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Over the long history of the Supreme Court, nominees to the highest court in the land have been opposed for a variety of reasons. Often opponents are concerned about the nominee's political ideology or competency. Occasionally, allegations are raised about political cronyism. And candidates have come under fire for their religion. But nominee Melville Weston Fuller’s selection launched a national debate that went to the very heart of what makes one qualified to sit on the Supreme Court: whether a judge should have a mustache.

On March 23, 1888, Morrison R. Waite died of pneumonia after sitting for fourteen years in the Supreme Court’s center chair. Approximately one month later, President Grover Cleveland nominated Fuller to be the next Chief Justice. A prominent and highly successful Chicago attorney, Fuller was a life-long Democrat who had sported a mustache at least since 1867. Fuller had previously declined appointments to be on the United States Civil Service Commission and to be solicitor general. This time, however, Fuller answered the call to duty.

At the time of Fuller’s appointment, it is highly unlikely that President Cleveland—himself the first president to have a mustache—anticipated that newspapers around the country would argue about the propriety of a mustached Chief Justice. After all, the previous Chief Justice wore a long and poorly trimmed beard—albeit a beard with a bare upper lip—throughout his time on the Supreme Court, and no newspaper had taken him to task. What difference could a mustache without a beard make? The answer was soon to come.

At first, Fuller’s nomination was met with praise and the national newspapers predicted a quick confirmation. Noting the public comments made by politicians and editorial pages on both sides of the political
When Melville W. Fuller was appointed to the Court in 1888, the press first made note of his diminutive size, calling him “rather below middle height.” Then newspapers critiqued his mustache.

aisle, The New York Times reported that “[s]ome of the most cordial words of approval of the nomination have been found in the newspapers that would naturally object to contrive objections to it” and that President Cleveland’s selection of Fuller “must be regarded as one of the most fortunate selections made by him since he took office.” The Washington Post echoed The New York Times’ assessment of the bipartisan support for Fuller, noting that one Republican senator even “spoke of Mr. Fuller in terms of admiration almost of love.” Concluded the Post: “confirmation by the Senate is assured.”

The New York Sun also weighed in on the nomination. The newspaper sang Fuller’s praises, telling its readers that Fuller was “preeminent in his profession, is of unimpeachable integrity, and his private character is exemplary in every respect.” The article ended by providing a physical description of Fuller.

[He] is a slim, wiry-looking man, rather below the middle height. He has silver-gray hair and a drooping gray mustache. He dresses well, and is considered exceptionally good looking. His face is fresh and unwrinkled, his 55 years notwithstanding.

The Sun did not further discuss Fuller’s mustache. Nor did it appear to see the darkening storm clouds ahead.

Many local and state newspapers reprinted the Sun’s physical description of Fuller, with a few papers adding amusing comments about his weight (between 120 and 125 pounds) and his diminutive stature. “It is well that he [Fuller] will take time to get a gown made for himself before his installation,” commented the Boonville Standard. “If he should venture to go through the ceremony in a gown borrowed from one of his associates…the clerk of the court would best tie a string to him when he gets into it or there will be some difficulty to find him afterwards.”

It was Fuller’s hometown paper, the Chicago Tribune, that first reported that people were grumbling about the nominee’s mustache. “The greatest objection that has been urged against Chief Justice Fuller is that he wears a mustache.” The Tribune reassured its readers, however, that the mustache would not be an impediment to Fuller’s nomination. “This is an objection that could be easily removed. It need not stand in the way of his confirmation, however, and probably will not.” Concluded the article: “He will be confirmed by a large majority, and without a close shave.”

Within a few short days, the New York Sun turned its full attention to the matter of Fuller’s mustache.

