The Making of a Rural Boss: Cy Leland, Jr.

Robert S. La Ferle

The depression of 1873 shattered the buoyant optimism that spurred railroad building throughout the plains and prairie states in the mid-nineteenth century. As economic activity slowed and delinquent tax rolls grew, the area's cities and counties, which had issued large amounts of bonds to help build the lines, struggled to repay the debts. In Kansas, a state that ranked high in local government indebtedness, an additional economic burden existed, the grasshopper invasion of 1875 and 1876. With greater frequency than elsewhere her counties began to stop payment on their debts. Local leaders, such as Cy Leland, Jr., of Troy, organized the defaults with one hope in mind, to use the moratoria to force bondholders to renegotiate the amounts downward. This action, they believed, would lower annual payments and provide some of the relief taxpayers were demanding.

Leland's county, Doniphan, located in the northeastern corner of Kansas where the Missouri River ruins the state's rectangular design, suffered a bonded railroad debt. The amount owed to help build the St. Joseph and Denver Railroad and the Atchison and Nebraska line seem modest in retrospect, but was gigantic at the time. In 1866 the county had voted $100,000 in bonds for each company, but that sum being insufficient to the task, it was raised to $200,000 the next year, making a $400,000 total debt. Because adequate private capital was not subscribed and because of fraudulent and poor management by the early builders that slowed construction, the roads were still not completed through Doniphan in 1870. Consequently, the county turned to other builders who finished the work in return for most of the companies' stock, the county's included. James F. Joy of Detroit, Michigan, railed the A and N while financiers organized by General George H. Hall of nearby St. Joseph, Missouri, completed the St. Joe and Denver. By 1880 these railroads had merged with larger systems. The A and N joined the Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy; the St. Joe and Denver became part of the Union Pacific.

Despite complaints that the bonds had sold for about fifty cents on the dollar when issued and that the builders shifted the original right-of-way and built too slowly to help county businesses, for eight and a half years Doniphan officials redeemed coupons and paid interest on the debt. By 1877, however, this burden in a declining economy created demands for temporary default. The fact that other counties had begun the process of defaulting encouraged Doniphan leaders to consider a similar course. Moreover, the general attitude towards railroads and their financiers was shifting from enthusiastic support, to guarded doubt and ultimate distrust.
In early 1877, after county commissioners asked for a show of public opinion regarding the matter, several area towns held meetings supporting default. Some of these towns, such as the county seat city of Troy, had incurred bonded debts of their own to help build the railroads. On May 19, 1877, a large gathering of representatives from across the county met in Troy to pass a resolution asking the board of commissioners to stop interest payment on the debt. Responding to the resolution presented at their next meeting, they agreed to “refuse to levy any tax for the payment of interest on said bonds.” In August, when taxes were determined, the board withheld the normal 10 mill levy for the debt and subsequently refused to make the second semi-annual payment. For the next 10 years no tax was collected. Then, in 1887, a court order forced a resumption of taxation to service the bonds. Despite refunding, and a partial payment of the debt, not until 1931 was the obligation retired.

Although the duration of this bond controversy was considerably longer than in other areas of Kansas, in most respects what happened there happened elsewhere. One meaningful political difference did occur. Out of the struggle a county leader emerged who, by the 1890s, was considered to be the “Big Boss” of Kansas Republican politics. In fact, he was probably the only genuine state boss in its political history. At least he was the only politician to face a coordinated, successful Boss-Busters’ movement to remove him from power. That boss was Cyrus Leland, Jr.

Leland began his political career years prior to the bond controversy. In 1864 he became the youngest man to be elected that year to the state legislature. He was twenty-three and a First Lieutenant in Company F, 10th Kansas Volunteer Infantry Regiment assigned as Aide-de-Camp to General Thomas Ewing. In fact it was Ewing who encouraged Leland to run. The general intended to contest Senator Jim Lane in 1865 and wanted men loyal to him in the legislature where the race would be decided. Furloughed by Ewing to return to Kansas, Leland, a four-year veteran wounded in the battle at Prairie Grove, Arkansas, won easily. His victory and subsequent events caused trouble among Republicans. He and his former company commander, Captain Nathan Price, sought to control the local party through a group of courthouse politicians known as the "Troy Gang" or "ex-soldier clique." Early settlers in Doniphan County, who had avoided military service by hiring substitutes, opposed the move and began a ten-year intra-party battle against Leland and Price. If Sol Miller, editor of the Kansas Chief at White Cloud, was not the leader of the latter group, he was its most successful spokesman. For a decade this split allowed Democrats, independents, and third party politicians considerable local success.

