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Henry N. Blake, a Harvard-educated lawyer who loved the challenge and the flummery of the western frontier, became one of Montana’s most eloquent editors and most eminent jurists.

He was born June 5, 1838, in Boston. He attended schools in New England.

Mr. Blake practiced law in Boston, then joined the Union Army as a private in 1861. He was promoted to second lieutenant May 16, 1862, for “brave and meritorious conduct in action.” He was wounded in the battles of Bull Run and Spotsylvania and was discharged as a captain in 1864. His war experiences are described in his book, Three Years in the Army.

At the age of 27, Mr. Blake left Boston for Montana, where he labored unsuccessfully for 10 days in the Virginia City gold fields. In August, 1866, he became the second permanent editor of Montana’s first newspaper, the Virginia City Montana Post. Mr. Blake later wrote that he had been selected “for this responsible position upon the presumption that, having been born and educated in New England, I must be capable of thinking for myself and expressing in correct English an opinion on public affairs.”

Remembered as a pugnacious editor of the Montana Post from August to Dec. 28, 1866, Mr. Blake crusaded zealously for development of mining and agricultural interests in Montana, for efficient courts and government and against Democratic party leaders and activities.

He encountered much difficulty in obtaining news from the states and supplies from Salt Lake City. He once said, “When the outside world was cut off by winter snows, the cry of the ‘devil’ for copy... produced a thrill of terror in the editorial breast similar to the fire alarm at midnight.”

Mr. Blake became U.S. attorney for Montana in 1869, district attorney in 1871, associate justice of the Montana Supreme Court in 1875 and, in 1889, chief justice, a position he held when Montana became a state.

In 1874 and 1875, he was editor and part owner of the Virginia City Montanian.

Mr. Blake died in November, 1933, at the age of 95. In his final years, he was the oldest living graduate of Harvard University.
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No. 11 Spring, 1968
A STUDY OF THE ‘ORTHODOX’ PRESS:
THE REPORTING OF DISSENT

BY NATHAN B. BLUMBERG

Professor Blumberg has served as dean of the Montana School of Journalism since 1956. He has resigned, effective next July 1, to devote his time to teaching, writing and research as a professor at the University of Montana and to participate, as he puts it, in the "New American Political, Social and Economic Revolution." He is the author of One-Party Press? (1954), the first significant study of press performance in a presidential campaign, and many articles about the press and international affairs. He has lectured throughout the country on those subjects and on current trends in American society, with emphasis on black men and women and young men and women.

This manuscript was completed in mid-February, before President Johnson announced a dramatic change in American policy in Vietnam and his desire not to run for re-election; before the New Hampshire primary shocked many persons into recognizing the degree of support for a dissenting policy in Vietnam; before the referendum in Concord, Mass., revealed that 39 per cent of the voters approved immediate withdrawal of United States forces from Vietnam; before the Madison, Wis., referendum in which 42 per cent of the voters expressed approval of immediate withdrawal; before the report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and before the riots in the wake of the assassination of Martin Luther King. These and other events—and, unfortunately, those yet to come—add pertinence to the discourse that follows.

It is not enough to suggest that one of the most significantly misreported news stories of the past three years has been the growth and depth of disaffection toward the American commitment in Vietnam. The imperative next question must be: Why did it happen this way? One probable answer is that it always has happened this way and we have been looking at the history of the American press through an unfocused microscope.

A curiously consistent thread runs through the pattern of press performance from the time of John Peter Zenger to today. The historians and the critics have examined and diagnosed the press as if it were a monolithic structure, when the historical fact is that we always have had a press that was essentially satisfied with the government and generally satisfactory to the government (which could be called an "orthodox" press) and at the same time another press that sought to change the status quo (which in the current sense could be termed an "underground" press). Thus Zenger's paper stood alone in challenging Governor Cosby. Tom Paine was primarily a pamphleteer whose revolutionary essays were reprinted in newspapers hostile to the colonial authorities. The Anti-Federalist editors who vigorously opposed the policies of the government were subjected to the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, which were aimed at silencing opposition. William Lloyd Garrison started his own newspaper to crusade for the abolition of slavery; how many newspapers, even a third of a century later at the time of the Emancipation Proclamation, did anything to free the Negro except, toward the end, to deplore mildly the institution of slavery? The most celebrated martyr of the American press, Elijah Lovejoy, published a newspaper devoted solely to Negro emancipation. The muckrakers, who sought to expose unsavory aspects of American society shortly after the turn of the century, found hospitality in some courageous magazines while the remainder of the press did little more than occasionally nibble at the edges of corruption and injustice. And today it is the little publications of the "underground press" that ask the questions that should be asked and thrive on the issues the "orthodox" press ignores.

There is another—and revealing—side to the coin. On one of those rare occasions when the power of government...
fell into hands that sought to alter significantly the economic, social and political bases of American society, the “orthodox” newspapers and magazines stood in resolute opposition. When it became clear that Franklin D. Roosevelt intended to make what were then regarded as fundamental changes in the structure of society, the vast majority of daily newspapers and mass circulation magazines turned on him with unremitting hostility.

So long as the mass media are dealing with political parties, groups, movements or individuals seeking reform or change within the explicit structure of the current society, they generally perform with fairness and objectivity. But let someone or something advocate a fundamental change in the status quo—opposition to a war or a contemplated war, the abolition of slavery, Wobblyism, communism, socialism, anarchism, fascism—and the press moves over to join those in political or economic power who also have a stake in the continuation of things the way they are.

Thus it should come as no surprise that the mass media of information have been incredibly slow—and still are—in reporting the revolutionary temper that racks the Negro ghettos. The indictment becomes damning when one adds the failure to recognize and report what was happening among Negroes in the ‘fifties and early ‘sixties, so that riots came as a surprise and most white people even today are at best only dimly aware of the causes of the open revolt brewing in our cities. Many of the same arguments are found in this article concerning the press and dissent apply equally to the press and the American Negro. Indeed, a report issued recently of a “Conference on Mass Media and Race Relations” at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism makes it clear that minority groups are convinced that “to a large extent, the press is thought to be ‘in cahoots with the enemy’—the police or local government,” and “part of the white economic power structure.”

Similarly, hippies—who do not drink booze, are non-violent and insist on structuring their lives outside the demands of a conformist society—most often are subjected to reports ranging from bristling hatred to amused contempt. The members of the New Left and other revolutionaries can count on distortions of their views and actions by an uncomprehending press (or, if you will, a press that on occasion comprehends only too well). And it is not only members of the radical left who generally receive the back of the hand from the mass media; the Ku Klux Klan, the American Nazi party and the John Birch Society similarly have legitimate complaints that they rarely receive objective treatment in news or interpretive stories.

In much the same way the mass media, wittingly or not, have minimized the nature and extent of dissent from the war policies of the government. It is essential to recognize that dissent has come to be regarded as a threat to the existing order because it has moved out of the halls of the Capitol, where a Fulbright balks or a Mansfield broods, into the streets, to the ballot box, to the very places where men are asked to give their lives. It is in the main a movement, furthermore, of the young, who are in revolt in a way this nation has never before seen. It has, finally, become linked with yet another threat to the political and economic power structure—the drive of the black American for a fair share of his political and economic rights.

What follows is not in any sense intended as a judgment of the policies of the Johnson administration in Vietnam. It is an attempt to document, by the employment of a few examples of the many that could be cited, the fact that newspapers, wire services, news magazines, general magazines, radio stations and television networks have failed, in varying degrees, to report accurately the high degree of discontent with American policies in Vietnam. It would be nonsense to suggest a publishers’ plot or an electronic conspiracy to deceive the American people. It is reasonable to suggest, however, that the press, as an important part of the established system, has been reluctant to report on the growth of dissent, especially when the expressions of dissent have moved beyond traditional political advocacy. Although the press constitutionally was set outside the framework of government to serve as a check on the errors and excesses of government, it nevertheless in its reporting of militant dissent has served to support policies of the governmental-industrial-military complex.

It also is necessary to point out that self-deception, rather than bias, may be the reason many stories concerning dissent and dissenters are omitted or distorted. A curious and often repeated phenomenon is the manner in which the media—both printed and electronic—can mesmerize themselves into a shared belief that something is so. One needs only to recall the almost universal self-delusion of the press in the 1948 presidential election, or the stunned disbelief with which the first Sputnik was greeted in 1957.

Some new stirrings of the conviction that the press is not adequately serving as a watchdog of government already can be observed. For example, James Hoge, managing editor of the Chicago Sun Times, objected to several phrases in the Associated Press report of the peace march on the Pentagon. He was quoted by Newsweek as complaining especially about the AP statement that the demonstrations had “the peaceful blessing of the North Vietnamese Government.” And Donald McDonald of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in the January ASNE Bulletin questioned what he called the growing and highly dangerous assumption of the press that it is somehow a “partner of government.” Confirmation came in the startling reaction of Roger Tatarian, vice president of United Press International. Writing in the U.P.I. Reporter of Jan. 18, 1968, Tatarian asked: “Does the press become a ‘partner in government’ simply by supporting government policy over Mr. McDonald’s opposition?” This astonishing question requires no reply; by definition, in a free society a press that uses its news reports to support government policy is not doing its job. That is what McDonald was suggesting, and that is what is being suggested here.

Tatarian, however, quite properly asked for some documentation of the charge. Perhaps what follows will serve the purpose.
the three referendums

An outstanding example of misreporting and nonreporting the extent of dissent has been the press coverage of three referendums dealing with United States involvement in Vietnam. Look first at the election of Nov. 7, 1967, in San Francisco, where voters were asked to vote “yes” or “no” to the sixteenth proposition on the ballot:

PROPOSITION P—It is the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that there be an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of U. S. troops from Vietnam so that the Vietnamese people can settle their own problems.

So intense were the feelings against administration policies in Vietnam last November that this incredible proposition, calling in effect for unconditional surrender by the United States, was approved by 36.6 per cent of the voters—76,632 in favor, 132,406 opposed. Yet this was not the way it was reported across the country by the wire services or the news magazines. Almost all newspaper accounts dealt with the result as evidence that most voters—two out of three, in fact—approve of American policies in Vietnam. “It was no secret,” said Newsweek, “that President Johnson was generally pleased with the results [of the elections]—particularly with the balloting on San Francisco’s Proposition P. . . .” “Backing for war,” U. S. New & World Report termed it. “On the Vietnamese issue, 2 out of 3 San Francisco voters cast their ballots against a pullout, although San Francisco has been a center of antiwar agitation.” Time magazine typically explained the issues involved by reporting that “the controversial proposition was supported by jalopy cavalcades featuring psychedelic paint jobs and antiwar posters, in newspaper and radio ads and at numerous Proposition P parties.”

This simple-minded kind of reporting made credible the incredible views of Vice President Humphrey, who declared the vote was both a test of public opinion and an administration victory. In effect, the reporting accepted even the convoluted interpretation of the Democratic national chairman, John M. Bailey: “The San Francisco vote proved there is a growing and hardening of support for President Johnson’s Vietnam policies. That proposition was worded to attract votes urging cease-fire and withdrawal so the Vietnamese people can settle their own problems. It was backed with plenty of money and a hard campaign by prominent, well-respected Americans. Yet it went down to defeat 2-1. That result proves what surveys are finding—that President Johnson’s policies in Vietnam draw the vote of most Americans when put up against any alternative.”

What hardly anyone outside San Francisco knows, because hardly anyone outside San Francisco has been told by the mass media, is that Proposition P was presented to the voters by a group of hard-rock, self-described revolutionaries who freely admitted that the primary function of the referendum was to encourage political polarization in the United States. As the San Francisco Bay Guardian reported, the 10 members of the Proposition P executive committee “were almost all hard-line leftists—some of them from Marxist-oriented organizations like Progressive Labor and the Socialist Workers Party, and some independent.” The wording of Proposition P—particularly the clause demanding unconditional withdrawal—caused an extended and acrimonious debate between moderates and radicals who shared little more than a common abhorrence of the presence of American soldiers in Vietnam. In the view of the professed Marxists and other hardliners in San Francisco, the adjective “immediate” was intended to modify “withdrawal” as well as “cease-fire.” No concession was made to moderates who were not happy with the conduct of the war but who were not willing simply to give up in Vietnam. The revolutionaries sneered openly at the “responsible opposition” (the quotation marks were theirs) which “doesn’t oppose the war [but] merely opposes the conduct of the war.” The idea, one leader wrote, was to “give people the chance both to vote for a radical program and to change their definition of themselves, however slightly, when they pull the lever.”

Quite obviously, many persons were unwilling “to change their definition of themselves” and were driven by the unyielding language of Proposition P to vote against it or to abstain. The San Francisco Chronicle reported that several ministers who oppose American policies in Vietnam refused to support the radical proposal. “I will vote no on Proposition P,” one minister was quoted as saying, “because I think it presents a cruel choice in a dishonest and superficial way.” The last 10 words of the proposition also drew opposition from voters who could not accept a proposal to abandon hundreds of thousands of persons in South Vietnam to the mercies of the Viet Cong. Even a pacifist organization urged a boycott of the election on those grounds, thereby further diminishing the number of anti-war votes. Furthermore, the most widely known opponent of American policies in Vietnam could not bring himself to approve the proposition on the ballot. When the San Francisco Examiner wired all United States senators asking how they would vote on Proposition P, Sen. J. W. Fulbright replied: “I do not believe it would be appropriate for me to attempt to answer with a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ a question as narrow as the one posed.” (Incidentally, but revealingly, of the 36 senators who responded to the Examiner query, 33 voted “no” and two—Democrats Gruening of Alaska and Young of Ohio—voted “yes.” The percentage of United States senators willing to advocate publicly a proposal of extreme dissent clearly is lower than the percentage of voters who are willing to express such views at the ballot box.) It is not surprising, therefore, that 46,558 of the 255,596 persons who cast ballots in the election—18 per cent—abstained from voting on Proposition P.

Admittedly, a few observers properly interpreted what had happened. The winner of the hard-fought, 18-candidate race for mayor, Democrat Joseph Alioto, who had campaigned against Proposition P, said it was defeated “because it called for unconditional surrender for the United States.” The Northern California chairman of the State Democratic Central Committee declared flatly that if the word “system-
"A press that chose to gloss over the unpleasant truth"

atic" had been substituted for "immediate," the proposition would have carried. Kenneth Crawford, who certainly is no dove, admitted in Newsweek that the San Francisco balloting demonstrated that "people want to get out of Vietnam but not by default." Time, after lacerating proponents of the proposition, ultimately concluded: "Still, the fact that more than a third of the voters supported a more or less instant-withdrawal position suggests that a more carefully phrased or more moderate de-escalating proposition might have carried." But these and other similar comments were lost in the maeldrom created by a press that chose to gloss over the unpleasant truth.

In addition, Proposition P was able to gain almost 37 per cent of the vote despite determined opposition by both daily newspapers. The Examiner called down its heaviest reporting and editorial artillery, including a daily editorial page attack on Proposition P for several days before the election and a front-page editorial on election day urging "Vote NO on Prop. P." A column by the publisher the day before the election was a fervent appeal to defeat the measure. The Examiner's news columns were opened wide to opponents of Proposition P in story after story and opened hardly at all to proponents.

The San Francisco Chronicle also opposed Proposition P in an editorial on Nov. 2. Its news columns, however, reported extensively and fairly on the many viewpoints toward the proposition. One reason for this was made apparent by a two-column paid advertisement urging a "yes" vote for Proposition P, signed by 102 Chronicle editorial employees, the day before the election.

The result of the San Francisco vote was not a political aberration. The first test of American attitudes toward the war in Vietnam was conducted a year earlier in Dearborn, Michigan, for 26 years the conservative fiefdom of Mayor Orville Hubbard. Dearborn is no haven of demonstrators, bearded hippies or New Leftists; Mayor Hubbard has proclaimed openly and repeatedly his "one million per cent" approval of segregation and a rugged brand of 100 per cent Americanism. He has made his city a white island in the Detroit megalopolis. Yet the residents of Dearborn on Nov. 8, 1966, voted only 20,667 to 14,124 against the following question: "Are you in favor of an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam so Vietnamese people can settle their own problems?" Of those who voted, therefore, 40.6 per cent favored an immediate, unequivocal, unilateral end to the war. Granting the quixotic conditions surrounding the referendum, the results appeared unbelievable. Yet the significance plainly was lost on the wire services. United Press International, for example, buried the result in an election roundup story with this single farcical paragraph: "In an isolated vote on the Vietnam war, the citizens of Dearborn, Mich., said overwhelmingly they were against a pullout of troops."

Then on Nov. 28, 1967, the result of a referendum held Nov. 7 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, was announced. The wording, while different, was as unrelenting in its refusal to recognize moderate viewpoints: "Whereas: thousands of Americans and Vietnamese are dying in the Vietnam war; Whereas: this war is not in the interests of either the American or Vietnamese people; Now therefore be it resolved: that the people of the City of Cambridge urge the prompt return home of American soldiers from Vietnam." The vote was 17,742 opposed, 11,349 in favor. The percentage of those voting for the proposition (39 per cent) was extraordinarily similar to the percentages in Dearborn and San Francisco. Time magazine concluded of the Cambridge referendum: "U.S. voters affirmed once again last week that they do not consider a precipitate pull-out from Viet Nam the best way to settle the war." Thus by Time's own evaluation, two out of five voters were so dismayed by the war in Vietnam that they cast affirmative votes for a rash, ill-considered proposition.

The perplexing lack of understanding and therefore the peculiar interpretation given to the Cambridge referendum included headlines: "Voters in Cambridge Support Viet Policy," said the Los Angeles Times; "Voters Back Viet Policy," reported the Washington Post. The headlines, news coverage and editorial comment, with notable exceptions, were ill-informed, inadequate or invisible. The New York Times recognized the significance of the vote by running a 12-inch story on page one with a two-column headline. The Wall Street Journal included the result as one of the 13 most important general news stories of the day in its front-page "World-Wide" roundup. The Atlanta Constitution, Washington Post and Louisville Courier-Journal played the story on page 2. However, a spot check of other metropolitan newspapers revealed that the Buffalo Evening News had a three-inch story on page 39, the Los Angeles Times gave it four inches on page 19, the Denver Post had a 5½-inch story on page 14, the Minneapolis Star devoted six inches to it on page 16, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch had a 10½-inch story on page 8 of its fourth section. No report at all was to be found in the examined editions of six other metropolitan daily newspapers.

Thus in three elections over a space of a year, in three cities widely divergent geographically, economically and politically, a remarkable similarity of attitudes of dissent (40.6 per cent, 39 per cent, 36.6 per cent) was reflected. The referendums not only won a majority of the vote in the University district of Cambridge, but received heavy support from the Negro neighborhoods of San Francisco and from some of the lily-white areas of Dearborn. Almost two
out of five American voters indicated they favor or are prepared to accept an extreme policy of "scuttle and run" in Vietnam. When one adds to this figure the large number of voters who could not bring themselves to vote for a policy of unconditional surrender for the United States, but who nonetheless desire de-escalation or an end to the war by a negotiated settlement, the conclusion appears inescapable: A majority of Americans opposes the present policies in Vietnam. It is, however, a generally unreported conclusion, one apparently so unthinkable to some persons that they don't want to think about it.

A second conclusion, based on the evidence, is that the results of a referendum, especially one with the manifest ramifications of the three cited here, cannot be reported as if it were an election between two men. A 60-40 vote may well be a "landslide" when it involves two candidates; it is a sign of serious disaffection in the populace when it is a vote on an issue controlled by the most intentionally divisive and revolutionary groups in our society. That is a conclusion reached by only a few members of the "orthodox" press, but a conclusion that appears eminently reasonable and valid.

**the march on the pentagon**

So much has been written about the gathering at the Lincoln Memorial and the subsequent "confrontation" between armed troops and peace marchers at the Pentagon last October that one turns to this matter reluctantly. Nonetheless, the reporting of the events of that day stands as a revealing example of the thesis being presented here.

While the "orthodox" press passively accepted the official line of the government, or at best only mildly wondered about it, the "underground" press cited the evidence that should have been available to all citizens. If a person is curious about what really happened Oct. 21, 1967, he has a choice of taking the interpretations of the wire service and newspaper reporters on the scene, the radio and television reporters, and the mass circulation magazines on the one hand, or the passionate, often frenetic, accounts in such publications as the Berkeley Barb and Los Angeles Free Press, or the New York Review of Books and some other publications which publish "unorthodox" writers. In this case, based on my eye-witness evidence as an observer of the march on the Pentagon, the latter group comes much closer to what happened than does the "orthodox" press. In fact, from the moment that the television networks agreed that the event should not be covered "live," the mass media of information consistently reported essentially—although not exclusively—what the Pentagon and administration officials wanted reported.

Although fewer than 700 persons were arrested—less than one per cent of the demonstrators—and the vast majority behaved in an orderly, even good-humored manner, a vein of hostility to the demonstration and the demonstrators runs through most published accounts in the general-circulation press, with emphasis on violence, peculiar dress, dirtiness, marijuana and obscenity. A Los Angeles Times staff writer, for example, wrote the following in the lead front-page news story: "By cautious estimate, perhaps one-third of the crowd was of respectable appearance and mien, adequately barbered and coiffed, sensibly dressed, seemingly more troubled than incensed or fanatically opposed to the war. The balance of the crowd was composed of the wildest mixed bag imaginable: Communists, hippies and flower-power advocates, unkempt, scrappy youths and girls. While many of that balance were patent anti-war, some seemed to view the demonstration as anything from a lark to an opportunity for romance or an occasion for flaunting an obscene poster."

The Washington Post sneered at the "shaggy doves and the sweet smell of pot," and the National Observer observed in its account that "in the core was made up of hippies and pseudo-hippies, students and pseudo-students—a great many colorful sheep. The sheep were ready to be led. . . . Despite the gymnasium smell and the dirty hair. . . ." Time's accounts were filled with misleading generalities ("Within the tide of dissenters swarmed all the elements of American dissent in 1967: hard-eyed revolutionaries and skylarking hippies; ersatz motorcycle gangs and all-too-real college professors; housewives, ministers and authors; Black Nationalists in African garb—but no real African nationalists; nonviolent pacifists and nonpacifists advocates of violence. . . ."), officially sponsored innuendoes ("Dean Rusk, whose State Department intelligence apparatus had long since assessed the degree and role of Communist influence within the antiwar movement, said earlier this month that 'we haven't made public the extent of our knowledge' for fear of setting off a new McCarthyism."), and insipid insinuations ("'You should see what we found out there,' said one worker. 'Nothing but bras and panties. You never saw so many.'"). Newsweek stressed Norman Mailer's "artist's freak-out," a "gaggle of hippies," the "rhetorical vitriol" at the rally and a concluding reference to an unidentified woman who "muttered as twilight descended" that she was leaving with her small son because "I guess he's seen enough democracy in action for one day."

In reporting the number of participants in the demonstration, the mass media became a partner of the government in a calculated attempt to minimize the total. The basis for the statistical hoax was that any crowd estimate must clearly delineate the time and the place. There were three major events during the day. The largest crowd gathered Saturday morning at the Lincoln Memorial, where approximately 100,000—including those who had other plans for later in the day, curious bystanders, button salesmen, police, press, CIA and others—would be a fair estimate (Dr. James Laird, a Detroit Free Press columnist, thought the crowd at the Memorial was "more than the University of Michigan stadium holds," or more than 100,000). About 60,000 of these made the march across Arlington Memorial Bridge to the Pentagon (the New York Times reported that an employee assigned to make a head count estimated the marchers who crossed Memorial Bridge at "more than 54,000"). Thousands of these persons, having made their point, were
Many reports ... played the Pentagon’s numbers game

on their way back even before the end of the parade reached the Pentagon’s north parking lot. At dusk, when the “confrontation” took place, more than 35,000 were on the Pentagon steps, the Mall and the grassy reaches extending to the parking lots (a figure the same as that finally issued by the Defense Department, which said it had made aerial photographs of the crowd at the Pentagon and had arrived at an estimate of 35,000 persons through military photo-inspection techniques). About 8,000 more on the parking lot did not pass beyond a point which was announced as the line to be crossed only by those who wished to push past non-violence toward civil disobedience or violent confrontation with the military. Many reports failed to distinguish between these three estimates and thereby played the Pentagon’s numbers game. The failures in reporting made it appear that the figure of 35,000 applied to the total number who demonstrated or, in other cases, emphasized the total of those who actually marched—about 60 per cent of those who were at the Lincoln Memorial. Even worse was the bland acceptance of “official” estimates, some of them patently ludicrous, of the police and military. Thus, Time made much of “35,000 ranting, chanting protesters” at the Pentagon without referring to the other two-thirds of the demonstrators at the rally, The Christian Science Monitor told of “more than 50,000 marchers” and the Washington Star referred to a “march by some 55,000 anti-war demonstrators.” The Washington Post, however, led off its story with “More than 50,000 persons demonstrated here against the war in Vietnam yesterday...” The New York Times not only accepted “a police and military consensus” that put the size of the crowd at the Lincoln Memorial at 50,000 to 55,000, but reported a “rally and march by some 50,000 persons” as if the same number had participated in both events. U. S. News & World Report also bought the figure of “about 55,000 persons at the Lincoln Memorial.” Newsweek settled for a “40,000-man army of widely assorted U.S. resistance groups descending on the Capital.” (It let a cat out of the bag the following week when it quoted an unidentified “important Democratic senator” as saying: “If they got 60,000 at the Pentagon last weekend, just imagine what kind of a protest they can stage at the [Chicago] Amphitheater next August.”)

United Press International said “police officially estimated that between 50,000 and 55,000 persons were on hand for the rally,” and accepted the word of a Pentagon spokesman who said apparently with a straight face that “between 20,000 and 25,000 protesters were at the Pentagon at the peak period of about 4 p.m. EDT.” The Associated Press took the same estimate of the number of persons at the Pentagon at the height of the demonstration (which the military subsequently increased by 10,000) and added: “U.S. Park Police had put the number at the Lincoln Memorial rally around 37,000—but march organizers claimed 200,000 were there.” The Communist press in Hanoi also claimed that 200,000 persons converged on Washington.

Clearly, wishful thinking was practiced by interested parties and governments on both sides. The spectacle of propagandists and governments lying is not unusual; when the press becomes a tool of the propagandist and government, however, the citizen obviously must beware.

Almost as bizarre as the statistical game-playing was the photographic coverage. The mass media featured photographs of those in extremely casual or imaginative dress, and ignored the more ordinary citizens. (“Hey, take pictures of us,” groups of adequately barbered and coiffed, sensibly dressed marchers pleaded with photographer after photographer. “I would,” a New York Times man responded quietly, “but they wouldn’t run it.”) More interesting is the absence of a photograph showing the entire crowd at the Lincoln Memorial (such as those published of the 1963 civil rights rally at the same place) or one of the parade including the beginning and some identifiable point toward the end so that an educated estimate could be made (photographers in helicopters passed over the marchers again and again), or one from the top of the Pentagon (which the Defense Department could have released to end that particular discussion). The aerial photo taken at the Pentagon, which served as the basis for military estimates, to my knowledge never has been published. And Time, which put a photograph of the start of the march on its cover in what it boasted was “the latest cover change we have ever made,” cropped it in a curious manner. If one eliminates the bottom inconsequential 1½ inches of the Oct. 27, 1967, cover photo, an entirely different effect of a huge parade is achieved.

The “orthodox” press, with some notable exceptions, was exceedingly gentle, kind and understanding of what was probably the most blatant lie of the government—the contention of the Defense Department that soldiers at the Pentagon fired no tear gas at the demonstrators. Despite the fact that several newsmen reported that they saw tear gas canisters launched by uniformed soldiers (and I personally saw one grenade fired and experienced the effects), Pentagon spokesmen not only persisted in maintaining that the troops were innocent but that the deed was done by demonstrators.

All of this was too much for the Washington Star staff writers who reported on the front page:

The Pentagon issued an official statement in which Defense officials said that tear gas had been used, but said it came apparently from the demonstrators. “Neither police, marshals or soldiers” have any record of tear gas being used, the spokesman said.

“We believe that the demonstrators are using their own” tear gas. One woman marcher and a military policeman were overcome, he added, and about 100 were “affected” by the gas.
However, reporters on the scene saw soldiers use gas on the crowd in a number of incidents.

In another story on page 2, the Star gave additional details in a story headlined: “Army Denies Tear Gas Used; Reporters Saw ‘Mist’ Fired.”

The Washington Post, however, reported only that “one tear gas grenade burst” and added: “A military official insisted that ‘our side has not reported using any tear gas.’ One soldier reported that a grenade had been taken from him earlier by demonstrators.” That was it until the next day when the Post recognized that “left over from Saturday’s violence was a running dispute over who launched the tear gas canisters that exploded several times in one section near the Pentagon where both troops and demonstrators were intermingled. Several newsmen reported that they saw tear gas being thrown by uniformed soldiers.” Then it quoted the commander of the security forces, Maj. Gen. Francis O’Malley, as saying: “The demonstrators in one area did succeed in breaking through a rank to obtain nine, we believe, tear gas canisters. How many of those were used by the demonstrators, we don’t know.” This is a statement so laced with the vilest kind of cynicism that it is beneath contempt. But the Washington Post did nothing to set that lie in concrete. Its efforts were devoted instead to a long story headlined “Troops Exercise ‘Flexible Response,’” which was bylined but could have been written by a Pentagon information specialist.

