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George Gilbert Hoole became a journalist at age 41 after an impressive career as an educator. He bought the Glendive Dawson County Review in 1924 and in the next quarter of a century built it into one of the state's most highly regarded—and most frequently honored—weekly newspapers.

Mr. Hoole was born Dec. 30, 1883, in Chico, Calif., the son of a newspaperman who had come west during the 1849 gold rush. Mr. Hoole's parents died while he was a boy, and he subsequently worked at various jobs to finance his education at Pacific Coast College at San Jose, Calif. He received a degree in commerce and education and later attended Zanerian Art College at Columbus, Ohio, and the graduate school at the University of Chicago.

Mr. Hoole came to Montana in 1909 and in 1912 moved to Glendive to join the faculty at Dawson County High School. Except for one year in the Army in World War I, he taught at Glendive until 1920, when he was appointed principal of the high school.

In addition to the Dawson County Review, Mr. Hoole owned the Glendive Independent and published the Glendive Daily News four days a week. During the 1930s and 1940s, the Dawson County Review was honored consistently at Montana Press Association conventions. It was named the best weekly in the state in 1935; that same year its editorial page was designated the best in the state—the first time one newspaper had won two of the three top awards presented at the convention. It also was named the best weekly in Montana in 1940.

Mr. Hoole taught generations of Glendive boys and girls to play tennis. He served for 25 years without pay as the high school tennis coach and during that time Glendive became known as the "tennis capital of Montana," owing to the numerous victories of its teams. Mr. Hoole won the senior singles championship of Montana for nine straight years, and his widow noted that "he played tennis until the day of his death."

In 1945 he was elected a vice president of the Montana Press Association and was elected president at the 61st annual convention in 1946.

He believed the press should report education news in depth and the columns of the Dawson County Review reflected that opinion. At the same time, his editorials could be critical and demanding in their assessments of the city and county school systems.

Mr. Hoole died Oct. 13, 1960, in Mesa, Ariz. He is remembered as an incorrigible optimist, a progressive, an educator, a civic leader—and as an editor who required and achieved excellence in his newspaper.
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The Montana Council of Defense

By CHARLES S. JOHNSON

In 1917 the Montana Council of Defense was created ostensibly to promote the war effort. Given virtual blanket powers, the Council passed orders granting itself the authority to issue subpoenas and conduct investigations. Its members, buoyed by strong support from politicians and newspapers, conducted witch-hunts in the guise of patriotism and tried to crush political opponents and dissenters such as Burton K. Wheeler and William F. Dunn. This report, submitted for the Senior Seminar, describes the role of two newspapers in the Council's deliberations. One, the Helena Independent, was a mouthpiece for the Council. The other, the Butte Bulletin, was a radical labor publication that became the Council's chief target. Mr. Johnson, a 1970 graduate of the Montana School of Journalism, has worked as a reporter for the Missoula Missoulian and the Helena Independent Record and as a newsman for the Helena Bureau of the Associated Press. During the winter of 1970, he was a Sears Congressional Intern in Washington, D.C. During the 1970-71 and 1971-72 academic years, he was a graduate student in history at the University of Montana.

Among the eight original members of the Montana Council of Defense was the editor of the Helena Independent, Will A. Campbell, whose editorials had embraced pleas to stifle anti-German sentiment and warnings to guard against spies and agitators "in our midst."1

Three days before the Council was created, Campbell, noting that every Belgian peasant had an American flag draped in his home, castigated those Helena residents who did not display flags: "We see scores, even hundreds of Helena homes are still failing to display the emblem. If a Belgian peasant can admire America, surely a person living here might deign to hoist the emblem as war begins."2

Campbell, through the paper, made his position on dissent clear:

"Americans . . . must not challenge their government's position; there must be no divided loyalty or conditional loyalty; internal dissension must disappear when we are threatened with grave danger from without. . . . The American people are now determined to "stand by the president" and believe in the sentiment, "Our country, may she ever be right, but our country, right or wrong."3

The same issue featured on page one a banner headline, "STAND BY THE PRESIDENT," written with stars and stripes garnished with eagles.4

1Helena Independent, April 14, 1917, p. 4.
2Ibid., April 18, 1917, p. 4.
3Ibid., p. 1.
The *Independent* warned against "harrying innocent aliens, for in a time of tension such as this, wild rumors fly and people are prone to believe anything." But if a traitor were discovered, "no punishment short of an ignominious death . . . would be fitting," an editorial said. As for those not contributing to the war effort, the *Independent* suggested letting them starve and cited Palm Beach and other "hangouts for the rich" as ideal places to find farmhands.

Editor Campbell made certain the Council received ample publicity in the *Independent*. One issue featured a cartoon entitled "My Idea of the Montana Council For [sic] Defense," showing a soldier, armed with a bayoneted rifle, shaking hands with a farmer holding a hoe. They were standing in front of an American flag and eagle with the motto "For Flag and Country."7

The national organization decided to standardize state activities and called a meeting for May 2 in Washington, D.C.8 Each state was to send one delegate, and Stewart picked Charles J. Kelly of Butte to represent the Montana Council.

Increased farm production was the primary goal of the Council, and although it at first tended to ignore internal security, Campbell and the *Independent* did not. The home guard Campbell had suggested earlier became a reality. In addition to its police duties, the Helena home guard had a secret espionage branch formed, Campbell said, "to investigate all reports as to suspicious characters, spies or disloyal persons."9

Campbell took advantage of the lull to discuss patriotism, democracy and espionage in his newly designed editorial page, which featured 36 American flags across the top.

He promoted Liberty Bond sales in an editorial campaign, saying "there is no better way to breed a patriot than to let your boy or girl buy one."10 Another editorial attacked Republicans who refused to purchase bonds because they were not contributing to the war effort, the *Independent* said. "As for those who oppose the bond drive, their death . . . would be fitting," an editorial said.5 As for those who opposed the war, such as the IWW, the *Independent* in a prophetic warning said, "it is high time that IWWism was taken by the throat and choked to death."13 Less than a month later, IWW organizer Frank Little, who reportedly had called American soldiers "uniformed scabs," was lynched in Butte. Campbell could hardly conceal his glee. A page-eight story, without a by-line or dateline, was headlined: "Prevalent Opinion Over/Butte Lynching Is That/Traitor Met His Deserts." The story quoted an anonymous Butte resident, who "called Butte home for 30 years; for the past 15 I have apologized daily for my hometown. I'll do less apologizing after this." That sentiment, the article concluded, appeared to be the unofficial attitude in Montana.14

**Campbell Issues Warning**

In an editorial, Campbell said only one comment was heard—"Good work: Let them continue to hang every IWW in the state." Though careful not to add his agreement, the Helena editor warned that unless the courts and military "take a hand now and end the IWW in the West, there will be more night visits, more tugs at the rope and more IWW tongues will wag for the last time when the noose tightens about the traitors' throats."15

Concerned over the industrial disturbances in Butte, the Council met in Helena Aug. 2, 1917. If tranquility did not return to Montana, Council members recommended a special session of the Legislature to establish a state sheriff's office of 400 men.16 A few days later, Governor Stewart met with five other Northwest governors to discuss methods to curb the IWW; all six favored using home guards instead of federal troops to quell the disturbances. Since home guards had no legal status, the governors, with the exception of Stewart, hinted they would call special sessions of their legislatures to grant the necessary authority.18 Stewart reiterated his position in September, saying there was no apparent need for the special session since Montana had no troubles that required exceptional treatment.19

The Council of Defense returned to less spectacular projects—the seed problem and sponsorship of picnics to promote patriotism.20 Campbell, however, kept hammering. He urged Helena school officials to eliminate German classes, insisting Spanish was "more useful." In an editorial that later would show how influential Campbell had become, he wrote:

> It is not known what the Helena schoolboy or schoolgirl thinks about it, but it would seem as if Spanish should prove the most popular—not because of the war with the Prussian autocracy, but because Americans in the coming century will deal largely with Latin America to the South of us from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn.21

---

11Ibid., May 3, 1917, p. 4.
12Ibid., April 21, 1917, p. 4.
14Ibid., May 17, 1917, p. 4.
15Ibid., May 12, 1917, p. 4.
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---

21Ibid., p. 4.
23Ibid., Aug. 13, 1917, p. 4.
27Ibid., July 20, 1917, p. 4.
He subsequently added more points to support this argument: The war "has nothing to do with literature but literature has much to do with the war." He concluded that there will always be Germans to translate German books to sell to those who do not read German. The literature of Germany, accordingly, would not be lost if the public schools of this country should cease to give instruction in the German language. The language itself does not make literature. Teachers justify the teaching of Latin because it's the mother language, but by no stretch of imagination can German be justified on that score.

When the Montana Council of Defense acquired greater powers in 1918, the German language was banned in Montana.

Isolated incidents incited Campbell to write vehement editorials. When an unemployed man turned down a farm job, saying "to hell with haying," Campbell proposed a "proper" punishment for future offenders: "Pick 'em up. Feed them as poorly as possible. Give them nothing but water to drink and work them all you can."23

He demanded that the citizenship of "disloyal" German-Americans be revoked. The ranks of the "disloyal" included those who so much as questioned American war policy. As punishment, he proposed that these German-Americans be interned until the war ended, then deported to Germany.24

Citizens concerned over the possible infringement of civil liberties during the war also were criticized. In an emotional editorial, Campbell said:

Men who will roar and rant about alleged technical violations of some supposed law in the United States will have nothing but excuses and condonement for the enslavement of whole nations, the useless slaughter of women and children, the torpedoing of neutral steamships with the corresponding loss of life.25

**federal court criticized**

In August, 1917, the *Independent* began an attack on the federal court in Montana, without mentioning names. Campbell said the state needed "men who will not excuse treasonable utterances on the ground that we are guaranteed free speech, but will jail those who utter them on the ground that such an abuse of language is sedition—is giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States."26

Campbell soon identified his prime target—Burton K. Wheeler, U.S. district attorney, whose office was in Butte. Ironically, Wheeler was a part-owner of the *Independent*, having put up $500.27 The editorial criticized Wheeler for not taking the IWW and similar organizations "as seriously as he should." Though it did not believe Wheeler was a Socialist, the newspaper said he lived "more or less in a socialistic atmosphere," but it did not elaborate. The editorial concluded that "this newspaper holds no brief for a public official who will not do everything in his power to support this country and enforce law and order at such a vital time in our history."28

Montana residents, whose daily newspapers were filled with editorials similar to Campbell's, reacted. Some believed Germany was operating a spy post outside Helena. The *Independent* reported residents had seen an airplane of "curious design hovering over the city under the cover of darkness." Hamilton residents also reported seeing a plane.29

In October a Carl von Pohl was arrested in Butte and charged with spying.30 Von Pohl was convicted, and Campbell regarded him as part of a massive espionage operation. Butte spies, Campbell said, were thought to have sent information to a wireless station in the forest west of Missoula, where it was relayed by radio to Germans in Mexico.31

On the following day, the *Independent*, in a boldface box on the front page, offered a $100 reward to anyone who could locate the mysterious airplane that flew south and east of Helena and identify its owner. Two *Independent* reporters had heard an exhaust sound while hunting and reasoned that it was an airplane since they were at least three miles from a road. The statement concluded:

> Are the Germans about to bomb the capital of Montana? Have they spies in the mountain fastnesses equipped with wireless stations and aeroplanes? Do our enemy [sic] fly around our high mountains where formerly only the shadow of the eagle swept?28

Concerned citizens besieged Wheeler with requests to investigate the possible infiltration. An old railroad worker offered an explanation: He told Wheeler the light seen near Hamilton was the North Star.33

Disturbed because Wheeler futilely tried to obtain a search warrant and thus was unable to enter von Pohl's room, Campbell warned that the *Independent* would give Wheeler only "a little more time" to make good before it joined his critics and demanded his resignation.34 He later suggested that von Pohl, "a pretty important wheel in the Kaiser's spy machine," be transferred to a jail in another city. Though not mentioning Wheeler, Campbell said there were "a number of pro-Germans who would help von Pohl" in Butte.35

Campbell praised the *Independent* for being "100 per cent American all the time, and if there is one paper in all Montana which has given 11 of its employees to the Army and raised hell with the Germans since war was declared, it has been the *Independent*."36 The next day he asked how

---

any "100 per cent American business house" could advertise in papers like the Montana Staats-Zeitung.\(^37\)

In December, 1917, Campbell revealed his plan for dealing with "disloyalists"—revoke their citizenship, confiscate their property, intern them until the war ended, then ship them to Germany. Those steps were necessary because America was "fighting a government of scientific Apaches."\(^38\)

### bulletin founded

Meanwhile, a labor newspaper, the Butte Weekly Bulletin, was founded Dec. 15, 1917.\(^39\) A group of young Butte lawyers, including Wheeler, had provided money for the paper to compete with the Butte Post and Butte Miner, both owned by the Anaconda Company. Wheeler, who paid $1,000, and his friends turned over the newspaper to Butte labor groups.\(^40\)

The editor was William F. Dunn,\(^41\) an embittered labor organizer whose father was killed during the Colorado strikes in the early 1900s.\(^42\) Dunn had served as the Butte Electrical Union's strike representative to the Metal Trades Council. In the coming months, Dunn and Wheeler would fight with Campbell and a more powerful Council of Defense, a battle that would continue after World War I ended.

### II

Early in 1918, many Montana citizens pressed Governor Stewart to call a special session of the Legislature. They believed stricter laws were needed to deal with the "disloyal." The acquittal of a Rosebud County rancher, Ves Hall, in federal court in Butte provided the spark. Hall was prosecuted under the 1917 Federal Espionage Act for allegedly saying Germany was justified in sinking the Lusitania, that the United States was fighting the war for "Wall Street Millionaires" and other statements considered seditious by many.\(^43\) A controversial judge, George M. Bourquin, acquitted Hall without referring the case to the jury, saying the declarations were made at a Montana village of some sixty people, sixty miles from the railway, and none of the armies or navies were within hundreds of miles so far as appears. The declarations were oral, some in bad English: with the landlady in a hotel kitchen, some at a picnic, some on the street, some in hot and furious saloon argument.\(^44\)

Campbell denounced Bourquin for freeing "a man who had slandered, libeled and lied about the country we love."\(^45\) In another editorial the same day, he said Bourquin's decision showed why the state needed its own sedition act, since the federal act was not being enforced properly by federal officials in Montana.\(^46\)

On Feb. 1, 1918, Governor Stewart, who earlier had thought there was "no apparent need" to call a special session of the Legislature, announced he was calling one, the third in Montana's history. Stewart listed the following reasons for ordering the special session: To amend the state seed grain law, to amend state law to permit Montana soldiers in France to vote, to pass a state sedition act, to pass a state sabotage act, to authorize and finance a national guard, to consider the prohibition amendment and to legalize and finance the Montana Council of Defense.\(^47\)

Campbell, who promoted Stewart's proposed programs before the session began, urged legislators to pass a state sedition law "which will get every offender behind the bars who cannot be reached through federal courts."\(^48\)

The special legislative session convened Feb. 14, 1918, and Governor Stewart in his opening address defended the Council of Defense, recommended that it be made a legal body and asked the legislators to appropriate funds for it.\(^49\)

The Legislature passed a bill that legalized the Council, and Stewart signed it. The number of Council members was increased from eight to eleven, specifying that at least three had to be farmers. Members would not receive a salary but would be reimbursed for travel expenses. The Legislature granted the Council what was tantamount to blanket powers and allowed it to adopt bylaws by a majority vote, so long as they were not inconsistent with the U.S. Constitution or federal or state laws. Those who violated either state or county Council orders could be fined $1,000 or imprisoned for a year or both. County Councils, comprising three members per county, were to be appointed by the State Council. The Councils' powers were to end when peace terms were signed. The Legislature appropriated $25,000 for operating expenses and lent the Council $400,000 to help farmers purchase seed.\(^50\)

\(^{37}\)ibid., Sept. 1, 1917, p. 4.
\(^{38}\)ibid., Dec. 22, 1917, p. 4.
\(^{39}\)Mrs. Harriett Meloy, librarian at the Montana Historical Society Library in Helena, said there are no known copies of the Bulletin available from Dec. 15, 1917, through Aug. 15, 1918.
\(^{40}\)Wheeler interview.
\(^{41}\)Although his surname was Dunne, he referred to himself as Dunn in the Bulletin during this period.
\(^{42}\)Wheeler interview.
\(^{43}\)Wheeler, Yankee from the West, pp. 153-154.
During the special session, the Legislature unanimously passed a state espionage act, later incorporated in the amendments to the Federal Espionage Act. This law was directed against anyone who orally or in writing used “any disloyal, profane, scurrilous or abusive language” in reference to the United States government, Constitution, flag, soldiers and their uniforms. Montanans who violated the law could be fined $10,000 and imprisoned for 20 years.

At its meeting April 1, 1918, the Council endorsed a proposal that permitted the county councils in Eastern Montana to hire a secret agent.51

Between Council meetings, Campbell advocated his pet issues and with some success. He noted proudly that the Helena school board had removed German from the curriculum. Quoting a Baltimore paper, the Manufacturer's Record, he said teaching the German language was “part of a persistent political propaganda intended to wean the people away from Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Celtic origins and divide the national interest and sympathy.” He also criticized German-Americans who withdrew their children from public schools in one unidentified Montana county and taught them German in a Lutheran church: “That is absolutely un-American, and such citizens should go back to their native land and stay there.”52

Spurred by Campbell and a Helena attorney, John G. Brown, the Council outlawed the use of the German language in Montana. It also ordered librarians to remove 12 books about Germany and requested them to withdraw other books from circulation.53

Campbell could not keep his feelings out of a front-page news story: The action was necessary because of “the falsehoods and ridiculous statements made by the subsidized and corrupt authors of the books.”54

Before the Council approved that order, it passed one supplementing a 1907 Montana law that dealt with vagrants. It expanded the 11-year-old law so men not working five days a week could be imprisoned up to 90 days.55

The Council also passed Order Number Four, reiterating Montana laws that prohibited “stealing” of rides on railroads.56 It adopted a slogan, “Work, War or Jail.”57 appropriated $1,000 for brochures warning about venereal diseases58 and authorized Secretary Greenfield to buy official badges for Council members.59

Council actions attracted national attention, and President Wilson praised the Montana Council for scheduling a war conference May 28 and 29, 1918, in Helena. The

President also commended the Council for its “determination to perform the necessary sacrifices” during the war so “our ideals of justice, humanity and liberty shall in the end prevail.”60

The Council met May 29, 1918, and announced plans to investigate three men—Eberhardt von Waldreu, Oscar Rohn and Carl von Pohl. Von Waldreu, hired by Lewis and Clark County officials to watch the German-Americans in Helena, had been arrested for espionage by federal authorities in Butte.61 Rohn operated a Butte mine and had hired an undercover agent—von Pohl, who also had been arrested for espionage.62 The Independent did not mention the Council’s newly acquired powers but did discuss forthcoming hearings, which were to produce some classic confrontations63 between the Council and its most outspoken critics—Dunn and Wheeler.64

III

Meeting behind closed doors in the State Capitol May 29, 1918, the Council, with members of some county councils, decided to take on U.S. District Attorney Burton K. Wheeler. Wheeler was not invited and his side was not presented. C. A. Thurston, a member of the Dawson County Council, introduced the resolution, which was to be sent to President Wilson, to protest reappointment of the controversial Wheeler. It said: “We do this sincerely believing that Mr. Wheeler’s reappointment to this important position in the present critical conditions of our State and Nation would be inimical and injurious to the best interests of this State and the peace of its people.”65

The resolution passed 28-7, but the individual votes were not recorded.66 Then some members of the State Council began to doubt the wisdom of the action and decided to defer action on it until after the von Waldreu hearings.67 Thus the resolution lay dormant, but the damage had been done. The Independent, in a two-column box, printed the resolution on page one.68

hearings begin

The von Waldreu and Rohn hearings, which served as devices to get Dunn and Wheeler on the witness stand, began May 31. Since these were the first hearings, members of the Council had to determine whether they were to be secret or open to the public.

Asked for his opinion, Wheeler said he preferred open

60Helena Independent, May 8, 1918, p. 1.
61Minutes, pp. 41-42.
63See Minutes, pp. 45-48.
64Helena Independent, May 29, 1918, p. 1.
65Minutes, p. 49.
67Minutes, p. 49.
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meetings but would be unable to reveal confidential information unless they were closed. Before answering the question, however, Wheeler criticized the Council and told members he did not know why the meeting had been called. Wheeler said he thought he had been subpoenaed "for the purpose of trying me, so to speak." He offered to resign if anyone could prove he had been derelict in his duties, but he knew he had not been derelict and therefore did not intend to resign.

In a tirade against the Council, Wheeler said he did not think it was "the province of this council to either exonerate anybody or try anybody." He also doubted that the Council had the right to issue subpoenas and compel attendance of witnesses, despite Orders Number Seven and Eight.

In a thinly veiled criticism of Campbell, Wheeler reiterated his preference for public sessions but only with assurance his testimony would not be "jumbled up" and "misquoted" by the newspapers. Wheeler criticized the Independent's advance story that implied he, not Rohn or von Waldreu, was on trial. Though not apologizing, Campbell admitted the article was erroneous and written in "bad English."

Wheeler then queried Council members about the resolution. Though convinced most Council members did not want to "play politics," he said to the others that "if you don't, then you have been grossly misrepresented in the various newspapers."

When he finished his diatribe, the Council, knowing members would have ample time to question Wheeler later, returned to deliberations about whether the hearings would be open or closed. It voted to have closed hearings, but all testimony was to be transcribed.

First on the agenda was the case of Eberhardt von Waldreu, arrested by federal authorities in Butte May 22 for posing as a government agent. He had been an officer in the German army but was discharged for gambling. Then he had worked for several German-language papers in the United States and had been in prison one year at Deer Lodge for forging checks. Despite his background, von Waldreu was hired by the Lewis and Clark County Council as a secret agent. Wheeler asked T. A. Marlowe, chairman of the Lewis and Clark County Council: How valuable was the testimony of an alien convicted of a felony? Marlowe replied, "If you want to catch thieves, you don't use a Sunday school scholar to do it."

Thomas Topping, a special agent for the Department of Labor, testified that the warden of the state penitentiary had recommended that von Waldreu be interned during the war in the interest of public safety. Imprisoning von Waldreu, however, would have negated the value of his testimony, which led to 25 to 30 arrests, Topping said, so he was not interned.

Campbell soon began to question Wheeler about matters totally unrelated to the von Waldreu hearing, and he eventually reached the real issue—patriotism. Campbell accused Wheeler of refusing to make public addresses on behalf of Liberty Bonds, War Savings Stamps and the Red Cross, but Wheeler said he had spoken at the Masonic Hall in Butte and was willing to speak again if asked.

Campbell asked Wheeler how many Liberty Bonds he had purchased. His answer, between $500 and $750, did not satisfy the Helena editor, who asked Wheeler to reveal his personal wealth. Wheeler evaded the question, saying he was in debt because he had just bought a hotel.

Wheeler, highly critical of what he termed the "subsidized press," was asked to identify the guilty papers. He cited the Butte Miner, owned by W. A. Clark; the Anaconda Standard, owned by the Daly interests; and the Butte Daily Post, Great Falls Tribune and the Helena Independent as being partially owned by the Anaconda Company.

In Wheeler's opinion, accepting an advertisement from the Anaconda Company constituted a subsidy "to a large extent." By "subsidized" Wheeler meant that "the editorial policy of your papers . . . must have come from sources that either were taken for granted, or that you didn't inquire as to whether or not they were correct."

wheeler called a socialist

Shortly thereafter, Campbell called Wheeler a Socialist and the district attorney responded:

I am not a socialist, never have been a socialist and never expect to be a socialist. Not only that, I feel, however, absolutely that a great many of the principals [sic] of socialism are correct, and they are being adopted by the democratic and republican parties but I feel this, that as far as the socialist party is concerned, and the socialist ideas, that they are so impractical that they cannot be carried into effect and that they are purely Utopian ideas.
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Testimony at Hearings Held at the State Capitol May 31, June 1 and 2, 1918, by the Montana Council of Defense, pp. 9-10.

Ibid., p. 13.