Despite these conditions Leland did hold a few offices after he left the Kansas House in 1867. He was the local United States collector of internal revenue, postmaster for Troy, and the town’s mayor. Most of his energy then was devoted to business. He began a general dry goods store, which he owned until the twentieth century. He also laid the basis for business enterprises that made him one of the richest men in Doniphan County. He ultimately owned several
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scaled-down payments of back taxes and grant numerous road and bridge alignments at county expense. Allegedly, in order to win elections, he stuffed ballot boxes, voted repeaters, voted blacks as a bloc, dispensed whiskey freely, and coerced employees. On major issues he took the popular position. He was anti-railroad, anti-prohibition and fought the railroad bondholders. Based on a careful reading of the county's two main newspapers, the Chief and the Troy Times, the impression emerges that the bond controversy exceeded the other two as the major concern of Doniphanites from the late 1870s until the early 1890s. (Of course, constitutional prohibition which was adopted in Kansas flared up as an issue in the early 1880s and briefly pushed most others aside.)

Although later allegations claimed Leland had stopped immigrant caravans moving West in 1866 and 1867 in order to vote them in the railroad bond elections, he actually had not been part of the leadership on the matter at that time. All subscriptions voted on in 1866 and 1867 had carried with comfortable margins. Although later allegations claimed Leland had stopped immigrant caravans moving West in 1866 and 1867 in order to vote them in the railroad bond elections, he actually had not been part of the leadership on the matter at that time. All subscriptions voted on in 1866 and 1867 had carried with comfortable margins. 

Except for praise given the county commissioners at the time not a great deal was said in print about the decision. Opinion in opposition to the action was not reported because Sol Miller, an early advocate of default, supported the board. For several months before the rally he had argued that the increased value of the dollar justified cessation of payment. Deflation had made the 1877 dollar supposedly twice as valuable as that in 1867 and, accordingly, a 50 percent compromise was considered to be fair. The first meaningful opposition to the default came not from Kansans but from a Pennsylvanian, Smedley Darlington,
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really ceased to be the entering wedge." Leland and Darlington,
after prolonged negotiations, reached a settlement. To
influence Darlington and other bondholders, Leland secured an
act from the state legislature empowering Doniphan County to
refund the bonds at a rate of no more than 50 cents on the
dollar. He quickly arranged a new bond issue under these
terms and in June, 1879 completed the agreement with
Darlington by tendering him $15,000 in new bonds. Leland
expected other bondholders to be forthcoming. Yet despite his
optimism and that of the Chief, which predicted "that the
entire indebtedness . . . would be compromised without
difficulty," such did not happen.

Improved economic conditions after 1879 increased the
county's ability to tax and probably hurt Leland's effort to
secure a 50 percent compromise. Only two other bondholders
settled at this figure. In 1880 the county redeemed bonds
valued at $22,500. These were to be the last refunded until
1892. A court order did force the county to pay off $45,000
of the debt in 1884. For $53,761.49, the county purchased
bonds held by S.A. Walker, T.J. Chew, Jr., and W.B. Clarke, a
Kansas City banker who represented the "Bingham judgment"
rendered by the 8th Circuit Court. From available figures it
is apparent that $53,761.49 of the sum was current and unpaid
interest. Although the minutes of the county commissioners
board for July 11, 1884, note that the payment was made "as
per compromise," the only meaningful
"compromise was on the
interest which should have been $22,050.

Leland could justifiably claim that the amount saved on
interest constituted a compromise of the bonds because the law
of 1879 which limited refunding to 50 percent or less of the
bond's face value had been changed by the state legislature.
In 1881, at Leland's request, Doniphan county was allowed to
reissue its debt on whatever terms it might negotiate. The
new law had been sought to accommodate a large bondholder from
St. Joe who seemingly had agreed to a 65 percent refunding.
After the law's passage the bondholder reneged. At least this
was Leland's story later when allegations were made that
he had not tried to reach a settlement with the party involved.

