181</sup> *New York Times* count. *Michigan Manual* count: 17 Democrats, 3 Patrons of Industry, 12 Republicans.

<sup>182</sup> *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan, 1893*, vol. I, 537. Note: vol. II of the *Journal of the Senate, 1893* is not digitized.

<b>1891-1892</b>	59 Democrats, 4 Patrons of Industry, 3 Industrials, 34 Republicans <sup>183</sup>
<b>1893-1894</b>	27 Democrats, 4 Populists, and 69 Republicans <sup>184</sup>
<b>H. B. 718</b>	48 Republicans voted Yea; 19 Democrats, 1 Populist & 6 Republicans voted Nay
<b>1895-1896</b>	28 returning members, all of them Republicans, 71 new R and 1 D
<b>H. B. 210</b>	52 Republicans voted Yea while 1 Democrat and 19 Republicans voted Nay

Newspapers regularly referred to the 1895 antifusion bill as the Shaw bill after its sponsor Senator Edwin Shaw of Newaygo County (R) to discredit it as partisan. Shaw, a long-time Republican newspaper publisher, Mason, and lawyer barred in 1892, served on the Michigan Republican Party's central committee during the failed fusion ban in 1893. After that failed attempt, Shaw opposed the Farmers Alliance or Populists and its "new party, fusion" in the pages of his influential newspaper the *Newaygo Republican*.<sup>185</sup> Governor John T. Rich (R) attended the paper's party to celebrate twenty-five years of Shaw's editorship in 1894.<sup>186</sup> Shaw represented his newspaper at the May 1895 meeting of the Michigan Republican Newspaper Association just weeks after the fusion ban.<sup>187</sup> In the heat of July, Shaw described the year's legislation to the 27<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the Michigan Press Association alongside fellow lawyer and Republican publisher Perry F. Powell of the *Cadillac News and Express*.<sup>188</sup> Shaw defended his intentions:

It is, in spite of the misrepresentations indulged in, really a law in the interest of purer elections and is calculated to supplement those previous Australian enactments which have done so much for the purification of the ballot. All those familiar with practical politics know the disgusting methods and corrupting practices of strikers who make a business of getting up fusion alliances for hire.<sup>189</sup>

Shaw's accusation that "strikers" profited from "fusion alliances for hire" likely referred to candidates who struck their name from the ballot and offered their line to a fusion candidate.

Rather than debate fusion on its merits, Shaw parroted familiar Republican charges that associated fusion with fraud. Shaw claimed it was "well known that men have in the state frequently gotten up so-called conventions, manipulated the same so as to have themselves nominated, and then sold out for cold cash to some other candidate nominated on some other ticket."<sup>190</sup> For example, Shaw found it suspicious that the Populist convention nominated a Mr. McDougal of Hillsdale County for U. S. representative from the third congressional district but Mr. Albert M. Todd became the candidate after McDougal declined. Further, fusion deceived voters because a Prohibitionist like Todd could hypocritically run as a Democrat opposed to liquor bans.

---

<sup>183</sup> Two Republican representatives, Hawley and Kirk, died during session. White, "Coalition Legislature of 1891."

<sup>184</sup> *Michigan Manual* count in directory and legislative biographies.

<sup>185</sup> "Farmers' New Party," *Newaygo Republican*, June 1, 1893.

<sup>186</sup> "Editorial Anniversary," *The Grand Rapids Press*, January 12, 1894, 1.

<sup>187</sup> *Owosso Times*, May 10, 1895, 4. Republican newspapers active in 1895 included: the State Republican, the Ionia Sentinel, the Detroit Tribune, the Newaygo Republican, the Bay City Tribune, the Cadillac New and Express, the Port Huron Times, and the St. Clair Republican.

<sup>188</sup> "The Michigan Editors," *The Semi-Weekly Palladium* (Benton Harbor), July 9, 1895, 1.

<sup>189</sup> Shaw quoted in "Passed Too Late to Effect Candidate Todd," *The Times Herald*, March 26, 1895, 1.