Ibid., p. 20.

Ibid., pp. 21-22.

Ibid., pp. 24-27.

Ibid., pp. 37-43.

Ibid., p. 106.

Ibid., p. 163.

Ibid., p. 174.

Ibid., p. 368.

Ibid., p. 369.

There is some doubt as to who owned the Independent at this time. Campbell's son, William C., said in an interview in Helena, Sept. 9, 1969, that the Anaconda Company did not purchase the Independent until 1924. He said, though, that the Independent was highly sympathetic to the Company before the sale. Wheeler insisted in an interview in Washington, D.C., March 20, 1970, that the Anaconda Company already had taken over the Independent during this period. He said the stock was purchased by the Company and put in a trust fund under the name of Governor Stewart's brother, a judge.
On June 2 the Council adopted a resolution concerning the von Waldreu case. Members concluded that von Waldreu was an alien-enemy and had him placed in the prosecution cases in Helena.86

The *Independent*, in a front-page story, called the series of hearings "the most determined effort ever made in the state to get at the bottom of alleged sedition and espionage case." The hearings would result in clearing the atmosphere and cleansing several reputations or resulting in prosecutions. Probably written by Campbell since the hearings were closed, the article predicted that the Council "will make some startling recommendations when the hearings are concluded."87

The next day the *Independent*, in another front-page story without a by-line, said it appeared as if "Mr. Wheeler was himself under examination."88

After the von Waldreu hearing ended, the Council took up the case of Oscar Rohn and, indirectly, Carl von Pohl. Rohn, who ran the East Butte Copper Mining Company, had hired von Pohl to spy on Rohn's employees, but von Pohl had been arrested in October, 1917, for alleged pro-German activities. Rohn had described von Pohl's duty—"to protect the operations of the Company against the presence of dangerous characters"—in a letter to the Council.89

On June 4 William F. Dunn, editor of the *Butte Weekly Bulletin*, appeared before the Council of Defense, ostensibly to testify in the Rohn hearing. After answering a few routine questions about his background, Dunn faced a volley of questions about the *Bulletin*. Council members were upset with an editorial, "Turn on the Light," in the *Bulletin* May 31:

"At first blush," as one of our prominent acquaintances puts it, we should say that the convention of the state and county councils of defense protesting B. K. Wheeler's reappointment will receive about as much consideration from President Wilson and Senator Walsh as a prohibition resolution at a meeting of the Brewery Workers' Union.

And that is more than it deserves, if we can stop to consider how this gang got together. Our governor can hardly be said to be friendly to Mr. Wheeler. The governor appointed the State Council of Defense, the state council appointed the county councils.

All have grown lean and gray, or fat and bald in the service of big business. All are tried and trusted lieutenants of the same old political gang. They are all birds of a feather and they flock together at Helena supposedly working for the state but apparently for political reasons of their own.

We can imagine no better nucleus for a political machine than the present state and county organizations.

The resolution condemning Wheeler passed 28 to 7. Each county has three representatives. Where then were the rest of the 42 counties' faithful fakirs? Evidently some were not present or what is more probable they refrained from voting, the stunt being too raw for their calloused consciences.
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Gentlemen of the State Council of Defense, you should change the last word to offense, for by these putrid tactics you offend the nostrils of every right minded citizen in the state that you knowingly misrepresent.

Another thought strikes us. If we are not mistaken Mr. Kelly is a member of the Council of Defense. B. K. Wheeler had this gentleman tried and convicted for using undue influence with a federal jury. Mr. Kelly was fined $500 and the court of appeals recently upheld the conviction.

Can it be possible that Mr. Kelly is using state machinery to avenge himself on Mr. Wheeler?

We are unwilling to believe it but anything can happen these days.

If there is to be a hearing on this matter, let it be in public, in the light of day and not in some dark corner of the capitol building.

The public is heartily tired of star-chamber sessions. Turn on the light.90

Dunn admitted that the editorial had erroneously confused Charles Kelly of the Council of Defense with Dan Kelly, whom Wheeler had prosecuted. He maintained that an explanatory paragraph had been deleted from the editorial without his knowledge.91 How an explanatory paragraph would have connected the two men was not discussed. Although Dunn promised to rectify the error, he contended the Anaconda Company newspapers frequently used similar tactics against labor leaders.92

After several more questions about his newspaper, Dunn asked if he had been subpoenaed to testify about Rohn or about the *Bulletin*. Stewart said he had been called to testify about Rohn but assured him that the *Bulletin* would be investigated later.93 But Campbell again questioned Dunn about the editorial and demanded a retraction, which Dunn said he would be willing to publish. Dunn, upset because the *Independent* had published the statement of a witness calling him "the most dangerous man in Montana," said Campbell's newspaper owed him an apology. After Campbell disagreed, Dunn said, "Well, I have no objection, if you will just explain to whom I am dangerous."94

*council criticized*

Wheeler criticized the Council the next day for passing the resolution against his reappointment. Again he accused the Council of playing politics and requested that it write to President Wilson to apprise him of the status of the resolution. Wheeler said:

How would you like to have some little body of men get together in a secret meeting and pass resolutions and send them to Washington condemning you whichever way you voted upon it . . .

I defy anybody to come before this State Council of Defense to prove one single thing that was said before the County Council of Defense and say that they based it
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Wheeler: “... they have done every possible thing ... to prevent my reappointment. ...”

upon facts. Not one of those men was under oath when they made the charges. ...

I say to you, gentlemen of this Council, that you are taking a mighty serious step. You are doing me, and you are doing the prosecution and the government, the prosecution in the United States court, a mighty serious injury. I will say to you frankly, so far as I am concerned, as to whether or not this Council approves or recommends my appointment ... does not make one bit of difference to me, one way or another. ... I know that there are men on this board politically opposed to me. I know that there are men on the board that have done everything in their power to prevent my reappointment in Washington. There is no question that they have done every possible thing in the world to prevent my reappointment in Washington, and it has been done for political reasons.®

Wheeler challenged the legality of the Council, asking:

Under what pretext, I ask you, can you go before the people of the State and say that you passed upon these things that you are going to pass about the von Waldreu matter, that you are going to subpoena witnesses and me before this State Council of Defense, to ascertain whether or not there is anything in these complaints?®

Campbell assured him the Council would take that up later.®

The Rohn hearings ended, and the Council later decided that Rohn was not guilty of sedition or disloyalty but had been indiscreet in hiring aliens such as von Pohl.®

The Independent gave the hearings top play, using sensational headlines. One said “ROHN DETAILS HIS RELATIONS WITH SUPPOSED GERMAN AGENT,” with this bank:

DIAMOND DICK RECALLED BY WEIRD ADVENTURES OF BUTTE MINING MAGNATE WITH MYSTERIOUS VON POHL—GAY LADIES, WINE SUPPERS AND A DEEP DARK PLOT INVOLVING WIRELESS ACROSS TO GERMANY FIGURE—HEARING WILL BE HAD AGAIN TODAY, MASS OF EVIDENCE TO BE PUT IN.®

Campbell's newspaper also capitalized on the Bulletin's mistaken identity of Kelly, calling it a “deliberate and studied falsehood” in an editorial entitled "BUTTE BULLETIN LIES."®

Coverage of Wheeler's testimony showed just how unobjective the Independent's news report was. The article, on page one, said Wheeler had "worked himself into a white rage" and "exploded." It referred to Wheeler's ac-
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IV

With the Rohn hearing ended, Council members decided to investigate the Butte Weekly Bulletin. On May 29, they had received from the Montana Newspaper Publishers Association a letter that said, referring to the Bulletin:

The press of the United States and of Montana is rendering loyal service by promoting every war activity for which its help has been asked. The editions of the newspapers submitted are not in accord with the spirit of the times and seem to hinder and delay the war program for which your Council is striving by creating dissension and prejudice at a time when loyalty and unity of purpose is earnestly sought.®

The letter, signed by L. L. Jones of the Missoula Missoulian, J. K. Hester of the Butte Miner, and J. D. Scapan of the Miles City Star (and the Custer County Council of Defense), provided the spark for the investigation.

First to testify was R. B. Smith, managing editor of the Bulletin. He was questioned, primarily by Campbell, about ownership of the newspaper, and he said various Butte unions held stock in the Butte Bulletin Publishing Co., the controlling interest being held by the 11-union Metal Trades Council of Butte. He testified that Wheeler did not own stock in the company,® although Wheeler maintains that he did.

Still feeling the sting of the editorial "Turn on the Light," Campbell asked Smith if Council members had "grown lean and gray, or fat and bald, in the service of big business," as the editorial had asserted. Smith said he could not say but admitted that as managing editor he was responsible for everything that appeared in the Bulletin. Although Smith said he did not always agree with the articles and editorials, he defended the newspaper, calling it "an independent newspaper with a favor to labor."®

Smith questioned an Independent story that said he and the other Bulletin staffers were Wobblies. He insisted that none was a member of the IWW and that the staff had rejected IWW philosophies. Furthermore, the IWW did not approve of the Bulletin, according to Smith.®
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As soon as the money could be raised, the Bulletin planned to appear daily, Smith said.106

As usual, the questioning centered on one area—patriotism. Smith said he purchased three Liberty Bonds and cited two instances in which the Bulletin carried patriotic advertisements for free, one a ½-page ad for War Trading Stamps and the other a ¼-page ad during the third Liberty Loan Campaign.107 The Bulletin, to Smith's knowledge, had not run a single editorial critical of the conduct of the war or the war aims of the government, although the paper reserved the right to criticize any individual, including the President.108

**dunn at his best**

The writer of the much-discussed editorial, William F. Dunn, was recalled and he was at his best during the questioning, whether poking fun at the Council or espousing revolutionary ideas. Asked if he had referred to Council members when he said they had grown lean, gray, fat and bald, Dunn replied: "Why, I should hope so."109 Campbell then pointed to each Council member and asked Dunn if that individual had "grown bald and lean and gray and fat in the service of Big Business." In Dunn's opinion, only M. M. Donoghue, president of the Montana Federation of Labor, had not.110

The two editors, Campbell and Dunn, compared and discussed journalistic principles after Dunn defended his editorial by saying "that a person in writing articles of this kind does not have to nor are they supposed to stick strictly to the facts in the matter" (a rather strange philosophy since the Bulletin's slogan was "The Truth Is Good Enough").111 Campbell asked Dunn where he had received his journalism training. "Principally through observation," Dunn replied, noting that the Independent was on the Bulletin's exchange list.112 Dunn again assured the Council he would "make amends insofar as it is necessary" to correct the error in the editorial.113

Using the witness stand as a forum as Wheeler had done, the Butte labor organizer and editor scored the Council for "setting itself up on a pinnacle." He quickly qualified the statement and said he did not think members were "any better or any worse than any other similar constituted body."114 His major criticism was that Council members "are all a unit in believing that society as now constituted is right and just," whereas Dunn favored "a complete reconstruction of the present form of society."115

Dunn was asked if all citizens should support state and nationally constituted authority, particularly during the war. "Oh, yes," he said, "all legally constituted authority undoubtedly," in an obvious insinuation regarding the Council's legality.116

Industrial mediator John H. McIntosh of Butte took the stand and said:

I am on this stand today to testify in all earnestness and sincerity that the Butte Weekly Bulletin is doing more actual harm and damage to the Government cause in the State of Montana than if the Kaiser and his whole regiment were turned loose in this state and I say it unqualifiedly and I say it advisedly, and I can prove it . . .

The miners of the state and the farmers of the state are being absolutely poisoned by the pro-German propaganda such as the Butte Weekly Bulletin is disseminating in every issue that comes out.117

The Russian revolution, according to McIntosh, was caused by "exactly the same kind of propaganda that the Butte Bulletin is spreading."118 McIntosh offered "absolute proof" of the dangers of the newspaper, claiming that the IWW ranks in Great Falls had trebled since the Bulletin began circulating among workers there.119

When Dunn was asked if he would be willing to sacrifice his life for the United States, he said, "Well, I probably will if it keeps on."120 He said he probably had sacrificed more "than most of the flag-waving patriots or any members of the Employers' Association."121 To assure the skeptical Council members of his patriotism, Dunn said anyone who wanted Germany to win the war was "absolutely crazy."122

Dunn and McIntosh tangled over Dunn's role in the Butte labor movement, and the editor maintained that his influence was "greatly overestimated."123 McIntosh accused the Bulletin of being "openly and confessedly and radically socialist" and said the Socialist party was not on record as being loyal to the government. Pouncing on this faulty charge, Leo Daly, secretary of the Butte Bulletin Publishing Co., asked McIntosh to prove that the Bulletin was tied to the Socialist party, while Dunn demanded that he differentiate between socialism and the Socialist party.124

Dunn asked Stewart if the Bulletin was on trial "because our competitors have preferred charges against us," referring to the complaint from the three newspaper editors.125 The sole reason for the investigation, Stewart said, was the editorial attack on the Council. Dunn said his staff had already apologized, but Stewart said, "If you will do that in a public way, it will be more effective."126

---
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The Council deferred action until members received copies of the Bulletin to study.\textsuperscript{127}

The Independent called the 10-day series of investigations "the most remarkable hearing ever conducted in Montana" and "the greatest show-down ever held."\textsuperscript{128} In the same issue, another article noted the incongruity of the Bulletin slogan, "The Truth Is Good Enough," and Dunn's admission that he did not always "stick strictly to the facts." The article called the editorial "Turn on the Light" a "nasty attack" on the Council.

Meanwhile, Council members decided to approve the resolution, already passed, opposing Wheeler's reappointment. Their statement said:

The Council does not desire to impugn either the integrity or the professional ability of Mr. Wheeler, but the Council is of the opinion that at this critical time in our Nation's history, when internal dissensions must be avoided in order that they may not grow into serious proportions, all federal and state officials must not only possess honesty and ability but must be vigorous and enthusiastic in the suppression of internal disorders.\textsuperscript{129}

\section*{V}

After the grueling 10-day session in late May and early June, the Council did little during the summer. Then on August 12 it prohibited weekly newspapers from publishing daily by issuing Order Number Twelve, which announced a War Industries Board ruling that—to conserve newsprint—papers could not publish more frequently.\textsuperscript{130} Eight days later, in apparent defiance, the Butte Weekly Bulletin became a daily.

The Bulletin, which had planned for almost a year to convert to a daily, reacted with an editorial entitled "The State Council Again":

Using the prevailing sentiment to boost the game of the exploiting interests of the state is the latest stunt of the handpicked gang who masquerade under the title of the State Council of Defense. They have declared against any more daily papers during the period of the war, knowing that thousands of people in this state are anxiously awaiting the first issue of the Daily Bulletin, that they may be able to obtain the truth on matters affecting the independent-minded people of Montana.

Once before, when we stated as our opinion that the Council was dominated by the same slimy political gang, whose actions are a stench in the nostrils of decent people, we were hauled before that body and given the third degree. We were willing at that time to take their vociferous protestations of innocence at their face value and did so.

But their latest dictum stamps them as what they are and have always been, the tools, the willing, cringing tools of the autocratic forces of the state.

Fortunately, they have no legal status or authority. They can fuminate to their heart's content against anything and everything that menaces their master's interest, but—no one need pay any attention to them.

The Daily Bulletin will be on the streets when the plant is ready, and if we are interfered with, we will take it to the highest courts of the land. If the Council had boldly stated that the Bulletin was dangerous to the privileged interests of the state, and that as loyal servants they were compelled to throw every possible obstacle in its path, we should have respected them as honest though ignorant. But by their hypocritical attitude, they have shown that they dare not fight on the issue of right or wrong.

Our feeling for them is therefore one of pity mixed with contempt. On second thought, our feeling is mostly contempt.\textsuperscript{132}

The newspaper had planned to become a daily June 1, 1918, but the date was moved to August 1. Late arrival of printing equipment delayed the change until August 20.\textsuperscript{132} Smith, the managing editor, had revealed those plans to the Council during the investigation of the Bulletin in early June.\textsuperscript{133}

The Independent noted in a front-page story August 22 that the Bulletin had violated Order Number Twelve.\textsuperscript{134} In an editorial the next day, Campbell said the Bulletin's defiance would result in "grief for the handful of agitators" who had disobeyed state laws.\textsuperscript{135}

On September 23, the Bulletin printed a brief history of its problems. Highly opinionated, the story accused the Anaconda Company of enlisting the support of the Council to suppress the Bulletin. The Bulletin said it had heard nothing from the Council or the War Industries Board.\textsuperscript{136}

\textbf{bulletin staffers subpoenaed}

On September 9, Dunn, Smith and Daly were subpoenaed again to appear before the Council in Helena.\textsuperscript{137} Dunn, of course, was the witness Council members wanted to interrogate, and, as in June, they were not as concerned about the Bulletin itself as they were about Dunn's editorials. Asked by Governor Stewart if he had been fair in criticizing the Council in "The State Council Again," Dunn replied:

As I understand it, the matter for the Council to decide and the reason we are here is to find out whether or not we are governed by the recent order of the War Industries Board and affected by that order. Now, my personal opinion of the State Council of Defense, or the Bulletin's opinion of the State Council of Offense—Defense; pardon me, it was unintentional; it was not sarcasm—should not enter into the proposition as I see it.\textsuperscript{138}
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When asked why the Bulletin had lambasted the Council of Defense, Dunn said the staff simply opposed the kind of people the Council represented. He said it was a simple matter because the governor was elected by a party that received most of its funds from contributions from large corporations. Therefore, he said, Governor Stewart and the Council members he appointed must pay more attention to corporate interests than those of the common working man. Dunn, who recently had announced his candidacy for the State Legislature, was asked whom he would represent if elected. He replied that he owed allegiance only to the working men, who constituted 90 per cent of the population. Asked what he would do if the large corporations contributed money to his campaign, Dunn laughed and said: "There is no danger of my candidacy being benefited by it." Joining the questioning because he always had to "ask one or two questions or I wouldn't retain my job," Campbell pressed Dunn about the paragraph that said the Council lacked legal authority. Dunn refused to answer the questions, insisting one paragraph could not be isolated from the rest of the editorial. This exchange followed:

Campbell: Did you mean what you said in there when you said that no one need pay any attention to them? Did you mean that when you wrote it?

Dunn: I am not going to answer.

Campbell: Did you mean that?

Dunn: I am not going to answer any such question as that yes or no. Any witness has a right to explain his answer.

Dunn finally said he recommended resisting the Council by challenging it through the courts.

Campbell charged that the Bulletin had supported the Wobblies found guilty of sedition in Chicago and that by urging readers not to support the Council of Defense, Dunn was "just as guilty of sedition as Bill Haywood is, and I hope to God that someone will prosecute you because that is the very thing that Haywood's going to the penitentiary for right now." Dunn assured the Council he was willing to stand trial at any time for anything in the Bulletin.

He then excoriated the Council and its hypersensitive head, Governor Stewart:

Dunn: You seem to assume, Governor, that the moment a man steps out of private life—or a lady either for that matter—and takes an official position, they are immune from criticism.

Stewart: No, I don't.

Dunn: Your statements would lead us to infer that. That is the impression I got. If the reverse is true, simply because I don't happen to be a member of the State Council of Defense, I have no redress. They can vilify me and say anything they like about me and stay within the law so are if I am a member of the Council, I can call them before the Council and give them a grilling. I can ask about the circulation of their paper; I can ask who finances it; I can ask what his religion is; where they are born; what they intend to do a year from now; any questions I see fit to ask them I can do it all because I happen to be a member of the State Council of Defense appointed by the Governor of the State of Montana. That to me is simply absurd, because the moment the right of criticism on the part of any citizen is taken away, right then government ceases to be a democracy. I maintain that I have the right, the Bulletin has the right, to criticize the State Council of Defense as a body or as individuals. If we say anything libelous we can be prosecuted for it. If the matter is seditious, there are courts to settle that, although personally to me it appears to be a far-fetched proposition.

Now we are before the State Council of Defense. We are subpoenaed for one reason or another. The minute the matter is known the daily press of this state proceeds to open their mud batteries on us. They started this morning. If they don't write special articles, stating absolute untruths, they so arrange their headlines that the public will get an entirely wrong impression. We are the only paper in this state, with one or two exceptions, possibly, who are opposed to the Anaconda Mining Company, and it is public knowledge that this state is controlled by the Anaconda Mining Company, I don't care who denies it. We know that practically every paper in the state is under the thumbs of corporations. They publish their stuff for them, starting in Libby, Montana, down to the Livingston Enterprise, the Billings Gazette, the Miles City Star, the Butte Miner, the Anaconda Standard and the Helena Independent. Because for some years there has not been a paper that fought these interests, naturally the things that we are doing and say look a little worse than they really are. We will not attack a man's personal character, except where the matter of public interest, public welfare, for instance, if a man had some trouble with his wife, I would not think of saying anything about it. If he bribed a jury, that is public welfare, that is a different proposition entirely.

That is the way we intend to fight—on principle. I know and am absolutely certain that our views are not the views of the members of this body. That is one of the reasons why we are over here. There is absolutely no chance to get together on the proposition, absolutely none, because you think differently than we do. We can't make you see our point of view, however much as we try. There are, however, questions of common sense and justice and fairness that we might be able to approach one another on, but outside of that it is simply a question of whether or not a paper, or a group or a movement which is opposed to the dominating interests of a state or nation can be persecuted and be put out of business by those interests. That is the only thing there is to it.

That the Bulletin regularly carried national news of the IWW shocked Campbell. The IWW stories, Daly testified, were printed solely for their news value, and their publication did not imply that the newspaper was defending the Wobblies' actions.
Dunn, Smith and Daly charged with sedition.

The Bulletin lured readers September 11 with a three-column, two-line headline on page one: "WHAT WE THINK OF THE STATE COUNCIL OF DEFENSE/ WILL BE FOUND ON PAGE TWO, COLUMN FIVE." The entire column was blank.147

dunn arrested

On September 14, Dunn and two other members of the Bulletin staff were arrested for sedition by Silver Bow County authorities. Members of the Butte IWW had joined a nationwide strike the day before, and the Bulletin staff was accused of printing the strike posters. Charged with sedition were Dunn, Smith, managing editor, and Daly, circulation manager. They were released on $1,000 bonds September 15, but Dunn was rearrested immediately and charged with carrying a concealed weapon. Later that day he was arrested again for sedition and taken to Helena since the warrant was issued by Lewis and Clark County officials. Smith and Daly also were charged with sedition by Lewis and Clark County.148

The Independent and the Bulletin had opposite views of the arrests in their opinionated news stories. Noting that sedition was "only one degree removed from the charge of treason" and punishable by 10 to 20 years in prison, the Independent called Dunn "a labor agitator from Seattle imported by the Wobblies of Butte to conduct their labor troubles," Smith "a tramp who became president of the Butte Typographical Union" and Daly "a Sinn Feiner whose meal ticket is furnished by Dunn and his Wobbly crew."149 The paper also described the Bulletin staff's latest appearance before the Council:

Dunn, Smith and Daly came to Helena a belligerent sort of way, willing to admit that they ran their paper as they pleased, printed whatever they desired, defied the government and told authorities to "go to" whenever they pleased, particularly the authorities of Silver Bow county and state council of defense.150

Dunn and Smith said they had wanted to be arrested so they could test the legality of the Council, the Independent reported, but Daly was "not so anxious to be a martyr."151 "RAID MADE ON OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER" read the five-column headline in the Bulletin. A three-column deck said:

Rhule, Berkin and Carroll Secure Services of A.C.M. Gunmen and City Detectives and Swoop Down in the Dark on Bulletin Office. County Officials, Federal


The Bulletin blamed the arrests on the Anaconda Company, charging that the newspaper had "begun to cause uneasiness in the haunts of the copper-collared gentry and the parasite press."153 When arrested, staffers were not informed of the charge, the article said. Although the Bulletin office was ransacked, officials were unable to find proof that the strike posters had been printed there, but they did steal a list of subscribers, according to the Bulletin. The paper praised the work of Major Omar N. Bradley (later General of the Army) and the federal troops called in to guard the Bulletin office after the raid.154 Citing an argument frequently used against itself—that newspapers were essential for the successful prosecution of the war—the Bulletin announced that it might file charges against the law officers who raided the offices.155

Dunn, Daly and Smith all pleaded not guilty of sedition and each side was given 20 days to file briefs.156 Meanwhile, the Wobblies returned to work in Butte September 28, and a much-pressured Burton K. Wheeler resigned October 9 as U.S. district attorney in Butte.157

Although the fighting in Europe ended Nov. 11, 1918, the battle in Montana continued. After the armistice was signed, Dunn openly supported the Bolshevik government in Russia, which appalled Campbell, who vehemently denounced "the radical Dunn."158

Campbell did not forget one of his pet accomplishments—banning the German language in Montana—when the war ended. Eight days after the armistice, he urged that the state continue to ban German. Returning American soldiers would be offended if they heard German spoken, for they had seen "the Huns in action." Campbell said German literature could not be trusted for a generation.159

The Council held its last meeting November 25. For the fourth time, members turned down a request from some German Lutheran ministers asking them to rescind the order barring the use of German in schools and churches. Reports showed that of its $25,000 appropriation, the Council had $13,477.61 left.160
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Attorney General Sam Ford, suspected by the Council of telling Dunn that the Council had no legal authority, wrote that he had rendered only one opinion about its authority, a verbal one soon after the Council was legalized. Angry because the Council had doubted his loyalty, Ford said there was "no foundation" to its suspicions.