United Press International declared flatly that “tear gas was spewed at demonstrators at one point,” and—to its great credit—nailed the fact: “UPI reporter Jed Stout reported that Defense Department officials had “lied” in denying that tear gas was used against one group trying to force its way through the lines. A Defense Department spokesman insisted none of the government forces had unloosed tear gas in defense of the Pentagon. He said further it was believed that the demonstrators possessed tear gas and may have used it.” The Associated Press, however, saw it all that Defense Department officials had “lied” in denying that troops had used tear gas against the demonstrators at the Pentagon.

There were angry charges by demonstration leaders that Defense Department officials had “lied” in denying that troops had used tear gas against the demonstrators at the Pentagon.

Last night the Department said that if tear gas had been used, it had been used by the demonstrators against the troops.

In this fashion is the matter of truth and falsehood allowed to remain moot.

Mention also should be made of the case of the alleged defectors at the Pentagon. The “underground” press repeatedly has insisted that some soldiers—the number cited ranges from one to four—refused to follow orders and were placed under arrest. The important point is that none of the government forces had used tear gas against the demonstrators. . . .

Still another curious sidelight on this entire issue was the strange case of Pfc. Guinn. Millions of television viewers one night heard Walter Cronkite utter the following words:

Mrs. Blanche Guinn of Elizabethton, Tennessee, served Thanksgiving dinner today, one day late, and the honored guest was her son, Private First Class John Guinn. Earlier this week, Mrs. Guinn attended funeral services for the son, only to learn later that the Army had made a mistake, and that her son was being flown home from Vietnam to see her. Ed Rabel was at the airport when he arrived.

Mrs. Guinn fainted as she held her son in her arms. Then the “CBS Evening News” of Nov. 24, 1967, continued:

RABEL: Shortly thereafter she recovered and was all right. Private Guinn, meanwhile, held an impromptu news conference at which he expressed surprising bitterness with the entire Vietnam war.

RABEL: Would you go back to Vietnam if you had to?
GUINN: Well, if I was—when my three years is up, I'm coming out of service. I ain't going to re-enlist, and I hope they bring all of the United States boys out.

RABEL: Why do you feel that way, sir?
"The 'orthodox' press, it seems clear, has badly deluded itself"

GUINN: 'Cause it's not no war over there—it's just a tragedy.
RABEL: You don't think we ought to be there?
GUINN: No, sir.
RABEL: Guinn, who must serve 18 more months in the Army before his discharge, said his opposition to the war was shared by most of the men with whom he served.

Peter Jennings, in his ABC national newscast the same evening, showed a similar sequence and added Pfc. Guinn's actual reply when asked if many of his fellow soldiers "feel the same way you do":

"I guess all of them does."

The Huntley-Brinkley Report on NBC did not carry the observations of Pfc. Guinn in its on-the-scene report of the homecoming. Chet Huntley, when asked by this writer about the omission, said the comments were news to him and that apparently the film crew simply did not record this segment.

It is probably news to everyone else who didn't see one of the two national television newscasts or a sentence in Time magazine's report of the return of Pfc. Guinn: "Johnny later said bitterly: 'I don't feel we have any business being over there, and most of the fellows in my outfit feel the same way.'"

The Associated Press limited its reporting of Pfc. Guinn's unhappiness to a terse "No, sir," as a reply to a question about whether he wanted to return to Vietnam. The United Press International told its clients and their readers that Pfc. Guinn was home, then followed with a story emphasizing the soldier's view that his outfit was poorly prepared for combat in Vietnam. This story appeared in one newspaper—the Los Angeles Times, page 4 of Section B—of the 40 daily newspapers examined by this writer.

The case of Pfc. Guinn is especially illuminating because if it had not been for two television newscasts, the incident of the mistaken burial would have passed as nothing more than a curious eddy in the tides of war. As it turned out, it served as an unexpected leak in the military's smooth channeling of information. Pfc. Guinn uniquely has little to fear from the military; after the monstrous mixup, he will receive kid-glove treatment no matter what he may believe or say. No effort has been spared by the massive military-political machine to chant the litany that whatever dissenters may be saying and doing in the United States, the men in Vietnam have no doubts about why they are fighting the war.

The finishing touch to the Pfc. Guinn story was supplied by the Louisville Courier-Journal on Saturday, Nov. 25, 1967. Although it utilized resources identified as "From AP and Special Dispatches," that newspaper could not find space even for one of Pfc. Guinn's attitudes in a 605-word, 20-paragraph article. The story ended precisely before this point in the AP dispatch: "Asked if he would return to Vietnam during the rest of his year and a half stay in the Army, Guinn replied, 'No, Sir!' Yet, on the same day that the Courier-Journal didn't tell what Pfc. Guinn thought of the war or what was the prevailing attitude of soldiers in Vietnam, it ran an Associated Press story from Saigon under a two-line, two-column headline on page 2: "GI Morale, Vietnam Aid Impressive, Cowger Says." U.S. Rep. William C. Cowger, Kentucky Republican and former Louisville mayor, had been flown to Vietnam. He was quoted as saying: "For the last few days, I talked with two groups of Kentucky Marines in the Da Nang area and (Thursday) I had Thanksgiving dinner with 27 Kentucky sailors aboard the carrier Coral Sea. To a man, they know why we are here. They would rather be home, but they recognize our commitment in the Far East must be met."

critical need for examination

The "orthodox" press, it seems clear, has badly deluded itself by accepting the view of some political and military leaders, some bureaucrats and even some journalists that it has been basically unfriendly in its reporting of administration policies in Vietnam. The proponents of those policies complain of reporting that exposes conditions in South Vietnam or "gives comfort to the enemy," photographs that demonstrate graphically the horrors of war, television news shows such as the one showing Marines burning Vietnamese huts, and the like. Of course there have been specific incidents which reflect well on the press and which the President or the generals did not like, but the White House and the Pentagon have had their way almost all of the time. They complain because the ideal press in the eyes of government officials and military men is a press that tells exactly and only what they want told. They don't quite have this, but the unfortunate fact is that they have something uncomfortably close to it.

Perhaps it is too much to expect, as the hostile critics of the press have contended through the years, that a press with an undeniable stake in the economic and political system would report fairly on those who are fundamentally dissatisfied with the status quo. But the history of journalism is not without instances in which "orthodox" publications went "underground," and some examples cited herein demonstrate that sometimes some organs of information report facts that tend to disrupt the hegemony of the industrial-military-governmental complex. It is not too much to ask the men who publish and edit and write and broadcast for the mass media to examine their degree of complicity in the failure to tell it like it is. If after honest appraisal they come to a conclusion different from the one reached here, that is fair enough. The critical need is the examination itself.
DEAN A. L. STONE ADDRESS:
TOWARD A TWO-NEWSPAPER TOWN

By BRUCE B. BRUGMANN
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When the Heywood Brouns and the Richard Harding Davises, the Scaramouches and the Falstaffs, the Caesars and the Napoleons of the newspapers gather in solemn conclave, as they do at Hanno's bar in San Francisco, Turner Hall in Milwaukee and the Press Club bar in Washington, D.C., one thing is common: Most everybody talks about the sad state of press monopoly but nobody does anything about it.

The reason is simple: The rampaging contraction of the American newspaper business has become imbued with the estate and dignity of historical inevitability. It is now a journalistic maxim: If there is more than one newspaper in town, then it won't be long before one begins to slip, advertisers defect and another merger is upon us.

More mergers will come if Congress approves the "Failing Newspaper Act," one of the great legislative sleight-of-hand maneuvers of our time. The act would establish in every remaining bastion of competitive journalism an almost irresistible attraction to "fail" and merge. Even if the competitive publisher is making money, he can make much more by merging with his competitor into a joint agency, combining production facilities, using the same delivery trucks, arranging a whopping advertising rate, increasing circulation prices and tossing out as few bones of news as he chooses.

Crippling strikes in New York, Los Angeles and San Francisco foreshadow still further dislocations as new techniques of offset printing, photo composition and automation are brought to bear on notoriously medieval production and distribution processes.

Only through cannibalism have metropolitan newspapers survived the major shift of mass advertising to radio and television and the flight of much of their middle- and upper-middle-class audience to the suburbs. Only 45 cities now have fully competitive newspaper ownerships. Gross circulation figures, so often trumpeted as signs of health and prosperity, are maintained by a second growth of new dailies that are little more than undistinguished outcroppings of the move of retail merchandising to suburban shopping centers and bustling suburban main streets.

This, in a nutshell, is how things stand in the daily newspaper business: We read more and more copies of fewer and fewer newspapers, and the fewer newspapers read and look more alike. Lop the flag off the papers in your journalism library and I defy you to tell me which papers they are or where they are published.

The daily competitive newspaper has gone the way of the homing pigeon and the buffalo lap robe, but now there is hope that in its place will grow the roots, trunk and branches of a sturdy grove of new, competing newspapers—the metropolitan weekly, fortnightly or monthly newspapers.

This is the new frontier in American journalism. It is now possible in the vast no man's land left by this
sorry record of merger, consolidation and abandonment to establish a strong quality newspaper that can be published with a small capital outlay, with few of the disadvantages and many of the advantages of daily publishing and with a realistic chance of financial and editorial success.

I say this not as a professor without working credentials, not as a reporter without business experience, not as a critic who views the world from the height of an unpublished manuscript, but as the editor and publisher of such an enterprise—as one who speaks from personal, working knowledge that it can be done.

The larger point is that some competitive papers can be started and once started kept going. This has been shown by the Village Voice in New York City, Cervi’s Journal in Denver, the Texas Observer in Austin, the Los Angeles Free Press and many hippie and New Left publications busy with the salvation of humanity on many fronts. The point is that some sort of competitive press must be established, like copperheads behind enemy lines, to challenge the monopolies in news coverage and editorial commentary in their feudal baronies.

**a restricted news flow**

Not all the acres of new machines and automated equipment or all the Sierra and cascades of masonry in new buildings or all the new gadgetry in wire-service transmission can alter the fact that people are getting their news through an ever more restricted pipeline. And the pipeline, oddly, often is restricted at its very source—the gathering and sending of news by the two major wire services.

I have found that neither AP nor UPI, in the Bay Area at least and I suspect elsewhere, is much interested in passing along news that is not published by client newspapers. My newspaper has broken several major stories, many of which were picked up by radio and television. To cite one example, one of our stories rocketed to Sacramento and forced Governor Reagan to answer several embarrassing queries at his press conference, but neither wire service expressed interest in it.

Other nonclient newspapers have told me of similar problems. The result is circular noncoverage: It’s not news until the local monopoly paper prints it (and there are a hell of a lot of reasons why stories don’t make the local paper). In other areas, no one hears about the story unless it moves on the wires. What you don’t know won’t hurt you.

I appeared on a radio program recently with the San Francisco bureau chiefs of AP and UPI. Throughout the program, I made several critical remarks about the monopoly Examiner Chronicle, citing specific stories the papers had not covered. I described in detail how each paper had refused to dig into the major story of the mayor’s election (a story we published in considerable detail) — how a secret deal was put together to lure the mayor out and thrust a pro-Johnson businessman into the race.

Afterward, both men came up to me and said in effect:

> “I hope the radio listeners could tell it was you who made those remarks and not us.”
> “Why?” I replied. “Why didn’t you take me on?”
> Both seemed startled by my question.
> “Because they’re our clients, that’s why,” one said. “We don’t want to get into anything.”

The reason I emphasize the press’s narrowing lifeline is because I want to demonstrate how difficult it is for the press to regulate itself in the public interest, how impotent are the “remedies” to hold the press to account for its performance and how imperative it is for newspaper competition to assert itself.

What are these remedies? Well, the profession’s latherers and towelers will tell you that competition aplenty comes from radio, television, out-of-town newspapers, metropolitan magazines, radio talk shows, shoppers and suburban papers. That is partly true, but still there is nothing that can take the place of a metropolitan newspaper. Then they will tell you that the press is capable of regulating itself. This homey, just-between-us-fellers philosophy was best expressed by Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, in an address several years ago to the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the International Press Institute:

> The American press is very fully organized at many levels. These organizations have a continuous and often profound bearing on the better performance of the American press. Their efforts constitute self-control in the very real sense of self-improvement. Indeed, they are the very essence of self-control in terms of evoking a very deep, earnest and fundamental acceptance of professional responsibility. And they often bring to bear the most powerful of disciplinary influences, which is the sense of pride in professional achievement, and shame at doing less well than we can.

Since Canham’s paper has its foundations in heaven, perhaps he can be forgiven. If anybody else put forth that bilge, he should be required by law to build a stadium for us to laugh in.

Government regulation? Intolerable. The political cure would be worse than the disease. Union crusading? It never will come to pass. A code of ethics? Moonshine, said H. L. Mencken years ago and he’s still right. A strong professional association independent of management and the guild, as suggested in the United States by Louis M. Lyons and in England by Sir Francis Williams? A good idea, but a long while off.

Journalism schools acting as press critics? With few exceptions, journalism schools are so tied to the publishers and the press associations, so preoccupied with keeping a steady flow of young reporters moving to the city desks of big nearby papers, that they often become less of a critic and more of a cheerleader. If the journalism schools at Stanford, San Francisco State or the University of California have a bad word to say about the dreadful papers at large in the San Francisco Bay Area, no news of it has leaked out publicly to me.

Critical organs like Nieman Reports, the Columbia Journalism Review and the Montana Journalism Review? Good,
but neither local nor powerful enough to do the job. A review board to render regularly a collective judgment on the press? A good idea rising from the 1947 Hutchins Commission report, but not likely to have much influence even if it is established over the stout objections of the media.

No, it is obvious that none of those remedies will have much effect. For in the long haul only an influential competing newspaper can keep another newspaper honest—not a television station, not a magazine, not a review board. Only another newspaper. This I submit as Brugmann’s Law in Journalism.

It is virtually impossible now to start a daily newspaper against entrenched opposition. So solid is this glacial press structure that William Randolph Hearst, if he again went east with Mother Phoebe’s millions, couldn’t dent it much or for long. Those days are gone forever.

Happily, this is not the case in starting a weekly or fortnightly newspaper. Only a relatively small capitalization is needed if key economies—the use of an offset jobber, leased office space, a small staff, free-lance newsmen and writers—are used to avoid the heavy fixed costs of machinery, payroll and plant.

The Bay Guardian was started with $50,000 in capital, but the Berkeley Barb, a remarkable hippie paper, was started by Max Scherr on capitalization of $76 or so, just enough to pay a cheap printing bill.

Two other kinds of small newspapers are emerging—the cooperative paper, such as the defunct Berkeley Citizen, which grew out of the university town’s cooperative movement, and the metropolitan newspaper, like the Bay Guardian or the Pacific Sun, an excellent weekly competing successfully against a monopoly daily and several weeklies in Marin County just north of the Golden Gate Bridge.

“A Guardian reader,” its prospectus states, “won’t be educated, or overawed, or flattered, but will be considered an equal, a fellow member of a clearly defined group of people who share certain common interests and certain common knowledge.” The task at hand for us all is to get this “clearly defined group of subscribers” quickly enough, so that its size and strategic market position can attract consistent advertising revenue over a long period.

Once this circulation and advertising base is obtained, the paper can publish more and more often until, God willing, it could perhaps appear five days a week or daily. However, I have found that even with less frequent publication, ideally on a weekly basis, the paper can wield tremendous competitive editorial influence and, if it is put together by newsmen who know what they’re doing, can have more power—at least for the present—than any civilian review board or organ of press criticism.

**frightful odds**

Still, the small paper faces frightful odds in trying to hack out a publishing niche. My paper provides a typical example. I cannot get libel insurance (although I went all the way to Lloyd’s of London before being told we were too small and too controversial). A special restriction prohibits me from getting a loan from the Small Business Administration (as could, say, a lime and cement dealer or an agricultural-implement agent). Nor can I get conventional financing of any kind. I operate strictly on income and what money I can raise from private sources.

Because I use street newsracks rather than carrier boys, I cannot even hire boys to handle my distribution at the same government-subsidized, below-the-minimum-wage rate the big papers get away with because newsboys are “independent contractors.”

All the paid-circulation requirements of the ABC audit, second-class mailing privileges and wire-service use are stacked against the small paper struggling to get circulation to build an advertising base. I am forever vulnerable as a small newspaper, a small business and a small corporation.

I in no way suggest that this kind of newspaper ought to operate as a public ward or a private charity. A strong newspaper must have a strong and independent trading position.

(However, I see no reason why the monopoly papers should be able to reinforce their trading positions through the special anti-monopoly sanctions they seek. I find in their First Amendment guarantee nothing that says they must maximize profits each year or eliminate all competition or erect impregnable fortresses at the strategic passes to public information—lest the democratic system collapse.)

I suggest only that if we have such solicitude for the big fish, we can have some for the little fish. The above catalogue of problems could be brought to account through legislation or administrative review without in any way bringing the paper under the thumb of the local Dogberries or Sir Tobies.

As a starter, the Small Business Administration prohibition against small newspapers could be stricken to give the paper the same chance as, say, a hardware store. As a finisher, the government could force a reigning newspaper, if its monopoly position is left unassailable, to contribute a fraction of its enormous profits to subsidize a smaller competitive weekly—for the good of the community, for the good of the newspaper business and for the good of the big paper. This, I know, would be fraught with dangers, but none so dangerous as leaving monopolies as they are.

The defense of journalism as more than a business and as more than a monopoly—though a business it is and though a monopoly it has become—is properly the journalists’ duty. It is they who must understand that many (but certainly not all) of the basic problems are attributable to the exigencies of business monopoly as applied to the gathering of information and as applied to the dissemination of opinion, which once was considered so important that it was granted constitutional privilege and protection.

The journalist has both a professional and a public obligation to look after his inheritance. I assure you that it is a trade worth fighting for.

---
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A PUBLISHER’S STATEMENT:  
ANATOMY OF A FAILING NEWSPAPER

By FRED J. MARTIN

On Aug. 14, 1967, Fred J. Martin, publisher of the Park County News at Livingston, Montana, testified before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee considering Senate Bill 1312, the “Failing Newspaper Act.” The measure would “exempt from the antitrust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers.” Presented here is Mr. Martin’s statement, which contains numerous references to and opinions about the Montana press, Montana newspapermen and the Lee Newspapers of Montana. Owing to the controversial nature of several of Mr. Martin’s comments, a vice president of Lee Enterprises, Inc., Don Anderson, was asked to offer a response for publication. His article follows Mr. Martin’s statement. Mr. Martin is a 1923 graduate of the Montana School of Journalism. He has worked for six Montana dailies.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the subcommittee.

My name is Fred J. Martin. I am publisher of the Park County News, a weekly newspaper in Livingston, Montana.

This is the anatomy of a “failing newspaper.”

To admit failure, a sordid dividend for nearly 50 years of effort as a journalist, certainly is a blow to one’s pride. To make the admission before a United States Senate committee adds fuel to the fire. Yet, if we are to preserve freedom, including freedom of the press, we have to deal in unmitigated truths at the fulcrum of justice—such a committee as this where national policy decisions are formulated.

This testimony expresses only my own convictions, not those of any group or association. Perhaps the reason dates back to a letter, written in desperation July 26, 1964, to the then Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, in which the question was asked: “Is the American way for a bigger business to destroy a smaller one, perhaps force bankruptcy and destroy a lifetime’s retirement potential? My wife is 59 and I am 60. Our life savings, the Park County News, an independent weekly newspaper, has been given a slow, gradual death sentence....”

As your committee’s assistant counsel, Jack Blum, has scheduled, rescheduled and postponed my appearance, my views have twisted and turned. My statement has been torn to bits, rejected, revised and changed, until I began to wonder myself if I could contribute something worthwhile to the discussions of Senate Bill 1312, the “Failing Newspaper Act.” Yet, although it is my sincere conviction that there is segregation in newspapering, there is an underpinning of faith and hope that the United States Senate and House of Representatives will permit passage of such a proposal to concentrate power and further hog-tie the people’s freedom of the press.

So, if I talk despairingly, let the record show an underpinning of faith in the United States’ hope for equality for all.

To have lived in a “Company” (Anaconda) dominated state for many years and to have observed the sins of absentee exploitation and yet to have retained a sensible objectivity is an accomplishment. My native city of Butte has died many deaths, but the facts are that the mineral reserves are still seemingly limitless. The near-disastrous debacle of 1929 after the speculative orgy rebounded with the exploitation by Communists of the victims at the bottom of the economic pile—the impoverished and the unemployed, who became putty in the hands of Communists—to come dangerously close to a takeover. Yet, when aroused, the American people calm the waters. As long as we have the right to express our opinions, a rare privilege in today’s world, there is reason to be an incurable optimist.

In Montana, there seemingly has been an “antitrust exemption” for a long, long time for the former Anaconda Company, now Lee Newspapers, chain of newspapers. Montana’s total newspaper circulation is 333,362, of which 213,632 represents the circulation of 14 dailies and 119,730
the 74 weeklies. Of the daily circulation, that of the Lee
Newspapers, all dailies, in six cities (Anaconda, Billings,
Butte, Helena, Livingston and Missoula) totals 129,783, or
more than 60 per cent of all daily and 30 per cent of the
total for dailies and weeklies.

There are weeklies that compete with dailies in six Mon­
tana communities and two weeklies in the town of Cut
Bank. However, only in the case of Livingston is the cir­
ulation a threat to the daily’s domination.

The 1967 Montana Newspaper Directory lists the Liv­
ingston Enterprise (a Lee newspaper) with 2,832 and the
Park County News, a weekly, at 2,707. In Missoula, the
Lee Missoulian has 23,449 and the weekly Times 721. In
Billings, the Lee Gazette’s 63,961 compares with the weekly
Times’ 1,780. There is no competition for the Lee dailies
in Anaconda, Butte and Helena. However, the People’s
Voice, a liberal paper with Farmers Union and labor sup­
port, is published in Helena but does not solicit local ad­
vertising there.

Perhaps, because we have managed to survive this com­
petition for 21 years though the uneven struggle has been
a bit rugged, that’s why the Park County News falls within
the definition of Senate Bill 1312, a “newspaper publica­
tion which, regardless of its ownership or affiliations, appears
unlikely to remain or become a financially sound publica­
tion.”

The American Newspaper Publishers Association coun­
sel, Arthur B. Hanson, in his statement before you, aptly
stated: “Under a competitive economy, newspapers can
be published only in those areas where there are sufficient
readers and advertising services to provide an adequate eco­

The mystical town meeting concept of democracy is
so implanted in the minds of some educators that they
refuse to accept the idea that a structured power system
exists and that it may have numerous forms. As Warner
has commented, “All men are equal, but some are
equal more than others.” The practitioner needs also
to view the system as manifesting both formal and in­
formal structures. In the past we have missed the mark
by observing only the formal structure for decision mak­
ing. Power may be like an iceberg in which only a small
portion of the structure is visible.

In this day of centralization and concentration of power,
one sometimes wonders if the trend isn’t to eliminate the
little fellows, particularly in, say, a struggle with a news­
paper chain in Montana with approximately 130,000 circula­
tion compared with a weekly such as the Park County News
with fewer than 3,000. Seemingly, this was the case when
we endeavored to bargain with the Anaconda Company
officials and the Lee Newspaper chain for survival. But
what is most astounding is the absolute disregard for the
glory of an individual and the failure to keep even a
single promise.

These are problems that should be considered before
delegating privileges of monopoly which Senate Bill 1312
would give. Do we have segregation in newspaper pub­
lishing with the chain circulation giants ignoring the rights
of little people? Is that circulation power used as a threat
to public officials? Is it used as a wedge to get advertising
and special privilege, even in setting up wage scales and
working conditions with employees? Can a multi-million­
dollar corporation where moral decisions can be diffused
and thus disregarded supersede and destroy human rights?

Frankly, with our noose very, very close to the grindstone,
"To many, a damn fool stands before you"

we do not have the time or the funds for research. We only know from experience that the forces of destruction are at hand.

Power-structure freedom needs curbs instead of unlimited license to subvert and destroy the basic understructure of freedom for all. That's why, with your permission, my testimony dissects the failure of the Park County News and its publisher. The elements are complex, with factors including poor management, competition, employe relationships, public relations, the advancing technology and the failure of equipment manufacturers to provide the service to back up their promises, government regulations and taxation, plus the state of the economy.

To many, a damn fool stands before you. Perhaps you'll agree but let me give a little background in the anatomical dissection of the character of this newspaperman.

More than 50 years ago, I had a newspaper route, spent considerable time in newspaper offices, listened to discussions of political and economic problems in Butte, Montana, and acquired the conviction my thoughts and decisions would be my own, not some stuffed down my throat.

My father was a good citizen, but in Anaconda Company-controlled Butte a good citizen was one who conformed. At election time, my dad would listen to pros and cons about candidates and issues but would be wary of expressing an opinion. A day or so before the election, he would get a marked sample ballot from the Company as to how to vote. Dad had his own ideas, but, if he talked at home of voting against the Company slate, mother would remind him he owed allegiance. She remembered all too well what happened to courageous dissidents and their families.

Often the Company slate would change in the final days before an election to support of sleepers or dark horses to oust the favorites, some of whom implied a double cross. This method of subservience, though accepted by my folks, didn't conform to my notion of the right to vote according to one's conscience.

On Aug. 17, 1917, a gang of masked men seized Frank W. Little, an International Workers of the World (Wobbly) organizer, as he lay in bed and hanged him on a trestle. The Company press reported he made no outcry. Yet, none of his attackers ever was named publicly, accused or tried, although as a newsboy of 14 I heard the names of prominent citizens who were reputed to have been the hangmen.

At the University of Montana School of Journalism, we were lectured on the ethics of journalism, the free press and integrity, but in bull sessions we discussed how the Company ran the state with an iron fist, even forcing the firing of an economics professor who had shown statistically how agriculture was being taxed too much and mines were given a free ride.

There was talk of how courageous Joe Dixon, then governor, a former congressman and U.S. senator and later undersecretary of the interior, was being pilloried for advocating a metal mines tax to provide greater educational opportunities at all levels for young Montanans. Dixon had been elected in 1920 as the lesser of two evils over Burton K. Wheeler, later a U.S. senator.

My journalism career began in Missoula while attending the University and during vacations and after graduation at the Butte Daily Post. There I witnessed the humiliation and heartbreak of one of Montana's most illustrious journalists, J. H. Durston, who in the late 1880s had been recruited from Syracuse, N.Y., with most of his editorial and mechanical staff from the Syracuse Standard, to establish and edit the Anaconda Standard. Durston was recruited by one of the Copper Kings and the founder of Anaconda, Marcus Daly, who wanted a mouthpiece to compete with Senator W. A. Clark's Butte Miner.

But by the 1920s, Daly had long since died. The paternalistic sentimentality of the Daly and immediate post-Daly era was fading and the hatchet men were in the saddle. The "new" management was out to get rid of the editors, whose tactics, some of which bordered on blackmail, had been costly from a public relations standpoint as well as financially.

Durston had been edged out as editor of the Standard, but to humor "the old man," then in his 80s, he was named editor of the Butte Daily Post, an afternoon paper. Though many considered him in his dotage, he had a vivid mind, delighted us with his stories and his knowledge of English, particularly the derivation of words. He was still a brilliant writer. As the cub reporter, it was my job to type and attempt to decipher his penciled, hand-written editorials.

What happened could have been avoided if it hadn't been for a young hopeful's determination to show who was boss—that the old man was on the shelf. Until then, this new business manager (and self-appointed editor) had gone through the motions of giving recognition to the dignity of the "old Maestro," who had a doctorate from Heidelberg University in Germany. But on this day in 1924, the business manager failed even to pass the time of day with the old gentleman. Instead, he tossed art work and copy on the city editor's desk with the statement "this goes on page one." It represented a sudden reversal of policy—an attack on Governor Dixon.

Durston sensed the change, left his office, walked around the city editor's desk two or three times and finally asked, "What was that?" The city editor, who had been instructed to ignore the old gentleman, told him, then complied with his request to call the business manager. The latter bluntly told Durston his opinions or judgment did not count, though he was editor.

Durston called the Sixth Floor, company headquarters in
Butte, but got no satisfaction. He tried to telephone C. F. "Con" Kelley, the president, in New York City but couldn't reach him. He talked of going to New York, but he gave up. It wasn't long before he was confined to his room and died. Had a little man been a bit more diplomatic, the story might have had a different ending.

In those days the frustrations of newspaper editors and reporters were soothed in the bootleg joints. The city editor, a great one, would start with several drinks in the morning, have a bottle close by until lunch, drink his noon meal and often take a bottle to bed at night. The talk was not about the stories we wrote but what we couldn't or didn't write. Yet there was the hope the new Anaconda management attitude someday would result in improved, if not independent, Montana newspapers.