<sup>190</sup> Shaw quoted in "It Will Prevent Fraud. Senator Shaw Defends His Antifusion Law." *Cassopolis Vigilant*, March 28, 1895, 4.

Similarly, Republican Attorney General Fred Maynard judged this practice as one of the greatest outrages “committed against the purity of elections,” breathlessly demonstrating the confusion that occurs,

[when] a man who represents a party who believes in certain principles, can go to a man who has been nominated by another party who believes that the principles of the first party are all wrong from the ticket and get his own name inserted in place thereof, so that his name shall appear twice on the ballot, once as a candidate of a party believing in certain political principles, and in the second column standing as the candidate of the party opposing those political principles.<sup>191</sup>

Maynard characterized “the whole purpose” of a candidate’s name appearing on the ballot more than once as a form of parasitism and bad faith that catches “the votes of thousands of men who would not otherwise vote for him, believing when they do so that he stands as the representative of their party.”<sup>192</sup> Rather than an achievement of labor-intensive party organizing, which fusion can be at its best, Maynard reduced a candidate’s being named multiple times to an “unfair advantage over his opponent”—as if the dominant parties in a two-party system could not be accused of the same thing.<sup>193</sup>

### **Democratic-People’s-Silver Union Party**

Following the fusion ban, parties found innovative ways to continue the practice of cross-party coalition-making that played on the popularity and widespread familiarity of fusion in the state. Most notably, they formed conglomerate parties and adopted new hyphenated party names that signaled a coalitional practice for cooperative nominations of a single candidate or slate of candidates.

In the final days of Michigan state legislators’ debate over the antifusion law, national Democratic party leaders including Michigan’s George F. Richardson, former U. S. Representative, and Justin R. Whiting, former U. S. Senator, issued a silver manifesto calling for the remonetization of silver.<sup>194</sup> The money issue was bipartisan as well as bimetallic. Members of Michigan’s newly formed Free Silver Bi-Metallic League elected James M. Turner, the Republican candidate for governor in 1890, president.<sup>195</sup> Michigan Populists joined Republicans and Democrats at a one-hundred-person conference in the early days of 1896 and decided to form a new party if neither major party endorsed free silver in its platform.<sup>196</sup>

Silver Democrats took over their party the same day that William Jennings Bryan gave his famous “cross of gold” speech at the Democratic National Convention during the summer of 1896. Michigan played a crucial role in the national party’s embrace of Bryan and his promise of

---

<sup>191</sup> Fred A. Maynard, Respondent’s Brief, Maynard Report, 163.

<sup>192</sup> Fred A. Maynard, Respondent’s Brief, Maynard Report, 161.

<sup>193</sup> Fred A. Maynard, Respondent’s Brief, Maynard Report, 160.

<sup>194</sup> Lovchuk, “Michigan Gold Democrats,” 30.

<sup>195</sup> Lovchuk, “Michigan Gold Democrats,” 31.

<sup>196</sup> Lovchuk, “Michigan Gold Democrats,” 32.

silver salvation. Earlier that spring, a state committee including the Democratic candidates for Michigan governor in 1886, 1888, and 1894 formed to elect silver Democrats as delegates to the national convention.<sup>197</sup> U. S. President Grover Cleveland (D) directed a Michigan operative to swing the state to the gold cause. The operative manipulated a Michigan Democratic Party convention to win proxy votes from pledged silverites and thus elect a majority gold delegation to the Democratic Nation Convention.<sup>198</sup> After a series of maneuvers to reseat silver delegates from Michigan as well as Nebraska, the Democratic Party endorsed Bryan and adopted a silver platform plank in June.<sup>199</sup> Michigan's delegation was the most pro-Bryan of any state's.