Leland refunded the remaining $302,500 worth of the old
bonds in 1892. He accomplished this through W.B. Clarke, the
Kansas City banker involved in the 1884 redemption. Clarke
accepted a new issue of bonds that included not only the
face value due but also a large part of the old interest.
Because bond records no longer exist and because the court
ruled some of the interest void due to "statutes of
limitation," the exact amount due cannot be known. It appears
to have been about $585,516. This sum was compromised at
$463,000, or, as Leland claimed, at 85 percent. New bonds
bearing 5 percent interest per annum for 30 years were
accepted by Clarke.
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Midway through the period when Leland was unsuccessfully attempting to adjust the bonds, the court ordered resumption of interest payments. Taxes for this purpose began to be collected in 1887 when a 10 mill levy was imposed. To defeat this judgment Leland had the county reassessed, lowering property valued by about one-half million dollars. The court countered Leland's maneuver by increasing the levy to 17 mills. Later the State Board of Equalization raised Doniphan County's property value to approximately the old figure. Mill levies were stabilized at about seven mills per dollar after the last refunding. This lowered taxes and was sufficient to pay the debt's interest while creating a small sinking fund. Under the old bonds the 10 mill levy produced about $30,000 in revenue per year for debt interest only. The new taxes amounted to about $21,000 per annum for interest and the sinking fund.

The many court hearings, which resulted from extensive litigation, were additional expenditures for the county, which included paid attorney fees and the expenses of witnesses, including the board of commissioners who traveled often to either Kansas City, Leavenworth, or Topeka. Existing records do not reveal the extent of these costs, but numerous delays employed by Leland were undoubtedly expensive. Several times he and other board members were arrested and ordered jailed for contempt of court. That they were never jailed was unquestionably due to Leland's importance. They were once remanded to the custody of the local United States Marshal, but continued business as usual.

Leland repeatedly tried to schedule court hearings before Circuit Judge David J. Brewer, a future United States Supreme Court Justice and a friend who was favorably disposed towards the county's plight. Judge C.G. Foster, whom he considered hostile, heard the cases that resulted in important and generally unfavorable judgments. That Leland delayed orders to begin taking for about 10 years is testimony of his skill. That he waited until 1892 before finally settling the debt is evidence of his power. Whether he did the county a favor in the bond matter is debatable. The terms for the new bonds were excellent. A five percent interest rate for an agricultural county in the midst of the depression of 1893 indicates that his stalling tactics worked. As noted, the arrangement lowered taxes substantially. Nonetheless, Doniphan County ultimately paid more for its participation in building the A and N and St. Joe-Denver railroads than had been anticipated. The absence of bond records in the Doniphan County treasurer's office makes it impossible to know how much more, but the final sum exceeded the projected $1,240,000 first discussed in 1867. During the early twentieth century the county was better situated financially to meet the expense. This is what Leland hoped.

The controversy did serve Leland politically. During the 1880s the bond issue and prohibition were the major issues. Leland's anti-prohibition stand was popular with an electorate that voted 2150 to 821 against the constitutional amendment in 1880. By 1885, however, anti-prohibitionist sentiment was shifting as more and more Doniphan voters accepted the ban. By then the bond controversy was becoming the more persistent issue and one that Leland could exploit. Sol Miller,
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and politically. During the election were the major issues. A popular with an electorate constitutional amendment and in prohibitionist sentiment was an issue for exploration of the county. Becoming the more persistent was the Chief to praise Leland's compromise efforts and his firm stand against bondholders and courts. He constantly reminded the voters that, in urging Leland and other commissioners to default, the public had promised its support. In Miller's mind this meant keeping Leland in office. Meaningful local opposition to Leland's handling of the matter was not well organized until 1886. Before then he fared exceptionally well in local elections.