**a colorless newspaper**

What did happen is that direction, editorial and business, moved from the editor to the business manager. The individuality disappeared as the old guard, some of whose efficiency was impaired by overimbibing, was replaced by editors who found the best road to survival was not to rock the boat—avoid controversy and play it safe. The result was a colorless newspaper.

Mark Ethridge, a great American editor, in an interview at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, described the trend:

The responsibility of the newspapers—more than ever before in my life—is to explain what the issues in the world are. And yet at the same time there seems to be a trend for the newspapers to become only commercial enterprises. There are exceptions, of course. But I think some publishers think that it doesn't make much difference what a paper says as long as the balance sheet is all right.

Well, it makes a great deal of difference what the paper says; it does to me and I think it should to the American people. If newspapers are going to survive they're going to survive because they are vital factors in the life of our society and in the lives of their readers.

In 1930, it was my privilege to be campaign secretary for a great American senator, the late Thomas J. Walsh, in his last campaign. His conviction to be fair, even in the face of great pressures, reinforced my own convictions. How well I remember how an editorial writer, Charles Eggleston, one of Montana's best and a protege of Durston, cautiously came to Senator Walsh's hotel room in Anaconda with a proof of an editorial. It set forth Eggleston's views on Walsh's senatorial record, but Eggleston had been ordered not to publish it.

Montana's newspaper heaven in those days was the Great Falls Tribune, published by the late O. S. Warden. The Tribune was not anti-Company or anti-labor, but it operated as a newspaper, recognizing that news was a free-flowing commodity. The staff didn't have to fit into a mold; one could think for himself. Staffers didn't have to worry about the business office policy on any reasonable news story. During the many years I worked there, though I was a member of the American Newspaper Guild and was on the executive board of the county Trades and Labor Assembly, there never was a complaint about outside activities. I was active in community affairs as a member of the city-county airport commission, vice chairman and initiator of the Great Falls Housing Authority, active in support of the development of electric power at the Fort Peck Dam and an outspoken advocate for fair treatment for those on relief and unemployed. My father and mother, who had been advised their son had become a "vicious radical," came from Butte to Great Falls to warn and plead with me to get with the Company policy and reform.

Several months before Pearl Harbor, I was drafted to work for the Treasury Department's U.S. Savings Bond division in organizing Montana. Because of the organizational effort and the loyalty of Montanans, Montana in December, 1941, and in the eight subsequent War Bond drives led the nation in bond purchases as a percentage of per-capita income.

After the war, during which I served for a time in the Marine Corps, there were almost simultaneous offers to become the Republican governor's secretary, to become the executive officer of the Democratic Central Committee and to join the public relations staff of the University of Montana, as well as one to go to Washington on the staff of the U.S. Savings Bond division. But my dream of editing my own paper persisted. I had hoped for a daily, but the chips were too high in the few communities not having Company papers. So I put my neck in the Anaconda noose and purchased the competing Park County News in Livingston from two aging printers.

Here's where the earlier reference to a damn fool applies. Within a few days after the announcement March 17, 1946, of our purchase of the Park County News, the business manager of the Company papers—the same individual who had broken the heart of the grand old man of Montana journalism—called and asked me to come to his hotel room in Livingston, where one of the Company papers, the Livingston Enterprise, was a competitor.

After extending a welcoming hand, he indicated how much better it was to have me as a competitor rather than some radical. He declared: "I don't say that we never will, but I do not think we ever will do any more job printing at the Livingston Enterprise." At that time, I must admit my knowledge of the means of survival of a newspaper was limited. My concern was to edit a newspaper, not to sell advertising, solicit job printing, sell office supplies, be a flunky, printer's devil and office boy. The import of his offer didn't knock me off my feet, as perhaps it should have, because I know what you get you have to pay for. But I didn't say no. Later, he informed me that he had decided to keep the county printing, but the relationship never ripened into marriage.

In the late 1940s, when an out-of-state group asked me to make overtures to purchase the Company papers, hostility—rather than cooperation and friendliness—developed. By this time our newspaper had become a circulation rival in
"My basis of approach . . . what's best for Montana"

Livingston and our job printing had grown apace. The reason the out-of-state group expressed interest in the purchase was the threat of the Company to cancel membership in the Associated Press because the latter had cracked down regarding biased news coverage. Some top Company officials were sympathetic and friendly, but the newspaper management staff did not want to relinquish power.

In 1951, by invitation of the leading business leaders of Billings, we established a weekly newspaper by consolidating two failing weeklies. The basic purpose of the new paper was to have a club over the Billings Gazette's sky-riding monopoly newspaper rates and to hope that competition would result in an improved daily newspaper. The new paper was a good idea, but the initial working capital was paid to bail out the two previous weekly publishers instead of buying modern equipment. Perhaps a good share of the fault could be credited to my endeavor to be fair to the other fellow, rather than to our own business. But, at the same time, I was snared into unwittingly taking over the management of a gubernatorial candidate, which was a full-time job. Then, when prevailed on to become the governor's executive secretary, our interest in the Billings paper was sold in 1953. It has since ceased publication.

candidate promised support

The gubernatorial candidate, who had been a state representative and state senator, was assured of the personal support of one of the "Republican" public relations representatives of Anaconda. The representative promised all-out personal support, but the governor-to-be corrected him with this comment: "You'll do what you're instructed to do by 25 Broadway, New York." The address is Anaconda's headquarters. It is common knowledge that in that campaign the Company was playing a neutral role, though its "Republican" advisers were most friendly and helpful.

The dream always had been that the changing Anaconda management someday would see the light and sell its newspapers. My hope was that Livingston, because of my foothold there, would provide my opportunity. But the competitive squeeze tightened. Pressure was put on those who, because of our aggressiveness, gave us news. The offer was made to our rural correspondents to furnish the Enterprise news at double the rate we were paying. Special rates for space and frequency were made to advertisers. There was little doubt that we were to be denied any share of county or city legal advertising and printing. After all, because of chain power, what was lost in Livingston would be more than offset by the maximum rates that could be charged by the other papers at Billings, Helena, Butte, Missoula and Anaconda.

The narrower operating margin because of ever-expanding production costs and the need to meet competition by increasing efficiency through modernization have helped to shorten the time for the "death sentence." There was no recourse other than to follow the wage schedules fixed by agreement between the Company and the International Typographical Union representatives. The agreement would be reached for Billings, Butte, or Missoula, then, when the pattern was established, for Livingston and Helena. So, the competition fixed the price we could charge and what we had to pay in wages. The I.T.U. often would concentrate on Great Falls to set the Montana pace. What chance has the Park County News in this relatively helpless situation—nothing but a "failing newspaper" in the literal sense.

Imagine such pettiness as a determined effort to block, with threats, my election as a vice president of the Montana Press Association. It's ridiculous but true.

Yet hope never dies. In the Sunday papers of Sept. 14, 1958, appeared the announcement of the sale by the Anaconda Company of the Montana Hotel in Anaconda. The announcement included this comment by Vice President Steele: "... we believe this move will be for the best interest of the community of Anaconda. After all, the Anaconda Company is chiefly in the mining and metallurgical field and the decision has been made that the company should turn over the hotel endeavor to people who are experts in that line."

On that same date, the Park County News telegraphed C. E. Weed, Anaconda Company board chairman, concerning the Montana Hotel sale: "If this is intimation, indication or hint of major policy statement with respect to disposition of other properties, particularly with reference to newspaper holdings, I respectfully would like to discuss or be considered particularly with respect to the Livingston situation. My basis of approach is on simple, sincere premise of what's best for Montana."

Weed's reply was a basis for hope. Instead of a flat statement that the newspapers would not be sold, he said: "No decision has been made with respect to the newspapers in Montana so I cannot give you any answer or information on this subject." There was no immediate reply to efforts to arrange a meeting. Subsequently, through an intermediary, a contact was made with C. J. Parkinson, vice president and general counsel, suggesting a meeting, but a reply said Parkinson was in South America and would not return until January 15.

After a Newsweek statement that "the Anaconda Co. is privately taking bids for its chain of seven newspapers" and a United Press story about the sale of the papers, this wire was sent February 1 to Chairman Weed: "... The Newsweek and wire report statements imply the sale, if made, will be as a unit. Does this mean no consideration will be given to our willingness to negotiate for the Livingston
Enterprise, as per telegram of Sept. 14 and letters of Sept. 20 and Nov. 19 to Mr. Parkinson?"

On February 4, just as the Park County News was going to press, Parkinson called from New York. He said Anaconda was not seeking speculative bids and that it wanted the type of organization that would publish top-quality newspapers, not profit seekers. He said: "We'd naturally like to deal with someone who would be able to purchase our entire interest in the newspaper holding corporation, the Fairmont Corporation. However, we do have your correspondence, as well as that of others who have expressed interest in the Livingston Enterprise, and both Mr. Weed and myself would be glad at the proper time to give prospective purchasers, who in turn might not be interested in retaining the Livingston Enterprise, information about you and the others. Some definitely have indicated the Livingston Enterprise circulation would be a bit small for their consideration..."

The Park County News already had in type a story about the prospective sale and preceded it with the Parkinson interview, which in turn was picked up by the wire services, thus scooping the Anaconda Company dailies.

On February 25, after an Associated Press dispatch about Fairmont Corporation's sale of its stock interest in Wilkins Broadcast Co., owner of KFBB radio and television stations in Great Falls, the Park County News again telegraphed Parkinson:

In view of apparent disinterest in Livingston Enterprise by some prospective purchasers of your Fairmont newspaper holdings and today's Associated Press dispatch from Great Falls re J. P. Wilkins' purchase of Fairmont's stock in Wilkins Broadcast Co., respectfully suggest that equitable and fair agreement to all for separate purchase of Livingston Enterprise would be helpful. I would be glad to come to New York early next week to discuss the matter.

Parkinson's reply: "All matters stand just as I have previously explained to you. Don't believe a conference is advisable or would be worthwhile at this time."

This was a time when rumors were flying fast and furiously, when all kinds of out-of-staters were making inspection trips and contacts and discussing the Anaconda papers. Friends on the staffs of the Company papers, because of my stories and my contacts with New York officials, were calling me for information. At the same time, my friends throughout the state and nation were sending me tips and suggestions in letters, telephone calls and telegrams. Definite commitments were made by some prospective purchasers. However, the word came that Lee Newspapers, an Iowa-based Midwest chain, had the inside track.

**lee executive replies**

My first contact was with Don Anderson, publisher of the Wisconsin State Journal and a Montana native, the chief Lee negotiator with Anaconda. In response to a letter, Anderson replied cordially and in March, 1959, wrote:

In both my talks with Mr. Parkinson, he did make reference to Livingston as being a possible exception to this one rule [not to sell the papers after purchase] they are laying down. If we should get the papers, and Anaconda is willing to make an exception, then I will be very glad to sit down and talk to you about it. We might be able to work out a deal. Livingston is smaller than any other property we operate, and it might be to our advantage to spend our time and attention on the other papers.

I have no commitments nor correspondence with anyone else regarding Livingston, and am perfectly willing to give you prior rights to discuss the matter over anyone who might appear in the future. It would be dishonest of me to give you any assurances beyond this. We haven't got the properties yet, we don't know the price tag on them, and hence we haven't been able to get them.

There certainly is a possibility, however, that you and I might be able to work something out..."

On April 27, Anderson indicated a decision by Anaconda would be made in the next few weeks, and another informant on May 1 indicated it would be in two weeks. Anderson wrote again May 11, indicating he was "quietly biding my time."

On the basis of confidential information and confident—because of correspondence with Anderson—I wrote to Parkinson May 23 congratulating him on the sale to the Lee Group. But when Don Anderson finally was reached by telephone May 24, all the friendliness and the promises in confidential correspondence seemingly went out the window. He expressed great surprise that I knew about the sale ahead of the actual announcement and said something about "protecting the jobs of the Enterprise staff."

On May 27, I wrote to Parkinson: "My letter of May 23 was written prior to a telephone conversation with Don Anderson on Sunday, May 24. Twas then I learned the facts of life—I had been conveniently dangled by you both as a sucker."

Despite the run-around, the Park County News didn't become a crying towel. On May 28, 1959, our editorial was headlined, "ANACONDA SELLING NEWSPAPERS TO OUT-OF-STATE CHAIN WITH NO CHANCE FOR HOMEFOLK." But our headline June 4, despite our disappointment at broken promises, read: "ANACONDA CO.'S SALE OF MONTANA NEWSPAPERS TO MIDWEST CHAIN MARKS BEGINNING OF NEW ERA IN JOURNALISM IN TREASURE STATE." A subhead said: "New Owners Could Provide Spark for Progress to Initiate New Era in Developing More Opportunity."

Our editorial headline: "NEWS JUST DIDN'T HAVE CHANCE IN BUSINESS GAME OF CHECKERS PRECEDING SALE OF NEWSPAPERS."

The editorial included this comment:

Less than 10 days ago a hope was shattered into bits when Dr. Jekyll turned out to be Mr. Hyde. Faith in some people may shatter, but faith in all people never. Big and little business, big labor or big government, dictators or overlords may ignore little fellows, thinking they alone have all the answers, but there's a day of reckoning. Sometimes their own associates catch up with them.
"There is a definite need for cooperation, not concentration"

The attitude of the new Lee management in Montana was one of gloating and laughing up its sleeve at the Park County News. The handwriting of "failure" was on the wall. In 1961, following the offer of a job, I made another offer or gesture to "buy or sell" to the Lee chain, got an indication of great interest, then suddenly complete disinterest without the courtesy of a reply.

In 1966, a group in Bozeman urged consideration of a proposal to take over a weekly newspaper there. At that time, the editor and owner of the "failing" weekly newspaper in Bozeman got in touch with Don Anderson, a Bozeman native who spends his summer vacations there. Anderson, knowing that the Park County News was being urged to take over in Bozeman, arranged, through an attorney, a meeting with the News editor at which the proposal was made that the Lee papers might be interested in taking over the Park County News in Livingston if I would take over the Bozeman paper. However, a short time later I suffered a heart attack and was on the sidelines for several months.

Subsequently—in the light of the previous discussion and while convalescing—it was necessary that the Livingston Enterprise business manager and I meet on a joint promotional effort for a bank opening. During that meeting, we discussed my health, the possibility of working out something along the lines suggested by Anderson and even suggested that I would be willing until retirement (less than two years) to write a daily column for the consolidated Livingston papers. He assured me he would get "responsible" Lee executives to meet with me, but there never has been a word since.

Since the Lee chain purchased the Anaconda dailies, there has been no earth-shaking news-gathering revolution. A weekly newspaper, the Columbia Falls Hungry Horse News, edited by Mel Ruder, won a coveted Pulitzer Prize.

The Great Falls Tribune has been sold to the Cowles interests, publishers of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune and other newspapers and publications. Under the new publisher, Bill Cordingley, the Great Falls Tribune is even more aggressive and outspoken for the good of Montana than it was under the previous management.

The ability of United Press International as a competitor to the Associated Press has been diminished, with all Montana daily newspapers now subscribing to the Associated Press. But the Lee newspapers do have two roving correspondents based in Helena, and their columns appear in all the Lee papers in Montana.

When Gov. Tim Babcock called a press conference last year for the weekly press, the news coverage carefully omitted my name, although I opened the questioning on the highly controversial sales tax issue. Then at the start of the 1967 state legislative session, the concluding talk on "Executive-Leadership Relationships" was given by me. There was no mention of the talk, which won high praise from many legislators and other observers, in the daily press or wire service reports.

Again, a report on the joint Wyoming, Idaho and Montana effort to provide all-winter travel in Yellowstone National Park never was publicized, although the report was sent to the wire services. The project was endorsed by the congressional delegations of the three states, by the three governors and by the Montana governor's representatives on an interagency committee. Perhaps—because the Park County News editor was one of the initiators of the tri-state effort and was an appointee as a Montana representative, along with a prominent state senator—the report had no merit.

To conclude, there is a definite need for cooperation, not concentration or special privilege, among newspaper publishers. Surely newspapers that have idle press time could more efficiently print newspapers for satellite communities at a price within reason, not a holdup. The benefits of modernization in typesetting and reproduction should be shared by all. The cost is often too prohibitive for an individual weekly publisher, particularly one who does not have the benefit of the research and studies such as those prepared by the American Newspaper Publishers Association and other groups.

Not too long ago an official of the Lee newspapers quoted from a study that indicated the average age of members of the International Typographical Union was 53 years. I do not know whether or not this is true, but from the standpoint of one who has been endeavoring to recruit printers with a knowledge of offset, rather than just linotype operators, it has been most difficult.

It would seem as if the International Typographical Union could develop a more realistic apprenticeship program—one under which an apprentice would have to take technical vocational training in an approved school. Perhaps, also, the apprenticeship program could be shortened, provided adequate vocational training was substituted. At present we have to recruit from a nonunion area someone who has a certain number of years experience in a shop, regardless of the type of shop, have him become a member of the union, then pay union wages while he unlearns what's wrong and learns the new process. After he acquires union status, he often wants to move to a place where wages are higher still.

impact of wage rates

The I.T.U., the American Newspaper Guild and the other printing trade unions may be able to get higher and higher wages in the metropolitan areas, but with each increase there is a toll of "failing newspapers" in the hinter-
land as well. Surely, anyone who has served the cause of labor recognizes the absolute need for collective bargaining. Yet, a privilege carries with it a responsibility. An I.T.U. representative recently gave me a ray of hope.

Then there is a challenge to the printing machinery industry to provide equipment that is sensible, practical and reasonable, plus the service to back it up. Several years ago we bought a press. It didn’t work out as promised. The manufacturer sent from the East Coast the vice president in charge of design and a service man. They worked on it for two days, discovered what was wrong and sent a man to install new parts. Because of that previous experience, we bought from a dealer for the same company another press, but the same promises of service and instruction of our personnel were just promises.

In today’s complexities—international, national, and at the state and local levels—the need is for greater, not less, dissemination of the printed word. There is a need for more expressions of varying viewpoints, more understanding and questioning of the actions of big business, big labor and big government. The little fellow needs more publications to interpret his needs, his hopes and his aspirations.

You senators certainly would resist any curb on your powers from either the executive or another legislative branch. Likewise, we weekly newspaper publishers want no curbs to our right of self-expression by a Congressional grant of special privileges to chain or powerful daily newspapers.

It is my sincere hope this distinguished committee will not permit a greater concentration with the power to curb further freedom of the press such as would be possible under Senate Bill 1312. Thank you.

---

**Missoula’s First TV Station**

By Raymond G. Dilley*

A. J. Mosby, a pioneer Montana radio broadcaster, started the first television station in the university town of Missoula. He had made a lengthy study of television programming and equipment and, when it appeared a station might be successful in Missoula, he began to search for a transmitter location on one of the nearby mountains. He determined that an unnamed peak north of the city would be a suitable site. Later, it was dubbed appropriately TV Mountain.

Work began on an access road and, in the spring of 1954, concrete was poured for the transmitter building and antenna foundations. Mosby recalls that the construction crews never had been on snow-covered mountain roads and “were scared to death. Of course there were deer, elk and brown bear running around. They had quite an exciting time. They brought cameras with them and the story got into some of their trade magazines.”

On July 1, 1954, KGVO-TV went on the air, but not without a few tense moments just prior to air time. The mayor and other local dignitaries had been taken to the top of TV Mountain in an old bus Mosby had bought to take his employees to work each day. At 3:30 p.m., 30 minutes before air time, the dignitaries were going over their speeches and a piano was being tuned in the studio. Then an engineer discovered no one had remembered to bring a studio microphone. Fortunately, one was in the transmitter room for the announcer, and everyone helped convert a corner of that room into a studio. Mosby said: “We were all busy with knives scraping off wires and sort of splicing them together. By four o’clock, we got the thing on the air. We then introduced all the hotshots in town who wished us well. It was quite exciting and quite a scramble.”

After one winter of daily trips up TV Mountain, the bus began to break down frequently. It had become apparent that the mountain-top studio was impractical, so Mosby offered to buy the American Legion Hall, a Missoula building that had been vacant for some time. As Mosby was meeting with the owners of the building at a nearby restaurant, they heard a fire siren, dashed outside and watched as firemen battled flames in the American Legion Hall. A year later, when the hall was repaired and reconditioned, KGVO-TV moved in.

In 1958, the station—renamed KMSO-TV—proudly announced it would teletcast the World Series using a new microwave system. Considerable money was spent to advertise on radio and in the local newspapers. But on the day of the opening game, no one in Missoula could get a clear picture. A herringbone pattern appeared as interference across television screens.
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Mosby immediately called in an FCC inspector, who found a jamming device in a small rented chicken coop in the Rattlesnake area near a translator. Mosby described this scene as he and the inspector approached the chicken coop, which had been converted to a slaughter house: “There was some smoke coming out of the building so I hollered. A fellow came out wearing a rubber apron and he had the innards of a cow wrapped around him. This guy said he didn’t know anything about it. Then the federal man spoke up and said he was a representative of the United States Government, and he could be thrown in the hoosegow if he didn’t tell. Well, he opened up...” Mosby and the FCC inspector determined that the jamming device was picking up the KMSO-TV signal and rebroadcasting it on Channel 4, the Butte frequency. The Butte translator then rebroadcast both Channel 4 signals on Channel 11. That apparently caused the translator to operate off frequency, affecting the signal on Channel 13.

In the spring of 1963, Mosby purchased a $100,000 RCA antenna. The installation proceeded smoothly until workmen lifted the top section into place. Then a jin pole snapped and the entire antenna fell on the old one, destroying both.

Charles E. Meyer, chief engineer for KMSO-TV, described his telephone call to RCA: “I called the RCA man who had sold us the antenna. I told him we needed a new light for the top of the tower. He said, ‘What for. The one we gave you was all right. Did you break it?’ I said, ‘It broke a little when they dropped the antenna.’ There was a long silence on the other end. Then a gasp and he said, ‘You’re putting me on.’ ”

*Excerpts from Raymond G. Dilley, “The Development of Television in Montana,” unpublished master’s thesis, University of Montana, 1966. Mr. Dilley, who earned a bachelor’s degree from the University of Vermont and a master’s degree from the Montana School of Journalism, is director of in-school services for the Vermont Educational Television Network.
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A LEE EXECUTIVE’S RESPONSE: THE ECONOMICS OF SUCCESS

By DON ANDERSON

This article was written at the request of Montana Journalism Review to provide a response to the preceding commentary by Fred J. Martin. Mr. Anderson, a native Montanan, is a vice president of Lee Enterprises, Inc., which owns five Montana and nine Midwestern newspapers. He is publisher of the Wisconsin State Journal at Madison and from 1959 to 1967 was president of the Lee Newspapers of Montana. He became interested in journalism as a high school editor in Bozeman and later worked on the weekly and daily newspapers in that city. After a short tour of duty in World War I, he worked as a reporter for the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times. He attended Montana State University at Bozeman and the University of Wisconsin. In 1923, while a student in the Wisconsin journalism school, he went to work for the Wisconsin State Journal and subsequently served as reporter, Sunday editor, city editor, managing editor and business manager. Mr. Anderson is a former president of the Inland Daily Press, a trade group of more than 500 newspapers. He is a life member of the Butte Press Club.

An admission of failure is not pleasant reading. It is sad that the American system that produces so many success stories also has witnessed some that failed.

Mr. Martin does not do justice to himself in his testimony. A larger arena in which to play his game, a bigger paying audience in the stands, more talented players and better equipment for his team and the final score might have been in his favor.

Certainly his lifetime of hard work and devotion to his craft entitle him to a more deserving finale.

It may not give him much comfort to know he has company, but it is a fact that the small, independent, family-owned and operated business faces an increasing struggle for survival. Today's changing business scene portrays this too often. No one yet has offered a satisfactory solution. The small neighborhood grocery, the small drugstore and the small family farm all are having trouble keeping alive. The small weekly newspaper too often has the same difficulty. It is tragic, because these institutions have played important roles in the history of our country.

Daily newspapers, working against some of those same odds and faced with the same inevitable failures, have approached the problem by the route of corporate reorganization. I do not know who was first to experiment with this method, but by the 1920s and 1930s it had become a fairly common device.

Competing daily papers, each trying to save its own editorial voice and opinion, began to pool mechanical equipment and commercial energies and to publish two newspapers at a single plant. The method succeeded and today many American cities have two editorial voices rather than the one destined under the old cutthroat competitive system. Corporate reorganization stemmed from the economic fact that few American cities can afford the luxury of two mechanical plants, sales forces and business offices. Dozens of newspapers failed, and their cities were reduced to a single newspaper. Consolidation or merger saved many others.

The economic squeeze has reduced the number of newspaper owners even in our larger cities to one or two. The papers in Chicago and Los Angeles are two-ownership publications. San Francisco has two ownerships but a single publishing plant. Milwaukee, Louisville and Indianapolis have one-ownership newspapers. The consolidation or merger device has preserved two newspapers in many other cities. Tucson, Ariz., where the current monopoly controversy started, presents a good example.

The Tucson Arizona Star was in sound fiscal condition. The Tucson Citizen was floundering. It had lost money and faced bankruptcy. In 1940 the two papers merged their business and mechanical departments, moved into one building and created an agency company to publish both papers. News and editorial direction remained in the province of the
original companies. The result has been financial success for both. Many observers see something more important—Tucson was assured two newspaper points of view, two editorial opinions.

The Department of Justice prosecuted monopoly charges against newspapers in New Orleans and Kansas City, Mo., some years ago. The mergers of all the others apparently had the blessing, or at least the acquiescence, of the department until the Tucson case in 1965.

The owners of the Arizona Star, no longer interested in the active publishing of the paper, agreed to sell to the Brush-Moore Group of papers with headquarters in Ohio. The Small family, owners of the Tucson Citizen, exercised a contractual right of prior purchase. On Jan. 5, 1965, the Department of Justice started action in the Federal District court of Arizona to prevent such a sale and to prosecute on the grounds of violation of the laws prohibiting monopoly based on the original merger. The sale subsequently was permitted. On Jan. 31, 1968, Federal Judge James Walsh of Tucson ordered William Small Jr. to sell the Arizona Star and ruled that the 1940 agreement between the papers was “illegal per se under Section 1 of the Sherman Act.” The so-called “Failing Newspaper Act” was introduced to preserve the Tucson situation and many others like it.

**bill widely supported, opposed**

The bill has been widely supported and widely opposed. An important amendment, it is hoped, will meet many of the objections to the original bill. The proponents say the bill will help halt the decline in the number of American newspapers. Some critics argue: If a newspaper cannot succeed in competition, let it fail and make way for some new entrepreneur with new capital to take its place. This, they claim, is the American way. They overlook an important fact. Readers show a growing tendency to support the stronger of a community’s two newspapers. Newcomers have little chance of survival against a well-established paper with a built-in audience. Reader habit, one of a newspaper’s great assets, augurs in favor of the one already operating. The Oklahoma City Journal is the one exception I know of in recent newspaper history, and it has survived only because Publisher Atkinson had large financial resources in his nearly four-year fight for survival. Recent efforts to start newspapers in Atlanta and Phoenix failed.

Mr. Martin testified about the Livingston situation. It is the only Montana city I know of where such a problem exists. Montana communities have not had competing dailies for years. In a few, the daily and weekly papers exist side by side and seem to get along well. The “Failing Newspaper Act” is the one means that would permit the merger or sale Mr. Martin seems to desire. Without such legislation, and considering the present climate in the Department of Justice, the thriving daily in Livingston would not dare be a party to such a venture.

This is a problem for more than the newspaper business. The technical and management revolutions that so profoundly affect today’s newspapers differ only in degree from the revolution that stirs every other segment of the American economy. Changes in culture and society may have had a greater impact on newspapers than on other businesses, but in pure economics, the newspaper is compelled to face the realities of a changing world just as any other business, be it a grocery or a bank. Deplore it if you will, and for good or bad, change is here, and it deeply affects every newspaper and the personal and business life of every man in the newspaper business.

Newspapers and commercial printing for years lagged behind other industries in discovery and development of modern machines and technology. During the 1930s, a change in the attitudes and demands of organized labor encouraged new inventions and improvements on old processes. After World War II, this movement began to snowball and now rapidly is changing the form and character of newspaper mechanics. Methods of financing changed as older techniques became inadequate. Today’s publisher must know, or have access to, someone who knows and understands the modern money market—where and how money best can be obtained to finance the cost of modernizing his plant.

Today’s editing and business management call for a new school of practitioners. Years ago a competent attorney reaching the end of a long career could say: “I know the law.” A doctor: “I know medicine.” An editor or publisher: “I know newspapering.” That cannot be said with accuracy today by anyone in those fields. A publisher must face problems in taxes, labor, personnel, marketing, finance. No man can know it all.

Today’s business manager must understand today’s machines. Offset presses, the cameras and chemistry of photo composition, hot-metal pasteup and computers rapidly are taking over the earlier world of linotype and letterpress. Using them effectively is a must for both executive and employee.