Gold Democrats adopted a new name, the "National Democratic Party."<sup>200</sup> A week later, Michigan's Silver Democrats decided they needed a new name and new allies. The "Union Silver" party included many silver Republicans and some silver Prohibitionists. The sole surviving founder of the Republican Party, Albert Williams of Ionia, was the honorary chairman of Michigan's "Union Silver" convention held in August.<sup>201</sup> Former U. S. Representative George F. Richardson, who was elected on the Greenback ticket in 1884 and on the Democratic and Patrons of Industry tickets in 1890, was elected secretary of the "Union Silver" party in July.<sup>202</sup>

## Conclusion

We have shown that Michigan's political parties engaged in fusion nominations to pass pro-democracy reforms typically with the Democratic party and other third political parties. We provide documentary evidence that each party received its own ballot prior to Australian reform and its own ballot line after that reform. We have also shown that, in Michigan, relative to other states where electoral fusion was practiced, political parties and voters made exceptionally consistent use of fusion nominations in the 1891-1892 legislative session. Alliances between labor parties and Democrats secured the passage of ground-breaking democratic reforms, including the secret ballot and district-level selection of presidential electors. We have shown that Michigan's 1893 failed attempt to ban fusion involved an exceptionally blatant act of ballot manipulation, where Republicans un-seated Democratic legislators to secure sufficient votes to effect the ban. We have also shown that both attempts to ban fusion were motivated by partisan animus against challenger parties and comprised a broader rollback of democratic electoral and other reforms.

Fusion was so familiar and so firmly woven into Michigan political culture that political parties continued to forge the cross-party alliances that had been so consequential throughout the century and advertise them in their names—despite that the antifusion law allowed them no consequential presence on the ballot. Having lost the crucial electoral foothold of an independent ballot line, those attempts soon died out.

We verify that this report was jointly prepared by us.

---

<sup>197</sup> George L. Yaple in 1886. Wellington R. Burt in 1888. Spencer O. Fisher in 1894. Lovchuk, "Michigan Gold Democrats," 35.

<sup>198</sup> Operative Don M. Dickinson. Lovchuk, "Michigan Gold Democrats," 34-49.

<sup>199</sup> Lovchuk, "Michigan Gold Democrats," 62.

<sup>200</sup> Lovchuk, "Michigan Gold Democrats," 76.

<sup>201</sup> "Charles R. Sligh. Nominated for Governor by Three Parties." *Yale Expositor*, September 4, 1896, 2.

<sup>202</sup> "Organized a New Silver Party," *Washington Post*, July 17, 1896, 3.

Signature

Date 18 May 2026

*Wm J Diach*

*Kelly Goodman*

Signature

Date

**Appendix H. History of Fusion Voting in Michigan Fig. 1 Senate, 1890-1896**

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	SB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Jordan / Seat Wilkins	SB 20 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	SB 63 Fusion Ban
John	Beers	Democratic	Y	Y						
Charles	Boughner	Democratic	Y	Y						
Martin	Crocker	Democratic	Y	Y						
Peter	Doran	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	
Charles	Fridlender	Democratic	Y	Y						
Peter	Gilbert	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N		N	N	
James	Holcomb	Democratic	Y							
Augustin	McCormick	Democratic	Y	Y						
William	Miller	Democratic	Y	Y						
James	Morrow	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N		N	N	
Enoch	Mugford	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	
Peter	Park	Democratic	Y	Y						
George	Porter	Democratic	Y	Y						
George	Sharp	Democratic	Y	Y						
Frank	Smith	Democratic	Y	Y						
Chauncey	Wisner	Democratic	Y	Y						
John	Bastone	Patron of Industry	Y	Y						
John	Benson	Patron of Industry	Y							
Aaron	Brown	Patron of Industry	Y							
Marcus	Wilcox	Patron/Dem	Y	Y						
Joseph	Flesheim	Republican	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Jan	Garvelink	Republican	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Alfred	Milnes	Republican	Y	Y						
Frank	Prindle	Republican	Y	Y						
Marden	Sabin	Republican	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
John	Stevens	Republican	Y	Y						
Robert	Taylor	Republican	Y							
William	Toan	Republican	Y							