VI

The trial of William F. Dunn began in Helena Feb. 19, 1919, after Judge R. Lee Word denied a defense motion asking for a delay requested because Dunn was serving as a representative in the State Legislature. His attorneys—Burton K. Wheeler, James Baldwin, Louis Donovan and Tim Nolan—tried to have Judge Word disqualified for "bias and prejudice," but the Montana Supreme Court rejected the motion. The prosecution offered from the War Industries Board a letter that called for creation of the Council of Defense, thus proving its legality. And a Bulletin subscriber in Helena, one Will A. Campbell, called Dunn "one of the most dangerous men at large in the state of Montana today."

Answering Campbell's allegation, Dunn testified: "Well, now, if I am dangerous, I am only dangerous to the corrupt political interests in this state and the people with whom I referred to in that article." Dunn insisted he had been brought to Helena for trial because his opponents knew he never could be convicted in Silver Bow County, where he said he was elected to the Legislature without advertising and campaigning. (Actually, Dunn used advertising and the editorial and news columns of the Bulletin to promote his candidacy.) One reason for the arrest, Dunn said, was the rumor he planned to run for mayor of Butte and if convicted would not be able to hold public office. He referred to a "rottenly corrupt political gang of politicians" and said the Bulletin was the only paper in Montana to fight the copper press. Then he added:

As a citizen of the United States and of the state of Montana, I not only have the right to express my opinion of a duly constituted state or federal authority or of the Montana Council of Defense, and if I think, as I said in that editorial, that they are not upholding the interests of the people of the state, it is not only my right, but it is my duty, to inform the people of these circumstances, and that is what I did and what I will continue to do as long as I have a pen with which to write and a tongue with which to speak.

The prosecutor, Lester H. Loble, defended both Campbell and the Independent:

They have both at all times been on the right side in this war. The Independent and Mr. Campbell have never hesitated to throw the light of publicity upon and attack all persons and agencies that have been anti-American in the war, and this is why Dunn and the Butte Bulletin have been the objects of these attacks.

The jury found Dunn guilty of sedition but recommended clemency. Ignoring the recommendation, Judge Word fined Dunn $5,000 and told him that

the people of Lewis and Clark county are utterly opposed to preachers and supporters of sedition, and . . . they are determined to stamp out sedition.

Your faith is not in the ballot but in the bullet. I have watched you carefully, and I am satisfied that you are against all legal authority. Never before have I seen a man with as little apparent regard for laws, courts or juries. Your doctrines go back to the cavemen, who recognized no authority. You, an intelligent man, should know that in a country where democracy rules, the ballot must bring about all reforms and changes.

On the same day he was fined, Dunn announced he would appeal the decision to the Montana Supreme Court.

legislator moves to expel dunn

In the state House of Representatives, a Missoula legislator, Ronald Higgins, organized a movement to expel Dunn because he had been convicted of the "most heinous of all crimes, save one." The "most heinous" crime, the Bulletin said, must be the bribing of legislators. The House unanimously voted to delay action on Dunn until the Montana Supreme Court ruled on the case.

Meanwhile, Dunn ran for the Democratic nomination for mayor of Butte. In the primary, first reports showed Dunn upsetting William Cutts by a narrow margin, but the following day Cutts was proclaimed the winner, 4,627 to 4,519. Dunn then announced he would run as an independent, and three days later he contested the election for the recount, and the city clerk refused to accept Dunn's petition as an independent candidate, a decision upheld by the Montana Supreme Court.

In a separate trial, a jury found R. B. Smith, managing editor of the Bulletin, guilty of sedition, and he was fined $4,500. Like Dunn, he appealed. After the verdict,
Loble announced that the case against Leo Daly might be dismissed, since he no longer worked for the newspaper. Charges apparently were dropped, for Daly was not mentioned again.

On May 3, 1920, the Montana Supreme Court unanimously overturned Dunn’s and Smith’s convictions and ordered new trials. Ruling on the Smith case and then using it as a precedent for the Dunn case, the court noted errors by Judge Word in examining and instructing jurors and other technical mistakes. The court ruled that

the language of this editorial ["The State Council Again"] might be published in time of war and under such circumstances that would not make it a crime. To illustrate from this record: It appears that Mr. Campbell exhibited this editorial to the county attorney, and that afterwards it was reprinted in the Helena Independent, a newspaper of which Mr. Campbell is the guiding genius. In each instance there was a publication but not such a publication as constituted a crime.

To be classified as seditious, the court said, the editorial must have occurred under such circumstances that the language thus published was calculated to incite or inflame resistance to a duly constituted federal or state authority in connection with the prosecution of the war. Whether or not it was calculated to have the effect, that was a question to be determined by the jury from all surrounding facts and circumstances, including the manner and extent of publication as well as the inherent quality of the language itself.

The court ruled that as far as the record showed, Smith was not responsible for the editorial becoming known to any person in Lewis and Clark county, other than Mr. Campbell. Can it be said then, that in the hands of Mr. Campbell alone the published editorial was calculated to incite or inflame resistance to the Council? Who but Mr. Campbell could be incited or inflamed to resistance, and is it within the range of probabilities that he would be incited to resist the very organization of which he was a member? We think not.

The report of the court’s decision was buried on page four of the Independent, with a separate story in which J. R. Wine, Loble’s successor as county attorney, said he would move for dismissal of the cases since “further proceedings would be futile” if the convictions could not be sustained on the facts brought out in the previous cases.

If the decision upset Campbell, the court’s reference to him as the “guiding genius” of the Independent infuriated him. In an editorial that appeared the same day as the news story, Campbell said:

The Reds were happy last evening. Not only was W. F. Dunn, supreme radical, granted a new trial in his sedition case by the Supreme Court of Montana, but the court was flippant enough to gratify the Reds by going out of the way to take a fling at a member of the State Council of Defense.

The Bulletin, though pleased with the decision, viewed it as only one round in a long fight against a clique of partisans, whose cowardly and mean subservience to the invisible powers that prey caused them to engage in an effort to destroy every fundamental liberty, every inherent right, every guarantee of the Constitution, and that the servile servants of the copper bureaucrats did not attain a full measure of success in their foul design is due to the support given to the Daily Bulletin by the workers and other citizens.

bulletin suspends publication

In June, 1921, the Bulletin was in financial trouble and it temporarily quit publishing. In an editorial entitled “Death by Its Own Hand,” Campbell said:

The Butte Daily Bulletin is dead and o’er its grave no mourner weeps.

It preached destruction and died by its own hand. The seed it sowed in Butte brought forth unrest, unemployment and want. The Bulletin starved to death in its own home where it had invited the wolf of hunger and despair to make its abode. To be mourned a newspaper, like a man, must have accomplished some good in the world; must at least have been kind and considerate if only to a few.

The Bulletin was a lying, libeling, scandal monger. It tried to see how mean, cruel, daring, unthinking and unfeeling it could be. It tossed its red-stained harpoons at “capitalists” one day and the next it raved about the “wage slaves” who failed to heed its call and seize the mines of Butte, the government of the State and march on to the abyss of a national upheaval.

Its editor was a gun-toting carpet-bagger convicted of sedition and turned loose on a technicality through the mistaken kindness of a jurist. Its business manager was convicted of sedition. Its former circulation manager was a fugitive from justice, suspected of being a porch-climber and a stick-up man.

The only thing which the Butte Bulletin set out to accomplish has been realized. It wanted the mines closed down so that the miners would be out of work and desperate. If the miners were desperate for food and their families in want, the Bulletin figured, the crisis would come. Then the miners might be driven by its abuse and its ravings to commit acts of violence and actually seize the private property.

The suspension of the hydra-headed poison-slinger was not unexpected. Dunn and his gang had wrung the last dollars from the workmen of Butte. They appealed for outside help.

But as we said: the Bulletin is dead. Obscurity for its promoters, backers, editors and its many misdeeds will be enough. If by them the Bulletin enterprise shall be remembered or forgotten, decent men will be satisfied.

The obituary was premature, for the Bulletin resumed publication as a weekly July 15, 1921, and was published until Jan. 11, 1924.

*Ibid.


Helena Independent, June 3, 1921, p. 4.

Later in the summer, Aug. 25, 1921, peace terms were reached, and on August 26 Gov. Joseph M. Dixon, in a formal proclamation, disbanded the Council of Defense.190

VII

Some of the key persons in this chapter of Montana history played prominent roles in the state and elsewhere in subsequent years.

Campbell, who had become editor of the Independent in 1913, remained influential in that capacity until his death Dec. 15, 1938, at age 57.

Dunn, leaning toward Bolshevism during the tenure of the Council of Defense, turned to communism and became a co-editor of the Daily Worker in New York. He died Sept. 23, 1953.

Wheeler, after losing the governor's race in 1920, appeared to be through politically. But in 1922 he was elected to the U.S. Senate, where he served until 1946. In 1973, at age 91, he was an attorney in Washington, D.C.

The reluctant attorney general, Sam Ford, became governor of Montana in 1941 and served to 1949. He died Nov. 25, 1961, at age 79.

The young county attorney, Lester H. Loble, became a widely known district judge in Helena, retiring in 1971.

The period provides some faith and encouragement for the journalist: It shows how one small newspaper resisted massive attempts to suppress it and finally won a major victory over a powerful triumvirate—a giant corporation, the political system it dominated and the newspapers it controlled.

The 1972 A. J. Liebling Counter-Convention--I

By John V. Pearson Jr.*

Abbie Hoffman was the biggest rip-off artist of them all. However, he not only provided the best entertainment—he was honest about himself, his views and purposes, and the way he uses the media to get his message across. With his deep tan and his net shirt, he was the healthiest-looking person there, and the most refreshing.

He sat patiently, sometimes looking a little bored, until it was his turn to speak.

"Hi.

"This is only the second time in my life that I've ever been on a panel. The time previous to this I was invited to Dartmouth to be on a panel entitled 'The New Politics,' and I went all the way up there thinking that it had been 'The Nude Politics.'

"I've been away from this mad little island for six months, living on another mad little island, under an assumed name, growing a beard, raising vegetables and other good things for the body, scuba diving, diapering our baby, and I got a call from a reporter who had found my number in some devious way, and made me an offer I couldn't refuse.

"I have a theory that there is no such thing as news, that news is a very highfalutin word. If we destroyed it in our minds, substituted the word gossip, we would have a correct appraisal if we see the press as some vast reporter of truth and not what it is in reality, which is a number of very large, very wealthy corporations who are very powerful, and have to protect their own self-interest and have the will to do anything to maintain that power. If we don't see that, we're really missing the point.

"The major networks are like strawberry, chocolate, and vanilla. Their news department for New York City alone—NBC has over 1,500 people here, and half the news that you see at 7 o'clock is cut out from the front page of the Times! What the hell, 1,500 people in New York City running around investigating, and down in Washington one guy sits with a pencil and a phone, and his feet up on a desk, and the U. S. Government leaks! All over the place!

On corrections, he said "every newspaper oughta have a page in which corrections are put by themselves. Usually corrections are in a little black box on the obituary page...

"Free speech is the right to shout theater in a crowded fire," Hoffman concluded. "If you ain't shoutin' you ain't in."

The first day of the A. J. Liebling Convention had ended, and I walked back to my hotel tired and disappointed that the last panel had turned into such a celebrity show. But retrospectively, I cannot say that it was completely irrelevant. So much of what is considered to be news does revolve around personalities that perhaps this panel was in many ways one of the most relevant of the whole Counter-Convention.

Abbie Hoffman summed it up with one of his small anecdotes. He said "CBS radio—after that haircut thing—said 'Well, you call us again anytime, no matter where you are, call us collect.' I said 'Why?' He said 'Abbie, you're the media's wet dream.'"

*The writer is a graduate student in the Montana School of Journalism. See also short items on pages 26 and 32.

Montana Journalism Review
Montana's Negro population has remained small—never exceeding 1,834 and never accounting for more than 1 per cent of the state's inhabitants. Yet from 1894 to 1911, Montana had successively three Negro newspapers: The Helena Colored Citizen, the Butte New Age, and the Helena Montana Plaindealer. The short existence of each paper (and, in the first two instances, even the inception of the journals) can be explained in terms of the social and political milieu extant in Montana during those 17 years. The combined histories of the newspapers is, in essence, a study in socio-political exploitation.

The Colored Citizen appeared Sept. 3, 1894, ostensibly as a paper "devoted to the social, moral and industrial interests" of the state's Negroes. "The state of Montana has just right to feel proud of its ... colored citizens," the paper said. "They are of the brawn that have unfettered and exposed to the sunshine of our unsurpassed clime the treasured wealth of ages ...." Editor-manager J. P. Ball Jr. went on to justify his publication: "Every people have modes peculiar to themselves and the Afro-American is not an exception to the rule. [W]e have a race pride that has clung to us from generation to generation, that time can not eliminate."

But Ball had a less altruistic purpose in mind. In the fall of 1894, Helena and Anaconda were in open and often vicious competition for the designation as permanent state capital. The lead article on the first page of the Colored Citizen suggested the paper's role in the contest: "COLORED CITIZENS! VOTE FOR HELENA!":

The colored people of Helena have a lively interest in the welfare of their city .... The people of the city are well disposed towards them and offer them every opportunity to go upward and onward .... We hope that our people throughout the state without exception will speak a good word for Helena as the permanent capital and on the 6th of November next vote for the city where five hundred of us live.

We will consider it a race compliment.

As the election neared, the paper's rhetoric became more vitriolic and open attacks against Anaconda and the Anaconda Copper Company president, Marcus Daly, became frequent. Under the headline "The Anaconda Company Employed Only White Men and Dagoes," the paper said:


* Ibid. According to the Bureau of the Census, 279 Negroes lived in Helena in 1890 and 228 in 1900.
We are reliably informed that though Marcus Daly and the Anaconda company give employment to thousands of men, not a single colored citizen can be found among them. Yea, even more, we learn that "No niggers allowed in our works," is the unanimous sentiment of those who control the company as well as those who are employed by the company... He [Marcus Daly] will hobo and coddle us now, for he says to himself, "I'll give the niggers a little water and lots of promises now in order to get their votes, and then they can go to Helena." 8

The last issue of the Colored Citizen appeared the day before the election. On the front page, in bold type, was a single article reminding readers that the Anaconda Company did not employ "a solitary Colored Man." It concluded by telling blacks throughout the state to "stand by your Helena Brethren." Tucked into the columns of page two was a small notice extending the paper's "sincere thanks" to those who had given "assistance, encouragement and advice." 9 Helena won the November 6 election. The political need had ended and the newspaper was discontinued.

On May 30, 1902, the second Negro newspaper appeared in Montana, purporting to be a "medium to bring the colored people of the state closer together." The editors of the New Age provided a flood of flowing prose:

"[W]e embark this journalistic canoe, set sail, afloat the truth, fore the facts, to the wind of public sentiment, hoping not to get wrecked upon the financial shoals and have sufficient ballast on board not to be dismantled by the derelicts and typhoons which will be directed our way, but that upon the turbulent and stormy waters of newspaper life we will be kept safely buoyed by helping hands and guided by the lighthouse of solid race support and the support of the businessmen who are benefited by the race, we will pilot safely into the harbor of success." 10

The first issue contained one advertisement—that of the Acme Shining Parlor, which offered "Polite Attention" to the needs of ladies and gentlemen. There was a note to the "Advertising Business Men of the State": "An ad in our paper will reach directly a higher class of buying citizens than can be correspondingly found anywhere." 11 Advertisements from the Butte community were forthcoming. Hennessey's Department Store, the Daly Bank and Trust Company and F. Augustus Heinze's Aetna Savings and Trust Company advertised regularly. 12

**a united force**

The New Age sought to achieve a portion of its goal of racial solidarity when it broached the suggestion of a state convention in Butte or Helena to present a "united force" in the form of an Afro-American State League. 13 In later issues, the paper expanded the idea, concluding that blacks had not "demanded recognition in the proper manner," and until that was done there was no way they would be recognized "as being worthy of notice." 14 Initial responses from throughout the state apparently were lacking in number and enthusiasm. The paper prodded its readership to "awaken from the lethargic state in which we have been repining."

The New Age also transformed its initial purpose into a crusade:

"It shall be the purpose of the New Age, while we are not here by any means for purely political purposes... to awaken the colored voters of this state to the realization of the fact that as a unit we can be a most potent factor in the political affairs of the state..."

Unfortunately, purely political considerations became more and more paramount to the state and the newspaper. The Amalgamated Copper Company, successor to Marcus Daly's Anaconda copper mining interests, engaged in an economic and political struggle with F. Augustus Heinze for the mineral wealth at Butte. As the election of 1902 neared, the struggle concentrated on control of the legislature, where each side hoped to foster its self interests. Little in Montana escaped the resultant polarization—the New Age was no exception.

In August, the paper urged its readership to "stand united and lend their support to the right parties" who would, when in office, not forget their "colored brother." 15 In the midst of this political debate, the New Age became temporarily preoccupied with derogatory news coverage that appeared in another Butte newspaper, the Inter Mountain: "The official organ of the republican party" and "the most ungrateful and biased news journal published in the northwest." The latter publication continually referred to Negro criminals as the "King of Darktown" or "King of the Colored" and insisted on reporting attendant interviews or testimony in what the New Age called "negro dialect."

The city editor knows neither negro dialect or English rhetoric, and when he mixes the two, the compound is a species of language which has not yet been classed... His mangled verbiage at present... is worse than the joiour of one of Professor Hoffman's monkeys. 16

If the paper’s politics were in doubt prior to the episode with the Inter Mountain, they became clear as the paper swung strongly behind the local Democratic candidates and against F. Augustus Heinze: 17

---

13Ibid., June 13, 1902.
14Ibid., June 20, 1902.
15New Age, June 27, 1902. The Montana Plaindealer estimated in May, 1908, that 100 Montana Negroes were registered to vote.
16Ibid., Aug. 9, 1902.
17Ibid., Aug. 30, 1902. There also are articles or editorials about the Inter Mountain in the issues of Aug. 9 and Oct. 4, 1902.
18According to Thornborough (p. 479), Negro newspapers rarely were Democratic.
The New Age succumbs to social and political forces.

We have taken stand in the interest of the democratic party [sic] and are now ready to take a ride in politics. We must not sit still upon the stool of idleness and allow this would-be hero who changes his politics oftener than many people do their sox, to drag down the fair name of Montana.18

The New Age now advertised itself as the "Leading race journal of Montana, Utah, Idaho and the Northwest" and reminded candidates that its columns provided direct access to the "colored vote of the county or the state..." It was instrumental in organizing the Colored Democratic Club in Butte, and when local candidates spoke before the group Oct. 22, 1902, the New Age covered the gathering in detail.20

The New Age did not publish an election-week issue. After what the paper described as "a quiet repose of two weeks" and a "little recess," it resumed publication November 15 with a different format. Subsequent issues contained no information about the outcome of the election (which Amalgamated won) and no editorials on any subject. The paper also minimized local coverage, relying on national press releases for most of its material. Several new advertisements appeared, among them notices for the Anaconda Standard, the Inter Mountain and the Butte Miner—all owned or controlled by the Amalgamated Copper Company. The advertisement for Heinze's Aetna Savings and Trust Company appeared in a few issues, then was discontinued.21

The paper itself appeared irregularly into February, 1903, then ceased publication.

The demise of the New Age and its relatively short life suggest that its initial legitimacy as a truly representative Negro newspaper is questionable. It is possible that the Anaconda Copper Company, which Amalgamated controlled in 1902, remembered the existence of the Colored Citizen in 1894 and sought through the New Age to win the minority vote in the crucial election of 1902. Or it is possible that the paper's inception was legitimate but that Amalgamated interests got its support directly or indirectly. Of ultimate importance is the fact that the New Age lost its editorial independence and succumbed to existing social and political forces in Montana.

In March, 1906, J. B. Bass became owner and editor of Montana's third Negro newspaper—the Montana Plaindealer, which had the best claim to legitimacy as an apolitical, racial publication. Bass said the paper had three purposes: 1) to "at all times advocate the principles of Peace, Prosperity and Union" and to "stand up for right and denounce the wrong," 2) to "at no time stir up strife, but rather to pour oil on troubled waters;" and 3) to advocate the "progress and uplifting of race with which our destiny is linked forever."22 The paper identified itself as Republican.

Bass absolved himself from financial ties with his two predecessors, for in his second issue, under the editorial heading "Who Owns The Plaindealer," he said he was the paper's sole owner and manager. He admitted that he had borrowed $3,000 to get started, and he offered to divulge the source of the loan to anyone who inquired at the newspaper office.23

Bass did not hesitate to take political and moral stands on contemporary issues. In so doing, however, he exposed himself to the same social and political vicissitudes of his predecessors. In the third issue, March 30, 1906, he attacked Lewis and Clark County Attorney Leon LaCroix for his racism in a closing address during the trial of a Helena Negro. The Plaindealer felt such sentiments "would only be expected from Ben Tillman... in the jungles of the Southland, where there would possibly be some excuse to go outside of the case, and appeal to prejudice..."24 The paper held its ground on the issue and was somewhat taken aback several weeks later when LaCroix declined to subscribe to the publication. Bass reaffirmed his right to criticize a government official and promised to adhere to the principles he had established for his journal.25

The attacks on LaCroix aggravated Helena's "coterie of pot-house politicians" as Bass called them.26 On June 21, 1906, the city council revoked the license of L. V. Graye's predominantly Negro Zanzibar Saloon—"the resort of the criminal element" where "70 percent of the crime of the city could be directly traced."27 The Helena Daily Independent was overjoyed:

No action of any city council for many years met with such instant and unanimous approval... The people of Helena have decided that the Zanzibar shall not survive. The people of Helena have been insulted, menaced, discouraged and disgraced by the immoral effluvia and the indecent emanations of what is known to be the vilest, the most insolent, the most degenerate and the most anomalous warren of salacity and sin that Montana ever knew...28

Bass retaliated in a series of muckraking stories beginning July 20: "Attention Everybody! Gambling In Helena Has

18New Age, Oct. 11, 1902.
19See the issues of Sept. 20, Oct. 4 and Oct. 18, 1902, for coverage of the campaign.
20New Age, Nov. 15 and Nov. 22, 1902.
21Montana Plaindealer, March 16, 1906.
22Ibid., March 23, 1906.
23Ibid., March 30, 1906. The newspaper took issue with this statement by LaCroix: "It is time that respectable WHITE people of this community rise in their might and assert their rights."
24Ibid., May 18, 1906.
25Ibid., Jan. 4, 1907.
26Helena Daily Independent, June 22, 1906.
27Ibid., June 28, 1906.
Opened Up. The Big Dailies are mum, the OFFICIALS whose duty it is to enforce the law, it seems, do not move. HELENA IS OPEN! GAMBLING RUNNING FULL BLAST!39 Throughout August and early September, the newspaper reported the gambling violations continually and advocated action by city and county officials, who did nothing. The Zanzibar quietly reopened as the Pekin.