An editor must understand a lot of things about a lot of things. On a big or little paper, he must thoroughly understand the social and economic status and future of his community.

The only quality these new top executives have in common with their predecessors is the “flair for management,” that invaluable ingredient that sets the pattern of any successful venture.

Another quality that determines success or failure, or even survival, is the ability to meet modern competition. The casual observer who sees the increase of one-newspaper cities often assumes competition is dying in the newspaper world. Wrong. There is more competition today for the advertising dollar than ever before. Radio, television, CATV, magazines, billboards, mail order and telephone solicitation fight for a slice of advertising. This has created a demand and need for new goods and services and has built bigger advertising budgets in every facet of industry and distribution. But the laggard will lose his place in the line if he fails to battle for his share.

There is more competition today for the reader’s time and
attention than ever before. Newspapers generally have lost none of their audience. In fact, the newspaper reading audience in the form of paid subscribers has grown. What newspapers have lost is some of their readers' time. With magazines, books, outdoor recreation and busier community lives competing actively for the time of every American, people do not have the leisure they once had to read newspapers. In 1927 I helped conduct a survey of rural mail boxes in my county. We discovered that in more than 70 per cent of the rural homes, the daily or weekly newspaper was the only printed material that regularly reached the farm family. Look in today's mail box and you will see how that has changed.

Alert editors and publishers have solved the problem by printing more lively newspapers, by writing in greater depth about important subjects, by encouraging controversy on subjects that deserve it. They have made their papers more interesting with livelier and more up-to-date news, with better typography and better news pictures. The old-school Chesterfieldian essay-type editorial nearly has vanished. To-day's readers want their editor's opinion in a few succinct paragraphs. They want a greater variety of editorial thought than the pioneer editor could provide. They expect some entertainment with the meat and potatoes of hard news.

new formula required

All this demands a new formula in editing and publishing newspapers. With one or two men unable to possess all the necessary knowledge and skills, there is a rapidly increasing growth in team effort—groups usually of young men skilled in special segments of newspapering. There always has been, and always will be, someone at the top who makes the final decision, the last guess. But his responsibility is being bolstered today by cadres of young professionals who have great knowledge about the highly specialized divisions of newspapering. You will find them in growing numbers in news and editorial rooms, business offices, mechanical departments.

Today's political reporter often has his master's in political science, the editorial writer may be qualified to teach history at the college level, the mechanical superintendent might have a degree in industrial engineering. Dozens of newspaper personnel managers are graduate psychologists.

This growing trend is producing more aggressive and more competent newspapers, better written and more efficiently produced than ever before. If you doubt it, go to the library and pore over the old files. Except for possibly better proofreading, you'll discover the old-timers were not as good—certainly not good enough to meet reader demands today.

This whole revolution has created a growing number of newspaper groups. The group idea is not new. Hearst and Scripps-Howard established groups more than a half century ago. However, their old concept—a number of newspapers under a central control that directed both the business and policy-making—is fading. Each of those old groups has fewer newspapers than it had 25 years ago; neither is as important in the over-all newspaper world as it once was, despite the ownership of a few strong individual papers.

The revolution has caused many collections of small- and medium-size papers. They are papers that found it desirable to join others for success and survival. Big metropolitan dailies can afford the luxury of their own crew of experts. The smaller papers cannot, so they have joined to pool the skills of the editorial and news experts, the tax and finance specialists and the production and labor professionals so necessary today.

Lee Newspapers, on whose team I have played for nearly a half century, is one of these groups. I can speak of it with authority because I have been one of its publishers and officers long enough to know its philosophy, having helped form some of it.

The Lee Group started in the 1890s with a few small Iowa dailies. By 1959 it comprised nine daily newspapers in five Midwestern states: Iowa, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Missouri and Illinois. There were radio and television stations in Iowa and Illinois and partial ownership in three others in Nebraska, Minnesota and Wisconsin. Each property was separately incorporated and directed by its own local management. About all that tied them together was a generally common ownership, although this varied from city to city.

In 1959 Lee was the successful bidder for the Anaconda Company newspapers in six Montana cities. It offered us an exciting challenge, not so much to make money as to take a bigger stride in the newspaper world—to give six new communities better newspapers. One almost has to be a newspaperman to understand this, but it's basic to our entire professional lives. Without it, we could find easier and possibly more lucrative ways to make a living. With it, we enjoy as many satisfactions as in any other job in the world.

To meet the challenge in Montana, we had to grow up, to become modern, to get our house in order. First we merged our companies. This was done to simplify the financing of the Montana purchase, to get the best money rates, to systematize our routines. Figures can be understood better if all books are kept by the same system. Successful methods could be shared better with fellow publishers; unsuccessful ones could be avoided.

Through it all ran a policy of improving employe and management welfare. For example, some of our new Montana properties had pension programs, others did not. There was a variety of other fringe benefits—savings plans and insurance programs. We wanted uniformity and adequacy of living and working conditions for every Lee employe, and that could best be achieved if we were under one roof.
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As important, we knew the success of our venture depended on the quality and skill of our manpower. We wanted to increase the responsibilities and rewards of those who performed well in key positions. We wanted growth opportunities for promising youngsters. We knew we must attract the best of today’s young men and women to operate our newspapers and radio-television properties tomorrow, and that we must give them adequate training and experience. One of our first steps was to initiate a comprehensive training program. In the past nine years, about 30 young men have gone through the program and are in positions of management or ready for them.

Lee has in Davenport, Iowa, a center office with a general manager who has experience in most phases of newspapering. There is a mechanical expert, who understands new machines and processes; a personnel manager; a marketing and advertising specialist; a certified public accountant. Those men are subject to call for expert advice at any time and are only as far from every Lee editor or publisher as the nearest telephone.

There is no news or editorial man in that list of experts. Lee believes the setting of news and editorial policy and procedure is entirely a matter for local management. No editor ever is told what issues he should support, which candidates he should try to elect or defeat. No two communities have the same opportunities and problems. The man on the scene is best qualified to decide what is best for his city and his newspaper. No two Lee papers look alike or think alike.

I have worked as an editor or publisher of a Lee paper since 1923, and no one at headquarters ever has told me what to print. Like every other head of one of our papers, I have been my own man. The faults in my paper have been my faults; the strengths, my strengths.

We pay great attention to the reading content of our papers but only in the area of techniques. We hire the best experts available to advise us on better methods—better coverage of important stories, better writing, better balance in news and features, better digging on background for editorials, better news photos.

A news and editorial board represents all Lee newspapers. The editors elect their own members. It is on the same level of importance as the divisional operations board, which concerns itself with business matters. The news board meets four times a year, and its committees meet whenever they feel a need to do so. Once a year all the editors gather to talk shop. Leading authorities in many fields are invited to speak. What they have said has had a strong impact on editorial policies.

At one meeting, in Helena, Mike Mansfield, Senate majority leader, came from Washington to talk about Southeast Asia. In 1966, the editors, meeting at Iowa State University, heard about the new world of science. In 1968, the editors will meet in Billings for a discussion of new production processes and how they affect the reporter and editor. Each paper is encouraged to send staff members to the American Press Institute seminars at Columbia University. Lee editors belong to professional societies concerned with their problems.

Every Lee newspaper must stand on its own feet, meet its own expenses, pay for its own improvements. None lives on the benevolence of another. The measure of quality and performance is gauged by the skills of its management and the economic base of its community. Lee can arrange financing, but the newspaper must liquidate it. Lee can lend manpower and talent, but the paper getting it must pay for it. The center office can give advice when it is requested, but each paper’s management fee supports that office. No one rides free, because we believe a subsidized press is neither free nor responsible.

Lee is owned mostly by people who operate its various newspapers and radio-television stations or by families that once were in that position. The biggest single stock ownership by an individual or family is less than 15 per cent. Lee stock is widely distributed among our employees.

Only one thing all of us are—newspapermen.

We prefer that our people do not run for public office or hold directorships of banks or other commercial ventures, because of the possibility of conflict with our basic interest in publishing newspapers. We do expect our people to be good citizens in their communities, to fill roles of leadership wherever possible, to accept purely civic jobs, to stand up and be counted on important issues affecting their cities.

the nine-year record

Lee is proud of its nine-year record in Montana. Prior to June, 1959, the Anaconda Company owned a majority of Montana’s daily newspapers. It had acquired or founded them in the early years of the Company, when business and industry considered it important to have newspapers to wage their political wars.

In 1958, Anaconda officers, realizing their major concern was with the mining and processing of metals, decided that to publish newspapers was an anachronism. Expressing a feeling of responsibility to the people of Montana, Anaconda sought a buyer it felt could best meet this responsibility. The Lee Group was chosen because it had a broad background of experience in publishing papers in communities the size of those in Montana. No strings were attached to the sale. Anaconda expressed the hope its newspapers could be bought as a unit and that the buyer would publish in each city as long as it profitably could.

The Company probably hoped that Lee would treat the former owner as fairly as it treated other businesses in the state. Any company that is doing anything, like any individual, makes mistakes. The Anaconda Company has erred at times. The Company is Montana’s biggest industrial unit. When a Lee editor has felt that Anaconda has been wrong, his paper has said so. In the face of criticism, no responsible Anaconda official has tried to bring pressure on the newspapers to change policy. Montana editors live and work today in a climate as free as that anywhere in America.

In the nine years of ownership, we have given our communities better and more responsible newspapers. The im-
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“We do not aspire to be the biggest or the richest”

Improvement program will continue. When we took over, the manpower pool on the job was assessed and the strongest men assigned to new positions of responsibility. Little infusion of out-of-state talent was required. To our great satisfaction, we found able young men in the Midwest to strengthen our Montana papers. A few who mastered their craft in Montana now are giving strength to our Midwest papers. This spirit of reciprocity has improved all our papers and has opened many better jobs to deserving journalists.

Every news staff has been bolstered by receiving better educated and better trained reporters and editors. For the first time, every paper acquired a staff photographer. Wire-photo services were installed in the four biggest papers. A capital news bureau was established with veteran and skilled reporters.

The papers are linked by a telephone hot line over which editors and reporters can exchange information and suggestions. An important story breaking in one city, with angles of interest to others, can be relayed in minutes by lifting a receiver. The editors hold a weekly telephone conference to discuss state stories and plan cooperation in further developing the news. This line is used for facsimile transmission of pictures and TWX. Soon the Missoulian will be using the line for Dataspread contact with the computer in Billings for the setting of type in Missoula.


The building in Butte has been remodelled. Helena is to have new press units this summer. Missoula is converting to offset and photo composition. Livingston, the smallest of our papers, has moved into a new plant with photo composition and offset press. When Billings completes its investment in new equipment and building, that Montana city will have one of the most modern newspaper plants in America.

Lee’s contribution to better journalism in Montana is only part of the picture. Farsighted and aggressive weekly papers are fighting to maintain their important position in the communication world and are succeeding. Mel Ruder’s excellent Hungry Horse News is a profitable enterprise in Columbia Falls, one of Montana’s smallest communities. Three years ago it won a Pulitzer Prize for excellence of performance on a big news story. Cut Bank’s tri-weekly is a strong voice in state affairs. The weekly Gallatin Country Tribune in Bozeman has come to life under new owners and shows promising signs of survival and profit. Those are some of the successes in the weekly field.

The Great Falls Tribune, long one of the state’s good dailies, has improved its product and strengthened its position under new owners, the Cowles organization. The Miles City Star, under new ownership, is giving that city a stronger newspaper. Kalispell’s Inter Lake is an attractive evening and Sunday daily, printed by photo composition and offset in a new plant.

Newspapering is looking up on the Old Frontier, and we of Lee are happy to be a part of it.

America is not static. To survive and flourish, a newspaper cannot stand still. We intend to have our newspapers keep up with change and even lead the parade. We do not aspire to be the biggest or the richest newspaper group. We would like to be the best.

Our Favorite News Item

The late Miles R. Wing, who was laid to rest yesterday, under the auspices of the Sherman and Reed Burial association, was only a member of this society thirty days. It guarantees to its members a $175 funeral.

From the “Butte in Brief” column in the Butte Miner, Nov. 13, 1903, p. 7.
LET'S HEAR IT FOR SHIGELLA:
THE SCIENCE STORY SHUFFLE

By CHERYL S. HUTCHINSON

Miss Hutchinson, a 1966 graduate of the Montana School of Journalism, was an associate editor of the University's student daily, the Montana Kaimin. She has worked as a reporter for the Butte Montana Standard and the Missoula Missoulian. Since June, 1966, she has been publications editor in the University of Montana Information Services office. This article is based on a report submitted by Miss Hutchinson for graduate credit during the 1967 summer session in the course Mass Media in Modern Society. She decries what she terms inadequate interpretation of facts in science stories, and she suggests methods to improve the readability and facilitate the understanding of news stories about faculty research projects.

The headline “What Was That Again?” in the June 16, 1967, Spokane Spokesman-Review topped a story that described a $21,400 grant for “support of research entitled ‘Permian Shelf Carbonate Facies and Microfauna, Western Phosphate Province.’”

The researcher planned to study the “relatively unknown microfaunas of the Permian Period, 200 to 250 million B.C., and their relationship to the origin of phosphate deposits in western phosphate areas of western Montana, Wyoming, Idaho and Utah.” The story, based on a university news release, was characteristic of the plethora of science news items that must, indeed, confuse the so-called average reader.

Most universities lack enough information services employees to report in depth and to interpret adequately the science news that originates on campuses. Many information staffs are restricted by time and manpower limitations to an occasional feature article about an unusual research project.

Spot reporting of research endeavors at the University of Montana has included announcements that professors are “finding a cure for Trypanosoma cruzi,” “researching the pathogenicity of Shigella,” “working on hydrological data acquisition through remote reconnaissance systems” and “exploring the electrolytic reduction of the carbon-oxygen single bond.” Attempts have been made to explain the technical terms, but many explanations become as involved and as complex as the titles of the projects. Readers are bewildered by the stories. Worse yet, they rapidly may become uninterested in them.

Concern over the dissemination and interpretation of science news stories is not a recent development. In 1963, Leland J. Haworth, director of the National Science Foundation, said that scientists often had satisfied ourselves that we have told the citizen of our activities by repeating our own shoptalk and catch phrases in our public appearances and press releases. When asked for further details, we have gratuitously provided copies of our highly condensed and sophisticated technical papers and let the matter drop.

Another statement by Haworth raises an important question: Does the reader want to know more about scientific research? Haworth’s answer:

I am convinced that the citizen wants to know more about our scientific achievements. Certainly he deserves to do so. In the final analysis, the labor and toil of the citizen have paid for the freedom of the scientist to conduct research with dignity and honor. Do we not owe that citizen, as his right, some part of our time to assist him to enjoy the thrills of better understanding of the fundamental principles of nature and of the impact that science has on his daily life and on world affairs?

Alton Blakeslee of the Associated Press has said:

Each citizen has a great stake in the progress of science. It is affecting him personally. It is creating choices which he must help make in a democracy. He has a voice in how well science shall be supported through tax funds, or through encouraging more and more young men and women to enter careers to maintain and nourish
Universities clearly are obligated to convey scientific information to the public. William K. Stuckey, science editor at Northwestern University, gave these reasons for the need to disseminate news about scientific research: Universities owe the public, the tuition-paying parents and faithful alumni an explanation about what is going on in those messy laboratories and ominous computer installations; most universities are not looking for additional students, but they are constantly searching for the brightest ones as well as for the best instructors; common to any public institution is the obligation to tell the taxpayer what is happening to those federal research dollars that finance the vast majority of university science activities in the United States today.4

When science is becoming more important, when science news must be reported to inform the public and when universities increasingly are becoming involved in scientific research projects, what role should be assigned to the university public-relations department? Brent Breedin of the American College Public Relations Association has said that science needs public-relations help, adding: “The nation’s scientific community must realize there is no Santa Claus.”5 He quoted presidential science advisers Donald F. Hornig and Ivan Bennett, who said: “The scientific community is going to have to learn to articulate its hopes . . . to express the excitement of the new intellectual thrusts—but to do these in terms which the American people, who are expected to pay the bill, will gradually understand and have faith in.”6

Referring to news writers and their difficulties with professors, Stuckey said it is easy to become convinced that “few academicians are interested in press coverage unless the facts are expressed in mathematical Latin and are heavily qualified to prove that nothing really important happened.”7 He labeled that the “scientific dignity-protective obscurity syndrome.”8

Cletis Pride, director of the news service at Duke University, pointed out another difficulty: “The professor often seems to resent the mere suggestion that his complex research project . . . can be put into words the public will understand. In an attempt to please him, the newsman sometimes writes a story that can be understood only by another professor in the same narrow discipline.”9

Interpretation and explanation are mandatory, however, for adequate coverage of scientific projects and findings. Earl Ubell, former science editor of the New York Herald Tribune, suggested that writers should “make definitions organic to the story we are telling rather than separate them out as a dictionary might.”10 He said science writers are aware that the public has an interest in science but also has a deep ignorance concerning some of the basic concepts of science; consequently, the writer should “hesitate to use in a newspaper such terms as magnetism, atom particles, X-rays, enzymes and even proteins without appending in some way a useful definition of these terms.”11

**Guidelines offered**

Many guidelines for writing general news stories are useful to the science writer. John Foster Jr., for example, has offered these suggestions: Avoid writing down to the so-called lowest common denominator, the now infamous 12-year-old level; develop a clear mental picture of a particular person and write to that one reader; deal with concrete rather than abstract words, and reduce the number of ideas per sentence.12

The information staff at Northwestern University concentrates on the newspaper science story that reports either on completed research or on research which has reached some sort of definitive stage. The best time peg for this type of story is the mailing or publication date of a scientific journal in which the research results are reported or the date on which the results are officially presented in a paper at a professional meeting.13

The Northwestern science editor avoids stories about research that is just starting—the award of a grant, for example—unless the amount of the stipend or the unusual nature of the project is particularly newsworthy. He has noted that “editors appreciate knowing that you are not deluging them with relatively insignificant stories of limited interest.”14

Ubell recommends the use of photographs to increase interest in science news, but he contends that pictorial coverage is hindered by what he terms a serious difficulty:

In modern science that which is newsworthy is usually microscopic or immense—atoms, cells, galaxies. Rockets and space vehicles, the visible aspects of modern technology, have now become clichés. Thus the nature of the material eludes the mainstay of pictorial representation in newspapers: the news photographer. He is driven to photographing the usually white-coated scientist bending over a microscope or standing in front of a piece of incomprehensible machinery.

In this effort, newspapers could use more drawings and other illustrative art material. Yet the deadline works against preparation of illustrative material, since it takes a science writer’s time to explain to the artist what must

---

7_Ibid._
8Stuckey, _loc. cit._
9_Ibid._
11Ibid.
be done. I visualize a future time when it will be possible to assign to science departments of news services or to the large metropolitan newspapers "science artists" whose main job it will be to run down good illustrative material for daily and Sunday science articles.\(^5\)

How can the university information staff improve and increase the coverage of research projects? Here are some methods that have been used with success:

**Invitations to local newsman.** The information staff can encourage local reporters and wire service newsman to visit the campus for interviews with researchers. Most city editors, of course, are well aware of the story possibilities at the nearest campus. An invitation to pursue a specific story often will prompt the editor to send a reporter to the university.

**Science columns.** At Ohio State University, the information staff prepares a weekly science column that is sent to 120 newspapers in the state. The column is an effort "to reach the intermediate-sized and smaller newspapers with significant and exciting stories of the university's science and research programs." Described as an in-depth but non-technical column, it is sent only to editors who said they would like to receive it.\(^6\)

**Articles in trade magazines.** Editors of trade magazines are eager to examine articles of special interest to their readers. Some will send a writer to a campus; others prefer to correspond directly with the professor in charge of a research project. The information staff can inform trade magazine editors about research activities in specialized areas.

**Newspaper Sunday magazines.** The growth of newspaper Sunday magazines has resulted in an estimable market for articles about scientific research. Some of these magazines contain sections devoted to science and research. Many, if informed about a significant research project, will invite the professor to submit an article.

**Campus publications.** Kelvin J. Arden, director of publications at Cornell University, and William J. Whalen, publications editor at Purdue University, have stressed the importance of research stories in university house organs.\(^7\) The faculty and staff magazine and the alumni magazine are ideal publications for such articles. Purdue University publishes a periodical entitled "People . . . They Make a University Great." It focuses on the researcher instead of on the research project.

**Broadcast media.** The opportunities to describe and portray research activities on radio and television need no detailed description. Such coverage has obvious advantages and disadvantages, but it invariably is valuable in telling the science story.

A parallel expansion of science and the need for science reporting has occurred in recent years. But the mass media are not responding adequately to the challenges presented by dramatic discoveries and promising new theories in astronomy, medicine, metallurgy and numerous other fields. University information staffs are becoming—or soon will be forced to become—aware of the key role they can perform in getting science news to the public.

Stories that announce but do not explain grants for research on permian shelf carbonate facies and microfauna in the Western Phosphate Province do not satisfy the reader, the scientist or the university. They do not inform or educate the reader and it is unlikely that they spur public contributions for additional research. To borrow a phrase from *Life* magazine columnist Shana Alexander, such stories nothing readers to death.

---

**Our Favorite Headlines**

**Fly In Breakfast Set For Local Airport Sunday**

White Sulphur Springs (Mont.)

**Angels Beckon Judge Cardozo**

Helena (Mont.)
Independent, July 10, 1938.

---

\(^5\)Ubell, *op. cit.*, p. 298.


NO FUDGING IN MISSOULA:
A NEWSPAPER LAID OUT

By SAM REYNOLDS

This editorial, reprinted from the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian, appeared Oct. 13, 1967, during National Newspaper Week. It is presented here because it describes in a cogent, simplified manner what a newspaper is all about. Moreover, it avoids those banalities that appear so frequently in Newspaper Week editorials. Mr. Reynolds, editorial-page editor of the Missoulian since March, 1964, was a visiting lecturer at the Montana School of Journalism during the fall and winter quarters of the 1966-67 academic year and often has been a guest speaker in journalism classes. He has a bachelor's degree from the University of Wisconsin, a master's degree in Russian history from the University of Wisconsin and a master's degree from the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. From 1959 to 1964, he was an education and political writer for the Wisconsin State Journal at Madison. His article "The Conspiracy Syndrome: Newspapers and Paranoid Readers" appeared in the 1967 Montana Journalism Review.

This is National Newspaper Week, a time when newspapers modestly toodle their virtues and mutedly allow that they are not perfect.

We'll take the occasion to state some facts about the Missoulian and explain what it is and is not.

It comprises two separate parts—a business part and an editorial part—linked by the publisher, who as top man over the entire operation very successfully separates his business obligation from the paper's news and editorial responsibility.

The business part includes retail and national advertising, classified advertising, job-shop printing, circulation and the paper's own business office, which collects and spends money and keeps the books.

The business part also includes the mechanical production of the paper—the shop work involving skilled printers, stereotypers, pressmen.

The editorial part has charge of everything else: All the news, this page, the women's page, society, sports, funnies, farm—all the material in the paper that nobody pays to get into the paper.

The business part of the paper is composed of persons with a business responsibility. Their basic job is to sell services. The money they collect supports the entire operation.

The editorial part is made up of persons in the journalism profession. Their sole responsibility is to the public. They don't accept any business responsibility.

On some papers the separation of business from news is fudged. A big advertiser can get a big news story in about his doing. The editorial side thus is prostituted to gain revenue.

That is not true at the Missoulian, though some people think it is. When persons approach the editors and reporters of this paper with a story they want printed, a few of them cannot resist the temptation of saying that they advertise.

This is comparable to telling a clergyman that a money contribution to the church should get the contributor into Heaven. All it elicits from Missoulian editorial people is a reaction of pity and contempt.

If anything, the person who hints that his advertising should gain him news-space favor hurts his news chances rather than helps them because he makes the newsmen plumb mad. If you want to get on his mental queer list, wave a dollar bill at a Missoulian newsman.

The Missoulian's news and editorials are not swayed by a national political party, the John Birch Society, the Communist party, the Anaconda Company, the forest-products industry, the AFL-CIO, Montana Power Co., other Lee Newspapers or any other outside interest.

They are controlled solely by Missoulian employes. Editorial policy—the paper's own opinion—is set by the editorial board of the Missoulian and expressed by the editor of this page.

Some editorials and news stories cost the paper money by losing advertising. That is inevitable in any honest news
De Gaulle’s Faux Pas: Reaction of the French Press

By Merilee E. Fenger*

All they did, as Goodman Ace put it, was invite him to the fair to eat some cotton candy, ride a Ferris wheel, see a belly dancer, shoot some clay pigeons and act like a guest. But when Charles de Gaulle visited Canada in July, 1967, to help celebrate its centennial, he committed an international faux pas that spurred protests by newspapers throughout the world.

He shouted “Vive le Quebec libre” to a small group of separatists. He refused to display the Canadian flag on his ship as it proceeded from Pierre-et-Miquelon to Quebec City. He hailed the advent of a people who wish to take their destiny into their own hands.” He did not visit Ottawa.

Such actions resulted in a formal rebuke by the Canadian government.

From Gaulist to left, the French press condemned the verbal excesses that led to De Gaulle’s sudden return to France. The President, supported only by Communist newspapers, commented: “I don’t know whether to be more astonished by the formidable reception in Quebec or by such a hostile reaction of the French press.”

The influential *Le Monde* reported De Gaulle’s activities in its usual sober style. Editor Hubert Beuve-Méry, however, commented in an editorial that the Canadian incident was a demonstration of double standards, since the Gaullist doctrine of nonintervention seemed to apply in the Middle East and Vietnam but not in Canada, where De Gaulle himself had meddled in internal affairs.

Beuve-Méry wondered about the sudden astonishment over De Gaulle’s behavior when it had been proved long ago that he “suffers from an unhealthily over-developed ego.” He urged that De Gaulle’s “anguished” inner circle replace him and called the General’s behavior “the shipwreck of old age.”

*Le Figaro* referred to De Gaulle’s “brusque action,” “serious diplomatic defeat” and “theatrical blow.” It commented wryly: “Have confidence in the General, they declared to us each time we were not in agreement with them. He has a prophetic look that is exhaustive of things. He cannot commit errors. He has never been wrong.”

*Le Figaro* demanded an explanation for what it termed an act that would not give France the image of a president who could control himself and who knew where and how far he could go.

The right-wing *L’Aurore* said De Gaulle had spoken of “Free Quebec” and “liberation” as if Quebec were occupied by an enemy.

It asserted: “It is too obvious that this policy leads nowhere, and achieves no results. Too obvious that it can create disorder in Canada.”

*Combat*, a liberal newspaper, asked in a front-page editorial what right De Gaulle had to get involved in the internal affairs of another country, especially when Quebec had economic ties with the United States, not with France.

A pro-Gaulist newspaper, *Presse l’Intransigeant*, also criticized the General and said his “bad manners may shock. They should not surprise.”

*Le Canard Enchaîné*, a satirical newspaper aimed at intellectual liberals and anti-Gaullists, referred to De Gaulle’s “cabin in Canada” and congratulated him on being so generous—with everyone but the French. *Le Canard Enchaîné* depends more on the power of words than story placement or large headlines to attract readers, and the De Gaulle stories usually appeared under two-column, two-line headlines. The newspaper asked how a nation could give technical and economic help when that nation itself is “economically and technically delayed.”

Standing alone in its support (albeit half-hearted) of De Gaulle’s actions, the Communist *L’Humanité* argued, nevertheless, that the Gaulist government should apply the principles of nonintervention on all occasions.

The weekly magazine *Minute* suggested it might be time to invoke a constitutional provision calling for replacement of the president when he becomes disabled.

*Paris Match*, France’s Life magazine, carried a picture of De Gaulle on the cover of the Aug. 5, 1967, issue with this cutline: “The soldiers in the red tunics that De Gaulle passes in review speak French. That is one of the unusual aspects of the trip that was ended by a theatrical blow becoming an international affair.”

The magazine indicated De Gaulle’s actions were preconceived. The *Paris Match* story was headlined “L’Affaire du Canada.”

Perhaps a Quebec newspaper, the *Chronicle-Telegraph*, summed up the incident most colorfully—it termed it the “costliest, biggest, brashest bash” in Canada’s history.

*An excerpt from a report submitted by Merilee E. Fenger for the International Communications course. Miss Fenger, a senior in the Montana School of Journalism, examined most of the newspapers and magazines cited in her report.
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IN MEMORIAM—W. J. B.: REFLECTIONS ON MENCKEN’S STYLE

By JANET MAURER DOTY

Mrs. Doty, a senior in the School of Journalism, was graduated in 1965 from Power (Mont.) High School, where she was editor of the yearbook and a contributor to the Farm Journal. Academically, she ranked first in her high school senior class. During the 1966-67 school year, she served as an associate editor of the University of Montana student daily, the Montana Kaimin. This article is a condensation of a report for an advanced course in the School of Journalism. Mrs. Doty discusses certain writing techniques used by H. L. Mencken in an essay about William Jennings Bryan.