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	SB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Jordan / Seat Wilkins	SB 20 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	SB 63 Fusion Ban
Joseph	Weiss	Republican	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
A. Oren	Wheeler	Republican	Y	Y	N				Y	
Robert	Wilkinson	Republican	Y							
William	Withington	Republican	Y							
Milton F.	Jordan	Democratic			Unseated			N		
Wellington	Burt	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
Myron	Clark	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
Lewis	Hough	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
Harvey	Mellen	Democratic			Y	N	N		N	
James	Turnbull	Democratic			Y	N		N	N	
Schuyler	Champion	Populist			Y	N	N	N	N	
Edmund	Barnard	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Charles LeRoy	Brundage	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Frank	Clapp	Republican			Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
Jesse	Crane	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
J. Milton	Earle	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Edwin	Fox	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Robert	French	Republican			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Charles	Gibson	Republican			Y	Y		Y	N	
Samuel	Hopkins	Republican			Y	N	Y	Y	N	
Augustus	Jewell	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Charles	McGinley	Republican			Y	Y		Y	N	
Joseph	McLaughlin	Republican			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
William	Mears	Republican			Y		Y	Y	N	
Peter	Pascoe	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Charles S.	Pierce	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Willis	Sawyer	Republican			Y		Y		N	
George	Steel	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Samuel	Wilkins	Republican			Y				N	

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	SB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Jordan / Seat Wilkins	SB 20 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	SB 63 Fusion Ban
Ezra	Barnum	Republican			N				Y	Y
Mendel	Bialy	Republican			N				Y	Y
Franklin	Briggs	Republican			N				Y	Y
Clyde	Chittenden	Republican			N				Y	Y
Edwin	Eaton	Republican			N				Y	Y
Joseph	Gaige	Republican			N				Y	Y
Julius	Jamison	Republican			N				Y	Y
Oscar	Janes	Republican			N				Y	Y
Ransom	Johnson	Republican			N				Y	Y
Miner	Keeler	Republican			N				Y	N
William	Kilpatrick	Republican			N				Y	Y
Chester	Martin	Republican			N				Y	Y
Richard	Mason	Republican			N				Y	Y
George	Merriman	Republican			N				Y	Y
George	Prescott	Republican			N				Y	Y
John	Preston	Republican			N				Y	Y
Edwin	Shaw	Republican			N				Y	Y
Carlos	Shelden	Republican			N				Y	Y
Herbert	Smalley	Republican			N				Y	Y
William	Thompson	Republican			N				Y	Y
Emory	Townsend	Republican			N				Y	Y
Fred M.	Warner	Republican			N				Y	
John	Watts	Republican			N				Y	

SB 64 Australian Ballot in *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan 1891*, vol. II, 1517-1518.

Unseat Jordan / Seat Wilkins in *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan 1893*, vol. I, 300.

SB 20 Fusion Ban in *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan 1893*, vol. I, 660.

Repeal Miner Electoral Law in *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan 1893*, vol. I, 141.

SB 63 Fusion Ban in *Journal of the Senate of the State of Michigan 1895*, vol. I, 374.

**Appendix H. History of Fusion Voting in Michigan Fig. 2 House, 1890-1896**

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	HB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg	HB 718 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	HB 210 Fusion Ban
Lewis	Baker	Democratic	Y	Y						
Levi	Baldwin	Democratic	Y	Y						
Thomas	Barkworth	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	
Fred	Bathey	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	
William	Blake	Democratic	Y	Y						
Philip	Botsford	Democratic	Y	Y						
Casper	Bowen	Democratic	Y	Y						
Frederick	Bullock	Democratic	Y	Y						
Lucius	Canfield	Democratic	Y	Y						
William	Carpenter	Democratic	Y	Y						
Rowland	Connor	Democratic	Y	Y						
Moses	Denning	Democratic	Y	Y						
Charles	Dodge	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	
Frank	Doremus	Democratic	Y	Y						
Alonzo	Downing	Democratic	Y	Y						
Michael	Doyle	Democratic	Y	Y						
Marvin	Ferguson	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	
Augustus	Ferguson	Democratic	Y	Y						
Francis	Fildew	Democratic	Y	Y						
Charles	Fitch	Democratic	Y	Y						
Joseph	Gibbons	Democratic	Y	Y						
James	Graham	Democratic	Y	Y						
John	Gregory	Democratic	Y	Y						
William	Harley	Democratic	Y	Y						
William	Harper	Democratic	Y	Y						
John	Hayward	Democratic	Y	Y						
William	Henze	Democratic	Y	Y						
John	Herz	Democratic	Y	Y						