But it is evident from an attentive study of MR. FULLER’S features that their chief curve of beauty, their piece of resistance and their point of support, is his uncommonly
luxuriant and beautiful moustache. In bristling reds, in car-driver blacks, in characterless browns or yellows, this moustache would not be the thing of beauty it is. Its form is good, but it is the grayish white or whitish gray of its color which raises it above the mob of plebeian and ordinary moustaches, and gives it character, dignity, tone. This moustache in any other color would not look so handsome.9

The Sun rejected the claims by unnamed critics that “[t]he idea of a Chief Justice with moustache is intolerable.” While conceding that in the “good old times” moustaches were only worn by military officers, and that tradition dictated that the upper lip of the man occupying the center seat at the court must be clean shaven, the Sun reported that admirers of the “lovely perfection” of Mr. Fuller’s mustache were raising their voices and demanding to know whether “this fair pearl [must] be melted in the vinegar of custom.” In the opinion of the Sun editorial board, the answer was a resounding “no.”

Mr. Fuller, in all the glory of his robes, but dismoustached, will not look so well as he does with that while glory overhanging his mouth, a shield and a benediction. We advise him not to shave it off.

Within days, newspapers across the country weighed in on the great moustache debate. “Mr. Fuller’s mustache is kicking up a great sensation at the north,” wryly observed the Atlanta Constitution.10 “Washington sticklers for judicial conventionality are troubling themselves very much because they fear that the newly appointed chief justice…will not conform to the custom which requires that there shall be only cleanly shaven upper lips on the supreme court.”11 The Rock Island Argus chimed in the next day, claiming that “no chief justice has ever disfigured his face” with hair on his upper lip.12 And the Herald-Ledger simply tried to put Fuller’s moustache in perspective, writing that Fuller “weighs 125 pounds, with or without the mustache.”13

While conceding the beauty of Fuller’s moustache, and admitting that “[t]o cut it off would be a positive disfigurement,” the Leavenworth Standard reluctantly conceded that “to wear it on the bench would do violence to the dignity of the court and would be a shock to the reverend judges who have such respect for precedent.”14 Warned the Standard: “It is possible that the senate will want an understanding with Mr. Fuller about this mustache business before his name is taken up for confirmation.” The historical record does not show whether the Senate Judiciary Committee sought such an “understanding” as it considered the merits of the Fuller nomination.

While the Kinsley Graphic did not officially take a position, it acknowledged that “it is generally believed that a Chief-Justice should not offend the legendary customs which pertain to his office—including keeping his upper lip ‘free from hirsute adornment.’”15 And other Kansas newspapers reported that there was a “widely prevalent conviction” amongst its citizens that the mustache should disqualify Fuller from assuming the bench.16 “It seems difficult to imagine a man with a dude mustache, and who answers to the name of Mel to be occupying a seat on the supreme bench of the United States,” grumped the Oberlin Opinion.17 Clearly, Fuller had lost the state of Kansas.

Some newspapers challenged both the “tradition” of bare upper lips at the Supreme Court as well as the recommendation that the nominee reach for his razor. Referring to the reports “that Fuller will be forced to ‘shave off his big, beautiful white mustache’ as ‘absurd,’” the People’s Press cited an unnamed but authoritative Washington insider as evidence that there was no tradition—
citing the beards of Justices Stephen J. Field, Lucius Q. C. Lamar and Stanley Matthews as evidence.\textsuperscript{18} What the Press failed to recognize, however, was the seemingly critical distinction between a mere mustache and a full beard.

A few newspapers made aesthetic arguments in favor of the mustache. “Mr. Fuller’s mustache is undoubtedly a thing of beauty, and therefore a joy forever,” proclaimed the \textit{Lancaster Weekly Examiner}. “If it falls a victim to the ‘barbarous shears,’ his fine face will lose some of its force and completeness.”\textsuperscript{19} The \textit{Lancaster} added, to its relief, that Fuller seemed inclined to keep the mustache. The \textit{Fort Worth Weekly Gazette} reassured its readers that changes in the nominee’s personal grooming habits were not to be feared, and that the future looked bright: “From under that silvery mustache will flow opinions worthy of that great court in its palmist days.”\textsuperscript{20}