Has it been duly marked by historians that the late William Jennings Bryan’s last secular act on this globe of sin was to catch flies? A curious detail, and without its sardonic overtones. He was the most sedulous fly-catcher in American history, and in many ways the most successful. His quarry, of course, was not Musca domestica but Homo neandertalensis. For forty years he tracked it with coo and bellow, up and down the rustic backways of the Republic. Wherever the flamebeaux of Chautauqua smoked and guttered, and the bilge of Idealism ran in the veins, and Baptist pastors dammed the brooks with the sanctified, and men gathered who were weary and heavy laden, and their wives who were full of Peruna and as fecund as the shad (Alosa sapidissima)—there the indefatigable Jennings set up his traps and spread his bait. He knew every country town in the South and West, and he could crowd the most remote of them to suffocation by simply winding his horn. The city proletariat, transiently flustered by him in 1896, quickly penetrated his buncombe and would have no more of him; the cockney gallery jeered him at every Democratic national convention for twenty-five years. But out where the grass grows high, and the horned cattle dream away the lazy afternoons, and men still fear the powers and principalities of the air—out there between the corn-rows he held his old puissance to the end.

Mencken at his best—his searing, eloquent, disruptive best. Few, if any, students of writing would challenge H.L. Mencken’s control of the language or his knowledge of it. He marshaled words as Wellington marshaled men: Each struck with optimum force; together they formed a phalanx of fury.

Among Mencken’s better-known works is his caustic—sometimes satirical—essay about William Jennings Bryan. It is entitled “In Memoriam: W.J.B.” An analysis of that essay—of the content, the syntax, word usage and literary techniques—provides certain clues to what might be termed Mencken’s style.

Mencken usually did not write about the temporary, often superficial issues of the day. Instead, he used a current event or idea to attack a more basic issue. “W.J.B.” offers a prime example. Bryan had represented an America that no longer could exist. Mencken realized that and berated Bryan for not realizing it. Bryan was, in fact, a kind of reactionary; he clung to the small-town heritage, the naivété of the rural past, the fundamental, unquestioning attitude toward religion. He was the standard-bearer of Americans

---

1It was printed first in the Baltimore Evening Sun, July 27, 1925. Revised versions appeared in The American Mercury, October, 1925, and in collections of Mencken’s writings.
2The author is keenly aware of the presumptuousness in attempting to identify or classify the style of a widely known writer. William Strunk Jr. has called style a “high mystery,” contending it can’t be explained satisfactorily. However, analysis of a prose style clearly can indicate or suggest techniques used by a writer.
3Mencken, in contrast, was an iconoclast. Coupled with that, he had a deep, dry sense of humor and a masterful grasp of the absurd in life. By any standard, Mencken was an intellectual; he noted frequently that he was writing for an educated elite, not for the masses. In that respect, he was snobbish and egotistical, but those characteristics somehow seemed to become him and they tended to enhance his writing. He could write at length about the American “booboisie” and delight his readers. Biographer Isaac Goldberg said, “Mencken, with roots that sink deep in America, is everything that the average American is not. He is not religious; he is not ‘moral’; he is, by temperament, therefore by philosophy, an anarchist; he is a natural aristocrat; he is antipedant.” Isaac Goldberg, The Man Mencken: A Biographical and Critical Survey (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1925), p. 4.
who could not confidently face the prospect of an industrial nation. While many Americans were charmed by Bryan, Mencken detected in him a pervasive superficiality. He viewed Bryan's death as an opportunity to attack not only the man but all he stood for. Mencken wrote:

The evil that men do lives after them. Bryan, in his malice, started something that it will not be easy to stop. In ten thousand country towns his old heellers, the evangelical pastors, are propagating his gospel, and everywhere the yokels are ready for it.

Always erudite, Mencken used a fluent and extensive vocabulary, and he placed his big words with precision. Examples—like Peruna and Homo neandertalensis—abound in "W.J.B." Mencken knew when and how to use a multisyllabic word for emphasis. For example: "The city proletariat, transiently flustered by him in 1896, quickly penetrated his buncombe and would have no more of him; the laborers were moved by him in 1896, but became disillusioned and deserted him; he was mocked at Democratic national conventions for twenty-five years." He could have said: "The laborers were moved by him in 1896, but became disillusioned and deserted him; he was mocked at Democratic national conventions for twenty-five years."

Mencken would have confounded the readability experts of the 1960s, for he produced clear prose despite long words and rambling sentences. For instance: "Wherever the flambeaux of Chautauqua smoked and guttered, and the bilge of Idealism ran in the veins, and Baptist pastors dammed the brooks with the sanctified and men gathered who were weary and heavy laden, and their wives who were full of Peruna and as fecund as the shad (Alosa sapidissima)—there the indefatigable Jennings set up his traps and spread his bait." The sentence is too long. It is too cumbersome. Yet it is a good sentence. It is effective, in part, because each word says something—not one is expendable. Its length helps convey an image. The big words used to describe a simple scene suggest the trumpery that Mencken detected in Bryan. Mencken wanted to establish a mood—to make the reader sense the absurdity of the man and the tragedy of the country people who deified him.

Mencken, with equal skill, could convey an impression with a terse sentence. In seven words—"The flivver dust would choke the roads"—he portrays both the size of Bryan's following and its reverence for the man.

Much of the success of Mencken's descriptive passages must be attributed to his use of adjectives. Bryan, for example, had not had merely a career; instead, it was a grotesque career. Moreover, Mencken did not hesitate to repeat adjectives: "He preferred the company of rustic ignoramuses . . . he staggered from the rustic court . . . in front of the office of the rustic lawyers." Nor did he fear using that same word as a noun: " . . . that the rustics of the state had a clear right to have their progeny taught whatever they chose." Few readers would fail to assign to the word rustic the meaning Mencken sought to convey—that is, unsophisticated, boorish, uncouth.

Mencken's adjectives inject vibrancy into his nouns. He speaks of a "preposterous country shirt," "ghostly concerns," "anthropoid rabble," "pathological hatred." Occasionally, he used adjectives to alter the principal meaning of a word: "sinister gems," "heavy greasy victuals of the farmhouse kitchen." Mencken, in short, chose his adjectives with the care and deliberation of a person selecting a diamond.  

The same deliberation is reflected in Mencken's choice of nouns and verbs. Instead of men, he offers primates. Instead of followers, ignoramuses. Lieges and jacquerie are other examples. The procession of lively verbs in "W.J.B." seems endless. He used them to create images, to tear down, to rebuke, to animate. Examples: Smoked, tracked, guttered, choked, sweated, lusted, ranted, bellowed. Verbs included inflaming, thirsting and sweating.

similes, metaphors used

To humble and to condemn, Mencken used similes and metaphors liberally. Bryan's eyes became "blazing points of hatred" that "glittered like occult . . . gems." Bryan "bit right and left like a dog with rabies."

Mencken presented Bryan as the height of superficiality, the base pseudo-intellectual. He destroys the man by revealing him, and he reveals him by describing Bryan's own contradictions. Mencken's first step is to attack the setting in which Bryan was most comfortable—the rural, small-town America. He portrays that setting as one that is repulsive or, at the least, contemptible. To accomplish that, Mencken employed a literary technique that might be termed the paradox—that is, he juxtaposed thoughts or words to build a pleasant scene, then demolished it with a single expression or term. For instance: "He liked getting up in the morning to the tune of the cocks crowing on the dunhill." Suddenly a cheery picture is tainted by the putrescence of the barnyard. One no longer sees a white rooster crowing; instead, he sees the dunghill.

Mencken endeavored through the paradox to expose Bryan as a king of fools. He mentions human characteristics, but they seem base and shameful. Here are examples.

He was born with a roaring voice and it had the trick of inflaming half-wits.
He somehow seemed dirty though a close glance showed him as carefully shaven as an actor and clad in immaculate linen.
There stood the man who had been thrice a candidate for the presidency of the Republic—there he stood in the glare of the world uttering stuff that a boy of eight would laugh at.
He lived long enough to make patriots thank the inscrutable Gods for Harding, even for Coolidge.
The President . . . at least doesn't believe that the earth is square, and the witches should be put to death, and that Jonah swallowed the whale.

Mencken once said that the real trick to good writing is to get the reader interested. In the opening sentence of "W.J.B.,” the reader gets a taste of Mencken's inimitable—sometimes abominable—wit and his deft toying with reli-

*To borrow Stanley Walker's expression.
*Quoted at the beginning of this article.
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Mencken's prose has a mystical element that, for lack of a better term, might be labeled sound or feel. It is an ethereal quality that begs identification or delineation. But it probably cannot be identified or delineated except by the writer himself. Perhaps Mencken hinted at it in this comment:

"The imbeciles who have printed acres of comment on my books have seldom noticed the chief character of my style. It is that I write with almost scientific precision—that my meaning is never obscure. The ignorant have often complained that my vocabulary is beyond them, but that is simply because my ideas cover a wider range than theirs do. Once they have consulted the dictionary they always know exactly what I intend to say. I am as far as any writer can get from the muffled sonorities of, say, John Dewey."

---

**Fact Plus Humor—London Observer Filler**

*By Kay Morton*

Some of the liveliest fillers in the London Observer, a Sunday newspaper, appear on pages directed primarily at women readers. The fillers seem to follow a kind of formula, typified by this example:

Cookery calls for concentration. The cover of Len Deighton's excellent "Action Cook Book" shows a seductive girl in a white frilly negligee coping with a saucepan full of spaghetti, in spite of the fact that her waist is encircled by a gorgeous, hairy male in a purple shirt. We prophesy one thing: The meal is going to be a disaster and it won't matter a bit.

Such paragraphs usually include a fact, light humor and an editorial opinion:

An elegant white battery-powered family toothbrush has four small (too small) brush heads. It doesn't do all the work for you; you still have to manoeuvre it about your mouth and it's heavier than a normal toothbrush. It does, however, make the gums feel healthy and invigorated. If you like electric toothbrushes, then it's neat and reasonably priced. But it didn't convert us.

Occasionally, a filler ends with a question:

For the clockwatcher who has everything, including religious feelings, there's an electric battery clock which is set in a frame above a reproduction of an old English church on a parchment background. What more could you want?

The United States often is mentioned:

Someone has rethought that basic household item, the scrubbing brush. Sent to us from America (of course), it is a tasteful olive green and shaped like an iron, with a handle on top. Why hasn't any brush manufacturer done anything so obvious as make a scrubbing brush with a handle before? It has specially hard bristles at the front (which get the wear) and is shaped to hook on to the edge of a pail. Someone copy quickly.

The Observer often presents fillers designed solely to entertain. A certain word or a subtle insinuation, while innately obvious to the writer, can latterly produce a guffaw, no doubt prompts many gentle chuckles. Examples:

Men obviously need to be taught how to undress gracefully. There are only two basic rules. The most alluring first movement is the slow loosening of the tie. The second rule is socks off first. There is no more seaside-postcard view than hairy legs between shirt and socks.

When did you last wear a melon? Our greengrocer didn't turn a hair when the Hippie ahead of us asked for a melon. "For tonight or tomorrow, miss?" "For now."

"Oh, you want it for the pips: well, here's two over-ripe ones for a shilling." To be made into Flower Girl necklaces.

It takes The Observer a long time to reach some parts of British Columbia, from where we have just received the following postcard: "We are reading by Valerie Wade about America in Observer paper 16 July. If she think English are better dressing than American she is crazy. See people come off boat Bella Coola wharf, change your mind. Indians all laugh at girl look like horse with pants on."

Obviously, someone at the Observer is striving to provide sprightly, readable fillers. Therein lies the difference between Observer fillers and those in many American newspapers. For example, contrast these two fillers, the first from an American daily and the second from the Observer:

**The House of Lords dining room serves square crumpets. Very appropriate.**

---

*Excerpts from a report by Kay Morton for the International Communications course. Miss Morton, a 1967 graduate of the Montana School of Journalism, is a candidate for the master's degree in journalism. She has worked as a reporter for the Kalispell (Mont.) Daily Inter Lake.*
MONTANA’S ‘VILE SCRIBBLER’:
THE POST’S MYSTERIOUS FRANKLIN

By PENNY WAGNER WILSON

Mrs. Wilson received a bachelor’s degree in journalism from the University of Montana in 1961 and a master’s degree in journalism in 1967. This article is a chapter from her thesis, entitled “The Political Coverage of the Virginia City Montana Post: August, 1864, to July, 1867.” Mrs. Wilson has worked for the Helena bureau of the Associated Press and as a reporter for the Billings (Mont.) Gazette. In 1964-65, she was a reporter and news editor for five weekly newspapers issued by the Valley Publishing Co. at Kent, Wash. Since April, 1967, she has been society editor of the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian. Mrs. Wilson contends that Franklin, the outspoken but pseudonymous Montana Post correspondent who covered Montana’s first legislature, actually was Frank L. Worden, a widely known merchant in the Territory from the early 1860s to 1887.

Among the tired and cold passengers on the coach that bounced down the main street of Bannack was a fiery individual who had come to the fading mining community to serve in Montana Territory’s first legislative assembly. His first appointment was at Harby’s Saloon, where he elbowed his way to the bar and greeted the men he knew.

In the next few days, preceding the opening of the legislative assembly Dec. 12, 1864, he joined congenially in the unofficial and well-liquored caucuses. He was welcomed warmly, particularly at informal gatherings of the Republican or Union party. He was an important man in the fledgling Territory, a leading merchant with money invested in enterprises in the thriving mining camps. He had lived in the region for nearly five years, and in 1864 a man was an old-timer if he had been in Montana two years.

The traveler was to do more than legislate at the assembly: He was to become its unofficial chronicler as Montana’s first legislative correspondent and first political columnist.

He complained that the legislature reminded him of the California legislature. “There is the same scramble here after the ‘good things’ and ‘fat takes’ that there was at that time,” he said, “and I notice a remarkable similarity in the methods used to accomplish the ends desired.”

He contended that the legislators’ drinking sessions were as engrossing as their lawmaking sessions. In one issue of the Virginia City Montana Post, the only newspaper in Montana Territory, he said:

Honorable members and Legislative bummers have

\[\text{Virginia City Montana Post, Jan. 21, 1865, p. 3.}\]

When the legislature adjourned, he wrote:

The high comedy which has been on these boards for sixty days closed Tuesday evening at 10 o’clock. The spectators were bored, the actors were weary, the scenery dilapidated, and the footlights dim. The whole round of cheap nonsense had long been exhausted. Even dullness became familiarly stale, and stupidity reigned unquestioned monarch of the assembled wisdom.

The pseudonym he scratched at the end of his pungently partisan, often sarcastic, always entertaining columns in the Montana Post was “Franklin.” His identity never was revealed. But he provoked the Montana House of Representatives to censure him officially and to appoint an unofficial “smelling committee” to “ascertain who Franklin is.”

Franklin smugly concluded his assignment in Bannack with his real name still a secret.

\[\text{Ibid., Feb. 4, 1865, p. 1.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., April 15, 1865, p. 1. This column was written in February, but its publication was delayed.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., Jan. 7, 1865, p. 3.}\]
For more than a century, Franklin's identity has remained a mystery, though one conjecture appears to have been correct. In a footnote in his dissertation about the early Montana press, Robert L. Housman said: "It is a temptation to suggest Frank Worden as possibly 'Franklin.' 'Franklin' was a Republican; he had been in California at the time of the first state legislature there; he was a strong advocate of the [Montana] Historical Society. All this applies equally to Worden."8

Franklin early in the session squelched any hopes the Montana Post might treat the Democrats impartially in its coverage of the legislature. What probably was most galling for the Democrats was the realization that Franklin, whom they called the "anonymous scribbler," was seated among them in the Council. Franklin let them know that when the legislature convened. And he said he didn't want anyone else reporting legislative activities for the Montana Post. He was jealous about that, he said, and he resented a Council member—an "inveterate scribbler"—who was writing letters to the newspaper and a "knight of the quill in the house." He had worked hard for the position as Montana Post correspondent, and he was paid well for writing the letters. "That they do not suit all is why they suit me so well," he said.6

In one Montana Post, a letter signed "R.H." referred to Franklin as "egotistical." Apparently R.H. had been accused of writing the Franklin letters, and he wanted to dispel that idea immediately.7

Franklin, meanwhile, was delighted that one of his fellow legislators had asked "if I had any idea who that 'vile scribbler' was."8 He chided Council member Charles S. Baggs, a frequent target, saying "bitter Democratic partisans" were beginning to question Baggs' loyalty. They had good reason to, Franklin said, because Baggs had faith in the republic as well as the Democratic party; "hence he cannot be implicitly relied on in all party drills." Then Franklin commented slyly that Baggs had drunk no "poor whiskey" since he had been in Bannack, "and this 'To the jealous confirmation strong, as proofs from holy writ.'"9

Franklin said the Democrats were "kept by the most ungodly pack of sinners that ever sought to do business upon the hypothesis that it was advisable to keep up a show of decency."10

In his letter of Dec. 27, 1864, Franklin launched a one-man war on the legislature's grants of charters for roads, ferries, bridges, utilities and navigation improvements. Franklin's adamant opposition to such charters is a valuable clue to his identity. It, more than anything else, leads one to conclude that Housman's suggestion was correct—that Franklin was Frank L. Worden, a merchant at Hell Gate. Worden and his partner, C. P. Higgins, also operated stores in Deer Lodge and Gold Creek and had money invested in Dance, Stuart and Co., a mercantile store in Virginia City.11

charters criticized

Freight costs were Worden's principal problem and accounted for much of his overhead. A man chartered for a toll road was responsible for its maintenance, but Franklin said experience had taught him that toll roads often were one-way bargains that merely increased the cost of travel and hauling freight. Here is a typical criticism of charters for such roads:

The most impudent thing of the session thus far, excepting the attempt of a rebel to get into the Assembly, is the claim of Messrs. John D. Ritchie and others to secure a charter for the road from Virginia towards Salt Lake. They have expended no dollar, performed no work, but claim the natural highway as a toll road, which if granted, will cripple the Territory for years. They rode over the route once or twice, and claimed it, they say, and gravely put this forth as a reason why the people of Madison County should be placed under contribution for years to come. Other parties claim it—some of whom it is alleged have expended nearly ten thousand dollars on it, but it is decent compared with the naked, bald claim of other parties. If corruption induces your representatives to cripple the industrial interests of the Territory by inducing such legislation as this, let the dear people remember those who thus vote away their dearest rights for paltry gold. Those who have built the road ought to receive what they have expended, but even that ought to be paid them out of the Treasury, and not by a charter.12

Frank Worden had enough experience hauling freight across the western plains and mountains to have acquired some strong opinions about the maintenance of toll roads.

Francis Lyman Worden was born in Marlborough, Vt., Oct. 15, 1830. The family, descended from early New England settlers, was of Welsh origin. Young Francis, called Frank when he reached the West, was sent to Troy, N. Y., at age 14 to learn merchandising and bookkeeping. At 21, he persuaded a cousin to stake him to $300, of which he spent $200 for a ship ticket from New York to San Francisco. He left March 23, 1852, and arrived in August. He signed on the steamship Oregon as a sailor, then quit after a few months and took a clerk's job in San Francisco's Occidental Hotel. In the summer of 1853, he left that job to work as a clerk for Gordon and Co. in San Francisco.13

Franklin had been in California; he complained during the Bannack legislative session that the routine business had become monotonous and the legislature "reminds me very

9Montana Post, Dec. 24, 1864, p. 2. The Council was the Upper House.
10Ibid., Dec. 31, 1864, p. 2.
11Ibid., Jan. 7, 1865, p. 4.
12Ibid.
13Ibid.
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much of the State Legislature of California.” He admitted to being “a carder, and a dicer, also. I have bucked the tiger in San Francisco, and have taken the real Bengal by the mane in Sacramento. I am an A.M. in the ‘seven damnable sciences.””

Worden did not object to gambling. He is said to have won the first pair of gum boots ever seen in the Territory when a man trying to raise money for a gun and clothing said he would raffle the boots at $1 a dice throw. Worden “stepped up and on the first throw won for himself the pair of gum boots.”

Worden left San Francisco to prospect for gold in Oregon. When he and his partner failed to find gold, they returned to California, then journeyed to a strike in the Colville, Wash., area. When they got there, they joined the Oregon Volunteers, a civilian group formed to fight the Indians. Worden served under Washington’s Gov. Isaac I. Stevens in 1856 in the Columbia River campaign. During that service, Worden may have met his future partner, C.P. Higgins, an Irishman who had come to the United States as a teen-ager. Worden was a clerk in the Indian Service Quartermaster Corps in Olympia, Wash., after the Indian War. In 1858, he went to Walla Walla, Wash., with a government permit to trade with the Indians, and he organized Worden and Co. He was appointed Walla Walla’s first civilian postmaster Oct. 1, 1858.

Worden learned a valuable lesson in Walla Walla: He extended too much credit and late in 1859 had sold $30,000 in goods but was $9,000 in debt with $10,000 to $11,000 out on credit. He later said he collected nearly all the money owed him. C.P. Higgins bought out Worden’s partner in Walla Walla and interested Worden in going to Montana, where Higgins had been a wagon master with Stevens’ exploring expedition. He knew the country and he had $8,000 to invest in the partnership. In 1860, Worden and Higgins took 75 horses loaded with freight over the Mullan Road and opened the first store at Hell Gate, west of the present site of Missoula, in what was to become a mining region. By 1865, Worden and Higgins had opened a branch store at Gold Creek and, with James Stuart and Walter Dance, stores in Deer Lodge and Virginia City.

Worden and Co. served as the Hell Gate agent for the Montana Post.

As the only storekeeper at Hell Gate, Worden also was a part-time banker, a role that helps substantiate his identity as Franklin. In one of only two pointed clues Franklin gave about his identity, he used a financial term—usury. It was in the Jan. 7, 1865, Montana Post, and Franklin was promising more scandalous tales about the legislators:

“Now my promise to tell you all about the tastes and habits of the members, their calibre and efforts to discharge their duties, etc., has put several of them not before ‘overly’ well-behaved (to use an adverb from Dixie, the only thing coined here recently except lies) upon their good behaviour, and you and I are compelled by the length of this epistle to defer that pleasant duty until a ‘more convenient season.’ They shall not be slighted alway, but I shall settle it by and by with usury.

I see the secret is out in this last line, and it is not my fault hereafter if all men do not know whom I am.

Franklin apparently thought he had provided a sure clue in the closing line of his letter. Worden undoubtedly was widely known in the Territory for his banking transactions. Even if he did not lend money, he might have charged interest on credit he extended.

When the backgrounds of other Republicans in the Council are examined, Worden is the logical choice as Franklin.

Only three members of the Council in the first legislature were not members of the second legislature: Worden, Frank M. Thompson of Beaverhead county and Robert Lawrence of Madison county. All, like Franklin, were Republicans.

Franklin evidently was not a member of the second legislature. On Feb. 3, 1866, the Montana Post printed this item: “Wanted—Our old correspondent ‘Franklin,’ to watch the Legislative body as of yore. The compensation will be according to the old contract.” But Franklin did not respond, and his letters did not appear in the newspaper during the second session or subsequent ones.

**lawrence headed council**

Lawrence was president of the Council but, as Franklin mentioned in a letter, was not present at its first meeting. Franklin also commented occasionally about Lawrence, telling how he took “that Websterian head of his out of both hands, where he carefully kept it most of the time,” about Lawrence taking the governor’s required oath and about the Council’s struggle to pass a resolution thanking Lawrence for his work as president.

In one letter, Franklin said: “Confidentially I will say to you, in your private ear, that I think it must be one of the three Governors here, whose name is Franklin. He is a close observer, a fine writer and watches the two houses so closely, that I think he has some ulterior object in view.”

Three legislators had the first name of Frank: Worden and Thompson in the Council and Francis Bell in the House. Bell was a Democrat from Madison county, and Franklin persisted in attacking that county’s delegation. Thompson was from Bannack in Beaverhead county. He supported the Montana Historical Society, as did Franklin, and was one of its original incorporators.

**Montana Post, Jan. 7, 1865, p. 2.**

**Ibid., Feb. 3, 1866, p. 3.**

**Ibid., Dec. 17, 1864, p. 2.**

**Ibid., April 15, 1865, p. 1.**

**Ibid., Dec. 24, 1864, p. 2.**

**Ibid., April 15, 1865, p. 1.**

**Ibid., Jan. 7, 1865, p. 3.**

**Worden was a prominent member of the Historical Society. When he died, the Society passed a memorial in his honor. James M. Hamilton, From Wilderness to Statehood: A History of Montana (Portland, Ore.: Binfords and Mort, 1957), p. 518.**
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"It is a private bill; pay me if you want my support"

At one point, it looked as if the legislature would not pass a bill incorporating the Historical Society. Franklin wrote: "The bill incorporating a Historical Society is lost. Better days and wiser legislators will yet organize some such society, and the folly which defeated this laudable design will be appreciated at its real value."

But when the bill was passed, Franklin took credit for it, announcing that "The Historical Society, thanks to this correspondence, is a body corporate, if not politic."

References in Franklin's letters indicate he was not Thompson. Franklin favored Virginia City as the territorial capital. It is doubtful if Thompson, who was from Bannack, would have cared for the move. But it is likely that Worden would have supported Virginia City as the capital, for it was the largest and best situated of the towns in which he had investments.

Franklin often criticized Bannack: "This dull town makes one long for the flesh pots of Madison county."

References to Thompson appeared frequently in Franklin's letters. For example, Franklin said he would importune "my good friends, Faulds, in the House, and Mr. Thompson in the Council" for an explanation of an act that barred certain games of chance. And:

So much of the Governor's message as related to Federal affairs was referred to a Committee whose report surprised every one who knew that Dr. Leavitt and Mr. Thompson belonged to it, but it has transpired that Mr. Baggs made it on his own responsibility; and Mr. Thompson openly stated that he had never heard it until it was read as the report of the Committee and I presume that Dr. Leavitt only awaits a proper opportunity to repudiate it also.

In his account of the final session of the legislature, Franklin told about Thompson offering a resolution thanking Lawrence for his service as president, about partisan haggling over the resolution and about Thompson finally pushing it through "with an ill grace" from two or three of the members.

Franklin frequently commented about the industry and integrity of the Republican legislators, but he mentioned Worden only twice. The first mention was in Franklin's first letter: "Such a showing was made with reference to the Deer Lodge returns that Mr. Frank L. Worden was admitted by the Governor as a member of the Council and Mr. James Stuart as a member of the House."

Franklin's identity was not intended as a clue. That was Franklin's resolute opposition to granting private charters for transportation "improvements." The Montana Post vacillated on that subject depending on the recipient of the charter. When one was granted to loyal Republican promoters or for a project needed in Virginia City, the newspaper supported it. Franklin, in contrast, was steadfastly critical of charters: "The idea seems to prevail that no good thing shall be saved for the public, but given to someone who claims it."

In one letter, Franklin said:

Quite a number of Madison county men are here to procure such legislation as interests them. The Madison canal or ditch company, which is to bring the Madison into the head of Alder Gulch, has been incorporated, and gentlemen from all parts of the Territory have procured the incorporations of mining companies to limitless numbers. One is dizzied at the figures named in some, but familiarity enables a man calmly to listen to the five millions or ten millions so often repeated, until he begins contemptuously to consider it as but enough to furnish him his morning meal.

Franklin's "libelous" letter

In his war against charters, Franklin also criticized the Montana Post's loyal friend, Col. Wilbur F. Sanders, one of several prominent Republicans in the charter business. The criticism was linked with the allegations that were to provoke the Montana House to censure Franklin. The lines that made Franklin's name profane in the Bannack legislature were these:

Private bills are passed by for the more pressing duties of the session, although I would not discourage those who have "axes to grind," provided they are able and willing to "pay the fiddler." And this last remark leads me to say that there is in this assembly some of the most venal, corrupt, and shameless legislators in the world. They who "do" the statutes for Pandemomium would shun their company. This letter, however, cannot be considered an exposé. Men openly in the streets propose to sell votes for a given price, and in any legislative body that ever before congregated, would be kicked out incontinently. We all remember Hon. O. B. Matteson in Congress in 1855, who for doing privately what is here a public and oft-repeated thing, was unanimously kicked out of that body. "It is a private bill; pay me if you want my support." As if any bill could be so private...
as not to affect for many years, if not for all time, the welfare of this people. Mr. Sanders, of your place, is said to be the author of this philosophy, and it has found a number of ardent advocates here. I suppose if McCormick were the judge in your county, he would take money from the hands of suitors because it was a "private matter." Out, I say, on all such injustice, and I hope the people of Madison will find who of their delegation are guilty, and "Lash the rascals naked round the world."92

Only a merchant whose profits depended in part on low freight rates could become so angry about private charters. Lawyers, in contrast, earned money as lobbyists for proposed charters and for interpreting and transacting privileges granted by charters.