“poor old LaCroix”

On Sept. 20, 1906, local Democrats nominated County Attorney LaCroix for reelection. A week later, Bass said LaCroix was unfit for his position because he permitted gambling and corruption to exist in Helena.30 The paper kept up its attack until the election. The first post-election issue proclaimed in banner headlines: "POOR OLD LA-CROIX! REPUDIATED BY THE PEOPLE. THE PLAIN­DEALER’S FIGHT ON THIS VACCILLATING OFFICIAL BEARS FRUIT." The story began: "It is not with gloating glee that we write the above headlines, but rather in keeping with the solemnity of the occasion wherein the last sad rites are performed over one."31

Bass did have reason for a certain sense of glee, in spite of his statement. The state Republican caucus had suggested him for a staff position in the forthcoming legislative session. The editor was confident he would receive the appointment as a reward for his partisan efforts.32 But his optimism soon ended.

The city administration finally decided to curb gambling. “Sergeant of Police Baily, a relic of antebellum democracy and veritable Negro hater,” raided the Pekin, closing it permanently.33 Bass was vitriolic in his attack. He admitted his disgust for Zanzibar-Pekin proprietor L. V. Graye, who had permitted gambling in his establishment, but he castigated the “ungrateful and acrobatic city administration” for permitting “White dens” to flourish—“dance halls whose owners have been tried and convicted of infractions against the law, but they are not the same color as Graye, so they can continue to run.”34

A second affront to Bass’s optimism—“a solar plexus blow from the Grand Old Party”—followed the closure of the Zanzibar-Pekin. The Republican party failed to confirm his appointment when the legislature met. “Repudiated,” Bass cried. “The Republicans have said by their actions, not words, ‘You may vote for us; you may take off your coats and work for us; but when it comes to the emoluments of office, we have none of that for you.’”35 Bass had learned what other black editors had learned—the state’s existing political structure used minorities to gain its own political ends, then repudiated them. The trend continued.

On Jan. 14, 1907, W. H. Haviland (Silver Bow County) introduced S.B. 7, prohibiting the use of “name, title of officers, insignia, ritual or ceremonies of certain Orders and Societies…”36 Haviland worded the measure to make it illegal for Negro members of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks to wear their insignia. “Innocent in appearance,” the Plaindealer warned, “it is as vicious as any JIM CROW legislation ever enacted in the south.”37 More vicious than the fraternal society measure was a miscegenation bill introduced by Sen. Charles S. Muffley (Broadwater) five days after Bass’s attack on Haviland.38 “Another Jim Crow Staresman,” Bass proclaimed, likening Muffley to “untamed southern fire eaters.”39

The miscegenation bill did not come out of the Senate Committee on Public Morals, but the legislature passed Haviland’s measure and the governor signed it February 19. Bass had a solution as he wrote, tongue-in-cheek:

> The imperial order of Wind Jammers . . . have about decided that the insignia of their order shall be a black suit of clothes, so all colored brethren are warned to be careful not to wear black suits or to jail they go for this enormous offense against society.40

On May 4, 1908, Helena law-enforcement officers arrested William R. Holland for violating the new law. He was tried in district court, found guilty and fined $100. Holland appealed and the Montana Supreme Court voided the statute.41 The Plaindealerlaus Holland for his perseverance: “[H]e is worth more to the progress of the race than a thousand agitators who produce nothing but hot air and theorize. The man of the hour is the one Who Does Things.”42

As W. R. Holland was winning his fight in the Supreme Court, the Plaindealer was losing a campaign in Helena’s eating establishments: “Up at the head of Wall St. on Main is a little old cheap dirty restaurant which has the nerve to put up a sign ‘NO COLORED TRADE SOLICITED.’”

80For documentation of the date Haviland introduced the bill, see the Anaconda Standard, Jan. 15, 1907. For the complete text of the measure, refer to Laws, Resolutions and Memorials of the State of Montana, Passed at the Tenth Regular Session, Jan. 7, 1907, to March 7, 1907 (Helena: State Publishing Co., 1907), pp. 24-25.
81Montana Plaindealer, Feb. 1, 1907.
82Muffley stated February 5 that he would introduce the matter (see the Helena Daily Independent, Feb. 6, 1907) and actually introduced the bill the following day (Daily Independent, Feb. 7, 1907). The Senate referred the matter to the Committee on Public Morals (Edward Cardwell, Jefferson, chairman; Edward Donlan, Missoula, and C. P. Tooley, Meagher, members).
83Montana Plaindealer, Feb. 15, 1907.
84Ibid., May 15, 1908.
85For the Supreme Court decision, see State vs. Holland, Case No. 2,575, cited in Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, March 5, 1908, to November 13, 1908, Vol. 37 (San Francisco: Bancroft-Whitney Co., 1909), pp. 393-407. Holland submitted his case to the Supreme Court June 29, 1908, and received the decision July 18, 1908. The Helena Daily Independent of July 19, 1908, carried a digest of the decision.
86Montana Plaindealer, July 31, 1908.
Bass maintained that "any colored man who would go into such a cheap dirty joint as this one to eat is not fit to associate with hogs." But his efforts were to no avail. During the fall, the signs on restaurants at the head of Main Street proliferated. The newspaper observed that unless some change was made, all public eating houses ultimately would be closed to Negroes.

Now, one strange coincidence is that the same fellows who object to eating in the same restaurant with the colored brother, fall over each other to get him in a Poker Game ... and they especially cater to his patronage and poor Uncle Zip walks right up to the trough. Although he is not fit to eat at a cheap joint lunch counter, they will let him play poker, and fitch from him his coin."

Sen. Muffley returned to Helena when the biennial session of the legislature convened in 1909. He resubmitted his bill prohibiting intermarriage between whites and Negroes or orientals. This time when the assembly refused the measure to the Committee on Public Morals, Muffley was chairman.45

During the first month of the 1909 Montana legislature, California's state assembly was embroiled in a debate concerning a Chinese exclusion law. Montana's press reported the arguments in detail. Meanwhile, Yee Hoe Joe married Margaret Gillette (both of Helena) February 1, and the Montana Daily Record wasted no time in chiding the Broadwater senator in an editorial entitled "One on Muffley":

That the Occidental is not able to cope with the Oriental, even if the former is a lawmaker, was illustrated yesterday in this city. . . sad to relate, and we hate to confess it, the Orient has won. While the pretty girls who engross bills in the senate were putting in shape the measure which has designed to put Cupid out of certain lines of business in Montana, Yee Hoe Joe was hurrying up the tailor to complete his frock coat and other habiliments of the bridegroom, and the bride-to-be was urging the modiste to make speed on her trousseau. It must be said for Senator Muffly [sic] that he knew not of the effort being made to beat his bill to the post, but that does not alter the results—Yee Hoe Joe, Oriental, has one on Muffly [sic], the senator from Broadwater, Occidental.46

Muffley hurried the bill out of committee and the Republican-dominated Senate passed it (15-11) two days after the editorial had appeared. While some state papers47 noted the oriental catalyst for the passage of the measure, Bass was concerned with the implications for Negroes. He expressed his displeasure in an open letter to the Montana Daily Record February 6, saying he hoped "broad-gauge liberal and progressive members" of the house would defeat the measure.48

In the next Plaindealer, Bass commented: "The result was a keen disappointment to our people, and what a surprise when the Republicans dealt the blow; going squarely back on one of the planks of their platform in the last campaign."49

After a three-hour debate in the Democratic House February 16, that body passed the measure (29-25) with only minor revisions.50 Editorial reaction from the state's daily press indicated general support. The Helena Independent agreed with Rep. George W. Pierson (Carbon) that the measure was not needed at present but that the state had best enact the bill 'before the harm was done.'51 The Butte Miner philosophized:

As a matter of fact, intermarriages between whites and negroes are a bad thing and have been condemned by advanced colored men as well as by intelligent white citizens.

Many colored leaders have held that the members of their race should have pride in their color and should oppose mixed marriages as strongly as the whites do.52

The Billings Gazette expressed the most extreme view, saying: "There is no sort of use for worrying about the effect upon the quality of our manhood . . ." because of the bill's passage. "Any man who would marry a woman of an alien race is so far down the scale that nothing in particular can hurt him, either morally or physically."53

Editorial reaction in the Plaindealer was brief: "Montana has joined the Jim Crow Colony alongside of Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas and Arkansas. God help us!"54 When the governor signed the measure March 3, 1909, the newspaper said: "We do not think that the governor who signed the Jim Crow Bill in Montana is any better than the republican senate that passed it."55

advertising declines

The miscegenation bill was the last major issue to occupy the pages of the Plaindealer. Advertising declined sharply and the newspaper experienced financial difficulties. In
January, 1910, it switched from a weekly to a monthly and acknowledged its frustration in attempting to get positive action through political channels: "The colored vote to our minds in the coming election will be an unknown quantity."56 On Aug. 11 and Sept. 8, 1911, Bass appealed to his subscribers to pay what they owed the Plaindealer, with the hope that the amount would be sufficient to "pay off our indebtedness."57 With the latter issue, the Plaindealer ceased publication.

The history of the Plaindealer and its two predecessors illuminates the socio-political exploitation of Montana's Negro minority through the press. Whites sought the Negro political currency at election time, exploiting it directly or indirectly through the state's Negro press. On matters of social equality and political power, however, the sign read "NO COLORED TRADE SOLICITED."


The Great Gray Blanket

By K. Ross Toole*

... until 1959 when the [Anaconda] Company at long last did sell the papers, the average Montanan saw his state only partially. It was fragmented—as the press saw it. He could not, indeed, even see his own town or valley in the actual terms of what was happening or what was needed or what was wrong. If he discovered these things at all, he did so on his own, in spite of, and not because of, the press. Unless, again, he served as his own reporter or investigator, he never knew what real issues faced the legislature or why—or even, indeed, how the legislature disposed of them—if it did.

Always there were small, independent papers, some "radical," some merely enraged. They came and went with regularity. None of them spoke to a significantly large constituency, except for the Great Falls Tribune, whose circulation in the 1950's was some 16,000. It was the one bright journalistic light in Montana—but it cast its beam into a very deep and palpable journalistic gloom.

Then on June 1, 1959, the Company announced the sale of all its papers in Montana. The purchaser was Lee P. Loomis, home base Mason City, Iowa, and head of the Lee Newspapers, an independent, successful, Midwest chain. The Lee chain provided an early editorial guarantee: "We serve only one interest—the public. There were no strings attached to the sale of these newspapers. Our only obligations are to our subscribers and our communities." But Montanans were wary. The Lee chain also announced that it was going to retain "the men and women who have worked conscientiously to develop your newspapers. ... We have met many of them, and we plan to build on with this team." One professor of journalism at the University remarked, "With this team! Well, then, there goes the ball game!"

But, oddly, that was not the case. True, change in the newspapers came slowly and varied widely from paper to paper. But it came. For older Montanans, those who "grew up" in the 1930's and 1940's with the Company press, it is still amazing to pick up the daily Missoulian, for instance, and find it vehemently attacking the Anaconda Company for air and water pollution—or to find it investigating in detail why the lumber industry (vital to Missoula's economy) is doing so little to fight environmental degradation.

All of the Lee papers give comprehensive coverage to legislative matters, to local government, to school problems, in short, to the real problems that confront their communities. The Missoulian, in particular, has come more and more to engage in "in-depth" investigations of Montana's racial problems (Indians), its lagging economy, and above all, environmental matters. Often, its editorial policy is openly opposed to the "interests"—the Company, the saw mills, pulp plants, and a timid U. S. Forest Service.

We will doubtless never know what precise considerations led the Company to sell its papers. But certainly somewhere behind the sale lay the factor of profound change in Montana and in the Company in the years subsequent to World War II.

Who Elected You?

By William H. Hornby

Mr. Hornby, executive editor of the Denver Post, gave this address Aug. 19, 1972, at the annual convention of the Montana Press Association. He holds an A.B. in the humanities and an M.A. in journalism from Stanford University. Mr. Hornby has worked for the San Francisco News, the Associated Press and the Great Falls Tribune. From 1957 to 1960, he served as copydesk chief and subsequently as an editorial writer at the Denver Post. He was managing editor from 1960 to 1970, when he was named executive editor. Mr. Hornby is vice president of the Eastern Montana Publishing Co. at Miles City. His opening remarks refer to short speeches by the state's major political candidates at the press convention.

Today we again have enjoyed one of newspapering's most pleasant moments—that every-other-year flowering of open communication between politicians and the press. In the August of campaign years, as our political acquaintances begin to hear again—faint but demanding—that clear call to public duty, we become aware that warmth seeps back into the relationship between harried scribe or beleaguered publisher and the elected official or those seeking that state. After this morning’s session, there could have bloomed the thought that we, the press, and they, the politicians, really are brothers, standing as one against the forces of ignorance, seeking as one what is best for our nation, state, county, town.

When rising as we editors all do to the sound of the initials “S.O.B.” to see who calls our name, we find that our political friends are using them to describe us as Sound Old Bastions of local wisdom and community leadership. How cruel it is, as this August camaraderie flows, to listen to any hidden voices reminding us that in the chill winds of late November those initials will again hail us in their traditional and more durable meaning. To the politicians elected and defeated in November we again will be the sinister ones who deliberately misreported campaigns, misunderstood purposes, underplayed achievements, overplayed mishaps and, worst of all, undernoticed various existences.

I used to think that this business about newsmen and politicians being natural enemies was conventional green-eye-shaded, sleeve-gartered newsroom lore of the fogies—the wisdom of a day when news writers more sensational. I thought that in these more sophisticated times the newsman and the politician could be natural allies in seeking good government and community progress, each understanding the other’s ground rules, each respecting the other’s role, possibly even intimate social friends when public smoke had cleared. Though an occasional politician were to storm the editorial office or chew out a hapless reporter, I thought we could be philosophical, in the spirit of General Custer, who said as the Indians screamed up the hill, “I don’t know what riled them up, but they’ll get over it. They were just fine at the dance Saturday night.”

But politicians are to us as the Indians were to Custer. It isn’t just the recent comments of the Vice President that have recollected this old truth. Nor have we been shaken by the claims of some of the McGovern people that the Eagleton treatments were unfairly shocking to the republic because the press had been unkind or tasteless. All of us in the newspaper business are fairly hardened to the truth that a good many people, when they look in the mirror, don’t like what they see, and some try to blame the mirror. And, of course, the mirror of the press is often smudged, cracked and in need of cleaning.

So it does not surprise or alarm us that politicians think the press in commenting is sometimes unfair or inaccurate or biased. Sometimes it is, and how could it be otherwise in a complex institution run by very human human beings. The wonder is that our professional ethical system works as well as it does to prevent error and bias and to correct it.
speeches are the natural home of the broad generalization. Lawyers or legislators, remodel them like the architects, or promptly when it sneaks by. At least our profession does not bury its mistakes like the doctors, amend them like the lawyers or legislators, remodel them like the architects, or classify them into oblivion like the bureaucrats. Our mistakes are open, for all to see, and for the most part apologies and repairs are open, too. I believe we can truly say we are what we seem to be,warts and all. We are blessed by membership in the least phony if most human of the respectable professions.

At the heart of the fundamental difference between politicians and newsmen is a differing psychological make-up. Of course this is a very broad generalization, but banquet speeches are the natural home of the broad generalization. Let us therefore classify the typical politician as single-minded, a true believer. He has a program—a goal—which he pursues with conviction. As conviction becomes sturdy, he increasingly classes opposing criticism or comment as being unfair and malicious.

By contrast we newsmen are broad-minded unbelievers. We see many sides to every question, sometimes too many. We deal in our daily life with sincere advocates of diametrically opposing views. We come to suspect that there is no absolute social truth, just too many sincere people pursuing too many worthy goals. The ego life of the politician lies in achieving specific programs, acts of legislation, a specific vote, winning. He has a goal, a battle, and a clear end in which he wins or loses.

By contrast the battle to the newsmen is seldom won or lost. There are always a hundred battles more. There are many struggles in which no one clearly wins or loses. The fundamental psychological framework of the newsman's daily life is the balancing and resolution of conflict, not winning. He suffers the agony of seeing both sides.

About the best that those on the two sides of this fundamental fence, the politician and the newsman, can bring to their meeting is the dual recognition that the other fellow is sincere and that he has his job to do. There are still on both sides plenty of practitioners who grant the other fellow his sincerity. But I see a growing trend on the politician's side toward an ignorance of the fact that we in the press have our job to do.

a politician's question

The other day a prominent Montana politician, whose integrity and acumen I always have respected, brought me up short—when I was pressing a point of view—by his question, "Who elected you?"

This was parroting a theme laid down, I believe, by the Vice President and widely repeated. The thrust is that the comment and coverage of the press in the field of public affairs is really a gratuitously self-assumed burden. No one asked us to assume it. It has no legitimate sanction. By implication, the country would be better off without it.

Who elected you? You can find this theme, or its roots, in many places. I suspect that the teaching profession, if the equivalent of civics or American history still is taught, no longer places much stress on the role of a free press, its constitutional sanctions, its elemental necessity to an open democratic society. Do you know what they say in your community classrooms?

I don't suspect, I know that the typical college law school turns out graduates readier to grind down the traditional liberties of the press than to defend them.

I don't think the members of your immediate families understand today, as well as you did as a youngster, just what the role of the press is and why it functions as it does.

Were you as surprised as I was, reading the Montana papers away from the scene, that the Con-Con delegates so vehemently and awkwardly chose to equate the individual's right to privacy with the public's right to know?

Who elected you? The implications of this question are fascinating. They imply that the only legitimate sanction for a public or professional role in this country is popular election. People would not think of electing their doctor or their lawyer. In those cases the concept of professional training is recognized in law as indicating certain skills and granting a certain necessary social role.

But with the journalist it is far different. His role is sanctioned by the Constitution—indeed in a far more basic way than that of the other professions. There is specific mention of the free press in its social role. It is true that we do not license our practitioners after a body of training as do the doctors and lawyers, but the fact that we require a professional training is obvious. But only to us. The old saw that almost no one thinks he could operate as well as the surgeon but almost everyone thinks he can edit better than the editor is as true today as when it was first sawed.

The thing that bothers me is a change in the kind of criticism the press is receiving. We always have faced criticism as to specific shortcomings about our performance. Many of those criticisms were valid. Too often we react defensively instead of doing something about them. We do need to strengthen the channels through which the public can criticize its press—more letters to the editors, perhaps community press councils, less complacency about our role in the community.

But the new attack goes beyond this traditional criticism. It attacks not our performance but our role.

Who elected you? This questions the validity of our basic function in society. It questions our legal foundations supposedly dedicated to open communication as the foundation for democracy.

The Supreme Court rules in effect that a newsman is no more privileged than a street cleaner in protecting his sources before a grand jury. Postal regulations, which for years recognized the special press role, are changed. Presidents and governors reduce contacts with the press, or structure them into dog-and-pony scrubs for the benefit of the cameras. Open-record and open-meeting laws are passed in public but hamstrung by bureaucrats in private, with too little effective outcry.

Why no outcry? Are we jaded? Don't we think the threat is real or the cause sublime?
When the politicians and community leaders come to us for help, do we pin them down as to their commitment to the open society and press freedom in return?

Do we make of our press associations real spokesmen for the causes of the press as a whole, or are these conventions merely pleasant rendezvous for venting the quarrels and frictions of our particular private lodge?

Do we consider ourselves personal lobbyists for the role of the press in our communities?

Can we lessen fragmentation of effort within the communications industry? Broadcasters meet with themselves and wail. Editors ditto. Publishers ditto. College journalism teachers ditto. Reporters ditto. No common strategies are ever worked out.

The printed newspaper faces a great future. We know, now, that television—network or local cable—is not going to run us off the map, either in terms of its advertising pull or in terms of the job it can do as a local information medium.

We know that we are on the threshold of technological changes that give very real promise of breaking the cost barriers that looked so impossibly high just a few years ago.

We know that the desertion of the profession by smart youngsters, worrisome in the 1950s, has been reversed. The public-service aspects of newspaper journalism are increasingly attractive to the new generation.

And while some of our communities have gone through rough times because of the great tilt of population into the cities, we can see around the corner a growing decentralization of our population and the communication and transportation technology to back up that decentralization. The countryside is going to have its revival.

The truly dark spot on our horizon is in the ineffective organizational structure we have with which to fight our battles as a profession in protecting our traditional role. The newspaper today is less threatened by its economic than by its political and social challenges. But publishers, editors, business managers and reporters are singing different tunes. In a very real sense we face a public-relations crisis which we, the great Communicators, seem to know less how to confront than do the deaf and the dumb. We weaken our professional associations by taking narrow views of their purpose and sometimes a stingy grasp of their purse. We do not broaden them to include all the segments of our profession or to mount common strategy, and we certainly pay little attention to broadcast media facing similar threats.

**press role questioned**

The challenge to the press from the politician in this country is more serious than before, because the focus of the criticism is shifting from our performance, which is proper and necessary criticism, to a questioning of the validity of our very role in society. Who elected you?

To meet this challenge, we are in sad shape as a profession. Our professional organizations are fragmented, understaffed and engaged in internal preoccupation more than in representing the profession to the public.

We seem ineffective as an articulate profession in being articulate in our own behalf.

But they, the Indians, are getting closer. They want to pass laws forcing access to our columns—the equivalent of the “equal time” provisions in broadcasting. There are those who are thinking of licensing the press, of censoring advertising, of adjudicating entry into and out of our business. Postal-rate increases threaten many publications.

What’s worse—the public is increasingly indifferent to the threat. I’m not at all sure our very children understand what we’re talking about or their teachers. I think the lawyer and the judge down the street get a secret thrill when they can slap us down. I think the mayor and the school superintendent would be happy to throw us out of their meeting, if they could.

But we can get our clout back, if we care. The problem can be overcome. Legislation can be passed and rulings amended to restrengthen our cause; for example, bills are in the congressional hopper to revalidate the newsman’s right to protect his sources.

The outlook for legislation guaranteeing a newsman’s privilege to protect his sources in court is likely to be a new bill drafted for the Senate Judiciary Committee. It possibly will not go as far in granting total immunity to newsman as would S3768 proposed by Senator Cranston of California. Nor would it depend as much on the not-so-tender mercies of the courts as would the bill by Senator Pearson of Kansas. There is some difference of opinion in the media about how far a newsman should be protected by legislation, but it seems self-evident after the recent Supreme Court decision that some action is needed. How will Melcher or Forester, Olsen or Shoup, Metcalf or Hibbard vote? We heard some general talk today, but I don’t know what the depth of their passion is.

We can win this fight and pass through the rapids if we will strengthen, not weaken, our mutual associations. If we will give priority to our efforts toward fighting our common fight. If we will make it our personal business to carry this matter to our community councils, each of us in his own way and according to his own circumstances. And if we will hold the feet of our political friends to the fire, to the end that their passion of August shall not cool by December. And if we will go out to rebuild our base with the public.

In Montana, for example, the public needs its free and independent press as it has never needed it before.

Who else will question the coal companies, try to save our water, stand up for a clean environment, ask the nasty business questions of the governor, press for more efficient legislators, bring air and light to complex constitutional battles, make the courts responsive to public needs, quarrel with bureaucracies about clear-cutting the forests, bring the wilderness questions down to the dinner table, keep pumping for better education, push through better social services for sparse rural areas, stand up for the farmer against the...
bureaucrats—to name just a few thorny areas that no one but the local paper can effectively touch.

But the Montana public doesn't really understand that it is their press; that for all its wars, it is their vital institution; that they, the public, are in real danger of losing their independent and vigorous advocate in their Montana communities.

They—the public—elected us. Through the Constitution, through 200 years of painfully developed American law and public tradition. That tradition is fragile—it has disappeared in many places.

The public elected you. Maybe it's time we turn into something of the single-minded politician ourselves and do a little work to stay in office.

The 1972 A. J. Liebling Counter-Convention—II

By John V. Pearson Jr.


Roger Angell, an editor at The New Yorker and a colleague of the late Joe Liebling, presented I. F. Stone with the First A. J. Liebling Award.

The little man stood quietly in the glare of the bright lights and television cameras as a horde of photographers swarmed in front of the stage taking his picture. He looked down at the small transparent plaque in his hands, turning it over several times as he examined it.