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	HB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg	HB 718 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	HB 210 Fusion Ban
William	Holton	Democratic	Y	Y						
George	Houghton	Democratic	Y	Y						
Samuel	Jackson	Democratic	Y	Y						
William	Jackson	Democratic	Y	Y						
Hiram	Johnson	Democratic	Y	Y						
Luke	Johnson	Democratic	Y	Y						
Birdsey	Knight	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N			N	
Reynolds	Landon	Democratic	Y	Y						
George	Lester	Democratic	Y	Y						
William	Lewis	Democratic	Y	Y						
James	Lowden	Democratic	Y	Y						
Adolph	Marion	Democratic	Y	Y						
William	Marsh	Democratic	Y	Y						
James	McCloy	Democratic	Y	Y						
Daniel	McGovern	Democratic	Y	Y						
Harvey	Mellen	Democratic	Y	Y						
John	Miner	Democratic	Y	Y						
Louis	Munthe	Democratic	Y	Y						
Lawrence	Nolan	Democratic	Y	Y						
George	Orth	Democratic	Y	Y						
George	Osborn	Democratic	Y	Y						
Hiram	Robinson	Democratic	Y	Y						
Hewlett	Rockwell	Democratic	Y	Y						
Frank	Thatcher	Democratic	Y	Y						
Arthur	Tripp	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N		N	N	
Philip	Wachtel	Democratic	Y	Y	Y		N	N	N	
Arthur	White	Democratic	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	
Travis	Leach	Industrial	Y	Y						
Samuel	Miller	Industrial	Y	Y						

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	HB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg	HB 718 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	HB 210 Fusion Ban
John	Rowden	Industrial	Y	Y						
Hugh	Chisholm	Patron of Industry	Y	Y						
John	Curtiss	Patron/Dem	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	
George F.	Richardson	Patron of Industry	Y	Y	N					
Marvin	Seeley	Patron of Industry	Y	Y						
Sylvanus	Alexander	Republican	Y	Y				Y		
Edmund	Barnard	Republican	Y	Y						
Darius	Buell	Republican	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	
Frank	Clapp	Republican	Y	Y						
August C.	Cook	Republican	Y	Y	N				Y	N
Gerrit	Diekema	Republican	Y	Y						
Charles	Eaton	Republican	Y	Y						
Norton	Fitch	Republican	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	
DeVere	Hall	Republican	Y	Y						
Willard	Harwood	Republican	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	
Dennison	Holden	Republican	Y	Y						
James	Kirk	Republican	Y	Y						
John	Lusk	Republican	Y	Y						
Alonzo	Northup	Republican	Y	Y						
John	Perkins	Republican	Y	Y						
Selah	Raymond	Republican	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Frank	Ryland	Republican	Y	Y						
John	Shull	Republican	Y	Y						
Walker	Smith	Republican	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	
Avery	Smith	Republican	Y	Y						
F[rederick]	Smith	Republican	Y	Y						
Edward	Spencer	Republican	Y	Y						
Alden	Swift	Republican	Y	Y						
Jacob	Tinklepaugh	Republican	Y	Y						