Though Franklin's arguments were sound, they were somewhat unrealistic in frontier Montana, where primitive government, engrossed in ending the war, would not risk thousands of dollars and men and equipment to build roads in Montana. The Governor even had found it necessary to use his personal funds to help pay the housekeeping bills of the legislature. Private sources were the only ones available for road and bridge construction.

Franklin's anonymous competitor, "R.H.," probably presented a more realistic picture in his wildcat correspondence:

Numberless bills are being introduced and passed, chiefly of charters for roads, ferries and the like; no great fights or discussions are being had on any question. Everything is ground through on the "get what you can" principle, in this respect showing the good sense of both houses, as it cleans up business with little waste of precious time. The Governor has approved all bills which have passed.88

One student of frontier Montana, James M. Hamilton, disagreed sharply with Franklin's viewpoint:

The members of the first legislative assembly were men of ability and undoubted integrity. The Territory, being without laws other than the Organic Act and the laws of Congress which were applicable, presented the twenty law-makers with a formidable task. They entered upon their labors with a determination to give people a set of statutes which would prove well suited to the conditions in the communities. The volume and quantity of the statutes enacted at this sixty-day session are proof that the efforts of no other Montana legislature have resulted in a larger or more practicable grist of laws.86

Considering the job that confronted the first legislature, it is, indeed, noteworthy that so much was accomplished. It enacted civil and criminal codes. It passed mining laws. Foreseeing development of a cattle industry, it passed laws regulating brands. It created eight counties and passed laws for establishing county and local governments and a public school system. To raise revenue, it approved a general property tax and a business licensing law.

Hamilton mentioned the key problem concerning roads:

Better and more roads were a necessity, but there was no money available to build public highways. In this dilemma, the assembly turned to private capital and chartered numerous companies to build tollroads, bridges and ferries. Instead of enacting a general incorporation law, the legislature resorted to the clumsy method of creating a multitude of private corporations by special acts, mining companies heading the list, with roads a close second.89

Franklin's diatribe about the so-called corruption of his fellow legislators prompted a censure resolution by the House. In the Montana Post containing news of the censure, the newspaper reacted calmly—much more calmly than did Franklin or than the newspaper would when the House refused to pay for its subscriptions. "Comment from us is unnecessary," the editor said, "as this gentleman is perfectly able to take care of himself."41

"a "malicious calumny"

The resolution, which was passed by the House Feb. 6, 1865, said, in part:

Whereas, a certain communication has appeared in the "Montana Post" over the signature of "Franklin," bearing date "Bannack City, January 27, 1865," charging certain members of the Legislature assembled from Madison County with venality and corruption, and desiring to exonerate the members of the Legislature from foul slander, published by this libelous scribbler and to show their contempt for the author of said communication: Therefore be it: Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Territory of Montana, that the author of said communication is a willful and malicious libeler and calumniator of the Representatives of the people, and that this house pronounces the charge of corruption against members of this legislature as a wicked, willful, malicious falsehood and calumny.84

Franklin replied sarcastically that grief had "overwhelmed and overshadowed me on that ever-to-be-remembered last Monday." He said that when the newspapers arrived in Bannack the morning of February 6, he saw "several members with faces as red as that of a dissipating duenna."43 He added:

During that day at my work I speculated upon the propriety of accommodating "R. H." and other inquisitive Eyes by repudiating my nomme [sic] de plume and giving "his [Franklin's] name to the public." But then I knew I should be bored as well as bribed. I thought of the flattery and drinks that would be urged on me; of the gawgs and grants—the charters and "chips" that would come to me unbidden, and I said devously, "deliver us from temptation," and resolved not to solve the mystery; although there is not a man here who does not know who your correspondent is, yet no two agree. When I went up town, I learned that the House had passed the resolution concerning me.44

After castigating Washington McCormick, whom he condemned as the father of the resolution, Franklin offered a $100 reward "for each and every man in this Territory who
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was convinced by the passage of that resolution that there has been no corruption in this Legislative Assembly."

Following the censure action, the Montana Post learned that the Council had voted to pay only $17.50 of its $35 bill for subscriptions and the House flatly refused to pay its bill. The newspaper contended that the legislature was using it as a whipping boy because of Franklin and said:

Driven to desperation, like the aboriginal inhabitants while declaring war, they drive their flashes through the brain of a committee man, and it is resolved, as soon as spoken, that the Council won’t pay for the paper, the contract with the Sergeant-at-Arms to the contrary, notwithstanding and nevertheless . . .

The proprietors of this journal, receiving the overwhelming intelligence, would doubtless have torn their hair, &c., but the coldness of the weather prevented their taking off their hats, and as for the monetary loss involved, they intend by retrenching all unnecessary expenditure, and by a continuous and diligent application to business, to accumulate sufficient capital to meet the appalling deficiency occasioned by the failure of the Council to keep their written engagements. Mr. Otis [the sergeant at arms who signed the subscription order] stands as an innocent but terrible warning to all persons who shall dare to promise anything on behalf of such a body. When a single individual thus behaves, men call him a “BILK,” but Legislatures “repudiate.”

Franklin said Baggs had delivered the diatribe against the Montana Post in the Council and had accused Franklin of lying about him. Franklin admitted he had, indeed, lied, adding:

Looking over all that I have written, humiliating as it is, I must acknowledge that the charge is true. I have lied concerning him. I see lies of commission and omission. You are right, Mr. Baggs. For instance, there is a lie of commission wherein I stated you were asleep. It is not a mistake. It is a black, naked lie. You were not asleep. I knew better, and I humbly crave your pardon. I will not depart from the facts again if you will forgive me. The truth is that you were drunk, and I knew it, and ought to have said so. Everybody else knew it, but I thought it a matter of such small importance that you would not object to one little romance in the letter, but as you do, I cheerfully make the amends honorable. Then right there following it is a lie of omission in that I did not say that the language you used to your colleague Potter [Anson S. Potter, a Democratic councilman from Madison county] would disgrace a brothel, but the truth is I was gone part of the day, and had not time to write all that would interest your constituents.

In his final letter, which appeared April 15, 1865, Franklin summarized his impression of the legislature, saying, in part:

No I am not going to write its history. The Union minority have done well. Not all of them can escape criticism or condemnation, but the Territory owes them much for the evil they have prevented, if not for the good they have accomplished. And now that my friends have subsided, I cannot speak of them unkindly. One domestic infelicity does not always break up the family, and my little honeymoon row shall not prevent me from doing these gentlemen the kindness of putting their names in print. I wish, however, to disclaim any affinity with divers and sundry of the two houses who shall not forget Franklin.

Indeed, Franklin would be remembered by his colleagues and by historians, for he was the only person who provided a continual commentary about the Territory’s first legislature.

By modern standards, Franklin would not be considered a good reporter. He seldom explained the legislation about which he wrote. He often referred to committee reports and speeches without telling his readers what those reports or speeches contained. He made no effort to record both sides of debates. He wrote with a total lack of objectivity, and his letters often were concerned with personalities rather than issues.

It also could be argued that he was a gritty commentator who provided personal insights into the workings of the first legislature and the activities of the men in it. He was a columnist and the first one in the Territory.

Worden’s business projects

Worden’s activities in the spring of 1866, when the second legislature convened, help explain why Franklin did not comply with the Montana Post’s request to serve as its correspondent at that session. At that time, Worden and Higgins were building a sawmill and gristmill at the site of the future city of Missoula. They had invested $30,000 in the projects, and Worden probably considered business much too pressing to spend 60 days in the new capital, Virginia City. Moreover, he was engaged in another time-consuming project: He was courting Miss Lucretia Miller, whom he married Nov. 29, 1866.

Worden was a Missoula county commissioner from 1870 to 1873. He and Higgins were among the founders of the Missoula National Bank (now the First National Bank) in 1873, and they are said to have financed the Missoula Weekly Missoulian in its “lean years” from 1874 to 1875. In 1880, Worden again was elected to the legislature as a member of the Council; the historic Montana Post had been discontinued 11 years earlier, having been moved from Virginia City to Helena. Worden died in 1887, never having acknowledged his contribution—controversial as it may be—to the pioneer journalism of Montana.
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A PROFESSOR LOOKS BACK:
EDUCATION FOR JOURNALISM

By ALBERT A. APPLEGATE

Professor Applegate, who earned a master's degree from the Montana School of Journalism in 1923, is eminently qualified to discuss what he terms the distinction between journalism education and education for journalism. From 1925 to 1927, he was associate editor of the Boise (Idaho) Statesman. He has taught journalism at the University of Montana and at Baker University. From 1929 to 1936, he was head of the printing and journalism department at South Dakota State University. He was chairman of the journalism department at Michigan State University from 1936 to 1955. During the next six years, he served as director of the speakers bureau at Michigan State University, then as director of information services at Berry College. In 1961, he became a visiting lecturer at Hillsdale College and in 1964 was selected "Professor of the Year" by the senior class. The Michigan State Press Association awarded him a plaque in 1966 "in appreciation for 31 years of service and assistance to Michigan newspapers." Now 79, Professor Applegate plans to retire from the Hillsdale faculty at the end of the 1967-68 academic year.

"Your graduates can't spell, and their grammar is atrocious."

If there is a journalism instructor who has not heard that accusation, he is new to the teaching field. The statement is made as if the journalism school's sole reason for being were to correct all the inadequate teaching in the lower grades and high school and to overcome slovenly home habits.

No one is more sensitive than journalism instructors about poor spelling, punctuation and grammar. They face, however, a three-headed problem: Should they teach primary mechanics of composition, teach journalism or try to combine the two? Most conscientious instructors choose the last.

Possibly, that combination is the true function of journalism education. When instructors first undertook to teach students what city editors tried to teach cub reporters—such elements as leads, action, etc.—they found they were confronted with the work of the copydesk, too. They had to correct errors, and by the very act of returning the student's work to him, they found themselves teachers of composition mechanics.

Some short-sighted instructors, I suspect, let themselves become so mired down in commas, dashes and semicolons they can't reach the firm ground of professional work. There are others, probably, who have their gaze so high they trip over slips in composition mechanics.

Fundamentally, the function of journalism education is to prepare young men and women for a profession. If that preparation must include teaching them to spell, punctuate and observe rules of grammar, so be it. If journalism schools are to launch graduates into successful careers, then their instruction also must be truly professional.

The concept of journalism as a profession is fairly recent in its development, and it appears to have come about simultaneously with or as a result of the offering of a four-year journalism sequence at the University of Illinois in 1904 and the founding of a school of journalism at the University of Missouri in 1908. At the University of Missouri, journalism began as education for editorial workers, while at Illinois it was offered in the school of business.1 From those two examples we can see the wide divergence of viewpoint as to what constitutes preparation for a journalism career.

Out of that divergence arose the idea of some educators that journalism schools were mere trade schools, offering skills that could be mastered by students with a grade-school education. At the other extreme have been those who

1Prof. Frank Scott did offer a course in reporting in the English department.
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believe education for journalism has nothing in common with skills. They contend that education for journalism should be on a cultural plane and that techniques would be better left to be learned on a job.

Between those extremes is a large middle group, of which I am one, which believes education for journalism, to be successful, must combine skills and broad education. Is it not reasonable, therefore, to say there is journalism education and education for journalism, two different but related fields? Journalism educators, more than other educators, realize there must be a combination of the two if journalism schools are to fulfill their avowed purpose of educating personnel for the communication media. Those media are seeking young men and women prepared, after a period of seasoning, to assume leadership in their fields.

What form that preparation should take is discussed today almost as much and as heatedly as it was in 1908 or 1910, with, however, weight of opinion going to the side of writing. No doubt mathematicians speak a language of their own; so do chemists. Still, the results of experiments have to be interpreted to those who are not mathematicians or chemists. So, journalism education and education for journalism find a common foundation—ability to write and education for writing. That foundation, I believe, is broad enough to accommodate various points of view. The fact remains that everything that is read, everything heard on radio, everything seen on billboards, television or the stage has been written. Similarly, every interpretation of scientific or technical developments must be written.

The recent rapid developments in technology have spurred a need for interpretation of technical things and perhaps some confusion about the need for training in the art of writing. The need for better writing is greater than it ever has been, since there are so many more complexities to interpret.

Because of swift advances in transportation and communication, a faulty impression has appeared occasionally that old ways—old standards of writing—are obsolete and that education provides adaptability and some assurance of success, that is, in finding the right niche. Emphasis on basic training also provides flexibility for the journalism schools to fulfill their avowed purpose of educating personnel for the communication media. Those media are seeking young men and women prepared, after a period of seasoning, to assume leadership in their fields.

What form that preparation should take is discussed today almost as much and as heatedly as it was in 1908 or 1910, with, however, weight of opinion going to the side of writing. No doubt mathematicians speak a language of their own; so do chemists. Still, the results of experiments have to be interpreted to those who are not mathematicians or chemists. So, journalism education and education for journalism find a common foundation—ability to write and education for writing. That foundation, I believe, is broad enough to accommodate various points of view. The fact remains that everything that is read, everything heard on radio, everything seen on billboards, television or the stage has been written. Similarly, every interpretation of scientific or technical developments must be written.

The recent rapid developments in technology have spurred a need for interpretation of technical things and perhaps some confusion about the need for training in the art of writing. The need for better writing is greater than it ever has been, since there are so many more complexities to interpret.

Because of swift advances in transportation and communication, a faulty impression has appeared occasionally that old ways—old standards of writing—are obsolete and that there must be shortcuts to the mastery of idea communication. That is not true.

The college graduate who has a sound, broad education and the ability to put facts, ideas and thoughts on paper is prepared to enter whatever field of communication he chooses, provided, of course, he selects the field for which he has the greatest enthusiasm. Even then he may discover his greatest ability and chance of success lie in another but related field. A survey we made of Michigan State College (now Michigan State University) journalism graduates over five years showed that more than half changed fields after graduation, indicating emphasis on basic training and broad education provides adaptability and some assurance of success—success, that is, in finding the right niche. Emphasis on basic training also provides flexibility for the journalism graduate as he pursues his career.

Developments in vehicles of communication have brought some changes in styles of expression—changes that have led the unwary into thinking superficial changes in styles of expression are basic changes in communication itself. Those changes have been necessary because of the nature of the vehicles and because of the increased pace of living today. In the heyday of Hearst and Pulitzer—but not because of their influence—news leads were long, sometimes containing 100 words. Such cumbersome sentences hardly could continue against the influence of radio, with its more informal style of writing. At one point, reporters affected a telegraphic style, leaving the reader to supply missing words, even verbs. Fads crept in, also, such as clichés in sports writing. A keyhole columnist and then a weekly news magazine began making use of tortured words to gain striking effects and get the attention of the reader. Those aberrations and developments have had a good influence on narration and description, making writing clearer and reading more interesting. Now the National Observer has developed its own style, taking the reader gently by the hand and leading him into the story, willy-nilly, as one might lead a child into cold water. Those various trends— Influenced by mechanical, electronic and social developments—are, in turn, shaping and developing our reading, listening and writing habits.

**influence of radio, tv**

Writing for the listening audience has influenced newspaper and magazine writing, making it more informal, more conversational, often less stilted. Whether one writes for the printing press or electronic projection, however, excellence comes not from intuition and inspiration alone but from study and practice.

Departments or schools of journalism provide acceptable opportunities for study and for some practice. But the number of journalism courses and the proportion of technical courses to cultural backgrounds are matters to be determined by each school. If the ratio between skills and background is to be kept at a level manageable in the accepted four years, rigid control of courses and credit hours must be maintained. I suggest 20 per cent of undergraduate work as perhaps the proper amount to be devoted to journalism courses and 80 per cent outside the journalism school. I suggest that proportion because it is a mockery of reality to say a person is equipped for a social profession in a social world if he is ignorant of that world.

The 20 per cent I have suggested, if offered in concentrated courses, will provide the graduate with basic skills for his chosen field. He can get sufficient practice only through experience, because there is not enough time in a four-year college course to get both practice and education.

The 80 per cent should help to give the journalism graduate a liberal educational background. Fields and courses should be fairly rigidly prescribed to offset the common inclination of college students to shy from courses requiring concentrated or prolonged study. Effects of rigid adherence to the 80 per cent of prescribed background courses became evident when Michigan State College required graduate record examinations in the school of liberal arts, which included journalism. Journalism students ranked only slightly lower in history than did history majors; the same was true in fine arts, although one journalism major outranked
all those with a concentration in fine arts. Mathematics majors barely outfigured journalism seniors, and those in political science fell below journalism students in the field of government. In the verbal factor, journalism students ranked higher than English majors did, and the profile of all journalism majors was consistently above that of students in other disciplines. The results of the examinations convinced us in the journalism department we were on the right course in requiring students to get more than a smattering of background classes. Students need the 80 per cent of their collegiate work in liberal arts if they are to get worthwhile courses in English and world literature, history, political science, economics, sociology, psychology, philosophy, mathematics, science, some of the arts and a foreign language.

**foreign language worthwhile**

Why language? One almost could be justified in answering, “Just because.” Reasons are obvious. Two, however, stand out: One is the influence on the mastery and use of our own language; the other is the resulting awareness of the existence of other peoples of the world, collapsing distances and disappearing barriers today.

Although I believe heavy emphasis on writing and editing courses is desirable, accommodations must be made to give students an informed start in advertising, management, programming, directing. But, as in the editorial field, not enough practice can be crowded into a college curriculum to make the graduate a skilled, educated practitioner. Just as a reporter on the job will conduct more interviews and write more stories in a week than he would in a college term, so in advertising the student will pile up more experience in a week on the job. The graduate will get his training in concentrated practice, based on the fundamental education he received in college.

Basic journalism courses such as those I have referred to should not be confused with scattergun or survey courses intended to give students a nodding acquaintance with various phases of journalism. Such courses, unfortunately, may give the student the erroneous impression he is educated in journalism. Glamour words attached to such courses—words such as communication or, worse yet, mass communication—cast a purple haze of confusion that can be dispelled only by courses in specific means of communication. Communication is such a broad term, applicable to engineering, war and disease as well as to writing, speaking and listening, that to apply it to journalism alone or confine it to means of giving and receiving ideas is misleading. All journalism is communication, but not all communication is journalism. But nearly all communication of ideas to widespread audiences has to be written, and adding the appellation communication to writing courses only adds confusion.

Yet, examination of their catalogues shows that some colleges and universities have set a glamour trap for students by dreaming up fanciful course titles. Some such titles, I suspect, are used by department heads to impress other department heads or the college administrators, as well as prospective students. One English department, for example, offers five courses in “Telecommunication Arts.” One wonders what the content of such courses may be.

Such pretensions (at least they seem to me to be pretensions) in course titles are not much more unrealistic than those of some departments of journalism. One three-man department offers 24 journalism courses; one technical school offers 19 undergraduate and seven graduate courses in seven fields. Those offerings, diverse as they are, appear lean compared with two universities that proudly include journalism in their titles. One offers 38 undergraduate and 24 graduate courses. The other, which offers a graduate program based on an undergraduate sequence, has three courses in communication theory, four in methodology, three in statistics, five in experimental psychology, four in social psychology and personality, three in sociology, plus 17 courses recommended for preparation of a thesis, although not all are required.

If those courses are journalism, then one must wonder what a graduate would do for his career. One answer would be that he would be a researcher, not a writing practitioner. Still, we must not discard research in journalism. Examination of graduate programs, though, appears to indicate the methods applied to research in journalism can be applied equally well in economics, political science or sociology and should not be offered as journalism.

Further, I doubt strongly the advisability of graduate study in journalism for practitioners in the profession. Graduate study, yes, but in other fields to provide broad and deep understanding of special areas.

Writing authoritatively in special areas requires familiarity with those areas, not courses labeled journalism in those fields. Courses labeled Sports Journalism and Labor Journalism have no place in a curriculum. If a man knows how to write and knows sports, he can be a sports writer. The same is true for writing about labor, business or science. The roll is long of sports writers who have turned to criticism, editorial writing or politics. The man who broke the story of the theory of relativity journalism. He had learned to write, and he had learned about the theory of relativity.

Generally, it can be said that the wider a person’s interest and education, the better reporter he will become. The better reporter, the better manager he can be, eventually, because he has learned to observe, question, evaluate and communicate the results of observation and inquiry.

Somewhere along the line, if he could not spell at the beginning, he will have learned the necessity of exactness. Finally, when he is in a position of management, he will turn to the schools of journalism and will make the accusation, “Your graduates can’t spell, and their grammar is atrocious.”
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MORE THAN ‘FRUIT ARRANGING’:
THE CASE FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS

By KIM FORMAN

Mr. Forman, a 1956 graduate of the Montana School of Journalism, was editor of the University’s student daily, the Montana Kaimin. He has worked as a reporter for the Miles City (Mont.) Star and the Ironwood (Mich.) Daily Globe. For seven years, he was a newsman for the Associated Press in Cheyenne, Wyo., and Helena, Mont. His bylined stories appeared often in Montana dailies, and he was known throughout the state as a newsman who reported and wrote accurately and who remained calm despite the pressures that exist in a small wire-service bureau. In 1966, Mr. Forman resigned from the Associated Press to become a public-relations representative for the Great Northern Railway Co. in the Seattle office. In this article, he offers his impressions of public-relations work and comments on the image of public-relations practitioners.

A page-one headline in the Billings Gazette last summer said, “PR Man Is Editor’s Best Friend.” Apparently that was a remarkable assertion—one that implied a public-relations representative of a company or industry might help an editor and not get in his way, mislead him or plague him with useless handouts.

The idea was expressed at the 1967 convention of the Montana Press Association by Paul Husted, editor of the Miles City Star and formerly of the Denver Post. It was Billings and it was mid-August. Some of the editors may have thought Husted was suffering from the heat.

Irvin Hutchison, editor and publisher of the Liberty County Times at Chester, was on a panel with Husted and voiced the more popular view earlier—that any industry would be wise to cut in half its public-relations budget and double its advertising. That drew cheers from the small-town publishers.

PR people have known for some time that their own image could be improved. But they also know, and are slowly convincing others, that public relations as a profession is an increasingly effective, responsible facet of business and governmental operations and that the reliance of the news media on public-relations men and women is great and growing.

Public relations is more than free advertising.

Part of the bad image of PR has resulted from big government’s mixing of public information with what is called news management.

Columnist Henry Taylor recently reported that “6,858 federal employes are kept busy part or full time arranging Big Brother’s fruit on the cart with the best side forward, the wormy things to the rear... At $425 million a year our government should practice full disclosure, but it comes a million miles from that.”

Taylor makes a common mistake. He and other newsmen often confuse PR work with that of a news bureau. Consider the difference in their definition of news. In his book Understanding Media, Marshall McLuhan says, “The press seems to be performing its function most when revealing the seamy side. Real news is bad news—bad news about somebody, or bad news for somebody.”

News media may try to balance the bad news with light features and human interest, but the biggest headlines always are about fire, famine, flood, pestilence, crime and accidents.

In contrast, one major function of public relations is reporting good news, the accomplishments of a company or an individual, to “arrange the fruit,” if you will.

That does not mean PR professionals are trying to duck bad news. They aren’t. They have learned that full reporting of facts as soon as possible can stop rumors and rumors are usually worse than the truth.

If wormy fruit can be thrown out, that’s even better. But the emphasis is on the good news, not the bad.

There is another difference between a news bureau and a public-relations office. They might be likened to two funnels gathering information at one end, processing the raw materials, then distributing information at the other end. A news bureau has its clients or members primed and waiting for the finished product, eager to use the informa-
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tion. Distribution is no problem. The news bureau spends more effort gathering the information, cultivating news sources, hiring stringers and training them. The public-relations office of a company generally has plenty of information and can gather additional facts without much interference. So the PR man concentrates more on the problems of distribution, seeing that the information goes to those it will benefit most, at a convenient time and in suitable form.

What about representing the company? There is a common misconception that even the best company will expect its PR office to see only part of the truth, to mislead the news media and to con the public. That is just not true. Many PR men are former newsmen. They didn’t change their morals, for better or worse, when they changed jobs. The misconception is kept alive by those who fail to see the evolution from press agentry to corporate public relations.

Consider this gem from McLuhan:

"Today’s press agent regards the newspaper as a ventriloquist does his dummy. He can make it say what he wants. He looks on it as a painter does his palette and tubes of pigment; from the endless resources of available events, an endless variety of managed mosaic effects can be attained. Any private client can be enconced in a wide range of different patterns and tones of public affairs or human interest and depth items."

Undoubtedly there are press agents of that kind, but McLuhan’s description does not fit most public-relations people. They gladly join newsmen in objecting to private publicity build-ups, ribbon cutting, the staged no-news press conference and the manufactured event.

Sociologist Ernest van den Haag put it this way: “Public relations can seduce but it cannot rape.”

PR cannot do the impossible. And no responsible company will ask the impossible of its PR department. It will not sacrifice a developed, long-range working agreement with the news media in exchange for a fast, flashy publicity campaign.

A sincere, principled PR department working for a public-spirited company will insist on proper conduct—by the company and by the department.

Author Robert Heilbroner says, “Good public relations has come to be something very much like the corporate conscience—a commercial conscience, no doubt, but a conscience nonetheless.”

What about the day-to-day routine?

In his book The Image Merchants, Irwin Ross says:

PR men who once nurtured serious aspirations as journalists often chafe under the inadequacy of their daily missions. . . . PR men who lack journalistic background are unlikely to be troubled by this complaint. With no image of themselves as potential rivals to Lippmann or Alsop, they find public relations as congenial as merchandising or advertising.

The “inadequacy of their daily missions” is probably most acute among those PR men who fail to see the greater challenges, the responsibilities that transcend mention in the daily press. Exposure in the news media may be one goal of advertising and publicity, but PR involves much more.

The general press, radio and TV are outlets for telling the good news, but the effective PR man also will use other means of communicating.

He knows there are many publics to reach. There are the company’s customers, stockholders, employees, legislators, students and, for the railroads, that special breed of cat, the rail fan, often an expert in certain phases of rail operations.

special effort required

It takes special effort to communicate with each of those publics.

For Great Northern, there are annual reports to stockholders, dividend enclosures, annual reports to shippers and a monthly magazine for shippers. There is a newsletter for officers and several monthly publications for employees.

Great Northern has sponsored and distributed several motion pictures to promote travel. A printed directory of western ski areas served by the company is revised each fall. Other travel brochures list attractions of Glacier Park and major cities on Great Northern routes. Special publications point out resources for industrial development in regions served by the railroad.

Great Northern cooperates with the Association of American Railroads and with various state railroad associations to communicate with the many governmental agencies that have a strong voice in the company’s future.

Our PR department coordinates company participation in many civic activities such as the United Fund, Junior Achievement, Scouting, Business-Education Day, open houses, plant tours and other special events.

In a year, we answer hundreds of letters from students—from kindergarten to college. We have a model builders lending library with blueprints, pictures and other services for rail buffs.

The PR department is interested in all contacts the company makes with those various publics, serving as a two-way communications bridge. We rely on those contacts to get our messages out and for feedback to tell us when the company is doing something it shouldn’t or not doing something it should.

So we are a news bureau, yes, and a lost-and-found department, complaint desk, travel agency, speakers bureau, photo studio, hobby shop, community affairs office, information window and an answering service.

We are the eyes, ears, nose and throat of Great Northern. It’s challenging work. And it’s interesting, constantly changing and fun.
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CRAIGHEAD’S NEW NORTHWEST: THE DEFENSE OF LOUIS LEVINE

By LYLE E. HARRIS

This article is based on a chapter in Mr. Harris' master's thesis, "Dr. E. B. Craighead's New Northwest: 1915-1920." Mr. Harris received a bachelor's degree from the Montana School of Journalism in 1962 and a master's degree in 1967. He has worked as a reporter and night editor for United Press International in Helena and Salt Lake City. During the fall of 1967, he was a graduate fellow at the Washington Journalism Center. He became a staff member of The National Observer in December, 1967.

In January, 1919, Dr. Edwin B. Craighead,1 who had founded the Missoula (Mont.) New Northwest2 after having been fired as president of the University of Montana, wrote an editorial calling for a "just and equitable" tax system for Montana. The State Tax Commission recently had spent $25,000 to review tax rates and Craighead doubted the value of the study: "If the people of Montana wish to know the truth about taxation, let them employ an independent expert to give us the facts. And let them place this expert beyond the reach of demagogues and exploiters."3

Craighead was born March 3, 1861, at Ham's Prairie, Mo. He earned a B.A. at Central College in Fayette, Mo., in 1883, then attended Vanderbilt University, where he received an M.A. in Greek in 1885. After advanced study in Leipzig and Paris, he returned to the United States. The University of Missouri awarded him an LLD in 1898 and the University of the South gave him the degree of D.C.L in 1907. In 1890, Craighead became professor of Greek at Wofford College in Spartanburg, S.C. Three years later, at age 32, he became president of the South Carolina Agricultural and Mechanical College at Clemson, S.C. He became president of his alma mater, Central College, in 1897, and four years later was named president of the Missouri State Normal School at Warrensburg. In 1904, he became president of Tulane University. Craighead became president of the University of Montana in 1912 and held that position until June 8, 1915, when he was fired by the State Board of Education. He had been charged with "loose administration of the finances of the institution and an attempt . . . to subordinate the real functions of the university to that of a personal machine." However, a report by the American Association of University Professors said his dismissal was "largely due to his activities in behalf of consolidation [of Montana's state colleges and universities], a policy opposed by the governor of the state."