The award was rectangular in shape and inserted in a stand, with a gold medal embedded in the center. Below the medal, etched in simple, unadorned lettering was an inscription which read "To I. F. Stone. For his commitment, carried on single-handedly over two decades, to independent and unrelenting investigation of public and private power in America and his defense of individual liberty."

As the applause died down Izzy Stone was momentarily silent. Perhaps for one of the few times in his long career as a crusader, this reporter who has raised so much havoc with corporations and government could think of nothing to say.

He looked over at the other panel members: Seymour Hersh, author of My Lai 4 and Coverup; Morton Mintz, investigative reporter for the Washington Post; Peter Davis of CBS, producer of The Selling of the Pentagon; Ramparts editor James Ridgeway; Les Whitten, chief aide to Jack Anderson; and Justin Kaplan, author of Mr. Clemens and Mark Twain.

"I'm not sure I deserve a Liebling Award—"

"YES YOU DO!" yelled Cowboy Hal Koppersmith from the back of the room. The laughter broke the ice.

"When you start out you get blamed for things you never did," said Stone, "and then gradually you get credit for virtues you don't even possess."

"You know, Liebling started the art of newspaper publisher baiting. One of his best exposés was the way he took apart Elizabeth Bentley, that horrible old disseminator of fiction and falsehood, at the very start of the witch-hunt. It was a very difficult thing to do, and very few people were doing it."

"I can see from this gathering that I retired just in time. With all of you young people breathing down my neck I'll get scooped and pushed out of business in no time."

"Hell, you're younger than we are!" shouted Koppersmith. The Populist Range-Rider was getting warmed up for the evening.

"I hate that damned word muckraker," continued Stone. "The word originated with Teddy Roosevelt, who was in many ways a premature fascist, with his cult of virility and that ugly cliche he picked up—'Walk softly and carry a big stick.' Do you know where that originated? It was a tribal saying, meaning 'Walk up to a sleeping enemy and then brain him.'"

"He was a terrible imperialist and oppressor of Latin America, and a real phony-factor who turned around and became a phony trust-buster when it became fashionable. So he called people like me—better men than me—there was a wonderful generation of journalists before the First World War—muckrakers out of Bunyan."

"I hate the appellation. I hate using it, and I hate its connotations. We're trying to fight injustice, to right the evils of society, to bring out the truth. Raking muck has nothing to do with muck, except the muck that accumulates around the lairs of public office."

"One of the most important things in journalism is to help in the search for understanding. The biggest pattern in this search is not the expose of wicked, evil, or crooked men. They're pretty much parts of human life. Much more important is to help ourselves understand the tremendous power of institutions over men. At the Pentagon you don't meet monsters. You meet guys like you and me that are unlucky enough to have landed in that damned place."

"It's important to understand how people are trapped by institutions and what institutions do to them, because the path to a better society is through the destruction of those institutions. Merely changing the men in them, or merely hating the men in them, will not get us very far."

"When a country has a military establishment as huge as ours, it's bound to get into trouble. It's that simple. Sending gunboats is a familiar military institutional response to trouble. Where you've got it you're going to use it. Where you spend so much money on it you're going to turn in desperation, in the attempt to deal with complex political economic problems, to affect military solutions. It's institutions we have to try to understand, what they do to men, and what we have to do to them."

"I don't want to be overoptimistic, but I think newspapers are a hell of a lot better than they were 30 years ago. I remember reading in the New York Times every day, a front-page story by Richard Willihan, the Times' chief Washington correspondent, who played medicine ball every morning with Herbert Hoover, that big fat blob in the White House. Every morning on page one, column eight, there was a long, disguised editorial talking about advocacy journalism—and that on the merits of Herbert Hoover."
Women's Pages in the 1970s

By ZENA BETH GUENIN

The author, a 1961 graduate of the Montana School of Journalism, has worked as women's editor and society editor of the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian and as home-living editor of the Albuquerque (N.M.) Journal. She also has been a general-assignment reporter for the Butte Montana Standard. For the past two years, she has taught reporting and editing courses in the journalism department at California State University at Northridge, and for the past year has served as adviser to the student daily.

Ben Bagdikian's observation — "Most papers still look as though they are edited on the social assumptions of the 1940's and 1950's" — fits the women's pages of many newspapers. Commentators on contemporary society portray the American woman as an individual changing her outlook, life style and image of self, but the changing woman may be reading a paper that views her as a bucolically contented simpleton whose "most pressing questions are whether the decorations for the Beaver Lodge party should be white and gold or green and pink . . . ."

Women's pages that operate on a stock formula of society, clubs, decorating, furniture, food, cooking, children and sewing represent an information failure obvious to their readers and often to the women who produce them. Within that limited field of coverage, such sections present shallow reporting — reflecting fashion in terms of the offerings of the newspaper's top advertisers, not discussing the high cost and poor quality of clothing; featuring cute layouts on a kindergarten party, not outlining the lack of day-care centers; and, in a surprisingly large number of dailies, reporting the total trivia of local women's clubs as if it were news.

Criticism of women's sections has been appearing in magazines, journals and reviews, and the current interest in this part of American newspapers is obviously linked to the liberation movement. In 1970, the late Maggie Savoy, then women's editor of the Los Angeles Times, explained the liberation movement to the nation's male editors. In her article in the American Society of Newspaper Editors' Bulletin, she suggested that because editors have "been reading the sports pages" (i.e., ignoring the women's pages), the change in interests of American women has gone unnoticed by editors.

Whether they're called Style, Family, Today, View or Women, the pages that could cover those facets of living that concern everyone — health, habitat, and, yes, happiness — are known both within the industry and to readers as the women's pages. If, as Nicholas von Hoffman, columnist for the Style section of the Washington Post, says, "people read the women's pages far more than the editorial pages," then why are the women's departments of many newspapers still considered the backwater of the newsroom, scorned not just by management but often by the very women who work in women's news? Why do young women in journalism schools say, as I once said, they'll do anything to break into the newspaper business but "I'll be damned if I'll get stuck in 'soc,'" only to find they may be damned if they don't? The women's department may be the only one where they can get work, regardless of their credentials, training, experience or potential.

First-rate women's sections do exist and some were doing a top reporting job long before the theme of women's liberation was heard. And there have been women who strived for excellence despite indifference from management. "There have been islands of creativity all around — but the problem

2"What Has Your Women's Page Editor Done for You Lately?" Glamour, September, 1971, p. 92.
is that these did not turn out to be major theme sections, due to course of a lack of interest and awareness by people on the publisher-top editor level," Jean Taylor, women's editor of the Los Angeles Times, has said.  

Critics within and outside women's departments often blame the editors and publishers for the condition of women's departments that use a marshmallow approach to stories closest to the genuine interests of readers. Management's tendency to ignore the women's page is partially responsible for its state of disrepair. "The afterthought of the managing editor" is how von Hoffman describes the women's page. Ms. Taylor says women's sections suffer from "lack of affection in high places. We are unloved. We are the pea under the publisher's pillow. When we come down the street on this side, the American Society of Newspaper Editors crosses to the other..."  

a reluctance to change  

In the summary of a 1969 survey of women's and managing editors' opinions about women's pages, it was reported that "on some papers the old-fashioned women's pages are retained by the insistence of higher authority. ..." Colleen Dishon, editor and president of Features and News, Chicago, and former women's editor of the Chicago Daily News and the Milwaukee Sentinel, lists "management's need to cling to the impossible ideal woman" and "top editors' needs to be accepted socially in their own communities" as reasons for the reluctance to change women's pages. One wonders just how many women's page editors, if given a chance to be publicly honest, could chronicle tales of stories written on the behest of not just the editor but more particularly a publisher — or, even more powerful in some cases, a publisher's wife.  

Pressure from the top joins forces with pressure from another very viable power within a newspaper, the advertising department. Edwin Diamond, a former editor of Newsweek, realistically notes, in speaking about women's pages, that newspapers are a business and "the law of business is the law of commerce, which is maximized profits and minimized expenses—and if you do get good things, it's because there are a few media barons who operate on the principle of 'noblesse oblige.'"  

Attitudes of some newspapermen toward women in journalism must be added to the list of pressures to oppose change. Those attitudes are enough to stoke the fires of the liberation movement for decades. "I have yet to encounter a woman as versatile as a man in the reporting business," an editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is quoted as saying, adding that it might be his own fault "for not experimenting more with women." Are women so oddly incompetent that their assignment to news stories must be an experiment? "Women just don't have the same flexibility in some areas," says James Hoge, editor of the Chicago Sun-Times. Such opinions are not relegated only to metro dailies with mass circulations. "As soon as this Vietnam war is over," grumbled the editor of a Montana daily, "I'm going to get all these goddamn women out of here." Logic cringes.  

Credibility was stretched to its furthest limits by the "official, considered response" of the Associated Press Managing Editors to an article written by women journalists at the University of Iowa about the APME's Guidelines, which the young women considered to be "blatantly sexist." The reply, written by Edward M. Miller, Guidelines' editor and a retired editor of the Portland Oregonian, was enough to send any woman journalist off to the nearest bar. He said, "Generally speaking, women are either uncomfortable or unsuccessful in the executive role because of the difficulties they encounter in divorcing their personal feelings and ambitions from the job at hand. This leads to unhappy subordinates and inefficient production." Are men, "generally speaking," always cool and detached from their jobs? Innocent of having any personal feelings about their employers, their fellow workers, and their own tasks? And, honestly, should ambition be "divorced" from professional performance? Of course, the answer is no. The detached person goes robot-like through life and if newsmen and newswomen are anything, they certainly are not robots.  

Miller says "women become excellent copy editors. They are patient, careful, cheerful and the repetitive nature of the work does not seem to bother them." But other editors do not share that view. Some, such as Chicago Today's copy desk chief, Cliff Bridwell, stage an absolute lockout against women. He reportedly "won't allow the female species to work on his desk, presumably because he had one once and didn't like the experience."  

On the copy desk of an Albuquerque newspaper is a woman who edited a paper in the East and was bureau chief with a staff of three for another paper before moving to the Southwest, bringing her rich journalism experience with her. Last year, after several years on the rim, she was allowed to sit in the slot to prepare page schedules and cull wires for possible page-one stories — but she must get up when the..."  
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slotman comes in. One day a week, she is "allowed" to "work the line," which means she goes to the backshop to direct the make-up of dummy pages. The irony of her situation is underscored by the fact that she fills her spare time by stringing for the New York Times and Time magazine, credentials that would qualify any man for an executive position. But the managing editor, after all, is a man — with a background of newspaper experience in Alamosa, Colo.

Despite a lockout on some desks and discrimination on others, some editors report they enthusiastically seek women for the copy desk. In the ASNE Bulletin in 1970, one editor said women "keep up with the men in speed, accuracy and interest — including creative approaches to handling news and in making judgments." Another commented, "We've been so pleased that we're considering expanding it [the use of women as copy editors] somewhat." Such enthusiasm is chillingly dampened when one realizes the sexist overtones — the surprise exhibited by men that women can do a good job.

the problem of stereotypes

Margot Sherman, senior vice president and a director of the McCann-Erickson advertising agency, accurately describes the problems of many women in the media: "Even the trained woman comes up against such stereotypes as 'Women are better at monotonous jobs....' Probably what is being said is you can get better-type women than men at the same salary, and what is meant is that they are cheaper."19

City editors often have narrow attitudes about women, and those women who reach top reporting positions usually have had to be better than their male peers. Editors have been known to ignore stories about women and their political or social activism or to encourage tips from the women's department, give the story to a male reporter and let the "ladies" be content with handouts. There are flocks of editors and reporters who view all women in the news business in that jocular, benevolent way that has helped inspire the contemporary use of the term "male chauvinist."

Discriminatory attitudes may be fertilized by fear that perhaps the gals aren't just kidding about equality. The result is a "yuck-yuck" attitude about the new movement toward full and equal rights for women. The prestigious Los Angeles Times and the even more monolithic Associated Press couldn't resist noting that the vote for the constitutional amendment to guarantee women's rights would be on "leap year day" — noted by AP in the second graph of its story but headlined by the Times: "Women's Rights Vote Due On Leap Year Day."20 One can hear the snickers.

Women's editors who want to change the content or the format of their sections need the support of management and that is a commodity desperately hard for some women's editors to acquire. Ms. Dishon notes that women often do not have "the necessary clout with management"21 to initiate change. Ms. Savoy challenged male editors in her 1970 article "to take a bold peek at your women's sections. Do you duck the responsibility of helping your women's editor achieve excellence for her 51 per cent of your readership? Or do you just listen to one, two or a dozen irate society women and sigh, 'Don't rock the boat?'"22

One reason newspapers isolate their women's staff by putting the department in a corner or down the hall from the photo lab may be the whole thing can be tidily isolated mentally too. It's easier for an editor to ignore the section and trust the competence of the women he has hired to keep quietly working within the prescribed format, catching their own errors, digging up story leads, fighting the layout battles with the printers, writing heads that fit — to do more, actually, than most city-side personnel and sometimes with less salary.

Is the accusation that women journalists receive less salary than their male counterparts a valid charge, or is it simply a tale of woe that managing editors are beginning to hear and skillfully ignore? A woman reporter at the Washington Post found that "At least 27 papers where the American Newspaper Guild has contracts pay society or women's news reporters less than other reporters. The difference is as great as $60 per week."23 And since many non-Guild newspapers do not meet Guild pay scales, it may well be that many women's editors receive slim paychecks in addition to their other problems.

Responsibility for the content of women's pages or for the status of women on newspapers cannot be placed solely with male editors and management. There are women's editors who have grown up in the stock society mold and couldn't break away from it any more than the traditionalist Edward M. Miller of Guidelines fame (or infamy) could be wrenched away from his convictions about "Our Friend on High,"24 creating such markedly unchangeable differences between women and men that they carry right through to the keys of a typewriter and the end of a copy pencil.

The female traditionalists in the women's department (I like to think of them as the "white glove brigade") are those who are as engrossed in printing a full social calendar as the sports desk is in making sure all the box scores are run. Such women's editors are steadfast in their devotion to the local club-social circle to the detriment of the majority of their readers. They fit their pages to the interests of a special (and usually moneyed) few and provide a steady source of scrapbook filler for the clubs they slavishly chronicle. Or they are so involved typing all the wedding and engagement stories, they haven't time to be relevant.

It may be true in some instances, as suggested by Pon-

---

chitta Pierce to a Penney-Missouri Awards audience, that a few women's editors "actually have little talent—either as editors or writers—but they have somehow landed the job..."25

No formula covers all attitudes of women in journalism just as there is no universal attitude among men. There are women like Joan Roesgen of the Kingsport (Tennessee) Times-News who says "women's editors are wallowing in relevance" because they are "having a hard time sorting out priorities."26 Roesgen says she's interested in getting her relevance in the general news columns rather than on the women's page. Such an attitude would inhibit rather than promote constructive change.

The basics of survival also might be one reason some women's sections don't change and don't challenge their readers. Unfortunate but true is the fact that though they are in the business of communication, most newspapers don't encourage internal feedback. Women on newspapers demonstrate the social-psychological theory that adherence to group norms is a function of the importance group membership holds for the individual. Although a women's editor may not be free or have the time and staff to produce the kind of journalism she would like to offer her readers, at least she is involved in the profession of newspapering and the importance that involvement holds for her may cause her to keep quiet, if maintenance of the status quo is what is expected by management.

Sadly enough, women often fulfill the "giddy gal" stereotype that some men expect. This bit of silliness came from an edition of Editor & Publisher under the headline "Oh deer — the gals edit quite a paper."27 The story, reprinted from the Detroit News, told how the male staffers of a small Michigan weekly left the paper to the women while the "boys" went hunting. The "all-girl" issue was "well received" with "all deadlines met," and the publisher said he was "not really surprised" because the women "on our staff are highly competent, very dedicated newspaper people." The women couldn't just do that highly competent job and let it speak for itself — they had to play the role of giggling girls by running "an eye-stopper of a picture layout on page one — leg shots of six members of the staff." If, as Jean Taylor says, the real point of women's liberation is to "get men to quit treating us as though we're a bad joke,"28 then women will have to quit jumping at opportunities to parody themselves.

attitudes are changing

Although change in a newspaper, as in any social institution, may not come quickly enough for those who crave

under restricting, old-fashioned policies, attitudes toward women and the women's section are changing. Some fine-looking, responsible journalistic efforts appear on women's pages in big and small newspapers around the nation. And some of the progress toward modern coverage of our rapid, mobile world has come from male publishers and editors. Noting readership surveys and predictably responsive to increased readership because it symbolizes an increase in advertising revenue, some publishers have initiated improvement in content and personnel in their women's departments. Occasionally there exist those gem-like editors who realize the women back in the corner have the same potential and training for reporting as the fellows in the city room.

Working too are strong-willed and intelligent women's editors, many with a background of city-wide experience, who approach their pages with a sense of professionalism and the goal of making their sections a relevant contribution to the newspaper.

The women's department offers a place for the "horizontal" story, for the feature, the probing effort—ignored or handled slip-shod city-side because of press of time or staff limitations. The boycott of women city-side on metro papers has, as noted in the Chicago Journalism Review, "caused one further development — some women now prefer writing women's page news to city assignments because it deals with areas of increasing concern.

Consumerism is one topic that newspapers have been forced to confront. It's a shameful truth that it took a non-journalist to prod newspapers into a field they should have been covering. Nader is to consumerism what Steinem is to liberation. If it takes a national figure to move the press into areas where it long ago should have been involved, then we can only be grateful for those individuals. Editors would be wise to unleash the talents of their women's department on such stories because "the poorest solution to handling the new landslide of consumer-area stories is for the newsdesk to steal them. . . It means women trained for years in food and shopping and housing and consumer fields are pushed aside."30

The basic need — as many of us who have been involved in women's departments have realized for years — is for paper-wide communication and involvement, a fluid interdepartmental motion so ideas are exchanged and staff used on the stories that best suit their experience and interests. When something "new" comes into the field, editors have the hysterical tendency to seek someone "new" to handle the stories instead of reevaluating the talents of current writers. Women who could perform superbly in advocacy-reporting roles about nutrition, health, and merchandise quality control should not be overlooked and left to perform mechanically in the constricting fashion of the past. And
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If the women's department were to disappear, "I could be a 'people' editor."

the city-side reporter, when he spots and wants to do a feature removed from his routine, should not be thwarted because he thinks there's no place to take his idea or the story.

Critics of a new approach to women's news call it a "force fed" message of activism, but it doesn't have to be. I agree neither with the sneering comment about readers who are "merely performing the duties of a housewife" nor with the critic who says women's editors are "career-oriented" and "tend to forget the unliberated women . . . the masses of housewives . . . who are contemptuous and resentful of working wives . . ." There is rancor here where none should be. Having seen service, so to speak, in both roles, I can honestly say that each can be both devastating and challenging and that neither is more difficult or more rewarding than the other. A women's editor with professional integrity can achieve an understanding balance in coverage, avoiding that kind of destructive bitterness.

The liberation movement has inspired a break-out of suppressed attitudes on a national level and has given women the courage to express openly the frustrations they have silently endured. Gloria Steinem, so coyly covered by the ASNE Bulletin with both a "kitschy" with-kitten front-page photo and a beaming, full-page photo inside, may be causing the same newspaper editors who smiled as they read the Bulletin interview some headaches as their women's department editors take Steinem's cue and demand to be heard.

What, then, if women's liberation succeeds? Will there actually be room in newspapers of the future for the women's department? Ms. Taylor of the Los Angeles Times says if the women's department were to disappear, "I could be a 'people' editor." Her point is well-taken. With audiences receiving more and more of their hard news coverage from television, there should be more newspaper emphasis on "life-style" stories and involvement with the actualities and frustrations of modern living.

As for content, papers seeking change in their women's sections will have to make some bold moves. I must agree with Nick Williams, retired editor of the Los Angeles Times, who says the sections are beautiful and loved by those who know them but they should be banished. Gloria Steinem thinks space for bridal photos should be purchased just like advertising, and some papers have tried this procedure. She also suggests that if wedding photos are run, they should include the bridegroom. Having been exposed to small papers that use couple shots, I can't agree with this at all. Brides do have an aura of loveliness about them (or enough netting to disguise most of the flaws) but bridegrooms — well, it may be reverse chauvinism — but they generally look uncomfortably stupid. Papers might sell fewer extra issues over the counter if such frivolity were dropped, but it is difficult to imagine any real loss in advertising revenue or in canceled subscriptions. A monthly tabloid of brides is another technique newspapers could employ.

an antiquated approach

As for the club events — the metro papers handle only those enormously influential groups (such as the ones to which the publisher's wife belongs) or events of general interest — open-admission fund-raising parties, shows and so on, local priorities have to be set, but it seems logical to hold the same standards for women's club coverage as for men's service groups. Let's face it — women's pages often have an antiquated "women are doing something" approach. It has been firmly established that women can accomplish positive things in their communities — coverage of their activities should not be chained into a club meeting-flower show format.

One of the main reasons Sue Hovik, former women's editor of the Minneapolis Star, initiated a disposal of the women's pages in favor of wide-interest feature sections called Taste and Variety was to avoid the sexist treatment of club news. "If a club event or program is newsworthy, it should face the same criteria for publication — regardless of the sex of its members." Gloria Steinem, so coyly covered by the ASNE Bulletin with both a "kitschy" with-kitten front-page photo and a beaming, full-page photo inside, may be causing the same newspaper editors who smiled as they read the Bulletin interview some headaches as their women's department editors take Steinem's cue and demand to be heard.

Critics and those involved in producing good sections stress content. Stylish appearance and a superficial nod to contemporary topics just won't reach the innovative goal. Diamond notes that "some [women's sections] are very impressive in the sense of big pictures, lots of white space, good heads and provocative stories. But it seems to me it's still some of the old Thunderbird wine in some new, French-labeled bottles. Is it really something new, or are we getting the same old segregated women's pages?"

Although the title may change with the direction, the
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need for a section involving women, both as writers and editors and as readers, is emphasized by most critics. At the A. J. Liebling Conference in New York in 1972, Ms. Steinem said she “has come back full circle in that I now feel the value of women’s pages. They should cover all subjects, including men, from a point of view that is not being represented.”

In an address to the 1972 Penney-Missouri Awards Conference, Molly Ivins, an editor of the Texas Observer, strenuously advocated change but not abolition of women’s sections. She suggested that “the cultural conditioning” that has produced the liberation-protested differences between men and women make women particularly able to communicate “because women have been forced to deal with people in the tightest pressure-cooker there is—the family.” This “special ability to deal with people,” she continued, can make women’s pages “a forum, a center, a means of communication and discussion, a source of ideas and of perspective with warmth, with friendship, with kinship and with understanding.”

And such sections, as a few already are, can be such a journalistic challenge to women (and to men) that no one who works on the women’s page need feel the isolation of damnation—but rather the exhilaration of liberation.


---

The 1972 A. J. Liebling Counter-Convention--III

By John V. Pearson Jr.

For me, the most important aspect of the Counter-Conventions was just the experience of being there. I was exposed to more than 100 of the best journalists in the business, from classic crusaders like Izzy Stone to new and radical journalists like Tom Wolfe and Paul Krassner. Each one reflected a unique background, education, journalistic style and perception of truth.

They destroyed a false impression about journalists that has been bothering me since I began my studies in September. It was the idea that journalists who do not raise hell daily about something are not accomplishing anything; that the best journalists are only those who are aggressive, outspoken people with strong, dynamic personalities, fire in their souls, and an intense desire to thunder against wrongdoing.

Tantrum-throwing is fine if it fits one’s character and temperament. But as Tom Wicker said in his speech, “Not all of us can be Tom Wolfe or Norman Mailer. We ought to avoid the notion that there is one true faith in our work.” There is no orthodox way of running newspapers; nor is there only one way to report news. Each reporter has to develop his own techniques and style that will allow him to do his best work.