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	HB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg	HB 718 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	HB 210 Fusion Ban
Milan	Wiggins	Republican	Y	Y						
John	Kolvoord	Democratic	Y							
George	Lambert	Democratic	Y							
W[illiam]	Wendell	Democratic	Y							
Lucius	Church	Republican	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	
David	Collins	Republican	Y							
Lemuel	Dafoe	Republican	Y							
Royal	Eaton	Republican	Y		Y			Y	N	
William	Harry	Republican	Y							
Willard	Hawley	Republican	Y							
Eugene	SaintClair	Republican	Y							
Edward	Stone	Republican	Y							
George	Wagner	Republican	Y							
John	Watts	Republican	Y							
Charles	Bailey	Democratic			Y				N	
William	Baum	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
Adam	Bennett	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
Charles	Brenner	Democratic			Y			N	N	
Fred	Buzzell	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
William	Crippen	Democratic			Y	N		N	N	
James	Dempsey	Democratic			Y			N	N	
John	Gilday	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
Horace	Holdridge	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
John	Holmes	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
John	Kirkwood	Democratic			Y	N			N	
Charles	Kline	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
William	McKinstry	Democratic			Y	N	N		N	
Frank	Mills	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
Christopher	Mohr	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	HB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg	HB 718 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	HB 210 Fusion Ban
Sanford	Perkins	Democratic			Y			N	N	
John	Sparling	Democratic			Y		N	N	N	
Frank	Sullivan	Democratic			Y		N		N	
James	Thompson	Democratic			Y	N	N	N	N	
Chauncey	Wisner	Democratic			Y			N	N	
Charles	Kellogg	Populist			Y	N		N	N	
Sylvester	Strong	Populist			Y	N		N	N	
Jeremiah	Anderson	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Richard	Bagot	Republican			Y	Y		Y	N	
Charles P.	Benoit, Jr.	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Roswell	Bishop	Republican			Y	Y		Y	N	
Abram	Blakley	Republican			Y	N		Y	N	
Abram	Butler	Republican			Y	Y		Y	N	
Job T.	Campbell	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
H. Frank	Campbell	Republican			Y	Y		Y	N	
John	Cartwright	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Fremont C.	Chamberlain	Republican			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
George G.	Covell	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
George M.	Curtis	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Harlow	Davock	Republican			Y		Y	Y	N	
Alvin	Ewing	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
William W.	Ferguson	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oramel B.	Fuller	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Anthony	Gluecklich	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
William D.	Gordon	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
George	Green	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Charles	Hammond	Republican			Y	Y		Y	N	
Patrick	Hart	Republican			Y		N	Y	N	
William	Hartson	Republican			Y	Y		Y	N	

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	HB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg	HB 718 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	HB 210 Fusion Ban
John F.	Henry	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
John	Hicks	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Eugene	Hicks	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
George E.	Hilton	Republican			Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
Charles K.	Hoyt	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
David	Huggett	Republican			Y	Y	Y		Y	N
John	Jones	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Edward L.	Kingsland	Republican			Y	Y	Y		Y	N
Samuel R.	Kingsley	Republican			Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Charles	Leavitt	Republican			Y				N	
Albert T.	Linderman	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Frank	Lyon	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
John	McKinlay	Republican			Y		Y	Y	N	
Philip D.	Miller	Republican			Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
John	Moll	Republican			Y	Y	Y		N	
Silas	Moody	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Charles	Moore	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Joseph D.	Morse	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Julian	Mudge	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Henry	Newkirk	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
John W.	Norman	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
John	Norrington	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
William D.	Place	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Francis W.	Redfern	Republican			Y		Y	Y	Y	N
Christopher	Roberts	Republican			Y		Y	Y	N	
John J.	Rogner	Republican			Y		Y	Y	Y	
Allan S.	Rose	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Bernhard	Schellberg	Republican			Y		Y	Y	N	
Carlos	Shelden	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	HB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg	HB 718 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	HB 210 Fusion Ban
Roger	Sherman	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Herbert	Smalley	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
John	Sumner	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
William A.	Tateum	Republican			Y	Y	N		N	
Edgar S.	Wagar	Republican			Y	Y		Y	Y	N
George	Wagner	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
George	Watson	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Augustus W.	Weekes	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Edwin A.	Wildey	Republican			Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
Ari E.	Woodruff	Republican			Y				Y	N
John	Zimmerman	Republican			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
John	Donovan	Democratic			N				Y	N
Giles B.	Allen	Republican			N				Y	
Edmund S.	Amidon	Republican			N				Y	N
Henry H.	Aplin	Republican			N				Y	
John	Baird	Republican			N				Y	Y
Lyman E.	Belknap	Republican			N				Y	Y
Samuel K.	Bradbury	Republican			N				Y	Y
Robert	Brown	Republican			N				Y	Y
Thomas M.	Camburn	Republican			N				Y	Y
Frank	Campbell	Republican			N				Y	
John J.	Cathro	Republican			N				Y	
Arthur H.	Chilver	Republican			N				Y	Y
Jasper N.	Clark	Republican			N				Y	
James	Cousins	Republican			N				Y	Y
Miles S.	Curtis	Republican			N				Y	N
George B.	Davis	Republican			N				Y	
William R.	Edgar	Republican			N				Y	Y
Charles H.	Fisk	Republican			N				Y	Y