At least one newspaper appreciated the importance of precedent in resolving the judicial dilemma. The \textit{Wichita Eagle} pointed to President Grover Cleveland’s mustache as precedent for Fuller’s facial hair. “That settles it. Let him be confirmed.”\textsuperscript{21} The Republican-leaning \textit{Jackson Standard} had a political reason to support the retention of the mustache. “Mel. Fuller’s mustache is a good quality for a Democratic politician—it shuts his mouth.”\textsuperscript{22}

On July 20, 1888, the United States Senate voted to confirm Fuller as the next Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Fuller’s confirmation, however, did not end the great mustache debate. Perhaps hoping to boost circulation by stirring the smoldering embers, in December of 1888 the \textit{Sun} itself returned to the subject of Fuller’s mustache. This time, however, readers were shocked by the \textit{Sun}’s announcement that the Chief Justice’s mustache was “deplorable.”

The \textit{Sun}’s new position on the Chief Justice’s mustache rested on argument involving courtroom statuary and artistic composition. After explaining to its readers that a statue of an eagle with spread wings was located directly about the Supreme Court Bench, the \textit{Sun} pointed to the similarities between this national symbol and the Chief Justice’s mustache.
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On July 20, 1888, the United States Senate voted to confirm Fuller as the next Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Fuller’s confirmation, however, did not end the great mustache debate. Perhaps hoping to boost circulation by stirring the smoldering embers, in December of 1888 the \textit{Sun} itself returned to the subject of Fuller’s mustache. This time, however, readers were shocked by the \textit{Sun}’s announcement that the Chief Justice’s mustache was “deplorable.”

The \textit{Sun}’s new position on the Chief Justice’s mustache rested on argument involving courtroom statuary and artistic composition. After explaining to its readers that a statue of an eagle with spread wings was located directly about the Supreme Court Bench, the \textit{Sun} pointed to the similarities between this national symbol and the Chief Justice’s mustache.
plain truth is that the decorative and symbolic effect of the eagle’s extended wings is dwarfed by the sweep and spread of the Chief Justice’s moustaches, immediately below. The lines are precisely similar, and the dimension nearly alike. There is no contrast to relieve the feelings of uneasiness and oppression which every beholder must experience, provided his eyes are at all sensitive to such violations of aesthetic propriety.23

Given the similarities between the mustache and the eagle’s wings, the Sun wondered aloud if attorneys appearing before the Court would lose their train of thought. Concluded the Sun: “This is not as it should be. It detracts from the dignity of the tribunal.” The solution? Either remove the eagle statue or shave off the mustache, lest the aforementioned similarities between the two continue “bewildering the bar and distracting attention from the business of the court.”24

If the New York Sun’s intention was to spark a second round of debate about the Chief Justice’s mustache, its plan worked. In the coming months, a flurry of new articles appeared on the subject. The tide of public sentiment, however, appeared to have turned in the Chief Justice’s favor. “Chief Justice Fuller doesn’t look half as funny with his mustache and his silk gown on as people thought he would,” the Fall River Globe gamely reassured its readers.25 The Chanute Weekly Times reported that “Chief Justice Fuller is one of the most striking figures in public life,” but admitted that the Chief Justice nervously “twists his mustache or strokes his fine flowing locks of white” while on the Bench. And the Atlanta Constitution reported that at a reception for the Chinese ambassador, former Secretary of State James G. Blaine had the “scrumptious good breeding” to not comment on the Chief Justice’s mustache.26 In sum, the battle over the Chief Justice’s personal grooming appeared over. “None of the abuse or sarcasm aimed
by Washingtonians at Chief Justice Fuller’s mustache moves him a hair,” trumpeted the Chicago Tribune.

Yet only two months later, the battle resumed. The first salvo was fired after the March 19, 1889 elopement of Chief Justice Fuller’s daughter, Pauline. Although the Fuller family did not seem distraught by the surprise marriage, some newspapers suggested that the Chief Justice might shave his mustache—perhaps as the modern equivalent of wearing sack cloth and ashes. This time, it was the Star Tribune that leapt to the defense of the famous mustache.