He had been the only county Republican to win in the Greenback year of 1875, defeating David Lee in the commissioner's race. In his first re-election bid, three months after the default, he ran unopposed. Two years later he was challenged by two candidates whom he defeated with 73 percent of the vote. In 1882 and 1885, running unopposed, he was said to have defeated the St. Joe bondholders. His success in these years led considerable intraparty squabbling. Charles Burkhalter, a former supporter installed as sheriff, rebelled in 1882. But Burkhalter was badly overmatched and in 1883, no longer eligible as a candidate for sheriff, was soundly defeated when he tried to become county treasurer.

Another former Leland associate, who had helped cause Burkhalter's defection, was not so easily dealt with and was probably the reason the bonded indebtedness was used so effectively as an issue after 1885. Fred J. Close had come to Kansas immediately after the Civil War. A Union Army veteran, he had lost an arm at the battle near Resaca, Georgia. Having graduated from Highland University at Highland, Kansas, he became the town's mayor in 1871. He failed in early attempts to win county office but, with Leland's aid, was chosen Clerk of the District Court of Doniphan in 1878 and again in 1880. Despite Leland's opposition, he won re-election for a third term as an Independent and Democrat. Admitted to the bar in 1883, he was elected as the Republican county attorney with Leland's help the next year. Soon after he became a friend of one of Leland's earliest and most enduring enemies, W.W. Guthrie of Atchison, an attorney for several holders of the railroad bonds. For the next ten years Close would be at odds with Leland while seeking various offices as a Republican, Independent, Independent Republican, Democrat, Alliance leader and Populist.

According to Sol Miller, Close and Guthrie induced A.W. Beale, a local newspaperman, to begin the Troy Times in 1886. With their financial backing, supposedly as representatives of the bondholders, and with the blessing of ardent prohibitionists, Beale commenced publishing the paper to reform county politics by ousting "Boss" Leland and his "Ring." During the next decade, despite several changes in editors, the Times carried on continual criticism of the way county business was done, particularly Leland's handling of the bonds. Few were the months from October, 1886 to November, 1892 when articles about them were not featured in its columns. In Leland's reelection years of 1888 and 1891, it was replete with criticisms of his management.
From the first the Times maintained that "the boss" used refunding "to do duty to carry men into office." When Fred Close's reelection as county attorney in 1886 was interpreted as a repudiation of Leland, Close asked the commissioners to issue new bonds, extend the time, and do not use it for political buncombe any longer. On numerous occasions either the editor, or letters-to-the-editor printed in the Times, claimed that Leland refused opportunities to compromise the bonds at 50 or 65 per cent of their face value. Stung by charges made by a former Democratic county commissioner, R.P. Shulsky, that he had not done all that was possible to settle the debt, Leland answered in a letter to the Chief. When Shulsky left the commission, Leland had asked him publicly if all efforts at compromise had been followed up. Shulsky answered, "yes." "The reason I asked him," wrote Leland, "was that I had heard of his talk when off the board, and knowing his two-faced cussedness so well, I thought it best to bring him out where he was bound to tell the truth, and I could have witnesses to the fact." Undaunted by Leland's replies or by editorials in the Times meant to destroy its opponent's credibility, the Times continued the assault. It insisted that Leland would never settle the bond matter because he was disliked by all parties involved—judges, bondholders and attorneys. "Mr. Leland's conduct towards the bondholders," it editorialized, "has been of an overbearing, insulting nature, characteristic of his conduct towards everybody." When Leland reassessed the county to lower the court imposed taxes, the Times insinuated that he was guilty of criminal conduct, subverting the laws of Kansas. In the early 1890s while some Republicans were assailing Populists for passing stay laws to relieve hard pressed farm-debtors, the Times, now an agrarian reform journal, pointed out that in Doniphan County, Leland was the "repudiationist." To claims that he was acting for the good of the entire county, the opposition answered that he used the default for personal financial gain. They pointed out that as the largest landholder in Doniphan County, he was saving numerous tax dollars through the action. They accused him of pocketing the difference between what the county paid for refunded bonds and what bondholders received. The well-publicized compromise in 1892 allegedly involved Leland and W.B. Clarke in a deal to split the "huge profits" made by Clarke. Certain segments of the local citizenry must have been impressed by the Times' explanation that Leland needed the extra-money to finance stock gambling and horse racing. Opponents also attributed his wealth in general to the use or misuse of county funds. None of those claims were proven, and on occasion Leland threatened lawsuits over them.