Only a few journalists at the Counter-Conventions came near fitting that image. All of them had pet issues and beefs: Izzy Stone on publishers and truths; Morton Mintz on facts; Tom Wicker on orthodoxy and advocacy journalism; Si Hersh on the realities of reporting and the ineffectiveness of muckraking; Gay Talese on accountability; Renata Adler and Calvin Trillin on the faults of New Journalism; Vin McLellan on professionalism in the alternative media; Claudia Dreifus and Susan Brownmiller on women’s lib; Fred Graham, Edwin Goodman, Howie Blatt, and Paul Jacobs on surveillance and harassment by the government and police; Anthony Lukas, Dick Pollak, David Halberstam, Stuart Loory, and Sidney Zion on editors; and Jim Higgins on the establishment press.

All are capable of raising plenty of hell when they feel the situation demands it. But for the most part the serious journalists at the Counter-Convention avoided polemics and outrageous statements. From Mintz to Krassner, they all shared the same characteristics: Love of writing; concern for integrity in expressing truth; a strong desire to base conclusions on facts; the ability to listen; and even among the radicals, a certain amount of conservatism and skepticism.

I concluded that the best trait a journalist can have is not an aggressiveness which burns itself out in a few years, but a quiet determination which will last a lifetime.

Journalism is more than a profession. The ability to perceive truth in real-life situations and translate it into writing so that the man in the street can understand it requires great sensitivity and creativity. Thus journalism is an art form. Because it deals with living things from day to day, it is organic. Reporters must depend on intuition as much as logic to get their stories.

The type of person who makes a good journalist is in many ways elitist. Operating in a focal point of communications, he has access to all types of information about the world which the average citizen will never see, and is very aware of political, social and cultural changes.

The journalist is an artist. He is highly individualistic and moral, often to the point of hypocrisy. As was said more than once, the journalist’s biggest problem is his own ego. He is in a unique position to make judgments and influence people, and he knows it. Impressed with his own importance as a representative of the public, he sometimes gets carried away by his imagination and makes grave mistakes. The journalist is so sure of his own righteousness that he will not hesitate to force his “rightness” on others.

More than anything else, the Counter-Conventions reflected the character of the journalist, with all his strengths and weaknesses. Its most important contribution was perhaps not what was accomplished but what was presented to the public: The fact that “reporters are simply not joiners.” They are not that interested in threatening anyone, especially editors and publishers, with a revolution in the press because they have careers and interests to protect, too. They prefer to be artists, not businessmen. The most important thing for them is “to work for people who care about news as much as they do.”

I returned from the A. J. Liebling Counter-Conventions with many, many new heroes.

See also short items on pages 16 and 26.
The Printer and Obscenity

By A. P. MADISON

Mr. Madison, a 1962 graduate of the School of Journalism, is director of Printing Services at the University of Montana. He has been news editor of the Healdsburg (Calif.) Tribune and assistant director of the Office of Information at Montana State University at Bozeman. This article is based on his speech at the annual meeting of the International Printing House Craftsmen Aug. 7, 1972, in Cleveland.

To print or not to print—that's not really the question. The question is whether the blasted computer will run. I am sure that at times a battle develops between the computer and one of my operators, who in a fit of anger punches “AXY.” The computer blinks its lights, groans and sends back “AXY to you too.” Then it grumbles, smokes and quits. Now “AXY” in computer language must be an obscene phrase, and the computer will not print such language.

Most of my presentation will deal with the student daily at the University of Montana, the Montana Kaimin. It is one of several student publications produced by the University printing department, which employs nine printers and three pressmen—all union. We produce about 90 per cent of the printing needs of the University and the students. In addition to the usual catalogs, brochures, journals, forms, alumni publications and promotion material, we print the Law School student newspaper, the teacher-evaluation book and the yearbook.

As director of Printing Services, I never have had a clear-cut policy of what language we can or cannot print. The administration has stipulated only that the work must be related to the University. We have no editorial control of student publications. We do not officially help establish editorial or content policies. The student daily is used for two School of Journalism practice courses—Advanced Reporting and Advanced News Editing. The journalism school furnishes an adviser, but it has a hands-off policy concerning editorial content. That is up to the student editorial staff and the Publications Board (mostly the student staff).

I believe the printing department staff takes more interest in the Kaimin than would the staff of a commercial plant, for we like to think we all are part of one big happy family. But, like many families, we don’t always agree. Problems develop and we’re not happy.

While an in-plant shop would seem to have fewer problems than a commercial shop regarding what to print, I believe a University in-plant shop has more. The independent commercial printer in most instances—and this is my opinion—has the right to refuse to print any job. You are not a utility. You do not operate a monopoly. You do not sell finished goods across the counter. You are an independent contractor who agrees to construct a certain piece of graphic architecture.

Of course, once you take a job, unless you have given your customer a clear understanding of a language stipulation, you must complete it regardless of the editorial content. That is not as easy as it sounds; there is no exact, clear-cut answer. This is not a black-and-white case—it has many areas of gray. It is not like selling potatoes, where you can tell at a glance whether these are grade-A, number-one spuds or culls. Of course, that is what makes the printing business so exciting.

The Montana School of Journalism, in my opinion, does an excellent job of teaching the law of journalism; therefore, libel is only a minor problem for us. Occasionally, the student editor in his fervent anxiety to castigate someone gets into trouble. As far as I know, no editor has been convicted; in fact, I don’t believe there ever has been an actual trial. A few years ago there was a threat that went as far as naming persons who would be involved should a libel suit be filed. The printing department was not named.

In most cases my printers will tell me about something of this nature or at least express their concern to the student. If I know about the incident before it goes to print,
I usually can advise the student and he will change the language. Libel has not been a problem.

The Kaimin adviser also reaches the advertising courses and, therefore, advertising presents no problem. The business manager, a student who serves one year, usually is aware of danger areas and will decline dishonest advertising.

Questionable political communications and obscenity are not as easy to deal with as libel and dishonest advertising.

Under questionable political communications, I would place student criticism—both by the editorial staff and in letters to the editor—of the state legislature, Board of Regents, elected and hired state, county and city officials, the student government and, always the prime target, the University administration.

Comments about the state legislature, of course, are disturbing (and I don’t care how you look at it or what arguments you give about freedom of speech) since they have a bearing on appropriations.

Even as a former newspaper editor, I have moments when I wish the University administration had editorial control of the Kaimin. The editor is on campus for only a few years, and he is hell-bent on making a name for himself. We, the administration, hope to be around for a long time. As a printer, political communications have not caused problems, though there have been comments—by both fellow University staff members and off-campus persons—of why we don’t do something about “that brash, loud-mouth kid who thinks he’s an editor? Why don’t we control those kids?”

The University president, an alumnus who was student-government president, rolls easily with the criticism and gets along well with the students.

Obscenity—that gray area that has been that way since the beginning of man—is a different story. Now before I am accused of being a male chauvinist pig, let me quickly say that our problems with obscenity have been caused by both men and women but mostly by men. I guess the student, trying to prove himself or herself, feels he or she must say something shocking.

**the literary magazine**

I would like to begin with an incident concerning the 1962 campus literary magazine, Venture. I don’t believe any new “obscene” words have been invented since 1962—just the frequency and places of use have increased. Remember that I am merely classifying various words as they were classified at a particular time and place—I have no desire to argue whether the classification is correct or whether I agree with it.

In 1962 a few “objectionable words” appeared in copy for Venture. The director gave the administration a copy, then an unofficial but accepted practice. The article was written by an instructor, and he was pressured to withdraw it.

The Kaimin editor learned about the incident and alleged the director was a censor. After several printers, also students, explained that the director did not censor the material (he merely showed it to the administration), the editor retracted his statements, stating he didn’t agree with the procedure but admitting the director was not a censor.

Leslie Fiedler, a professor at the University at that time, withdrew his writing in protest. The incident was no big thing and soon was forgotten.

In the spring of 1963, more “objectionable material” appeared and the administration decided to let it run. This time the governor banned publication of the magazine.

As I look back at the magazine, it contained nothing that isn’t published today in several daily newspapers and certainly nothing that you can’t hear in many movies and plays. But 10 years ago it was shocking—at least to Montanans—who really are not noted for their sophisticated language.

Some students decided to publish a protest magazine called Hazard. They furnished camera-ready copy—typed—for offset printing, but they found that getting it printed was difficult. They left out one poem and blocked out the four-letter word for sexual intercourse. A mimeographed copy of the censored poem was inserted in copies distributed to some faculty members.

Dorothy Johnson, author of “The Hanging Tree” and “The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance,” received a copy and said she didn’t know whether to be mad or pleased—did they think she would read anything or did they think this was her type of reading, which in those days was hard to come by?

Venture was replaced by a literary magazine named Garret, whose editor in 1965 had to decide whether to print a poem containing the same four-letter word. First she said she would, then after conferring with the Publications Board she said she would not.

The Kaimin editor, David Rorvik, who since has written several books and was a science writer for Time magazine, decided to run the poem in the student newspaper. The night foreman, Frank Winkler, refused to set the type and the battle was on.

The incident was grossly overplayed and, sitting comfortably at Montana State University on the other side of the Rocky Mountains, I began to wonder if anyone—the students, the public, even the press—really knew what freedom of the press was all about. No one gave a true picture of the situation—whether they didn’t understand it or whether, in the heat of debate, they didn’t want to clear the air.

Again, Dorothy Johnson, in a letter to the editor, described the problem clearly: She said the printer put his job on the line, and it was up to management to support him or fire him.

Management supported him and I would have, too, at that time.

In the fall of 1967, when I became director, this same printer warned me that the students had told him they might have a story containing controversial words and they asked if he would set them. He advised me that I had better think it over and be ready with an answer.

The story was about a local button shop that had been
closed because of the wording on several buttons—remember this is 1967 in Montana. The story, written by a woman, quoted from one of the buttons the word for sexual intercourse. The editor asked if we would print it. He intimated, but did not threaten—and this is important—that he would run to the press if we refused. Had he threatened, I immediately would have refused. Don't ever let yourself be blackmailed. The student reporter had overplayed the story, and I am sure the editor wanted to run it mainly to use the words.

In my estimation, the reporter was justified in using the direct quote, although at that time had she worked for me on my own paper, I would not have used it.

After weighing the situation—including having my secretary and the University administration read the story—I decided to print it and gamble that running it would do the least amount of harm to the University.

Winkler did not set the type, and I assured him I would not fire him. I wasn't worried about having the type set, since I still could run a Linotype and the union didn't have a strong argument if it decided to press charges for working without a current card. Another printer set the type. His comment was, "It pays the same money, doesn't it?"

The next confrontation came from the pressmen—one merely wanted a direct order from me.

Nothing more happened—there were no comments from off campus, and the incident attracted little attention. I think one student objected—not strenuously—to the language.

Internally, it was a different story. Winkler resigned as night foreman and never again was cooperative with the students. We later transferred him to the day shift, and he still refused to set certain words.

We started with a controversy in 1970. The editor decided to pick on the program council manager, who had run up a sizable deficit. The editor called him a "tin-horn," among other names, and a libel suit was threatened. Again, nothing more happened—there were no comments from off campus.

During that year, we warded off several attempts by students to print objectionable language. It was a tough year—a legislative year—but we were able to compromise with letters and dashes.

The next year, however, I decided to pull the stops and see what would happen. For one thing, it would destroy the drive for the editor to be the first to use dirty words.

OK—it's 1972 and let's go back and explore the incidents.

First, let's discuss the printer's refusal to set the words. As I said before, I would have backed him and I have since. The Montana Press Association gave him a commendation. I guess the story even made the eastern papers. The editor, who was out to make a name for himself, had arranged a conflict that he could not lose. If the poem ran, the administration might have kicked him out and the newspapers would have taken up the hue and cry for freedom of the press. If the Kaimin were banned—again, freedom of the press. As it was, the printer was blamed.

Although the printer also received a lot of credit, I wonder how much the University was damaged and whether there would have been less damage if the poem had run? After that statement you ask, "How come I would have backed him?" And in reply, I must quote from Emerson's essay on self reliance: "Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of our own mind."

a moral issue

If the printer felt so strongly about this issue that he was willing to put his job on the line, then I think I had to support him unless I had previously warned him and given him my opinions. This was not a black-and-white issue. It was not a failure to obey orders. It was a moral issue that was not easily resolved.

The second issue—the use of the four-letter word—was a bit different. Although Winkler had not given up his right to refuse to set the word, he had told me that it was up to me whether the word ran. Again I respected his integrity, but the controversy did cause some irreparable internal problems among the employees. Part of the battle was lost, but I still maintain that the University came out on top. It was my decision and it did not interfere with my integrity. I think we moved in the right direction.

By 1971 the climate toward obscenity had changed considerably. Hard-core pornography appeared on some newstands. The language and scenes in movies moved in this direction (and not just in skin-flicks). Even some news magazines were showing nude pictures and quoting "obscene" language.

In 1970 a federal judge ruled that a student newspaper could not be censored by the college administration.

Consequently, I decided it was time to convey in frank terms my opinions to my staff. It still was not a black-and-white issue, and even today I refuse to give the students a blanket endorsement concerning language.

I met with my entire staff, including secretaries and bindery women. Here is a summary of what I told them:

Three words seem to cause all the trouble—the earthy expressions for sexual intercourse, human excrement and the excrement of the bovine male. Said that way, no one raises an eyebrow, yet each of you knows the locker-room vernacular for each term. If I were to use this vernacular, no one would faint and no one would rush out and commit immoral acts or attack other persons. So the problem is one of morals—our own conviction, our own integrity. After spending a couple of years in the Navy, there is nothing that I haven't heard or perhaps even used, so these words do not bother me to any great extent. I don't like to see them in print and I don't like to hear people say them, but I lose no sleep over them. In everyday life there are other things that upset me a great deal more. And there are other words that upset me more, but that is my own hangup and I don't think I should force my opinions on you.

You have moral obligations set forth by your convictions. I also have a moral conviction that affects you—the obliga-
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tion to keep this department going. It provides you with a job.

If we censor these words in the newspaper, should we then censor them in a scientific report? Would you use them in a report on research to determine the effect of these words on students? We're headed for trouble. There will come the day when the objectionable four-letter word will appear in the Kaimin. I will not be happy, but it will happen.

At this time—and I will give due warning if I change—I will honor your refusal to set certain words. But do not look down on your fellow printer who does set the words. He is no more or no less of a citizen than you. In fact, any unfavorable comment or ill feeling toward that printer would bother me much more than using these words in the vernacular.

That is what I told my staff.

Little did I know that the troublesome four-letter word would soon appear. That fall my night foreman showed the story to me, and I said print it but cautioned the editor of the consequences.

The Future of the Underground Press

By Heidi Monika Gasser*

Most editors and students of the underground press view the future of the movement with optimism. As long as the conditions of society include a war supported by the orthodox press, a population polluting its own air and water, and cities racked by problems of poverty and racial divisions, it looks as if the underground press will continue in its fight against these conditions.

Underground newspapers have been becoming more polished and sophisticated since the beginning of the movement in the early 1960s. Some of these young journalists believe the underground will someday replace the orthodox press; some believe that it will become more an alternative medium. This is an opinion expressed in a letter from Judy Smith, editor of The Rag in Austin, Tex.:

There will be diversification—women's papers, gay papers, black papers, etc. Some papers that were just political expressions of a small group and didn't really communicate with anyone else will die. A paper must have a community it serves—it cannot exist in a vacuum. Other activity of the community determines how important a paper is—so I feel we must combine working on a paper with being in the movements and activities covered by that paper—otherwise we fall in the "objective observer" trap that the other journalism is in.

We printed it, much to the surprise of a couple of our staff members, and nothing happened. It has appeared several times since and by now has lost its shock effect. In fact, the other day a former Kaimin editor remarked about the increased usage and expressed concern. He didn't like it.

Some of you may think we were prostituting our profession. I don't think so. Whenever you go to work for an employer, you sell a bit of yourself—your ability and time. As long as the employer does not force you to forsake your integrity or does not forsake his, I see no prostitution.

I haven't given you a complete solution to the censorship problem, but perhaps discussing it and hearing the experiences of another printer will help you make your own decisions. The key to solving this problem—if I may use a cliché—is to be one jump ahead of the game. Examine both sides with as little emotion as possible. Develop alternate plans, then proceed with the one you think is best. Most importantly, retain your own integrity as a person and as a printer.

Ted Glasser, editor of the Stillwater, Okla., Andromeda, agrees that, although the underground press is still an unsophisticated attempt at journalism, it is "here to stay . . . at least for a while." In correspondence with this writer, Glasser says he believes mass-appeal magazines and newspapers cannot do an adequate job. The established media continually fail to accept responsibility. The underground press has a great deal of potential to publish credible newspapers. I think the alternative media will decrease in size; the more credible and reliable publications will, however, thrive.

Elihu Edelson, editor of Both Sides Now in Jacksonville, Fla., wrote his opinion: "If the underground press dies out, it means the movement did, and the music died."

Marvin Garson, an editor of an underground tabloid in San Francisco, the Express Times, in 1968 compared the new underground movement to the revolutionary days of the 1700s: "San Francisco is beginning to take on the flavor that Boston and Philadelphia must have had around 1770. If the monopoly press begins dying . . . 1776 won't be far away."

*Miss Gasser, a 1972 graduate of the Montana School of Journalism, is a reporter for the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian.
Reminiscences of a Columnist

By HAL BOYLE

This article contains excerpts from Mr. Boyle's speech to the Montana Press Association Convention August 18, 1972, in Miles City. Mr. Boyle joined the Associated Press as a copyboy in 1928 and in 1933 became its correspondent at Columbia, Mo. He was night city editor of the New York Bureau in 1942, when he was assigned to cover Allied campaigns in the Mediterranean area. In 1945 he was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for Distinguished Correspondence. His AP column appears in hundreds of newspapers.

One of our feature editors, Bill Wing, estimates that one out of every two newspaper readers has a secret desire to write a column and thinks he can do a better job than the columnist he is reading. And one of the uneasy things about being a columnist is that you think one out of four of those readers is probably right.

I originally thought that a columnist got up about noon, lived in a Manhattan penthouse and had a suite at the newspaper plant to which he was driven in his chauffeur-operated limousine. He spent his afternoons talking by phone with the White House and his evenings in a nightclub, maybe with a film star. But it hasn't worked out quite that way in my case.

I do make a six-figure income but I put the decimals a little farther to the left. I take the subway to work. I live on the eighth floor of a tenement, though it does have air-conditioning. If I don't get to the office by 8 a.m., everyone begins to wonder who will do my work for that day. I do have a phone on my desk, but my last White House call was from Calvin Coolidge—and he had the wrong number.

After writing a column for several years, I thought one day that I would write something to show my native power and the power of the press as I represented it. So I decided to denounce poisonous snakes. I went to the library and did a lot of reading and research, and I wrote one of the most vitriolic denunciations of the poisonous snake ever to appear. I put it on the wire and waited for the applause to roll in. But the poisonous snake in America seems to have many friends. I got all kinds of telephone calls from all kinds of people, and they all gave me hell. I learned a lesson from that—you've got to be very careful what you attack. Since then the only thing I've attacked successfully is poison ivy, which still doesn't have any friends.

I get several thousand letters a year from readers. Thank God, the people who don't read don't know how to write. Most of the readers are fairly kind and write compliments about the column. And judging from the letters, American women have a better sense of humor than their husbands do.

One unreasonable reader was Elmer Fitch of Alliance, Ohio. He was a stern critic, and nothing I wrote suited him. He would grab a penny postcard and dash off a one-sentence criticism. He never wasted words on me—just one sentence. His first card arrived when I wrote a column about my 40th birthday anniversary. I had confessed to several things I hadn't learned to do in 40 years of living. For example, I never had learned to drive a car (still true), and that really annoyed Elmer. He grabbed one of his cards and wrote: "You refuse the right of a college graduate to be ignorant." Another time he wrote: "God must have been asleep the day you were born."

Well, I read those postcards and I set about to reform myself along the lines Elmer wanted. One year I got dozens of cards from Elmer. Then suddenly they stopped coming, and I said to myself: "Hal, you must be perfect. If Elmer can't find anything wrong with you, nobody can." There I was patting myself on the back when I remembered that the Post Office that same week had raised the price of postcards one cent. Elmer had decided I wasn't worth two cents.

The rewards of newspaper work are a little cliche of the profession, but I do think the people you meet are one of the real rewards—one of the great charms. I interview
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many people—both celebrities and ordinary persons—and over the years I have found that the ordinary person tells the best story. The celebrity too often doesn’t want you to see the face he sees when he gets up in the morning. He wants you to see an image that he is trying to keep before the public. The reporter often never finds out what the real man is like.

Ernie Pyle was one of the most likeable persons I’ve ever met. He weighed only 113 pounds with his helmet on, but he did some of the greatest reporting of World War II. Most people don’t know that he suffered from anemia and that he had a lot of self doubt. Also, his wife had an emotional illness during the war. When Ernie and I were in Normandie, he would get about 75 or 100 letters at each mail call. He would look at all the envelopes quickly, but he never found the one he was looking for—a letter from home.

Ernie thought the war was more beastly than most of us did, and that contributed something to his writing ability. I recall that when we had gone through Tunisia and were resting on a Mediterranean beach before the invasion of Sicily, a bug started to crawl across the tent floor and one of the correspondents picked up a slipper to hit it. Before he could do it, Ernie reached over and stayed his hand and said: "I know this sounds silly to you, but we don’t need more senseless killing. In the last few months I just can’t stand the thought of seeing anything die, even a bug.”

A man renowned for being rough and tough was Gen. George Patton. He was rough, but he wasn’t cruel. When we were in Tunisia, his young aid, Capt. Dick Jensen, was killed at the front on a voluntary liaison mission. We went to the headquarters to get some background on Captain Jensen, and the chief of staff asked: "Do you want to talk to the old man?” We said, "Yes, you bet.”

So we went into Patton’s headquarters on the second floor of an old Arab schoolhouse and we talked to the general. It turned out that the Patton and Jensen families had been friends for three generations, and the general was very fond of Dick. He started to tell us about the young man, and it was like listening to an old-fashioned, country obituary being read aloud. The words were kind of flowery and a bit long, but they had an impact on us. Patton’s eyes filled with tears, which trickled down his cheeks and splashed on his summer uniform. Well, it was kind of embarrassing to see a three-star general weep, so we ended the interview as quickly as we could. When I hear people talk about Patton, I remember that underneath all that toughness and cynicism was a gentle man.

a sense of wonder

I’ve always liked to interview children. They keep a sense of wonder in their lives. When we take one tired word and another tired word and put them together, we just get another tired cliché. But when children put words together, they come up with bright, new meanings. I recall a New York woman who took her daughter to the American Museum of Natural History, where she saw the dinosaur skeletons and embalmed animals. When asked where she had been, the child said “Up to the dead zoo.” Who could describe that museum better?

I’d like to close with a few general comments about the field of journalism. I think there is too much cynicism about it in some quarters and a tendency to regard it as an industry that is past its peak. The need for good journalism never has been more apparent. As our civilization becomes more complex, it becomes increasingly important to explain the workings of it to its members. That is what journalists must do.

The reporters of this generation are the best and the most dedicated in the history of this nation or any other nation. American journalism is by far the most honest and most productive of any country.

Horace Greeley, in one of his more lucid moments, said: “Journalism will kill you in the end but it will keep you feeling greatly alive until it does.” I regard that as a great tribute to the profession. What better life could a man have than to dedicate himself to such an important cause in the most challenging period of world history.

How to Spot a Lawyer

The hearing room was crowded and judging from the number of yellow legal pads seen, many in the audience were lawyers.

—UPI Reporter, Feb. 8, 1973
When Bryan Came to Butte

By RALPH WANAMAKER

Mr. Wanamaker, a reporter for the Dickinson (N.D.) Press, is completing his work for an M.A. in journalism at the University of Montana. This report is based on a chapter of his thesis, a biography of Charles H. Eggleston of the Anaconda (Mont.) Standard. Mr. Wanamaker earned a B.A. at Elizabethtown College and subsequently was a teacher at Mount Joy, Pa. He has worked as a sports editor for the Livingston (Mont.) Enterprise.