The editorial preceded by one week the suspension of a University of Montana professor who had published his findings about Montana taxes. The suspension of Dr. Louis Levine, an economist, became one of the major academic freedom crises in Montana history. Throughout the controversy, the New Northwest was one of his most vigorous defenders.

The chancellor of the University of Montana system had directed Levine to undertake a study of taxes, but the chancellor had failed to place Levine beyond the reach of persons to whom the report might appear unfavorable. Levine's The Taxation of Mines in Montana was put on sale early in February, 1919. On February 7, E. O. Sisson, president of the University of Montana, received from Chancellor Edward C. Elliott at Helena a telegram ordering the immediate suspension of Levine for "insubordination and unprofessional conduct prejudicial to the welfare of the institution."4 Sisson obeyed the directive.

Seven days later, the New Northwest printed a page-one editorial about Levine's book and his suspension. Craighead said: "No one, we think, will question the statement that but for the publication of this book, Dr. Levine would today be teaching economics at the state university."5 The New Northwest carried on an inside page a letter from Levine defending his book and explaining he had met with Elliott in Helena and had been told the University would not publish the manuscript. He then sent it to a New York publisher. Levine denied he had been insubordinate, pointing out that the chancellor had not forbidden publication of the manuscript.6

President Sisson gave the New Northwest a statement in

---

1Ibid., p. 1.
2Ibid., p. 2.
3Ibid., Feb. 14, 1919, p. 4.
which he disagreed with the chancellor's action. But Sisson's statement also said Elliott's "prime and only motive in the drastic step he has taken is to protect the university, for whose welfare and advancement he is fighting in Helena." Sisson suggested that "it is entirely possible that the publication of Professor Levine's monograph may be the apparent occasion of the slashing of the university appropriation..."

An investigation and an explanation of the suspension were requested in a letter drafted by students. The Alumni Association also asked for an explanation.

craighead describes book

Meanwhile, Craighead, who had offered Levine, Sisson and Elliott space in the New Northwest to explain their positions, wrote nearly 5,000 words about the book, describing it as informative, scientific and "conservative... from the standpoint of big mine owners." He added:

Like a true scientist, Levine attacks his subject from every point of the compass. He leaves unturned no stone whose upturning may help him to get an additional fact. Like an aeronaut circling around the battlements of the enemy to get a new point of view, Levine goes round and round his subject inspecting it at close range, looking at it from afar, determined to test his conclusions by arranging facts against facts... Levine deals so tenderly with the mining corporations of Montana that he seems loath in a few terse pages to state all the naked truth. He is too gentle to do this. Like the average college professor, he cannot endure the thought of giving offense. Thus, he states that "if a mining company should" do so and so, although he knows perfectly well that there is no "should" about it. They are actually doing it and have always done it—we mean invested part of their profits in other enterprises, thus cutting down the so-called "net proceeds" on which they pay taxes.

The book said the mining corporations in Montana were not paying even half the taxes they should compared with other industries. Levine wrote that from 1914 to 1917 the Anaconda Copper Mining Company, the largest corporation in the state, had paid from 5 to 10 per cent of the total taxes collected in Montana. The average for the four years was 6.7 per cent. "This then is the measure of the tax burden borne by the A.C.M. Co. in the State of Montana," Levine said.

Craighead commented:

If these figures are justified, the [Anaconda] company is paying taxes on less than one-third of its total assets. But Professor Levine throws further light on the subject in his statement on page 66, that while the net income of the company in 1916 from operations in Montana was $42,837,600, its total assessment in 1917 was $55,606,347; that this total assessment was only $12,768,747 more than its income for the year! And in this connection it must be remembered that the net income was obtained after deducting all money spent for improvements. How ridiculous these figures will appear when placed side by side with similar figures representing taxes on other kinds of property. For example, suppose that a farmer were taxed not on the value of his farm but on the net income on his farm after deducting money spent for a new house and a new barn. What taxes would a farmer, owning say a hundred thousand dollar farm, have to pay? He would not even pay taxes on ten cents.

The accuracy and facts in the book were not questioned; it had been well substantiated and researched, written with what Craighead called understatement. The New Northwest editor said Levine should have been awarded a medal of honor, rather than having been suspended. Craighead added:

More summary action could scarcely have been visited upon him had he been convicted of some outrageous and shocking crimes, such as running away with another man's wife or robbing an orphan asylum... If professors, guilty of no other offense than that of giving the public the benefit of their expert knowledge on taxation or any other great public question affecting the welfare of the state, are to be summarily removed from their chairs, our soldiers have indeed fought a vain fight. We warn Governor Stewart that he cannot continue to trample under foot the moral sense of the faculty and alumni and students of the University of Montana. Montana is not Germany of ante-bellum days. We are not living in the Russia of the Czars.

The New Northwest said the governor, after Craighead and three professors had been removed in 1915, had promised "that in the future he would do his utmost to protect the rights of professors and to give them a fair trial in the event that charges should be preferred against them." But Craighead, who often had accused Governor Stewart of being subservient to the Anaconda Copper Mining Company, asked: "Did the governor ever keep any promise that the Anaconda Copper Company asked him to ignore?" Craighead said persons who knew Stewart could best answer the question. The editor criticized the State Board of Education for not developing a better system to protect academic freedom. Of Chancellor Elliott, Craighead said:

One thing, however, we regret, and the chancellor himself will in the future, we believe, regret, and that is, that he did not tell Governor Stewart in good old Anglo Saxon that he declined, no matter what the consequences, to accede to the dirty and cowardly and damnable demand that Professor Levine be suspended from his post at the university. Back of that demand unquestionably stood the shortsighted autocratic little officials of a gigantic corporation, who, blind as the blindest bourbon of ancient France, blind as the blindest Junkers of Germany, failed to realize that the world is moving forward and that they can no longer Prussianize the proud and splendid people of this great commonwealth. The chancellor himself

---

1Ibid.
2Ibid.
3Ibid., p. 4.
4Ibid.
5Ibid.
Craighead supported his defense of Levine by reprinting stories and editorials about the case from newspapers and magazines, including The New Republic, The Nation, Campbell's Scientific Farmer, Nonpartisan Leader and the New York World. The New Northwest offered Levine's book for $1 or free with a $2 subscription to the newspaper.

On April 11, 1919, the New Northwest announced that Levine had been reinstated by the State Board of Education. A committee at the University had investigated the suspension and recommended reinstatement. Craighead said in a page-one editorial:

> As one member of the board in Helena stated to a few of his friends, "the ball got too hot and we had to drop it." The threat of the hirelings of the company that they would punish anyone who dared to oppose them was proved to be an idle boast. The New York "bosses" of Montana felt that after patriotically selling copper to the government during the war at three times its normal value, they were strong enough to punish any member of a university faculty who would dare publish any fact which they did not regard as in their interest. The great wave of indignation which swept the state at the dismissal of the professor threatened the political control of the state.

> The company by sinister suggestion and open threats to the officials of the university had talked of cutting the port of the Committee on Service of the State University of Montana. The AAUP report had been based on that committee's findings. Craighead said that the Levine case had attracted national attention because people "felt that freedom of teaching and of writing were imperiled in the arbitrary action of the governor." Craighead added:

> The reinstatement of Professor Levine, unconditionally, is considered a great triumph for the cause of freedom in our universities by keen-eyed thinkers and professors who have watched from afar the turn of events in Montana. They will still watch to see whether Professor Levine will later be removed upon totally different charges.

In October, 1919, the New Northwest reported that Levine had left Montana to work for the New York World at $125 a week. Levine's book, Craighead said, would have "fallen still-born from the press" except for two reasons: "First, it was anathematized by the governor and pronounced dead, and, second, it was like good seed cast into good soil... That book, like John Brown's soul, still goes marching on."

incident summarized

Craighead summarized the case in an editorial headlined: "Is The Anaconda Copper Company Dodging Taxes?" He said, in part:

> There can be no question about that. Every intelligent and well informed Montanan has known for years that the Anaconda has never borne its just burden of taxation. Professor Levine of the University proved it to the satisfaction of experts, although Levine, wishing to make his statements unassailable, always understated his case. That Levine dealt the company a hard blow is attested by the fact that within twenty-four hours after the appearance of his book on the taxation of mines, the chancellor of the University at the command of the governor removed Levine from his chair. No sane man doubts that the governor was moved to act at the expressed or implied wish of the hirelings of the company. He was reinstated by the governor, who again doubtless interpreted correctly the wish of his master..."

On Jan. 9, 1920, the New Northwest printed part of a report by the American Association of University Professors, which had published in its AAUP Bulletin results of its investigation of the Levine case. The report substantiated Craighead's charges against Governor Stewart. In the Jan. 16, 1920, New Northwest, Craighead printed the entire report of the Committee on Service of the State University of Montana. The AAUP report had been based on that committee's findings. Craighead said:

> The best part of the [AAUP] report, however, is the able and courageous and manly report of the faculty of..."
the University of Montana which, under the new constitution of the university, had the right to examine the whole matter. This report is signed by [Professors] Morton J. Elrod, Paul C. Phillips and Walter L. Pope, Committee on Service, State University of Montana. This report, which will always remain a permanent part of the educational history of the state, is too important to be passed over hurriedly.24

Levine's book had virtually no effect on taxation of Montana mining companies. Still, the Levine case was a signific-

24 Ibid., Jan. 9, 1920, p. 4.

Walt Whitman: Editor to Poet

By Larry F. Cripe*

In 1857, two years after publication of *Leaves of Grass*, Walt Whitman became editor of the Brooklyn *Daily Times*, an assignment that was to mark the end of his full-time career as a newspaperman.

He had become a printer's devil in 1830 at age 11 and had served as a reporter and editor on numerous Eastern newspapers, including the *Brooklyn Eagle*.

In other years, his editorials had reflected a zeal to reform, to debate, to "disturb the public peace in various directions," as Ruskin had put it. By 1857, that reformist impulse was gone. One critic said Whitman had given up looking for panaceas.

Whitman's editorials seemed to avoid national controversies in the troubled years preceding the Civil War. He wrote in the *Times* only five editorials about slavery and none about secession.

In a period of fiery political feelings, Whitman had become politically independent. He wrote in one editorial: "The curse of American politics—especially in municipal and state affairs—is that men love their party better than their country. They see a man nominated for office whom they know to be unfit for the position, and seeking it only that he may plunder the treasury—yet rather than endanger the success of the 'ticker,' they vote him into power. . . . This tyranny of party fealty—this self-imposed yoke which hangs around the neck of so many of the best as well as the worst of the community—must be loosened.'"

And: "We thought that a far greater power had taken the slavery question out of the hands of conventions and parties. . . . We think the people will occupy some years in the weighing of slavery and will make a righteous decision upon it."

What had happened, of course, was that Whitman the journalist had become Whitman the poet. For years he had been a journalist who worked part time as a poet. Now he had become a poet who considered himself a part-time journalist. He had perfected a new medium of expression. His editorials show that specific issues and events were important to Whitman only in the context of the larger moral and spiritual questions central to his poetry. Follow-

ing a marine disaster, he wrote: "It is strange how out of evil good continually comes. Such great calamities as that which is just now occupying the public mind serve as reminders, as warnings, as lessons. They startle us from our paltry, apathetic selfishness, they elicit feelings better and higher than ordinarily move us, they link us together, for a time at least, by the bond of a mutual sentiment, they teach us that frail human nature can deport itself bravely and well under circumstances the most appalling."

By the spring of 1859, Whitman no longer was editor of the *Times*. It is uncertain whether he quit or was discharged, but scholars have suggested his departure was prompted by a dispute with local church leaders whom Whitman had called prudish and hypocritical.

As his eminence as a poet grew, Whitman continued to submit occasional articles to newspapers. He never lost his respect for the press and he predicted great achievements for it: "But what newspapers are at present is comparatively nothing to what they are destined to be. With the increase of mechanical facilities, the effort of producing them will be greatly lessened, and with the spread of intelligence among the masses there will spring up a far greater demand for news journals than at present. When the Atlantic Telegraph is an accomplished fact, as it will be in the end, we shall behold in the daily paper a complete reflex of current events in all countries, and its readers, sitting comfortably at their mutton coffee, may realize the words prophetic of a man 'who was for all time' and 'put a girdle round the earth in forty minutes'."

*An excerpt from a report by Larry F. Cripe for the Senior Seminar in the Montana School of Journalism. Mr. Cripe was graduated with honors by the University of Montana, then worked for the Missoula (Mont.) *Missoulian* and subsequently served two years with VISTA. He recently completed a year of study under an Inter American Press Association grant at the University of Buenos Aires.
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FROM BOG TO GRIDIRON:
HAPPY YEARS ON A WEEKLY

By Harold G. Stearns

Mr. Stearns has been a Montana newspaperman for 32 years. He was graduated from the Montana School of Journalism in 1936 and that year became editor of the Havre Daily News. Since 1940, he has been owner and publisher of the weekly Harlowton Times. In 1952, he also purchased the Ryegate Eastern Montana Clarion. Mr. Stearns often has been called affectionately "the sage of the Musselshell." He is a member of the University of Montana Council of 30 and a trustee of the Montana Historical Society. He long has been active in the Montana Press Association as well as in numerous civic organizations. This article is a reprint of Mr. Stearns' editorial in the Oct. 12, 1967, Times in which he reminisces about his 27 years as a weekly publisher.

Twenty-seven years! It just doesn't seem possible that time has flown by so swiftly and that we are now approaching twice as old as we were when we arrived in Harlowton with a bride of two-years duration and a six-month-old son.

We reread our first editorial of the issue of Oct. 5, 1940, in which we expressed our hopes of remaining for a long time (and we have). We also promised we'd give our best to the area, and we hope that in the main our efforts have not been deleterious.

They've been satisfactory and happy years and we shall always be happy we wound up here, instead of some big city we once had an ambition to conquer.

Folks have been kind to us and to our family, and Jean and I will never forget how wonderfully well we've been treated. The greatness of a small town and country area was best demonstrated to us when we lost our beloved 12-year-old Billy back in 1954. He fell off his bike at the foot of Central Avenue, and our lives were shattered by the impact of his tragic death. Our spirits were bolstered by such an outpouring of kindnesses by everyone that we have never gotten over the experience of knowing how truly wonderful people are. We vowed then we would never cease contributing our best efforts to this area and would always want to be here.

We are looking forward to at least another quarter century hustling for a living running a weekly newspaper and spouting off about local happenings and commenting and calling the shots as we see 'em, about any and all subjects, even if we don't know much about 'em.

We're optimistic for the future—some folks point out a dwindling population, and we can prove there are as many people in town now as there were in 1940. Others say there are empty buildings. We counter that by saying there are also a lot of new ones, on the highway particularly, plus more than 75 new homes that have been constructed since we arrived.

Sure things have changed. The passenger train is gone with the wind and steed. But the Milwaukee prospers with its freight hauling. The flour mill has departed as a major payroll. But we now have a terrific number of businesses that cater to the traveling public. When we came on the scene, there were no motels and about three service stations. There were no farm implement dealers—now there are several.

Our point is, our economy has changed and in many ways for the better. Irrigation has brought more farming and our livestock industry is tremendously more prosperous than it was. Now everybody is working and for good wages—when we came, we were still just recovering from the depression, the mill wasn't running, railroad business was down, nobody had any money.

Back in 1940 a county official drawing $1,800 a year had as good a job as anybody and better than most. Lots of store help got 25 cents and 35 cents an hour and labor on the railroad was around four bits. Of course you got bread for a dime, milk 10 cents a quart, hamburger 15 cents a pound or less.

True, good roads have challenged us to cope with the call of the city slickers. All smaller towns are in the same fix, but we are convinced we will survive, and in time people will move from the larger centers so they can enjoy the benefits of small-town living.

Our home town is infinitely better than it was in 1940.
Then we had no swimming pool, no hospital, no adequate-size gymnasium. We didn’t even have a decent fire truck. Nor did we have a sewer lagoon. Our football field was a bog in the park. We had no armory. Our golf course has been infinitely improved with a fine clubhouse. Add to this basketball and tennis courts. And the Youth Center. Plus a dandy new post office.

We’ve built a 12-room grade school and now have one of the finest school plants anywhere. The Forest Service has its headquarters here and, with other federal agencies, is housed in a commodious structure.

The Federated Church is new and so is the Episcopal Church and the Lutheran Faith Center. The Wesleyan Methodist and Catholic and Trinity Lutheran Churches have all been improved, and we now have a Latter-day Saints congregation in town. Add to those a number of new business buildings and a lot of fine homes.

**adventurous roadways**

When we came, there was no improved highway to Judith Gap, none to Big Timber, and you had to go around by Roundup to get to Billings. Believe me, it was an adventure to get to Helena or Lewistown in them days.

It’s hard for a young feller like me to realize we now are classed almost with the old-timers or first settlers. At least in business, there are only a few still here who were operating when we arrived. We don’t think we’ve forgotten anyone, but here’s the list—L. L. and L. C. Kalberg of the Toggery, in business, there are only a few still here who were operating.

Ed Wojtowick arrived the same fall we did. Reubin Johnson within a couple of years. A number of businesses that were here when we came are now under different ownership.

We think the *Times* has made progress. All we have left of the machinery we bought from Howard Squires is one old, small job press and a few makeup stones and tables. Long gone is the old Campbell newspaper press, succeeded by a Miehle. We have automatic presses in an A. B. Dick offset, a Heidelberg and a Kluge. Plus a power paper cutter, paper drill, tabulating broach, addressograph, two new linotypes, camera equipment, etc. Housed in a building constructed in 1942 and twice added on to. One old linotype is in Idaho, another in the Orient and one in Ekalaka. The old news press was junked.

And just lately we acquired a splendid new office, filled with Indian artifacts, historical loot, pictures, a fireplace, fancy desk, a rug. We want you to come in and sit down in the Uneasy Chair and talk of sealing wax, cabbage and kings.

It’s been 50 years since Howard Squires and Walt Hanson came to found the *Times*, in an era when more than a million acres of virgin land were plowed up, and everything was booming with 150 power rigs tearing up the sod. The average farm size was 488 acres then.

We look back over the years on some of our staff members. Gathered to their fathers are Ed Dott, Lyle Sheldon and Ole Christiansen, our first printers. The deaf boy, Bob Kosanovich, is on the Portland *Oregonian*. Others came and went. But thanks be we’ve been blessed by the presence of the most valuable and talented Jerry Miller for more than a decade. He’s a master printer and a craftsman artist, par excellence, dedicated to his profession, and skilled beyond measure. There ain’t nothin’ in the printin’ line he can’t do.

Elmer Mehlhoff, printer and operator, has been with us for five years, and we greatly value his talents, not only in the shop but as a master carpenter and cabinetmaker. Helen Miller has kept the subscription list for the *Times*, *Clarion* and Montana Wildlife Federation News for about as long. On press days we recruit Mary Tuss and Susie Goodman, plus our own kids (when they show up). Waide Doney is the current printer’s devil and we hope to utilize his artistic talents.

Jean’s the advertising expert, bookkeeper, society editor, and does the work while we go preaching or history chasing. Sometimes, we sort of get hurt when folks mention the paper was a lot better when she ran it during our Navy career.

They’ve been an exciting 27 years. Political scraps dating from Willkie vs. FDR, Ford vs. Ayers, Harry Truman, Zales Ecton, Burt Wheeler, Leif Erickson, John Bonner, Hugo “the galloping Swede,” Don Nutter, Tim Babcock, Mike Mansfield, Jim Battin, Wes D’Ewart, Wellington Rankin, Leonard Young, LeRoy Anderson. Good men, and some not so able, but all of ’em interesting fellers to know.

The battles for the new school and gym were stirring and after several times of having our head bloodied, the kids got what they needed. What would life be without school wrangles, hirings and firings?

The struggle for new roads. What a great day it was when the Bill Jacobs bridge across the Yellowstone at Forsyth was dedicated, and U.S. Highway 12 became a real thoroughfare. And when we got out of the mud to get to the Gap and Lewistown and to Big Timber. Also what a break it was when Highway 12 continued through town, rather than going through the golf course to the north, as was threatened. And now we’re getting a wider and better road both east and west, and the present dangerous stretch just south of town is going to be modernized.

When we bought the paper from Howard Squires it was housed in what was later a laundry, then Murry’s Cafe, and now Harlo Plumbing. Squires lived upstairs, and so did we for a couple of years, until we built our present structure in early 1942. Since then we’ve added on twice. Chet Comstock and Axel Johnson built the original building which was 60 feet long. Now we’re more than 100.

Picking out some highlights over the years—two floods which raised general Cain, mainly to us flat rats. The battles to build new schools. Tempers got pretty hot, superintendents departed, school boards were beaten and elected, but finally the kids got a splendid plant. We spent a couple of
years on Hugo Aronson's State Personnel Commission, trying to set up a good salary schedule for state employees, and the legislature booted it out. Now 13 years later we're being asked to give a new committee advice on the same subject. At any rate it was an interesting but mighty frustrating experience. We tried to convince the people we were legislature timber but got trounced and now we're glad of it, although it was humiliating at the time. We'd sooner pick on politicians than be one. Now we have a job on the Historical Society Board and are having the time of our life learning about the past. Speaking of politics, we broke with Don Nutter when he began assailing school people, and we weren't buddies at all. A current junior senator indicated last fall he didn't like us much, but as long as Mike Mansfield and Jim Battin are in Congress, we hope to be able to have a pipeline to Washington. We've been a sales-tax advocate for a lot longer than Tim Babcock and will continue to advocate this means of getting needed revenues. But we doubt it will add to our political glamour. Another real achievement was getting McQuitty football field, thanks to Supt. Gus Wylie and Mac and Dick McQuitty.

Jean and I came here with one son, and have wound up with three more living and a trio of femmes. Harlowton schools have provided them sound educations and for this we're thankful. A small town is an ideal place for kids to grow up—we hope our grandchildren will have the opportunity. (So far no sons-in-law or daughters-in-law.)

It's been fun working on road committees and helping get us out of the mud. We're happy the golf course has been developed so well. The flood-prevention project is another valuable acquisition. When the gym was built, we felt a real gap had been filled. And what a privilege to be part of Montana's top service organization—the Harlowton Kiwanis Club.

When Harlowton won the Number One Town in Montana contest staged by the Montana Chamber of Commerce, it proved to the world what we've always maintained—Harlo is Number One in our book. We're glad we accidentally heard of the Times being for sale way back in June, 1940, when we met our father-in-law's cousin, Bill Van Dyke, and he told us about it. Otherwise we might have been in Polson or Ephrata, Wash.

There's no place like Harlo. Where else can you meet people in every walk of life whose talents are so diverse? Folks who came here in the early days to conquer a primitive land. Others who in spite of formal education have made themselves truly educated in a variety of fields. Everybody working together in a common cause—community betterment. I question whether there's any locality anywhere where there's less bigotry and more tolerance and understanding than the Queen City of the Musselshell Valley. In short, the percentage of unlikable characters is fortunately smaller here than is usually the case. And this isn't just because we've outlived most of our enemies.

There've been a lot of changes in 27 years and we hope unlike some oldsters we "ain't been agin' every one of 'em." We've tried to stay young in our thinking and we hope not to fossilize. The future generations of the 1940 vintage are now in the ascendancy, and we think the years ahead are in better hands than ours.

Our advice after a half-century plus in this vale of tears—be progressive and don't get discouraged and stagnate. Most of all, don't be too impatient. We used to think the world had come to an end when our pet school building projects got beaten, but finally they were approved. So it has been with many forward-looking measures—they eventually become a reality if you keep digging.

That's Our Dorothy

Dorothy Johnson, who retired in 1967 as an assistant professor of journalism at the University of Montana and as secretary-manager of the Montana Press Association, is now a full-time free-lance writer and a part-time writer of letters to the editor. She is working on her ninth book and her letters to the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian occasionally influence such steadfast individuals as the county commissioners. For example:

"All of a sudden a lot of people, including me, are living on West Greenough Drive. We haven't moved, but new signs appeared on what was Duncan Drive. Nobody asked us, nobody told us—the county commissioners just did it. Pretty high-handed, eh?"

"I've just had new stationery printed with 2309 Duncan Drive on it and haven't paid the Missoulian for the printing job. If I send the bill to the county commissioners, do you suppose they'll pay it? Will our mailman continue to be amiable while mail for families along here comes addressed to a nonexistent street for the next several years? Will bills for property taxes still reach us?"

"Dorothy M. Johnson, Address Unknown."

That letter appeared Nov. 1, 1967. On Nov. 5, the Missoulian carried this editorial brief:

"The county commissioners are going to let Duncan Drive remain Duncan Drive and not let it be renamed West Greenough Drive."

"Their response to criticism about the name, which appeared in a letter by Dorothy Johnson on this page last Wednesday, is gratifying. Good work, Miss Johnson. Good work, commissioners."

Montana Journalism Review
THE POETIC IMAGE:
MANSFIELD OF MONTANA

By NANCY R. CHAPMAN

This article is based on a report submitted by Miss Chapman in the course Mass Media in Modern Society during the summer, 1967, term. Miss Chapman, who is studying for a master's degree in journalism at the University of Montana, is a graduate of the University of Mississippi. As an English and journalism instructor at Charles M. Russell High School in Great Falls, Mont., she advises the school newspaper, the Stampede, and the yearbook, the Russellog, both of which have received top ratings from the Montana Interscholastic Editorial Association. Miss Chapman examines in this article Sen. Mike Mansfield's use of the language and suggests that he may be remembered for his eloquence and poetic image as well as for his service in the Congress.

What is it about Michael J. Mansfield of Montana, Senate majority leader, that has prompted observers to call him a poet? Is it, perhaps, his affinity for the national ideal that has created a poetic mist? Is it the grace of his public statements—the thought, form, metaphor and harmony that pervade so many of his speeches? Or is it a poem itself—his eulogy to John F. Kennedy?

It is the purpose of this article to examine those characteristics that have led some to believe the senior senator from Montana does, indeed, possess "a touch of the poet." Does feeling for, faith in and loyalty to a national ideal make a man a poet? Francis B. Gummere, in Democracy and Poetry, has said: "The duty of every man to make the community efficient, to clear its paths, support it and submit to it, and keep it alive with his own life is a kind of doxology sung wherever the name of the republic is mentioned in assemblies of people."1 Accepting Gummere's conception of the national ideal as a lyric, one is tempted to conclude that men who best serve that ideal will be considered poets. Mansfield, by serving in three branches of the military, working as a miner, teaching in a university and representing his state in Congress, seems to have approached fulfillment of that "duty of every man." But service alone is not enough. It is the character with which one serves that determines the poetry of his image.

Mansfield has a reputation for being patient, studious and quietly persuasive. He refuses to exercise raw power or to coax, threaten or pressure his colleagues. Sen. Everett Dirksen, Senate minority leader, has said of Mansfield: "He is fair... never temperamental... no opportunism... no expediency... He is extremely cooperative and understanding. I couldn't have a better man across the aisle." In 1962, Sen. George Smathers of Florida said of Mansfield: "He has won his sainthood here on earth for his magnificent patience. He has had the fortitude of the Christian martyrs."3

It has been observed by one reporter that Mansfield's principal asset is his considerateness.4 Journalism students at Charles M. Russell High School in Great Falls, Mont., will vouch for that quality. When Mansfield visited the school Oct. 29, 1966, he agreed to be interviewed by student reporters. After the session had been under way for nearly an hour, I suggested to the students that the senator might wish to be excused, for he probably had other commitments. "Absolutely not," Mansfield said. "A politician must always be free to meet with the press."

But what about real poetry—poetry that is spoken or written? Does Mansfield have identity here? If one agrees with the standard conception of poetry as a process in which image, idea and language do their work together, then Mansfield is a poet. He employs in many of his speeches certain literary devices common to poetry: Designed alliteration, marked rhythms, repetitions and figurative language.

4Collins, op. cit., p. 9.
The alliteration used in this sentence from a speech during the Suez crisis in 1957 is illustrative: “That seems to me to be a formula for inertia, for drift, dodge, delay, and ultimately for disaster.”

Rhythm, repetition and figures of speech make the following passage sound distinctly poetic:

There is an ebb and flow in human affairs which at rare moments brings the complex of human events into a delicate balance. At those moments, the acts of government may indeed influence, for better or for worse, the course of history. This is such a moment in the life of the nation. This is the moment for the Senate.

And:

I commend him for forestalling political pyrotechnics on this issue, which, while they provide political capital and bright luster for the few, leave only the ashes of frustrated hopes for the many.

Mansfield was referring to the civil-rights debate in the first example. In the latter quotation, he was speaking about Lyndon B. Johnson, then majority leader.