We fail to see what connection there is between Chief Justice Fuller’s mustache, and the elopement of his daughter. A number of our contemporaries evidently believe that because Pauline ran away and was married, the Justice should shave off his mustache. We are puzzled as to why this is so. Simply because a girl married the man of her choice is this any reason, that the highest judicial authority in the country should wreak his revenge on the atmosphere, and deprive the zephyrs of their sport? Most assuredly not.  

But battle lines were again drawn. Newspapers across the country predicted the mustache was doomed because now the Chief Justice’s Bench mates were pressuring him to shave. “Chief Justice Fuller, mindful of the honored traditions of the court and yielding to the importunities of his associates on the bench, has consented to sacrifice his superb mustache, the fame of which has filled two hemispheres,” sadly reported the San Francisco Examiner. Noting that the “exceeding beauty” of the mustache “excited jealousies and arouses animosities,” the paper admitted that it did not know whether it should “congratulate the Chief Justice upon his sagacity in consenting to appease” or “deplore his lack of courage in so readily falling down before popular clamor.” And the Examiner had a final warning for the Chief Justice: if he shaved off his mustache, he would be unrecognized when he returned home to Chicago “with a nude upper lip.”

At least one newspaper publicly blamed the New York Sun for the second round of mustache mischief. “If the New York Sun doesn’t stop making fun of Chief Justice Fuller’s mustache, it will get itself disliked by all the young ladies in the country,” warned the Boston Globe. “They all say it is ‘just lovely.’ Our own opinion is that it is at least as handsome as the whiskers of the Sun’s office cat.”

In January of 1890, David J. Brewer joined the Supreme Court. A former member of the Kansas Supreme Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, Brewer took the judicial oath with a clean-shaven face “except at the chin, from which hangs a tolerably long beard.” Alas, the “tolerable” beard lasted less than a year. “Justice David J. Brewer…has at last sacrificed his imposing whiskers and he now appears upon the bench with a smoothly-shaven face,” announced the Wichita Beacon. The paper characterized the former beard as “a truly Western cut. It was confined in its growth to the chin, although it was a little more ample and luxuriant than the Napoleonic style.” Explaining that a shaved face “adds to the dignity of the owner, and consequently to the gravity of the great temple of justice,” the paper added that Fuller’s notorious mustache remained—as did the “moth-eaten old plantation whiskers” of Justice Lamar. As for Justice Brewer, he made no public statement as to why he banished his whiskers.

While momentarily silenced, in early 1890 the New York Sun made one more effort to whip up its readers. “It’s lucky that Justice is blind,” observed the Sun. “If she were able to see Chief Justice Fuller’s mustache waving in the winds of eloquence at the celebration [of the Court’s centennial] she would stop the
proceedings while she beat her sword into a razor.”

Once again, the newspapers rallied to Fuller’s side. “Chief Justice Fuller’s mustache is again agitating the public mind,” reported the *Tennessean*. “The abolition of the Chief Justice’s mustache is one of the reforms undertaken by the *New York Sun*.” The *Tennessean* reminded its readers that “it is nobody’s business except his [Fuller’s] own whether he be bearded like the bard or as clean-faced as a door knob,” at least as long as the Chief Justice did not “allow his mustache to absorb too much of his time and attention.”

The *Saint Paul Globe* tried to remain neutral. While admitting that the Chief Justice “looks a good deal more like a cavalry officer than the presiding judge of the United States Supreme Court,” the *Globe* pointed out that the undeniable fact that Fuller was “certainly the most handsome man on the bench; men and women agree as to that.” The chief concern for the *Atlanta Constitution* involved table etiquette: “[i]t is hoped the chief justice doesn’t drink buttermilk.”

The Chief Justice was reportedly “keeping a stiff upper lip” and sticking with his mustache despite more public pressure as well as his fellow justices’ continuing demands that he shave “in the name of dignity and impressiveness.” And the *Saint Paul Globe* informed its readers that the Chief Justice’s stubbornness was “all the more heroic” because he was receiving hate mail. The *Nebraska State Journal* reported that the anti-mustache “crusade” by New York newspapers, along with “an occasional spurt of assistance from a side concert of provincial editors,” had resulted in Fuller receiving threatening letters purporting to come from hard-fisted laboring men of the country threatening to ‘do him up’ in some shape if he does not shave it off immediately. One example of these letters was published by the *Daily Globe*:
When Justice William Moody became clean shaven in 1908, newspapers noted that the Court now stood “5-4 on whiskers.” He is pictured here in 1905, the year before he was appointed to be an Associate Justice.