On Aug. 12, 1897, Mr. [Charles H.] Eggleston, whose talents were hidden behind the anonymity of an editorial writer, broke into fame in spite of himself. He wrote an imperishable poem, "When Bryan Came to Butte."1

In 1896 William Jennings Bryan gave the keynote address at the Democratic National Convention and subsequently was elected the party's presidential nominee. His first bid for the presidency failed, but he won an overwhelming victory in Montana, where, especially in Butte, he was a hero. The Montana Democratic party had fused with the Populists and Silver Republicans to support the Nebraska congressman. Thomas Clinch commented:

The election of 1896 was a tragic one for Montanans of the Democratic, Populist, and Silver Republican persuasions. They had achieved a victory for free silver in the state only to see it nullified by McKinley's national triumph.2

The state's major newspapers endorsed Bryan and campaigned for him. The state had united on the issue of free silver. Even eastern Montanans backed the fusionists' ticket. Montana supported Bryan so strongly that fusionist candidates campaigned for him in other states. With such enthusiasm, it is easy to understand why "Montana newspapers initially refused to concede the Nebraskan's defeat;" furthermore, "it was difficult for them to swallow the pill of McKinley's victory because of the scope of the fusionist victory in the Treasure State."3

A "copper king," probably Marcus Daly, reportedly had contributed $50,000 to Bryan's 1896 campaign.4 Daly had ordered the Democrats to fuse with the other silverites. Moreover, he would meet with Bryan on his trip to Montana in 1897.

Although Bryan's campaign did not bring him to Montana in 1896, he was Montana's champion. So it was natural for Butte's mayor to invite Bryan to visit the city on his trip to Yellowstone National Park in the summer of 1897. On June 19, 1897, Mayor P. S. Harrington wrote to Bryan:

The announcement of your coming West has led several of our prominent citizens to believe that an invitation to visit Butte on your way to the national park may meet with your approval and earnestly requested me to extend yourself and your family a cordial invitation. We believe you would never have cause to regret the inconvenience of coming this way and see for yourself the splendid resources of this great mining center and also to give the people of this stronghold of bimetallism an opportunity to attest their indefatigable devotion to the greatest champion of the fight for the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at a ratio of sixteen to one.

My knowledge of the ardor and enthusiasm of the people of this locality in the cause which you so nobly espouse justifies the prediction that your reception here would be the greatest popular ovation ever given to any man in this rocky mountain region.5

The reply was from a Bryan assistant, G. W. Stapleton:

... Bryan can not name the date when he will visit Butte ... only says it will be in August. Says he will give 2 or 3 days notice of the time. He will also visit Anaconda, and Helena, and will probably visit Anaconda first and go to Mr. Daly's Bitterroot farms.6

2The poem was published Aug. 15, 1897.
4Ibid.
5Ibid.
6Ibid.
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In the Butte section of the Anaconda Standard, the reports of Bryan's forthcoming visit trickled in. On July 17 the Butte Bryan committee was assured he would be coming and also would visit Helena. On July 25 a story told about Gov. Robert B. Smith's plan to go to Yellowstone Park to escort Bryan through Montana, and August 25 was given as the tentative date for the visit. On July 25 a story told about Gov. Robert B. Smith's plan to go to Yellowstone Park to escort Bryan through Montana, and August 25 was given as the tentative date for the visit. On July 25 a story told about Gov. Robert B. Smith's plan to go to Yellowstone Park to escort Bryan through Montana, and August 25 was given as the tentative date for the visit. On July 25 a story told about Gov. Robert B. Smith's plan to go to Yellowstone Park to escort Bryan through Montana, and August 25 was given as the tentative date for the visit. On July 25 a story told about Gov. Robert B. Smith's plan to go to Yellowstone Park to escort Bryan through Montana, and August 25 was given as the tentative date for the visit.

Bryan's coming to Montana will be like a triumphal march; his reception will unquestionably be a demonstration the like of which this region has never seen. On August 5, Charles H. Eggleston said in the Standard that Bryan would rest in Idaho before visiting Montana:

Mr. Bryan is wise in taking a good rest before he strikes this state. Montana will give him ovations till he can't rest.

On August 12, Bryan left Idaho and entered Montana from the south. Meeting him in Idaho were Rep. C. S. Hartman, Sen. Lee Mantle and members of the Butte reception committee. That same day Durston wrote an editorial recalling Aug. 12, 1896, the day Bryan was nominated for President:

The contrast is that, a year ago this August day, Mr. Bryan was in the enemy's country; if ever a man was at the hearthstone of his friends, Mr. Bryan is there today. Eggleston's editorial paragraph also anticipated Bryan's reception:

The eventful year that had its beginning amid the plaudits in Madison Square reaches its close with the huzzas which the hills encompassing Butte will echo.

Anaconda's reception committee held several meetings, and the Standard's report of the final one said:

The committee desires to give the widest possible notice to the announcement that at the park the purpose is to reserve the grand stand for ladies, as far as that is practicable. All those who visit the park are earnestly requested to observe this arrangement.

The article said the street railway would be free to ladies: "The public is asked to remember that this courtesy is for those who are specified, and men will be expected to walk." The committee urged those wishing to hear Bryan's speech to follow the band and carriages and march to the race track. The article gave a schedule of Bryan's visit and said Mrs. Bryan would be the guest of the ladies' committee.

The triumphal journey

While the inside pages told of Anaconda's plans for Bryan, the front page announced his arrival in Montana. Bryan traveled through Lima, Dillon and Butte. The Standard's headline proclaimed: "WELCOMED IN ROYAL STYLE." Decks summarized the story:

Triumphal Journey Into Montana and Its Tremendous Climax at Butte.

WILD WITH ENTHUSIASM

He Speaks at Lima—Then Dillon Tenders Him a Brilliant Ovation and 4,000 People Listen to a Speech—His Arrival in Butte—All the Whistles Are Blowing, All the Bands Are Playing, and All Butte Yelling—A Mighty Procession Escorts Him to the Butte Hotel—His Speech on the Balcony—Brief Addresses by Mantle, Hartman, Smith and Quinn—The March to Walkerville With Cheering Thousands Tramping in the Dust Behind His Carriage—Walkerville Ablaze With Joy and Excitement—He Expounds to Its Citizens the Gospel of Bimetallism—The Return Up Town—Butte's Elaborate Decorations—Scenes and Incidents of the First Day of the Silver City's Reception to Silver's Champion.

The Standard's reporter described the trip from Spencer, Idaho, to Butte:

The first stop was Monida, which marks the border between Montana and Idaho. The town was named like a race horse, receiving part of the name of each state. It is only a small hamlet, but the people were out and prospectors and ranchmen had come down from the mountains to shake the great man by the hand. Mr. Bryan shook the hands of all of them.

At Dillon, Bryan spoke to about 4,000 persons:

The party was taken over to the band stand in the public square. There was a tremendous throng of people. There were some men from the mountains in the crowd who declared that they had ridden 70 miles to reach Dillon in order to get a glimpse of this great man. Bryan declared he "must be president." The Standard reported:

He said that if his friends, the enemy, told the truth, he was really the president of the United States. They had declared during the campaign that if Bryan were elected all the banks would close and the business houses would collapse.

"The banks have closed," said Mr. Bryan, "the main factories have been shut down, business firms have collapsed, so I must be president." The crowd laughed.

During the ride from Dillon to Butte, Bryan read the morning Standard. He noted Durston's editorial about the contrasting welcomes of Madison Square and Butte. The article quoted Bryan as saying "That is so. This is the anniversary of my Madison Square speech. I hadn't thought of it before."
Just outside Butte, Bryan heard numerous shrill whistles. The Standard reported his reaction:

"What is that?" he inquired.
"It is the whistles of Butte sending a welcome."
Mr. Bryan smiled.
"I never had a greeting like that before," he said. "I like the music of the whistles. It is the most significant sign of prosperity I have met with in all my travels. . . ."

As the outskirts of the town were approached, people were seen along the tracks in great numbers—people in carriages, people on bicycles and people on foot. All cheered and waved hats or handkerchiefs as the train passed along.21

The newspaper said the crowd at the depot was "thunderous, tumultuous, overwhelming":

There was nothing to be seen but a black mass of cheering people and waving hats. There was no elaborate decoration, nothing to relieve the blackness of the first impression of Butte save here and there a strip of color. . . . The people filled every window in the vicinity. A dense mass crowded all the space about the depot and the street leading up to the city. Three combined bands, numbering 63 pieces, played "Hail To The Chief," as the train drew up, but no one could hear the strain. The screaming of the whistles and the shouts of the frantic people drowned out everything else.22

The crowd was "so densely packed" that "at times the wheels of Bryan's carriage could scarcely turn."23 The Standard said:

One of the prettiest incidents of the arrival at the Butte depot was the reception for the Bryan children. The children of Henry Silverman were down there with their Shetland ponies, Skeeters and Gussie, each drawing a little cart. The Bryan children were placed in these and followed the procession up to town.24

In a brief speech from the Butte Hotel balcony, Bryan lauded the multitude for being "on the right side" and its firmness in standing with bimetallism until "the money of the constitution is fully and finally restored."25 He promised a vigorous bimetallism speech the next day at the Butte race track.

The trip to Walkerville was delayed because the Bryan group wanted to eat dinner. At Walkerville another celebration took place. The Standard's reporter pictured Bryan as a Messiah or a liberator:

The face of everyone was a study. It wore the expression of great anxiety, as if the owner felt that the man riding in the carriage ahead were the emancipator of his race, and to get near enough to see and hear him, to shake his hand, if possible, were a goal worth any effort to reach.26

Durston's Aug. 13, 1897, editorial, "Butte's Guest," said:

No man, if he has a heart in his breast, could be the central figure in a demonstration like the one which Butte witnessed yesterday and not be moved by it; indeed, no man lacking a responsive heart might expect ever to be the recipient of a greeting so cordial, so enthusiastic, so impressive.27

One lengthy description—perhaps a genuine piece of literature—remains. On that same editorial page with Durston's comments was Eggleston's poem "When Bryan Came To Butte." One reporter later analyzed the poem, noting it compared the silver champion's Butte reception to the great triumphs of history.28 The poem included the Roman triumphs, Napoleon's return from Elba, Victoria's diamond jubilee and the Democratic nominating convention—and gives the palm to Butte for enthusiasm:

When Bryan came to Butte
I have read of Roman triumphs in the days when Rome played ball,
When she met all other nations, taking out of each a fall;
When victorious Roman generals marched their legions home in state,
With plunder of the conquered—and the conquered paid the freight.
Gorgeous were those vast processions rolling through the streets of Rome;
Mad with joy went all the Romans welcoming the veterans home.
Gold there was for fifty Klondikes, silver trinkets big as logs,
Marble statues by the cartload, gems enough to stone the dogs.
Following chariot cars were captives, dainty damsels by the score,
Ballet dancers from far harems, savage men and beasts galore.
Millions cheered and yelled and thundered; shook the earth as by a storm;
All Rome howled—and yet Rome's howling after all was not so warm,
For these monster Roman triumphs, at which not a stone was mute,
Couldn't hold a Roman candle—
When Bryan came to Butte.

I have read of the convulsions of fiery men of France
When Napoleon came from Elba, eager for another chance.
Marble hearts and frozen shoulders turned the generals to their chief,
But the people hailed their master with a rapture past belief.
What though France lay stunned and bleeding, she arose and got too gay;
What though he had cost her fortunes, still the devil was to pay.
Though he'd slain a million soldiers and returned to slay some more,
The survivors stood there ready to pour forth their inmost gore;

21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
27 "Butte's Guest," Ibid., p. 4.
28 "State Mourns Death," loc. cit.
And they wept and sang and shouted, whooped and roared in sheer delight,
On their knees they begged, imploring him to pull off another fright—
Sure the champion was in training, and in training couldn’t lose;
Thus laughed and cried and acted as if jagged with wild-est booze.
But the passion that they cherished for this brilliant French galoot
Was as zero to that witnessed
When Bryan came to Butte.

I have read of Queen Victoria and her diamond jubilee.
London rose and did the handsome—it was something up to G.
Long and glittering the procession—beat old Barnum’s best to death;
When the queen is on exhibit, even cyclones hold their breath.
Troops of white and black and yellow—regiments from East and West—
All the glory of Great Britain—pomp until you couldn’t rest.
Russia also cut a figure when she crowned the reigning czar.
In the line of fancy blowouts Russian stock is up to par.
There were balls and fetes and fireworks, bands played on and cannons roared;
Monarchy was at the bat, and all their royal nibses scored.
Add the Moscow show to London’s, the take the paralyzing pair,
Put the queen and czar together, yoke the lion and the bear—
Swell these pageantries of Europe till you get a dream to suit—
And it’s pretty small potatoes—
When Bryan came to Butte.

Bryan has had many triumphs, some ovations off and on
Just a little bit the biggest that the sun e’er shone upon.
You remember the convention in Chicago, do you not,
When the party went to Bryan and the goldbugs went to pot?
You remember the excitement when he rose and caught the crowd,
When for fully twenty minutes everybody screamed aloud,
Oh, the mighty roar of thousands as he smote the cross of gold,
As he gripped the British lion in a giant’s strangle hold!
Oh, the fury of the frenzy as he crushed the crown of thorns,
As he grabbed the situation as he held it by the horns!
Some there were who leaped the benches, some who maniac dances lead [sic],
Some who tried to kick the ceiling, more who tried to wake the dead.
Twas a record-breaking rouser, down to fame it shoots the chute,
But it wasn’t quite a fly-speck—
When Bryan came to Butte.

Ah, when Bryan came to Butte! greatest mining camp on earth;
Where the people dig and delve, and demand their money’s worth.
Though the Wall street kings and princes spurn and kick them as a clod,
Bryan is their friend and savior and they love him as a god.
Did they meet him when he came there? Did they make a little noise?
Were they really glad to see him? Do you think it pleased the boys?
Twas the screaming of the eagle as he never screamed before,
Twas the crashing of the thunder, mingling with Niagara’s roar.
All the whistles were a-screaming, with the bands they set the pace—
But the yelling of the people never let them get a place.
Dancing up and down and sideways, splitting lungs and throats and ears,
All were yelling and at yelling seemed wound up a thousand years.
Of earth’s great celebration t’was the champion heavy-weight,
’Tis the champion forever and a day, I calculate,
For it knocked out all its rivals, and, undaunted, resolute,
Punched creation’s solar plexus—
When Bryan came to Butte.  

C. H. E.30

John F. Ryan, a reader of the Anaconda Standard, commented in a letter to Time in 1931 that Eggleston had concocted the poem “in a stupendous splurge of sheer inspiration.”31 William Allen said:

The editorial rooms of the Standard were in the same building and on the same floor as my offices. In going to and from my office, I would pass by Charlie Eggleston’s door, which he usually kept open. That night he was unusually busy and barely looked up to say hello. The next day or so I found out what had kept him so busy.32

In subsequent years, the Standard received many requests for the poem and "tear sheets were printed again and again to meet the demand. Finally the poem was reprinted in pamphlet form... Requests have come from Boston and New York, nearly 36 years after it was printed.”33 John F. Davies of Butte published the poem again in 1912. In a foreword, he said "it has been widely appreciated, and twice reprinted in editions distributed at the expense of the paper... The demand for a wider circulation has induced the present publisher to bring out this edition.”34

The poem was not quite the amazing "splurge of inspiration" some people thought. Eggleston had been writing political poetry throughout his years on the Standard, so it was not new to Standard readers. But the Bryan poem was circulated beyond Montana. Eggleston’s earlier poetry, directed to his Montana audiences, had dealt primarily with the state’s political rivalries.

33"State Mourns Death," loc. cit.
More than 20,000 persons waited in the hot sun.

Bryan's Reaction to the Welcome

Bryan termed the day one of his greatest tributes: "Of all the receptions I ever received, I never was honored by one that seemed so simple, so spontaneous, so universal."94

Bryan toured the Anaconda mine the morning of August 13, before speaking at the Butte race track. He joked with the miners, and he and Representative Hartman joked back and forth throughout the tour. His trip to the mine delayed his appearance at the race track about an hour, while more than 20,000 persons waited in the hot sun.95 The Standard described the race track scene:

Soon a steady stream of people coming through the gate was swelling the crowd between the speakers' stand and the grand stand. At first the stream of people was like a rivulet, which scarcely seemed to be noticeable to the lake of people which was steadily becoming broader and wider. The little rivulet would seem to lose itself in the lake without apparently adding to the latter's size. Then the rivulet became a stream and the lake, which had no outlet, grew and grew before the eyes of the watcher, stretching out on every side. Then the people came in a perfect torrent, seeming likely to tear down the fences and gateways in the mad rush to unite with the great lake of people and reach as nearly as possible to the center of the great sea of humanity.

When the great crowd, which accompanied the band, rushed to the great lake, it seemed like a cataract, like a broken dam, like a Johnstown flood. The rushing waters stirred and agitated the lake, causing it to sway this way and that, under the impulse of the entering waters, until at last the great lake slowly settled itself and became placid. But by that time the lake had become a tremendous sea, a wonderful ocean, stretching in every direction as far as one could see in front, or to the sides of the speakers' stand.96

Bryan told about three political parties using the money question as the important issue in 1896, saying that "for years the people have disputed and wrangled about other questions while the financiers took care of the money question. . . . Elections don't settle questions. Elections merely determine which theory shall be tried":

When a man is sick he seeks a physician. But he must be convinced that he is sick before he will send for the physician, and then he may send for the wrong physician or take the wrong medicine. Last year all the parties agreed that the country was sick and that something was wrong. But they differed in the remedies they advocated. The democrats proposed to increase the number of dollars and thus stop the rise in the dollar's value. The republicans said the trouble was that the people were not paying enough taxes, and that they should be loaded down with more taxes so that they could rise up and carry the burden more easily. (Laughter, and cries of "Hit 'em again!"") Other republicans said the agitators of the money question had made the trouble and it must stop, and that we must decide to do whatever England wanted, and then England might have mercy and loan us all the money we need. (Laughter.) Some democrats said we should have England's financial policy, but that we must also retire the greenbacks, so the money changers could control the primary money and the banks the credit money of the world. . . .

The financiers and politicians have been dodging this question and things grew worse all the time. But the people will solve this money question and they will settle it right when they settle it.97

Commenting on the commission sent to Europe to discuss the gold standard, Bryan longed for its success:

I hope the commission will be successful. I am so anxious to see bimetallism restored that I am not particular what party restores it. They say the republican party is going to steal our thunder. They're welcome to my share of the thunder, if they will only restore bimetallism. I have been called the repudiator so long that I would like seven million more repudiators. I have been accused of working for the mine owners so long that I would like seven million more people working for them. I have been called a demagogue so long because I favored letting the people pay their debts in either gold or silver, that I would like to see seven million more of the demagogues.98

Imagery and parables were used extensively to explain the silver arguments to the miners.99 Bryan asked the question: "What plan is most likely to secure co-operation of the old world?" then explained through a story what he called the inconsistency and error of the Republican argument:

Try it on your neighbor. Suppose a man in business tries to act on the policy of the republican platform. Suppose you have been in business several years and failed. Your neighbor in the same business had succeeded. You go to him and want him to go into partnership with you. You tell him, "You'll not make as much, but I'll make more." Why, even a republican wouldn't try that policy in everyday life.

(There was great laughter and applause at the last hit, and Senator Mantle turned very red. Mr. Bryan laughed himself and continued.)100

94 Ibid.
95 "It Was Butte's Great Day," ibid., p. 6.
96 Ibid.
97 Ibid.
98 Richard Hofstadter has commented: "The Great Commoner was a circuit-riding evangelist in politics; the 'Cross of Gold' speech, with its religious imagery, its revivalist fervor, its electric reaction upon the audience, was a miniature of his career. . . . Bryan [framed] his message for a simple constituency nursed in evangelical Protestantism and knowing little literature but the Bible. . . ." Richard Hofstadter, "William Jennings Bryan: The Democrat As Revivalist," The American Political Tradition and the Men Who Made It (New York: Vintage Books, 1948), p. 186.
Bryan summarized the 1896 campaign issue, saying it was the difference between political and financial independence and being ruled by England in financial and political matters. He said:

While we had political independence [from Europe], we could not have financial independence. We have got to have such a financial policy as the financiers of Europe demand. We are no longer free to legislate for ourselves on this question. If that argument is true, we are no longer a free people. If it is true, we have passed from democracy to plutocracy and to our ruler across the ocean we must bow on bended knee.41

He called the American dollar a "balloon dollar," a "greedy and gluttonous dollar":

If we are to have gold as a unit, if we are to have an appreciating dollar, we should change the stamp at the mint, take off the goddess of liberty and the American eagle and put on the picture of a horse-leech, with the words "Give, Give, Give!" The picture on the other side should be an open grave and for the motto the proverb: "It sayeth not, it is enough!"42

The speech, which lasted more than an hour, was a commitment to continue the fight for bimetallism in the 1900 election. Many of those present would read the Standard's account of the speech and remember Butte's greatest day. Others would journey to Anaconda the next day to hear Bryan assault the goldbugs again.

"a fitting respect"

At 2:30 p.m. Friday, August 13, the Anaconda committee boarded a train for Butte to bring Bryan and his party to Anaconda that night. Durston and Daly were members of the 20-man committee. Mayor Oliver Leiser's proclamation, published the day before, advocated "that all stores, shops, saloons and places of business be closed on that day [Saturday] from 2 o'clock p.m. until 6 o'clock p.m." so Anacondans could "pay fitting respect" to Bryan and so "all may have an opportunity to listen to his address. . . ."43

At 9:30 p.m. Bryan arrived at Anaconda, where about 5,000 persons had waited at the depot for three hours. He was greeted by the smelter's whistles and its 10,000 lights. The Standard described the scene at the depot:

Here again the police were kept busy in their efforts to keep back the crowds, but when Mr. Bryan, in company with Marcus Daly, Senator Lee Mantle and Congressman C. S. Hartman, stepped into the first hack, the crowd pressed up against it from the side opposite the platform, and for a time it was wondered whether Mr. Bryan would be allowed to ride in the hack or not.44

Meanwhile:

The Anaconda band, which was on hand to assist in the ceremony, and which rendered some very fine selections while the people were waiting for the train, could not stand the pressure of the surging crowds and were forced from the procession up a side street.45

When Bryan got to the Marcus Daly Hotel, he spoke briefly from the balcony:

I am not expected to make a speech to-night. I have not been in your town long enough to find out much about it, but I am prepared to answer one question. If anybody ever asks me what's the matter with Anaconda, I will tell them. (Great applause and cries of "She's all right!"

There is one thing that I have learned and it surprised me, because I never heard of the town mentioned in that connection before, but if anybody should ever ask me where people should go who had lung trouble, I would tell them that in Anaconda I did not find a person whose lungs were weak. (Laughter and applause) . . . They have told me much about the greatness of Anaconda, except in its social life, which I believe is not equal to Helena, according to reports.46 (Laughter and applause.)

I say they have told me so much that I have been very anxious to see your city, and I am going to put in tomorrow morning examining the largest smelter, I believe they say, in the world, and if I like it I may buy it and take it down to Nebraska. (Laughter and applause.)

I don't care much for the smelters, but if I could get you people down there who work in the smelters, the republicans would never carry Nebraska again. (Prolonged applause.)47

Marcus Daly, Representative Hartman and Senator Mantle also spoke.

Eggleston's enthusiasm for Bryan's visit was evident in his editorial paragraphs. On August 14, for example, he devoted six paragraphs to Bryan:

We would call Mr. Bryan's attention to the fact that the population of Anaconda consists of 14,000 original Bryan men, women and children.

Mr. Bryan will find plenty of prosperity in Anaconda, but Anaconda got it by coppering the rest of the world.

And since Mr. Bryan's arrival, what few enemies there were seem to have left the country.

Senator [Thomas H.] Carter is not in Montana to greet Bryan with the rest of us. So far as Montana is concerned, Senator Carter won't ever be in it again.

The silver city and the silver champion will keep each other reserved seats in the corners of their hearts.

Mr. Bryan will pardon Anaconda if she can't help entertaining golden opinions of him.48

Ibid.
Ibid.
"Mayor's Proclamation," Anaconda Standard, Aug. 13, 1897, p. 3.
"Welcome," loc. cit.
Paraphrases, Ibid., p. 4.
Saturday morning Bryan's party had breakfast with Marcus Daly. The group proceeded to the smelter, where Bryan talked with the men and asked many questions. There were some signs welcoming Bryan, and he thanked the men for them. After the tour, Mrs. Bryan and the Bryan children toured the city.49

That afternoon Bryan spoke to about 12,000 persons at Anaconda's race track. William Allen, then in the employ of Daly, described the transportation problem:

This [Anaconda's] track was about two miles west of town and reached by an electric carline, also owned by Daly.