For their part Miller and Leland tried to reply to specific accusations. Regularly, Miller recounted how Leland's business acumen in private affairs had brought him to riches. When charged with financial dishonesty in 1890, Leland offered to allow an independent, outside audit of county books if those making the allegations would pay for it. He had no takers. Leland and Miller also maintained, with justification, that the Times, Fred Close, and their supporters although agrarian reform leaders, were spokesmen
tained that "my boss" used me into office." When Fred Close in 1886 was interpreted as meaning that the commissioners had not issued the bonds and did not use it for bondholders and other railroad interests. The inference was that statements they made were not motivated by a desire to help local taxpayers but to serve these financial masters. Mostly, however, Miller defended Leland by reporting the many successful and unsuccessful attempts at compromise. He pointed out how county taxes had remained among the lowest in Kansas and threatened financial ruin for farmers if the bondholders forced 100 percent redemption. Such action Miller claimed would require a punitive levy of 17 cents per dollar of property valuation.

The Leland-Miller tactics worked. In 1888 Leland defeated Robert Ladwig with 63 per cent of the vote. At the same time he helped keep Fred Close, now running as an agrarian reformer, from winning a bid for the state senate. Leland's narrowest victory was in 1891 when Kansas Republicans were hard pressed by Populists, although not in Doniphan County. He defeated J.A. Symms, the People's Party nominee, by a margin of 58 to 42 per cent of the vote. In his last election to the commission in 1894, Leland received 69 per cent of the ballots cast, defeating candidates of both the Democratic and Populist parties. Although the bonded indebtedness was periodically discussed in the press after 1895, it was no longer the potent issue it had been. In fact, Doniphan politics moderated enough to prompt Sol Miller to write that the bitter feelings of past campaigns were over and that no longer were they "a veritable Hell in which hatred, malice, and slander reign supreme." At the height of the controversy, when Leland was being variously described as the "bull-headed boss," "king," "dictator," "thief," "cockroach," "liar," and "reptile," as well as in some unflattering terms, Miller had written: "They have charged him with robbery, fraud, violence, law-breaking, bribery and everything else except murder; and perhaps it will be discovered that he has committed murder... Still the people vote for him." Vote for him they did, because unlike the Republican strawmen that reformers of the era created, it was the Republican boss, Cy Leland, Jr., who fought the alleged malefactors of wealth, the greedy bondholders, the Shylocks. The absence of personal papers make his motives difficult to discern but, in addition to the obvious political advantage gained, he appears to have been genuinely interested in the welfare of his financially hard-pressed neighbors.

The most valuable insight offered by studying this episode of Kansas' past is the way it illuminates the complexities of what is sometimes called the "agrarian revolt" and the way it challenges the ordinary understanding of it. In Doniphan County, Alliance men and Populists sided with financiers and railroads, the forces they supposedly abhorred. In this case it fell to Cy Leland to act as the popular speaker. The county boss, to be sure, but not entirely the cynical, scheming manipulator presented by Populists, Boss-Busters and some modern historians. The entire episode also provides a footnote for the well-known fact that Western governments overburdened themselves with railroad debts in the years after the Civil War. In the life of Cy Leland, the
study illustrates a facet of his rise to power within the G.O.P., supplying data for his yet to be written biography. It likewise offers documentation for some future study of the late nineteenth century rural boss, a figure sadly neglected in a time when historical knowledge of the urban boss is being rapidly expanded.

NOTES

1. An excellent, although brief, account of defaults, especially in Douglas County, is L.E. Quastler, The Railroads of Lawrence, Kansas, 1854-1900 (Lawrence, 1979), 244-56. An ambitious, albeit sketchy, account of these matters is Colda H. Crawford, Railroads of Kansas: A Study in Local Aid, 1858-1920, B.S. dissertation, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, 1963. Crawford notes that of 56 Kansas counties issuing bonds 17 defaulted. Studies of local-government management of bonded railroad debt are few. Two studies that do provide some information are: Carter Goodrich, Government Promotion of American Canals and Railroads, 1800-1890 (New York, 1960), 247ff; Robert Siegel, The Story of the Western Railroads (New York, 1926), 81, 137.
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