Ef yer doant shave of that there hary main on yer mout weal sea that yer doant have no eezy time. Do yer ketch on? Wee’l shave it of for yer pretty soon. Take worning. 40

The Daily Globe concluded, based on the style of writing, that “[e]vidently it was not written by Fuller’s colleagues on the bench.” 41 What is truly evident is that the Daily Globe reporters had too much time on their hands and were having a bit of fun at the Chief Justice’s expense.

This curious national anxiety on facial hair was not limited to the Chief Justice alone; in the years following Fuller’s ascension to the center chair, a few court newcomers found their own facial hair coming under public scrutiny. A clean-shaved Henry Billings Brown did not offend sensibilities when he was sworn into office on January 5, 1891. But in the summer of 1892, newspapers warned newcomer George Shiras Jr. (who sported a combination of a beard and mutton-chops) to find a razor. “Chief Justice Fuller is allowed to keep his flowing mustache because there would be so little of him left if they were cut off,” 42 explained the Pittsburgh Gazette. “Justice Lamar clings to his chin beard because, if he should remove it, he would be doing violence to one of the most sacred traditions of the South.” Concluded the Gazette:

But these two cases are exceptions, as Mr. Shiras will undoubtedly learn. When Mr. Brewer came upon the bench he wore a long beard which he was compelled to part with after a few weeks. Justice Gray is pointed to as a man who has broken through the rule, but the point is not a good one, for the only whiskers worn by the Massachusetts giant, legally and physically, consists of two little tufts under his ears that are hardly noticeable. The rule that Justices of the Supreme Court must part with their whiskers when they assume their robes of office was made after Justice Lamar’s appointment, and is an ironclad one, which will be promptly called to the attention of Mr. Justice Shiras. 43

Whether the rule was formally called to Mr. Shiras’s attention or not, his facial hair remained.

We do not know what Chief Justice Fuller himself thought of the great mustache debate, but he must have been pleased when another part of his face—his nose—was publicly celebrated in 1891. In an article entitled “Statesmen’s Noses: Peculiar Probosces of the Great Men in Washington and What They Indicate,” the St. Louis Dispatch turned its attention to the nation’s highest court.

It is in the Supreme Court where you find the big noses of Washington. Justice Fuller has The Nose Of A Roman. It stands well up from his
cheeks. It sets off his classic features and makes his pale face almost noble as it stands out in front of his lionine gray hair above his fierce silver mustache.44

The Dispatch saved its most lavish praise, however, for Justice John Marshall Harlan. “Justice Harlan has a head which would do for a model of Jove and his nose is that of a God,” 45 it gushed. The justice with the least god-like nose? That was Horace Gray, who possessed a “weak, fleshy nose.”

By the time Chief Justice Fuller celebrated his fifth anniversary on the Bench in 1893, articles about judicial facial hair only sporadically appeared in national and state newspapers. This was undoubtedly due in large part to the fact that the newest justices (Howell E. Jackson in 1893 and Edward D. White in 1894) possessed perfectly smooth faces. The addition of Rufus W. Peckham in 1896 and Joseph McKenna in 1898 was met, at least when it came to their facial hair, with silence.

Rather than arguing about the propriety of mustaches and beards, most newspapers simply “kept score” in terms of the justices and their facial hair. “Mr. Justice Moody has shaved off his mustache and the supreme court now stands 5 to 4 on whiskers,” reported the Omaha Bee in the spring of 1908. “That’s the usual division.” 46 When commenting on Judge Horace Lurton’s potential nomination to the Supreme Court, the Ottumwa Tri-Weekly Courier blandly described him as a “small, white-haired man, with a white moustache.” 47 No mention of offense to tradition or style was made.