In December, 1963, when critics had objected to what they termed Mansfield’s failure to bring action on the late President Kennedy’s legislative programs, the senator countered with these words:

I am neither a circus ringmaster, the master of ceremonies of a Senate night club, a tamer of Senate lions, nor a wheeler and dealer. . . . I achieved the height of my political ambitions when I was elected Senator from Montana. When the Senate saw fit to designate me as majority leader, it was the Senate’s choice, not mine, and what the Senate has bestowed it is always at liberty to revoke. But so long as I have this responsibility, it will be discharged to the best of my ability by me as I am. I shall not don any Mandarin’s robes or any skin other than that to which I am accustomed in order that I may look like a majority leader or sound like a majority leader. I am what I am, and no title, political face-lifter, nor image-maker can alter it.

These two excerpts help substantiate further the poetic tenor of Mansfield’s speeches:

... I make these remarks today to express what I believe to be a deepening disquiet in the nation. It is as though we were passing through a stretch of stormy seas in a ship which is obviously powerful and luxurious, but a ship, nevertheless, frozen in a dangerous course and with a hull in pressing need of repair. . . .

... I meet with you fresh from an exposure to a cross-section of American sentiment as it exists in Montana, where the frost has long been on the pumpkin and the snows of winter have already begun to gather. I meet with you still strongly seized with what lies closest to the heart of the people of my state. . . . The war is clearly the nexus of the national anxiety. And peace lies at the heart of the nation’s hopes; peace—its honorable restoration at the earliest possible moment. . . . We owe that to the unfortunate people of that nation, to ourselves, and to the world.

In the former example, Mansfield was referring to the fears Americans had begun to express regarding so-called inadequacies in national defense and space programs in 1960. In the latter example, he was referring to a fall, 1966, visit to Montana and the opinions he encountered concerning Vietnam.

On May 23, 1963, Mansfield spoke at the dedication of the East Coast Memorial in New York City. That speech, reprinted here, serves as one of the most convincing examples of the man’s poetic capabilities:

It was not a long time ago, as time goes. It was scarcely twenty years ago when it all took place.

In the dawn and in the dusk and through the day, men and women went forth from this nation—to Africa, to Asia, to Europe, to the South Pacific, and to all the far places of the world. Week after week, they went, and month after month, and year after year.

Before it was done, eight million men and women in battle dress were outside the borders and, within, millions more were ready to go. And behind them, there was a nation with a whole people united in common purpose.

They came, these men and women in the Armed Forces, from the farms, the mines, the desks and the work benches. They came from slum and suburb, from country and town. They came from Utah and New York, from Puerto Rico and Georgia, from all the States and places in the land. They came from the long-rooted strains of Americans and from those so new that even the English language was still halting on the tongue. They came in all colors, all faiths, all creeds. And they were welcome in all colors, faiths and creeds.

Some came with fierce anger. Some came with cold hate. And some came with neither hate nor anger. Some knew why they came and some did not. Some came because they were told; and some because they told themselves.

In the end, it did not matter who they were, what they were, what they did, where they had come from, or why. They became—all of them—the sinew and bone and muscle of a mighty arm of a nation. The nation’s purpose was their purpose and it was they who bore the great costs and dangers of that purpose through the long years of the war.

A common human hope joined these Americans with others, with the English, with Russians, with Chinese, with Frenchmen and many more. And, in the end, this massive force swept, as a great wave, over the ramparts of the tyrants. It tore loose a deadly weight from the minds and backs of hundreds of millions and flung it into the cesspools of history.

And when this force had spent itself, for a brief moment, men and women throughout the world drank deeply of the meaning of peace and freedom. Many clutched that moment and held it. Many soon forgot or were compelled soon to forget.

And millions of those who had done so much to forget the moment were not there to live it when it came. Some had fought and died years before and some the day before. They had died in their homes or down the street or on the edge of town, against a wall, in a ditch, a courtyard or an open field. And others had died a long way from home, in an alien land or against a vast sky or in the pitch-dark of the sea’s depths.

Countless Americans were among those who did not see the bright flash of freedom and peace which swept the earth when the conflict ended. They died in all the places and in all the ways of war’s death. Today, most
of them lie here in the earth of America or in a plot apart in other nations which is of this nation because they are there. But for others, we are not able to provide even a grave with a cross or a star to mark their last traces.

These are the missing. And it is they who have summoned us.

How much do we know of these missing men, we who stand here today? We know their names. We know the numbers they bore in the Army and Air Force, the Coast Guard, in the Navy and the Marines. But what do we really know of them? Do we know them as a wife, a mother, a father, a sister, brother or friend might know them? For those close to them, each life lost was as a star in a human heavens, each life lost was as a star whose light was bright for awhile and then, in a moment, ceased to burn.

We cannot know that world, we who stand here, that closed but infinite world of each man’s circle. What we can know, what all in this nation can know, and all the world’s people should know, is that these deaths are a debt yet to be redeemed. And those whom we could not even bury are of its pledge.

Let us not delude ourselves. We do not pay the debt with these words today. We do not end it with these steles of granite pointed towards the sky nor with names struck upon stone.

We seek the words to praise these men and they are wanting. We search to express our thanks to these men and even the genius of the sculptor is not enough.

The debt remains unpaid. What we do and say here today is not needed by these men whom we honor. It is needed by ourselves. It is needed to remind us that the debt is unpaid. For these men whose names we record, and the countless others throughout the world whose passing was marked or unmarked, did not die for words of praise or memorials of stone. They died that those who lived might have a chance to build this nation strong and wise in justice and in equity for all, in a world free, at last, from the tyrants of fear, hate and oppression.

It was a long time ago, as time goes, that they died. It was not twenty years but fifty years ago or a century or a millennium. For they died not only on the Normandy Beachhead but at Verdun, at Gettysburg, at Valley Forge and in all the places and in all the times that the human right to be human has been redeemed.

If we would honor these dead, then—all of them—if we would praise them, if we would repay them, let us ask ourselves what we have done with this chance which they have given us. And let us ask ourselves again and again what we have done until there is, in this nation and in this world, the need to ask it no longer.

It would seem as if Mansfield’s poetic image is obvious when one considers the man himself and the literary devices employed so frequently in his speeches. However, the strongest evidence that he is an occasional poet rests in one public declaration—Mansfield’s eulogy to John F. Kennedy. It was delivered at the President’s bier in the rotunda of the Capitol at Washington, D.C., Nov. 24, 1963:

There was a sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a wit in a man neither young nor old, but a wit full of an old man’s wisdom and of a child’s wisdom, and then, in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a man marked with the scars of his love of country, a body active with the surge of a life far, far from spent and, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a father with a little boy, a little girl and a joy of each in the other. In a moment it was no more, and so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a husband who asked much and gave much, and out of the giving and the asking wove with a woman what could not be broken in life, and in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands, and kissed him and closed the lid of a coffin.

A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet, in death he gave of himself to us. He gave us of a good heart from which the laughter came. He gave us of a profound wit, from which a great leadership emerged. He gave us of a kindness and a strength fused into a human courage to seek peace without fear.

He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn, might give. He gave that we might give of ourselves, that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred, prejudice and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down.

In leaving us—these gifts, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, leaves with us. Will we take them, Mr. President? Will we have now, the sense and the responsibility and the courage to take them?

I pray to God that we shall and under God we will.

Analysis of the eulogy shows that it follows the classical structure of death poems: (1) It states the fact of death in interjectional outbursts; (2) it contains reminiscences of the deceased; (3) it asks a question of the living; (4) it ends in a statement of appeal.6

Gummere has said that the value of any poem is in proportion to the largeness of the mood that it is capable of creating in the properly sensitive recipient.6 If that is true, then Mansfield’s eulogy is permanent poetry, for men always will be sensitive to the mood of death—especially to the death of a President.

It is, of course, the task of future generations to determine the historical legacy of a nation’s leaders. Perhaps Senator Mansfield, in some other century, will be remembered not only as a Senate majority leader but also as a poet.
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STRIDENT CRITIC OF THE U.S.: THE VIETNAM COURIER IN 1966

By CARL A. GIDLUND

Mr. Gidlund earned a bachelor's degree and a master's degree from the Montana School of Journalism. He has worked as a reporter and news director at KQTE Radio in Missoula, Mont., and as a reporter for the University of Montana Information Services office. From October, 1961, to May, 1966, he served as an Army Intelligence specialist and was discharged as a chief warrant officer. He was stationed in Vietnam in 1965. This article is based on a chapter in Mr. Gidlund's thesis, which describes and analyzes the content of the Hanoi Vietnam Courier during 1966. The article examines the newspaper's arguments that the United States was failing militarily and politically in Vietnam. Mr. Gidlund is an information officer in the Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President.

The English-language Vietnam Courier was one of Hanoi's weapons in a war of words in 1966 as the Vietnamese conflict expanded and as the controversy over it became more clamorous.

Published by the North Vietnam Ministry of Information, the newspaper had been founded in 1963 and until Feb. 10, 1966, was issued every two weeks. Thereafter, it was published weekly and directed at the English-reading audience outside Vietnam. Its office was at 18 Ton Dan in Hanoi.

The Vietnam Courier often used 10 or more fonts on a page. Display fonts included Bold Gothic, Ultra Bodoni, Twentieth Century and type faces similar to Spartan and Lydian. Red headlines and kickers were placed over important stories.

The newspaper, a tabloid, usually contained eight pages. Photographic reproduction often was poor.

As an instrument of the North Vietnamese government, the newspaper's messages represented Hanoi's official view of the war. The Vietnam Courier in 1966 presented an account of the conflict considerably different from that normally available to the American reader, particularly regarding the nature and effectiveness of the United States' commitment in Vietnam.

The Vietnam Courier contended the United States was losing the war. The bombing of North Vietnam was hardening the resolve of the people. In South Vietnam, the allied armies were losing battle after battle. Because of continued setbacks, morale was crumbling among the allied forces and controversies were developing between the "imperialists" and the "puppets." In striking contrast was the newspaper's description of life in North Vietnam, where progress was reported in education, agriculture and industry.

While the audience of the Vietnam Courier was not necessarily committed to United States and South Vietnamese policies, the newspaper's reports were intended to affect attitudes and thereby to influence opinions about the war.

Numerous reports in 1966 contained exultations over the so-called failure of every phase of the policy of the United States. In one story, for example, a North Vietnamese
spokesman traced what he termed the history of American failures in Vietnam:

In 1954, the long-term and heroic resistance of our people ended successfully. Peace was restored in Indochina, North Vietnam entirely liberated. That great victory meant a failure not only for the French colonialist but also for the U.S. imperialists who had come thrice to their rescue. Dien Bien Phu was a disaster both for the French colonialists and the American imperialists. Thus the U.S. was defeated for the first time.

But U.S. imperialism did not reconcile itself to failure. During the years following the signing of the Geneva Agreement, it set up the dictatorial Ngo Dinh Diem regime and drowned the South Vietnamese revolution in blood in the hope of subduing the people and putting them under the yoke of neo-colonialism. But our compatriots in the South rose up and struggled resolutely against the U.S.-Ngo Dinh Diem clique. The Ngo Dinh Diem regime collapsed. That was the second defeat the U.S. suffered at our hands.

U.S. imperialism unleashed an undeclared war, and waged what they called a “special war” against the liberation of our people in the hope of conquering the South of our country. But our compatriots rose up as one man and combining political with armed struggle, frustrated the U.S. “special warfare” tactics in the main. It was the third failure inflicted by us on the United States.

Facing total bankruptcy, since the middle of 1965, U.S. imperialism has been sending massive expeditionary forces to South Vietnam with a view to preventing the collapse of the puppet army and administration, wiping out our revolutionary forces, regaining control of some lost areas, thus hoping to turn the tide of the war and bring a favourable change to the situation. The 1965-66 “dry season counteroffensive” strategy which inaugurated this pernicious scheme was foiled by the South Vietnamese Army and people. Thus was the fourth U.S. reverse in its dash with us.

Along with the stepping up of the aggressive war in the South of our country, U.S. imperialism has been waging an air and naval war of destruction in the North, hoping to undermine our socialist construction work, intercept the assistance of the North to the South and demoralize our people. The army and the people of North Vietnam have been returning telling blows, downing over 1,000 U.S. planes, sinking tens of U.S. commando boats, and thwarting the fundamental plans of the war of destruction. That was the fifth U.S. setback in the war against us.

signal of defeat

The Vietnam Courier alleged that the United States’ most serious failures were on the military front but its political setbacks also were numerous. Even the October, 1966, Manila Conference, which the United States said was to determine future strategy, was regarded by the newspaper as a signal of defeat for the “imperialists”:

Along with its military setbacks, its political failure is no less heavy. The U.S. scheme to turn its aggressive war in Vietnam into “Asia’s Collective War” was designed to alleviate its isolation. Cambodia’s Head of State, Norodom Sihanouk, put it more plainly: “It is a meeting of imperialists, colonialists and Asian renegades.” This U.S. scheme has gone bankrupt. Because of op-
The bombing of North Vietnam was described as a failure. Rather than lessening enemy infiltration, it had stiffened the determination of the North Vietnamese. Damaged military capabilities were repaired quickly, and the only serious effect was the suffering of civilians. The newspaper indicated the bombing should be stopped because it was not effective.

The *Vietnam Courier* often reported the war in feature-story style, describing emotions with which its readers could identify and portraying a dedication meant to inspire admiration:

The day was just dawning. There was a true bustle at the airfield. Chief mechanic Hong checked his engines for the last time. He stopped a long time by the planes on duty, minutely watching each of their "organs." He was glad that his unit had got everything ready for the sorties of the day. Everybody here harboured a deep hatred for the U.S. pirates who had been massacring his kith and kin in North and South Vietnam.

Mechanics and fighters marking runways could not directly defy the enemy in the sky but each of their acts was permeated with an eager desire: to defeat the U.S. aggressors. Everything was done to the best to secure victory for our pilots.

The sun soon shone warm and bright.

All of a sudden, the C.P. called us: "Enemy planes sighted. Take off!" The aircraft of H.'s formation shot off toward the sky. The enemy was on the left, the C.P. announced. Our pilots spotted four U.S. planes headed for Hanoi. "Those who attack our country's heart shall pay for their offence," this pledge of the men of H.'s formation resounded in their hearts. Our planes dashed forward, cutting the formation of Thunderchiefs into sections.

Attacked by surprise, U.S. air pirates lost their self-control, the more so as our A.A. batteries wove a close fire network before them. They hesitatingly turned back. B. kept a close watch on one of them and fired. Hit by the burst, the Thunderchief with its wounded white-helmeted pilot staggered and crashed to the ground. B. looked back and saw his comrade T. firing at a second Thunderchief. He had no chance to intervene since T., a pilot of much experience, scored a direct hit at the head of the enemy craft. The other Thunderchiefs hurried away. Our planes banked to greet the new exploit, while on the ground, the dyke and the river rang with applause and shouts of joy.7

Other reports attempted to show that the bombing was stiffening the people's resolve:

On the night of June 28, 1966, a mournful day for Hoa Loan, 160 youth of the village had volunteered for the army. Until then, most of them had been impatiently waiting for the drafting. I met on the drying floor a young man holding in his hand a screw driver. I asked him: "Did you enter your name on the volunteers list that day?"

"Yes," he answered.

"Why are you not leaving? Do you intend to get married before joining the army?"

"No, I don't," he replied. "I am awaiting my turn. Half an hour after being called up, I shall leave. I am ready to join the army."

The same answer, "I am ready," spontaneously came from Bau, a reserve N.C.O., Mai, a 17-year-old girl working in the stock farm, and many others. After the bombing she had thought to herself: "We must avenge our dead. It is good to produce much rice and meat for the front. But it's better to face the Yanks directly!"8

The newspaper often said that women in a small nation like Vietnam must be mobilized to fight a larger power:

"When the aggressors come, even the women fight them," says the proverb. That's what they are doing. They have been aroused by bitter hatred against the American invaders. They have been spending almost all their leisure time in learning how to handle anti-aircraft guns and sometimes they forget about their meals. They are determined to master A-A gunnery and make a direct contribution to the destroying of U.S. bombers. Luu Ai Van even sent the self-defence command a petition requesting the setting up of a women-manned A-A battery. On June 29, 1966, though she was not on duty, this girl, who was just out of her teens, volunteered to carry shells in the thick of a fight against U.S. air pirates. Each time, she carried on her shoulders the two shell cases which weighed some 70 kilograms.

Now recognized reserve anti-aircraft gunners, four girls kept asking for permission to fight U.S. planes. At last, on August 2, 1966, they were allowed to do so. They themselves managed an A-A gun and fired with surprising accuracy. U.S. aircraft were howling over their heads, diving on them and spitting rockets around their battery. But they calmly and resolutely fought on. On that day, they contributed to the common victory in a worthy manner. The armed forces of Haiphong, to which their unit belonged, downed five U.S. craft and drove the others away.

As soon as the engagement ended, they immediately resumed work in the shipyard. Spurred by their own fighting achievements, they did their utmost to raise their labour efficiency. All of them have recently fulfilled their plans ahead of schedule.9

The *Vietnam Courier* regarded the nation's youth as the most important class of contributors to the war effort. It frequently reported speech excerpts, such as this one:

It is obvious that our successes are not accidental. What is at the bottom is the fighting solidarity of our entire people in general and of our youth in particular. It is safe to say that our nation, our youth, are very strong. Only when the youth are strong is the nation strong. What is the source of our youth's prodigious

---


Outstanding contributors were mentioned in an attempt to prompt emulation:

Thirteen-year-old Nguyen Cong Tien of the Cam Binh School in Ha Tinh Province has been chosen as a good pupil and a good producer: he sold to the state 52 kilograms of fowls and his “anti-U.S. poultry” still includes 43 birds.11

The “sacrificing mother” image also was perpetuated, showing foreign readers that North Vietnamese mothers were contributing to the common effort just as mothers elsewhere had helped their countries in wartime:

In many localities of Hanoi suburbs, the Fighter-Sponsoring Mothers’ Association has addressed itself to the task of giving assistance to the families of armymen and militiamen by doing such work as minding or adopting their children. These mothers have also supplied boiling water to the soldiers in the course of drilling and growing fruit trees for them. Of late, the Fighter-Sponsoring Mothers have collected 10 tons of cast-off cloth for the soldiers to clean their firearms and thousands of bamboo poles and trusses of hay to camouflage their fortifications.19

Astounding successes were attributed to the “people’s army” in South Vietnam. The claims seemed designed to persuade readers that prosecution of the war would be futile.

**good guys vs. bad guys**

In describing friendly forces in the south, the newspaper told about soldiers who battled overwhelming odds but emerged triumphant owing to their almost superhuman skill and tactics. In contrast, the U.S. troops and their allies were losing because of the nature of their strategy and commitment. Again, the *Vietnam Courier* offered a black-and-white picture—the good guys defeating the bad guys. For instance:

It is crystal clear that the strategy and tactics of the people’s war are skillful, invincible, flexible and resourceful, while those of the enemy grow from bad to worse and are beset by unending crisis. The military setback of the U.S. imperialists in the dry season was the initial failure of the “local war” strategy, the third strategical mistake of the Americans, the first strategical mistake being their attempt to achieve neo-colonialism through the Ngo Dinh Diem regime and the second strategical mistake being the launching of the “special war.” It is clear the second mistake was bigger than the first one. The more the U.S. imperialists rely on their material strength and technique, the bigger is their mistake and the more bitter their failure.18

The war in the south was explained in terms that could be understood easily by the so-called average reader. The newspaper contended that all persons in South Vietnam except those in the pay of the “imperialists” were fighting against foreign oppression:

A most remarkable fact in the guerrilla movement in South Vietnam in these days is the participation of the population in the fighting under various forms. Feeling a deep hatred for the aggressors and proud of the people’s glorious traditions, the inhabitants are most eager to fight against the U.S. imperialists and serve the country, realizing the mottoes “When the enemy come, even women and children will fight,” “Seek out and attack U.S. troops and puppet troops.”

At Cu Chi, an old man who deeply hated the cruel U.S. aggressors insistently asked for a hand mine, learned to use it, then succeeded in blowing up an M-113 armoured car and wiping out nearly half a U.S. squad.14

Resistance to Hanoi, the newspaper contended, was prolonging the war and delaying what was inevitable. The more the “imperialists” fought, the more the populace would rally to the people’s cause. And the “war of the people” was achieving notable successes because of its very nature:

The guerrillas make their strong offensive position felt in contended and occupied areas, transform the enemy’s rear into our front line, consolidate and extend the liberated areas, and are ensuring protection for the population; they coordinate their activities with large-scale offensives mounted by the regular army and widen the scope of action of big units of the Liberation Army Front.15

According to the *Vietnam Courier*, the people’s army in Laos also was winning battles with “imperialist” forces. The reports suggested that continuance of the war there was useless:

During the past four months, with their valiant spirit and clever fighting, the Lao people and army, who are closely united with the Neo Lao Haksaat [Laotian Communist party], have repeatedly repelled enemy assaults on all battlefields in Upper, Central and Lower Laos. According to still incomplete figures, from early December [1965] to the end of March of this year, they wiped out more than 5,000 enemy soldiers, shot down 134 U.S. aircraft and seized thousands of tons of arms and ammunition and other military equipment. The number of enemy troops wiped out in the past four months equalled the 1965 figures.16

The *Vietnamese Courier* maintained that the Vietnamese conflict was part of a larger struggle against “imperialism” throughout Southeast Asia. The newspaper endeavored to convince readers the Communists had achieved a consensus—a united front—in Southeast Asia. All who valued democratic processes were expected to rally to the Communist side to oppose the United States.

The newspaper often said the morale of enemy troops was low and continued to decline, while that of Communist forces was rising. For example:

American troops are boxers not only half-blinded but lacking combativeness too. They are forced to wage an

---

11 Ibid., Aug. 11, 1966, p. 4, quoting Le Duan, first secretary of the Vietnamese Workers’ party central committee.
12 Ibid., May 19, 1966, p. 4.
16 Ibid., Dec. 5, 1966, p. 3.
unjust and utterly savage war on a terrain and in conditions with which they are entirely unfamiliar and which offer them so many difficulties to overcome. They do not understand for what purpose they have to sacrifice their lives on this harsh battlefield! That is why they have no heart and fear everything: they fear our fighters, our people, our climate, nature...”

Morale reportedly also was low among South Vietnamese soldiers. The newspaper said

the puppet army which had just experienced a bitter military defeat was beset with political crises and was crumbling morally and organizationally. Therefore, its fighting capacity was in practice negligible. Neither could it be a reliable force to be used in the “pacification” job."

The bombing of installations in North Vietnam was represented as an American effort to affect the morale of both citizens and soldiers. That effort was termed unsuccessful.

"a rising protest"

The nature and structure of the South Vietnamese government were discussed often in the Vietnam Courier. It asserted South Vietnam was a land and a people controlled by an enemy puppet administration, which, in turn, was controlled by the United States. The people of South Vietnam, however, were rising in protest:

In South Vietnam, while the Liberation Army Front [Viet Cong] attacks in different directions leave the U.S. command perplexed and guerrilla activities bleed the U.S. and puppet forces white without respite during the week, the struggle of the urban population has entered upon a more crucial stage. In Saigon, where the police have been given orders to shoot at demonstrators, youngsters have been cut down by bullets without the crowd being cowed. They have met police violence with force: a thug has been found dead and during the week, eight vehicles of the U.S. forces have been set on fire. Strikes have been reported that 1,500 men of the First Division, armed, are held, trees felled and barricades erected across the streets. In Hue, the opposition forces have also put up a stiff resistance to the oppression; eight troops killed and 12 military vehicles destroyed on June 18. It is further reported that 1,500 men of the First Division, armed, are still in rebellion against the Thieu-Ky puppet clique. Quang Tri and other provinces still ignore orders from Saigon."

While the essential details in that account were similar to those reported in U.S. newspapers, the implications differed. The Vietnam Courier described the civil disorders as uprisings against U.S. rule of South Vietnam.

The newspaper also detected what it termed a difference in the goals of the allied forces: “What is more, the master [U.S.] and servant’s armies were at cross purposes with each other, did not trust each other, and were unable to achieve close coordination...” Those different interests reportedly resulted in violence:

At the same time, the U.S. command attempted to send planes to evacuate the G.I.’s from A Sau [a U.S. Special Forces outpost under Viet Cong attack], abandoning the puppet troops to their fate. When an aircraft managed to land, Americans and puppets scrambled for seats on board. The former kicked and hit the latter and finally shot dead seven of them."

The Vietnam Courier said weakening bonds between the Americans and the South Vietnamese were caused by the nature of the war, which was being pursued by the Americans against the will of the South Vietnamese people. The South Vietnamese were mere tools of imperialism.

Despite the war, the North Vietnamese economy progressed steadily, according to the newspaper. Numerous news stories and feature articles told about production activities and economic gains. This excerpt is typical:

Quang Binh, Vinh Linh, Ha Tinh, Nghe An and Thanh Hoa [North Vietnam provinces] are daily facing up to the enemy’s ferocious bombing and strafing. Yet, in these provinces agriculture and industrial production keep on developing, the communication and transport arteries remain operative, the people’s life remains stable and hundreds of U.S. planes have been brought down."

Such progress and calm under conditions of war were attributed to the leadership of “Uncle Ho,” to communism and to the war itself. An example of what the newspaper offered as evidence of a link between progress and the war:

After a year and a half of bombing, traffic gets heavier than ever along Quang Binh’s roads. Destroyed bridges have been quickly replaced by ferries or pontoon bridges. Economic and cultural life goes on unabated. Quang Binh has given itself the pleasure of being one of the vanguard provinces of North Vietnam, not only with regard to the number of planes shot down, but also concerning the progress made in agriculture and education. Now handicraft and small industry undertakings have seen the light of day.

It is precisely the American bombings which have accounted for this upsurge in agriculture co-operatives, people have been striving to improve management, working techniques and farm implements in order to remedy the shortage of manpower due to enlistments in the army; to bring in the harvest in the shortest delay under the bombings, and to increase output, whereas workers and handicraftsmen have been emulating each other in the production of new commodities."

Many such articles were keyed to the achievements of an individual:

"Ibid., p. 11.
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Montana and Latin America: An Analogy

By William Forbis*

As I listened to the summit oratory of the American Presidents at Punta del Este last April [1967], I found myself ruminating on the far-off American state of Montana, where I grew up. In the economic sense, Montana is in many ways a microcosm of Latin America. It produces wool like Uruguay, beef and wheat like Argentina, copper like Chile, lumber like Honduras, sugar like Brazil, oil like Venezuela. The main difference is that Montana can trade without restrictions in a huge area: the whole U.S. No Montanan even troubles much to think about the fact, or label it with that resounding name, "common market."

Suppose, I asked myself, that Montana were an independent nation, Latin-American style: what would it be like? It's easy to imagine. There would probably be woolen mills protected by tariffs from Wyoming competition, but producing at high cost because of the small market (for Wyoming would also have tariffs to keep out Montana woolens). Other hothouse industries might be engaged in processing petrochemicals, or making shoes, and perhaps a small, high-cost steel industry would be running on imported ore. The capital for building these industries would have come from New York, and Montanans would resent it, because a mire of currency restrictions would keep them from becoming part owners of the "exploiting corporations" by buying stock on Wall Street.

The legislators might have decided that high tariffs on cars would produce lots of revenue, and as a consequence the highways would be (like Uruguay's) an entertaining museum of lovingly maintained Model A's, prewar Dodges, some Essxes, Franklin's, and Reos, and a few long, shiny new Chevrolets bought by people rich enough to ignore the cost, which, including duties, might come to $10,000. The food—beef, bread, corn, and mutton—would be hearty but simple, since imported items like California oranges, Wisconsin cheeses, St. Louis beer, and Idaho potatoes would be delicacies whose prices were swollen by tariffs. Real Scotch would cost around $15 a bottle, and people would drink something called, perhaps, Old Laird McLeod, whose elaborate label would reveal that it was "made in Montana." Gin would be made in the state, but it wouldn't taste like Beefeater. All other kinds of consumer goods—Kodak cameras, Bulova watches, books, computers, cosmetics, toys, bicycles—would be outrageously expensive or unobtainable.

The Montana analogy is instructive because it shows, by implication, how Latin America might benefit mightily from breaking the Gulliver strings of tariffs and restrictions that tie it down. It suggests that while the big semi-industrialized countries—Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico—may profit most at first from a Latin-American common market because they have a headstart, the other nations can assure themselves access to growing natural markets for their raw materials, better and more plentiful consumer goods, and the chance to develop sound industry for a big market rather than feverish fabrication for local use only.

An excerpt from an article by William Forbis in the June 1, 1967, *Fortune*. Mr. Forbis, a 1939 graduate of the Montana School of Journalism, worked for *Time* from 1948 to 1958 as a reporter in Latin America and as a writer in New York. He was a senior editor of *Time* from 1958 to 1967, when he became chief of the magazine's bureau in Rio de Janeiro and senior South American correspondent.
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