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	HB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg	HB 718 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	HB 210 Fusion Ban
John W.	Fitzgerald	Republican			N				Y	Y
James K.	Flood	Republican			N				Y	Y
Charles E.	Foote	Republican			N				Y	Y
Seymour	Foster	Republican			N				Y	Y
Robert D.	Graham	Republican			N				Y	Y
William	Harris	Republican			N				Y	
Donald	Henderson	Republican			N				Y	
E. S. Peter	Herrig	Republican			N				Y	
Charles	Holden	Republican			N				Y	
Arthur L.	Holmes	Republican			N				Y	
William J.	Kelly	Republican			N				Y	Y
William D.	Kelly	Republican			N				Y	Y
Reuben	Kempf	Republican			N				Y	
Henry	Kent	Republican			N				Y	N
Austin N.	Kimmis, Jr.	Republican			N				Y	Y
W. Irving	Latimer	Republican			N				Y	Y
Henry	Lee	Republican			N				Y	Y
Philo M.	Lonsbury	Republican			N				Y	Y
Joshua B.	Madill	Republican			N				Y	Y
Lester M.	Marsh	Republican			N				Y	N
Isaac	Marsilje	Republican			N				Y	
John A.	Matthews	Republican			N				Y	Y
Frank	McNall	Republican			N				Y	Y
Miller G.	Moore	Republican			N				Y	N
John	Mulvey	Republican			N				Y	Y
Lauren F.	Otis	Republican			N				Y	
Thomas H.	Parkinson	Republican			N				Y	Y
George W.	Partridge	Republican			N				Y	Y
Richard	Pearson	Republican			N				Y	N

First Name	Last Name	Party in Directory	1891-1892	HB 64 Australian Ballot	1893-1894	Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg	HB 718 Fusion Ban	Repeal Miner Electoral Law	1895-1896	HB 210 Fusion Ban
George W.	Peer	Republican			N				Y	Y
Charles W.	Perry	Republican			N				Y	Y
William E.	Rice	Republican			N				Y	
Irving B.	Rich	Republican			N				Y	
George W.	Richardson	Republican			N				Y	Y
John M.	Robertson	Republican			N				Y	Y
Orrin W.	Robinson	Republican			N				Y	Y
William A.	Rowley	Republican			N				Y	Y
Arthur W.	Saxton	Republican			N				Y	Y
Eleazar	Sherwood	Republican			N				Y	Y
James F.	Smiley	Republican			N				Y	Y
Charles	Smith	Republican			N				Y	Y
Otto	Stoll	Republican			N				Y	Y
Edward B.	Taylor	Republican			N				Y	Y
Peter	Voorheis	Republican			N				Y	
Bryon S.	Waite	Republican			N				Y	
George H.	Waldo	Republican			N				Y	Y
Joseph B.	Ware	Republican			N				Y	Y
Frank	Westcott	Republican			N				Y	N
Joseph H.	Whitney	Republican			N				Y	Y
Edwin S.	Williams	Republican			N				Y	
Theodore M.	Wolter	Republican			N				Y	
Lucian E.	Wood	Republican			N				Y	
Jabez B.	Wortley	Republican			N				Y	

SB 64 Australian Ballot in *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan 1891*, vol. III, 2184-2189.

Unseat Griffin / Seat Schellberg in *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan 1893*, vol. I, 608-611.

SB 20 Fusion Ban in *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan 1893*, vol. II, 1028-1032.

Repeal Miner Electoral Law in *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan 1893*, vol. III, 2054-2057.

SB 63 Fusion Ban in *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan 1895*, vol. II, 961.