One of the last stories about the Chief Justice and “will he or won’t he shave” appeared in The Chicago Eagle in 1894. Apparently, another tired round of stories had appeared about the Chief Justice and the potential loss of his beloved mustache. The Eagle would not stand for such a development. “We are opposed to Chief Justice Fuller’s proposition to shave his mustache,” announced the Eagle. “[W]e recognize the danger involved in the sudden dislocation of the center of gravity in all great bodies.” 48 This was the only time that physics was cited in support of retaining the country’s most famous mustache.

The nomination of Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. to the Supreme Court of the United States was the final death knell to the great mustache debate of 1888. Holmes arguably possessed the grandest mustache to ever grace the face of a state or federal court judge, a handle bar mustache that Holmes joked was “nourished in blood.” While the Chicago Tribune grimly predicted that “[t]he esteemed New York Sun will not fail to view with horror the spectacle of another judge with a long mustache on the United States Supreme Court,” 49 the Sun’s enthusiastic endorsement of Holmes’s appointment made nary a mention of his mustache. 50 The war was over.

This is not to say, however, that the guns forever fell silent on the topic of Fuller’s mustache. Even decades after his death, Fuller’s facial hair sparked comment. For example, when law professor John P. Frank reviewed Willard King’s definitive biography of the Maine-born jurist, Frank was a bit unkind regarding Fuller’s appearance. “His appearance in the standard pictures always seem to me to be a little unseedy,” wrote Frank. “I suppose it could be ‘majestic’ if you don’t mind unkempt hair and a straggly mustache.” 51 Professor James W. Ely Jr., another Fuller biographer, was kinder than Professor Frank—merely referring to Fuller’s mustache as “distinctive.” 52

So what should we make of the Great Mustache Debate of 1888? First of all, the fight over Fuller’s mustache, its aesthetic merits, and its alleged offense to Court tradition was surely tongue-in-cheek. That being said, the motives of the main player in the drama, the New York Sun, remain a mystery. At the time of Fuller’s nomination
to the Supreme Court, the editor of the Sun was Charles Anderson Dana. Although the newspaper was considered a Democratic publication, Dana was a fierce critic of Glover Cleveland (who had once turned down Dana’s request for a political favor, thereby becoming a life-long enemy) and the Sun referred to presidential candidate Cleveland as a “‘gross debauchee’ who would ‘bring his harlots to Washington and hire lodging for them convenient to the White House.’”

It is possible that Dana’s disdain for Cleveland meant that all the President’s nominees would be guilty by association. Yet the Sun originally praised Fuller’s nomination, and many of its articles about Fuller’s mustache were published after Cleveland lost his first reelection bid. And if Dana wanted to rough up a Cleveland appointment, surely the brilliant editor could have found more compelling faults than a simple mustache. It is much more likely that the Fuller articles are simply examples of what Dana biographer Janet E. Steele calls the editor’s “playful sense of humor.”

And what about the mustache’s impact on the institutional rules and norms surrounding the justices? Would it being going too far to argue that Fuller’s brave stand blazed a trail for such mustached justices as Peckham, Holmes, William Rufus Day, William Howard Taft (who also wore a mustache during his presidency), and Thurgood Marshall? Not to mention the goateed Charles Evans Hughes? If Fuller did have an effect, it was short lived.

After the retirement of Hughes, no justice other than Thurgood Marshall sported any variation of facial hair until the fall of 1996—when Antonin Scalia briefly grew a full beard (one might also include the long hair and bushy sideburns worn by William H. Rehnquist in the 1970s, which prompted a New York Times columnist to call him “the hippie of the court”). The sight of a bearded justice was so unique that, once again, articles about the return of facial hair to the Supreme Court appeared across the country. Somewhere Melville Weston Fuller must have been smiling. (Justice Scalia shaved the beard the following summer.)

Author’s Note: The author admits that he has had facial hair for the last twenty years. He would like to thank Chad Oldfather and Margaret Stein for their review and comments on an earlier draft of this paper.
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