The Bryan rally was held at this racetrack. The grandstand seated several thousand; besides, there was plenty of room within the mile track enclosure to accommodate all who came. Those were the days before automobiles. To reach the track other than by electric railway, horse-drawn vehicles were the only means of transportation. Long distances and lack of hitching space at the track discouraged horse transportation.

Special trains were run from Butte and Deer Lodge, and people came from every direction, all centering in Anaconda. I was then with the Street Railway and to get the thousands to the track was a problem. We had four electric motor cars with some trailers. To accommodate large crowds, we built a number of open gondolas to attach to the motor train. It was a single-track line to the racetrack, except for a siding about half way, where trains could pass each other. We kept two trains shuffling back and forth until we had landed about 10,000 people at the track.50

Bryan's Anaconda speech differed from the Butte speech. He discussed misconceptions and misunderstandings about free coinage and free silver and, in his best storytelling style, he recalled a Republican who did not know what free coinage meant:

Well, now the term free coinage has a plain and simple meaning, and yet a man living in my own town, upon the same street with me, said to me one day: "Mr. Bryan, are you in favor of free coinage?" I said "yes!" "Why," he said, "don't you know that if we had the free coinage of silver there would be more wildcat money in circulation than before the war?" I said, "How do you make that out?" and he said: "If every man had the minting of his own coin, his own silver, how could you tell whether the money would be good or not?" He thought that free coinage meant that every person would have a mint of his own, and yet that man is an intelligent man on most subjects and one of the most deserving republicans in my town.51

For an hour and 15 minutes, Bryan held forth against the goldbugs and their arguments. In a brief discussion of the "melting pot test," he said:

The man who talks about the melting pot test, or who talks about putting your money in a house and the house burning down, makes unusual and extraordinary use of money. Money is not made merely for the purpose of putting it in a house and then burning it down. (Laughter.) But there is just as much sense in trying to determine which is the best money by putting the money in a boat and turning the boat over as by purging the money in a house and then burning the house.52

Bryan continued with his stories about the goldbugs' contradictions, noting one goldbug speaker told some farmers that they shouldn't be concerned with financial problems of the country—they should just continue to work. At the next stump, he said the farmer's overproduction was the cause of devaluation of the dollar.53 Bryan told how a goldbug contradicted himself so badly that "he reminded him of the fellow who was traveling in the mountains by a path so crooked that he met himself coming back."54 and the Standard reported laughter.

The memory of Bryan's visit to Anaconda was retained by Eggleston's son until his death in November, 1971. After the speech, Bryan was given an evening reception party. Eggleston's son told this story:

During his 1900 campaign Bryan made a countrywide tour and Butte was on his planned itinerary but not Anaconda because of it being on a side line. Father wrote a poem, published in the Standard, the same day as Bryan spoke in Butte, entitled "When Bryan Came to Butte." It made such an impression on Bryan that he added Anaconda to his itinerary. When that became known in Anaconda, the little town went wild. There was a band to greet him at the train; a parade and big turnout for that size town. He addressed the throng from the balcony of the Montana Hotel and "Free Silver" shook the building. After the speech there was a reception in the hotel parlors and Bryan shook hands with several hundred people.

I was about ten years old and had been out with the kids shooting off firecrackers. One firecracker I didn't throw quite quick enough and it tore open one of the fingers on my right hand. With a bloody handkerchief around the finger, I shook hands with William Jennings Bryan. My father, standing with the town welcoming committee, introduced his son to the great Bryan, who seized my blasted hand in his great paw. I winced with the pain and he discovered blood on his own hand. He spoke to my father telling him he didn't think his coming to Anaconda was going to cause any bloodshed and he wouldn't have come. So father took me to a doctor and had my finger patched up. Don't think I'll live long enough to forget that handshake.55

Bryan's party left for Hamilton with the Dalys Sunday afternoon and spent a few days there before completing the Montana tour. The tour seemed to be a Daly affair, with

---

50Ibid.
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52Ibid.
53Ibid.
54Ibid.
only one mention of W. A. Clark—that Bryan and his family had visited the Clark residence in Butte. Clark was not on the Butte welcoming committee. Bryan visited Helena, Great Falls and Bozeman before leaving the state.

According to E. B. Davis, former editor of the Missoulian, Bryan had referred to the "Eggleston panegyric," and noted that he was an admirer of Eggleston.66 One writer told of Eggleston's claim to fame and said his "vinegary" prose delighted Butte though "seemingly his epic fire was spent on this lone magnificence, 'When Bryan Came to Butte,'”


Press Coverage of the Montana Constitutional Convention

By Donald E. Larson*

This report compares quantitatively the press coverage by three Montana dailies of the fourth state constitutional convention, which met from Jan. 17 through March 24, 1972, in Helena. Two Lee newspapers—the Billings Gazette and the Missoula Missoulian—are compared with Montana's single major independent daily, the Great Falls Tribune.

Press coverage came from three primary sources: The Associated Press, the Lee State Bureau and the Tribune State Bureau. For each paper, AP copy made up roughly half of the volume, while the respective state bureaus supplied the remainder of the Con Con coverage. Scarcely any of the Con Con coverage provided by the papers was staff-written, locally, and none of the papers maintained a staff writer in Helena during the convention (other than their state bureau writers).

Gary Langley, Missoulian staff writer, spent a week in Helena interviewing the Missoula delegates for an eight-part series.

Of the three papers, the Tribune provided the greatest volume of Con Con coverage. It printed 430 stories for a total of more than 5,300 column-inches. The Missoulian, in contrast, ran 347 stories totaling 4,300 column-inches, while the Gazette ran 271 stories totaling 3,200 column-inches.

The Tribune out-distanced the Missoulian and Gazette in almost every quantitative respect. It ran a total of 220 AP stories, 190 State Bureau stories and 16 local staff-written stories between January 17 and April 1.

The Great Falls paper also ran more stories on page one than did the other papers. It played 73 stories totaling more than 1,200 column-inches on the front page during the 67 days. The Missoulian ran 60 stories, the Gazette 48.

Surprisingly, the Billings Gazette, with one of the largest news holes of any Montana paper, provided the least coverage of any of the three papers.

The Gazette ran less AP copy, less Lee State Bureau copy, less locally written copy and fewer editorials than either of the two other papers.

Of the three papers, the Gazette's coverage was voted the worst by 24 Con Con delegates surveyed. The reasons were based on the editorial policy, the "flap" headlines and the scanty coverage. The criticisms appear justified when the Gazette is compared with the Missoulian and the Tribune.

The Tribune printed 26 editorials about Con Con during the 67-day convention. The most concerted barrage was a three-editorial discussion of the right-to-know proposal, which Con Con adopted over the objections of the press.

adding that Eggleston's poem had been a forerunner "by fifteen years of Vachel Lindsay, Sandburg, and the rest of the current trumpeters."67

Eggleston's poem was a splendid tribute to Bryan and, according to the Standard's coverage of the visit, an accurate description of Butte's reception. The poem had mirrored the city's enthusiasm for the man who evangelistically proclaimed the free-silver cause.

67Reuben Maury, "Butte Circa 1925: Hymn to an Oasis," Montana Journalism Review, 1972, p. 50. This article originally appeared in the October, 1925, American Mercury under the pseudonym Arthur O'Dane.

If any adjective can be used to describe the common ground of the Tribune editorials, it would be inoffensive or mundane. The Tribune editorial writers took no strong stands and avoided the more controversial issues such as the statewide property tax and the unicameral proposal.

Instead, editorials on "man, the most destructive animal in the environment" (January 22), on the convention delegates' competence (February 27) and on the North Dakota constitution (March 5) typified the Tribune editorial policy.

Between January 17, the opening date of the convention, and April 1, the Gazette editorialized 13 times about Con Con issues.

The Gazette's editorial policy was perhaps the most notorious of the three papers because of its March 10 editorial, printed with a yellow backdrop, on page one. Entitled "A Right to Conceal," it decried the Con Con's move to adopt a right-to-know provision. The Gazette was following the statewide press bandwagon in its move to kill the proposal.

This was the only topic that the Gazette editorial writers discussed more than once. Gazette editorial writers avoided the more controversial and more complex issues.

Sam Reynolds of the Missoulian wrote 22 Con Con editorials during the convention. His most concerted campaigns were three editorial discussions of the public-trust doctrine, which he supported, and a three-editorial endorsement of the Montana Plan, which he also endorsed.

Reynolds warned against unicameralism and supported local government (home rule). He jumped on the state press bandwagon in arguing against the anti-secrecy provision as worded by the convention. He lauded the convention's accomplishments on a couple of occasions. And he opened his editorial comment on the convention with delineation of what he considered to be its "mandate," accused the delegates of not fulfilling it about midway through the convention and ended with endorsement of the proposed document.

This author agrees with the majority Con Con delegate sentiment that Reynolds produced the most persuasive, effective editorial page in the state.

Only two of the 24 delegates surveyed disliked the press coverage. Both were Missoula delegates who seemed to have personal reasons for their disapproval.

*Mr. Larson is a senior in the Montana School of Journalism.
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The Dervishes of the Bunker Trail

By ROBERT C. Mcgiffert

Professor McGiffert, who swore off watching golf matches in the mid-1930s, finds to his surprise that the quiet old game has become a rip-roaring sport for finely honed athletes who surge and vault and rush about the links.

TUCSON, Ariz. (AP) — John Lotz, an obscure tour regular from Hayward, Calif., burst out of the pack with a remarkable eight-under-par 64 Friday and bolted into the second round lead in the $100,000 Tucson Open golf tournament.

Back in the 1930s, my father took me to see Gene Sarazen and Vic Ghezzi play an exhibition match at the Harker's Hollow Golf Club near Phillipsburg, N.J. On the second hole I decided I was watching the dullest spectator sport in the solar system, and vowed never to go to a golf match again.

For decades I was true to that oath, but a few years ago, after reading an AP account of a tournament, I wondered whether I'd been missing something. It appeared that this somnolent game, which I'd always associated with businessmen, dentists and elderly lawyers, had been turned into a rousing sport for finely honed athletes.

From all accounts, the modern golfer has little in common with the knickered gnomes of Harker's Hollow. For one thing, he seldom walks. He rushes and vaults. He surges and forges, leaps and soars. He bolts out of packs, bursts out of logjams and barges out of fields. He charges. He sweeps and struggles and bounces. He churns and romps. When he's in trouble, he scrambles.

All this is tough on the athletes, particularly the ones on Medicare. When it gets to be too much, the victim drifts, staggers, fades, falters or stumbles, only to be back the next week, storming and romping.

For younger players, the main hazard of the pro golf tour is pressure. Pressure on the golf course is unique. Unlike the pressure of a handshake, cooker or aircraft cabin, it doesn't squeeze, push, crush or press. Instead, it grinds.

The athletes who leap and soar in the grinding pressure are an assorted lot. Some are fabled, some are storied and some are legendary. Some are refugees from the rabbit ranks. Others are obscure until the day they bolt out of the pack. At least one is immortal, which may explain why he has survived down through the years.

In appearance and temperament, too, the competitors are heterogeneous. A lean and moody man may bolt out of a logjam one week, a paunchy funlover the next. The bolter may be pokerfaced or flamboyant, talkative or laconic, brash or conservative, longhaired or balding, a big happy rookie or a dour little veteran. You never know.

Nor can you predict what effect physique, temperament and violent effort will have on the fortunes of the players. The golfers who charge, bolt, surge, leap, soar, charge and vault are, it seems, making a mistake. They win less often than players who stay cool, calm, placid, deliberate, conservative, mild-mannered, rock-steady and dependable.

It can't be denied, of course, that on occasion churning does win a tournament. But so does ambling. Furthermore, a study of the AP's tournament coverage through seven months of 1970 showed that for every successful charge, bolt, burst or barge, three failed. For example, John Lotz, the stockily built obscure tour regular who burst out of the pack and bolted into the lead in the Tucson Open, didn't win. First prize went to swarthy, boisterous, flamboyant, happy-go-lucky, talkative Lee Trevino, a self-styled merry Mexican who apparently neither burst nor bolted.

In the Bob Hope Desert Classic at Palm Springs it was grinning, happy-go-lucky Larry Ziegler who burst out of the pack and barged into the lead, but then he let slim Bruce Devlin storm past him.

Big Fred Marti barged into contention in the Houston Champions International Invitational, but lost to balding Gibby Gilbert, an obscure club pro.

gilbert charges and drifts

Earlier in the season, in the Doral Open at Miami, the balding Gilbert had charged out of the pack, only to falter and let methodical Mike Hill bounce back to win. Off his
performance in the Houston Invitational, one might have thought that Gilbert had learned his lesson. Not so. In the Canadian Open at London, Ontario, he charged again. Predictably, he then drifted back into the pack to join veteran Al Balding, towering George Archer, funloving, quick-quiping little Chi Chi Rodriguez, and graying, husky, soft-spoken Bob Stone. The winner—loose-jointed, long-striding Kermit Zarley—passed the faltering leaders by simply ambling out of the pack.

Sometimes, of course, a player does learn from experience. The boisterous Trevino tried rushing in the Greater Jacksonville Open, and it didn’t work. The next week, in the National Airlines Open at Miami, he craftily let lanky young Bob Stanton barge out of the pack, then went on to win the tournament himself.

The Monsanto Open at Pensacola was rough on the roughnecks. In that one, big Bill Collins shouldered his way out of the pack, tough young Grier Jones drifted back into it, and swarthy, paunchy Homero Blancas (the happy hombre) charged in with the best round. Meanwhile, first place was being locked up by pleasant, thoughtful, soft-spoken young Dick Lotz, a dark and stocky refugee from the rabbit ranks.

Even the giants of the game don’t always succeed when they charge and bolt. Big Jack Nicklaus charged in the Bing Crosby Pro-Am at Pebble Beach and the Andy Williams Open at San Diego, but he didn’t win either one. The other giant—fabled, magnetic, dynamic, incomparable Arnold Palmer, the indomitable millionaire—bolted into the lead in the Byron Nelson Golf Classic at Dallas, but then struggled and let the husky, blond, powerful and mild-mannered although also indomitable Nicklaus sweep by. Palmer stormed into the lead in the Greater Greensboro Open but didn’t win, and his acrobatics failed again in the Citrus Invitational at Orlando. There the aging charger soared into the first-round lead and barged into the last-round lead, but the tournament was won by burly Bob Lunn, who scrambled.

The AP’s evidence against the utility of hustle and muscle goes on and on:

Wintu Indian Rod Curl bolted into contention in the Greater New Orleans Open.
Veteran Dan Sikes leaped into contention in the Byron Nelson Classic.
Steve Reid bolted out of a logjam and big, handsome, husky Bobby Nichols charged and vaulted in the Western Open at Chicago.
Dark Dave Hill swept into contention in the U. S. Open at Chaska, Minnesota.
Laconic Don Massengale bolted out of the pack in the Milwaukee Open.
Doug Sanders surged in the British Open at St. Andrew’s, Scotland.
Young John Miller bolted into contention and young Bert Greene surged into the lead in the Phoenix Open.
None of these guys won. The top prizes went to people like veteran Miller Barber, the swarthy Trevino, the swarthy Blancas, the husky Nicklaus, the lean and lanky Douglass, the slim Devlin, little Deane Beman, drawing Hugh Royer, and bright, handsome, personable young Tony Jacklin.

Of the winners, only Douglass got noticeably physical. At Phoenix, he burst.

In a few tournaments, extraordinary gyrations pay off. For example, longshot Pete Brown churned out of the pack to win the Andy Williams Open, husky young Rod Cerrudo charged through the rain to win the San Antonio Open, and tough little Gary Player rushed and surged to the championship in the Greater Greensboro Open.

The Danny Thomas-Memphis Open provided evidence favoring both the excitable and the placid. Tall Tom Weiskopf romped home but didn’t win. Steve Spray bolted into contention but didn’t win. Yet brash, slim, dark, stormy, gritty, controversial Dave Hill charged home in the first round and romped through the rain in the last round, and won.

Victorious rompers are exceptions, though. The winners are more likely to play placidly like tour-tested, rock-steady Billy Casper, a svelte, mild-mannered stylist who was once bulbous; quietly like conservative, dependable, rock-steady Frank Beard, or serenely like pokerfaced Bert Yancey.

While style makes a difference on the tour, temperament and physical attributes don’t seem to. For example, the Los Angeles Open was won by the svelte Casper, the Colonial National Invitational at Fort Worth by the paunchy Blancas.

And among winners or contenders are found men of such assorted silhouettes and manners as lean Bert Greene, husky Jimmie Wielchers, tall Terry Dill, the gangling Archer, slim Larry Hinson, hefty Bob Murphy, dour little Jack McGowan, lanky young Stanton, lean and lanky R. H. Sikes, the mild-mannered Nicklaus, the magnetic Palmer, soft-spoken Gene Littler, big Marri, little Rodriguez, big Collins, burly Lunn, pokerfaced Bruce Crampton, dour Bob Charles, the grinning Ziegler, the pokerfaced Yancey, the husky Stone, the talkative Trevino, the laconic Massengale, stocky Jack Lewis, stocky John Lotz, thoughtful Dick Lotz, methodical Mike Hill, brash Dave Hill and the happy Blancas.

Even weary, crippled, courageous little Ben Hogan, the fabled Texas Hawk, made one run at the leaders. That was in the Houston Invitational, where the immortal 57-year-old started well before stumbling and fading into the pack.

pressure always grinds away

So size, health, age, personality and philosophy of life don’t seem to affect the tournaments. Pressure does. It’s always out there, grinding away. Normally, the golfer either survives it or bows to it, but once in a while he is ground into collapse by it. In the Atlanta Golf Classic, the tall, moody, boilyshly handsome Weiskopf faltered in the grinding pressure and stumbled in. The next week, in the Kemper Open at Charlotte, stocky, pleasant, dark Dick Lotz survived the grinding pressure and vaulted into second place on the year’s earnings list. In the National Four-Ball Championship at Ligonier, Pennsylvania, the challenge of Bruce Crampton and Orville Moody collapsed in the grinding pressure, and in an early round of the Western Open,
the drawing, pokeryfaced Royer, while apparently not ground by the pressure, bowed to it.

That Four-Ball tournament corroborated other evidence that fairway acrobats are a bad risk for the better. The two giants of the game, Nicklaus and Palmer, teamed up to win it, and although the AP reported that they scrambled and struggled before they pulled their awesome talents together, it did not suggest that they charged, leaped, vaulted, churned or burst. Gardner Dickinson and the legendary Sam Snead, on the other hand, charged out of the pack, only to drift back. Crampton and Moody forged, yet the grinding pressure finally did them in.

All this happened back in 1970, but last year I got curious about the long-term effects of soaring and bolting, and went back to the papers. I found that while there were a few new contenders, like young Jerry Heard and charging rookie Larry Wadkins, and while a few players had added to their physical and emotional dimensions, like skinny, easy-going, placid Johnny Miller, the old pros had for the most part held up consistently and well. In the Phoenix Open, Homero Blancas blazed before faltering, and the personable young Jacklin stormed. In the Bob Hope Classic, balding and paunchy veteran Bob Rosburg fought off a bunch of younger rivals before drifting back, and the youthful Heard vaulted. The indomitable Palmer, though, was content to move into contention. It may be that the aging dynamo will someday make yet another fabled charge, but should he do so, he may find a formidable obstacle in the fantastic Golden Bear, playing again with the awesome majesty he displayed in winning the Walt Disney World Open.

Pistols and Coffee for Two

In the Oct. 6, 1866, Virginia City Montana Post, editor Henry N. Blake referred to Thomas Francis Meagher, former acting governor, as a "notorious individual" and "the most unimportant member of the community." He said the "flattering demagogues who made him [Meagher] think that they heard his footsteps echoing in the vestibules of the Senate chamber in Washington will pass by him and be interested in something upon the opposite side of the street." The October 20 issue of the Montana Post, the Territory's first newspaper, contained the following challenge by General Meagher and editor Blake's response.

Virginia City, M.T., Oct. 19, 1866

TO CAPT. HENRY A. [sic] BLAKE. Sir.—As I am given to understand, within the last half hour, there have been some falsifications circulated in regard to the interview which my friend Dr. Daems, had with you the other day relative to the scandalous article you wrote and published against me personally, in the Montana Post, of the 6th of this month, and in order that such falsifications may be at once and completely refuted, my friend, Mr. James K. Duke, in the temporary absence of Dr. Daems, now calls upon you to publish, in the next number of that paper, an ample apology such as he will approve of; or, declining to do that, to make immediate arrangements with him for affording me that satisfaction, which, from your recent association with gentlemen in military life, it is, I presume, entirely unnecessary for me to particularize.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your most obedient servant,

THOMAS FRANCIS MEAGHER
Virginia City, M.T., Oct. 19th, 1866

TO GENERAL THOS. F. MEAGHER — DearSir: — Your strange letter of the same date herewith has been duly received. You assume that I "wrote and published" the article to which you refer. I infer from your language that you consider that I have been guilty of circulating the alleged falsifications in regard to my interview with Dr. Daems. I desire to inform you that I cannot comply with any of the requests or demands which you have made. As the editor of the Montana Post, it is my right and duty to criticize the official conduct of public men. I always act in pursuance of the most upright motives, and, if you are negligent in the performance of your tasks as the Secretary of our Territory, you cannot escape censure. I may be misinformed by the citizens concerning yourself, but I am not only ready, but anxious to rectify any mistake that is published in the columns which I supervise. If you will write any communication, in which my errors are pointed out, it will be published with pleasure. If you decline to adopt this method, the law and courts will afford you a complete redress.

I understand without any explanations your designs. I notify you formally, as I stated to Dr. Daems privately, that I regard a duellist as a murderer; that the miscalled code of honor is a relic of barbarism and ignorance; that it is contrary to the spirit of our republican institutions, and that I could not stultify myself by attempting to take the life of a man against whom I have no feelings of enmity. You have seen fit to send me a challenge, although you knew that I could not and would not accept it. I am astonished that one who fills a post of national importance, and whose chief task is the execution of the statutes, should try to incite me to commit the capital offense of murder. I shrink with awe at the dreadful possibility that I should ever be compelled to shed the blood of any individual.

You allude to my "military life." During my term of service in the Eleventh Regt. Mass. Vols., I never witnessed or heard of any duel in our glorious army. I will not disgrace my record. You may publish me as a coward, but my scars, of which this inclement storm reminds me, will proclaim that the charge is false. Two warrants and three commissions, which were received by me during the late rebellion, for my services in twenty-one battles and skirmishes, will completely refute the statement.

In conclusion, I will assert that your letter and conduct do not intimidate me in any degree. While I occupy my post as editor, your official acts will be examined, and I shall have no hesitation in expressing my views regarding them. I am, very respectfully,

HENRY N. BLAKE
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Foreign Correspondents at a Distance

By GENE KRAMER

The writer, who has been a guest lecturer at the Montana School of Journalism, is a native of Missoula, Mont., and the son of the late Dr. Joseph Kramer, emeritus professor of botany at the University. Mr. Kramer attended the University of Montana in 1945 and 1947 through 1948. He earned an A.B. in political science at the University of California at Berkeley, where he was editor of the Daily Californian. Since 1950 he has been a newsman and correspondent for the Associated Press, working in San Francisco, Tokyo, West Berlin, Warsaw, Bonn and Prague. He wrote this article at Prague, where he reported the aftermath of the Soviet invasion, Communist-bloc affairs and cultural and economic news. In 1972, Mr. Kramer was transferred from Prague to New York to cover the United Nations.

"Ah, the foreign correspondents are here. I like foreign correspondents very much, but at a distance."

Speaking was Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Roman Catholic primate of Communist-ruled Poland. Ascending to his apartment in the bishop's palace at Lomza, he had spotted western newsmen at the foot of the grand stairway and turned to bestow those few words on us.

It was one of the very few times His Eminence ever spoke to me and others of the Warsaw press corps who for years had followed him from one end of Poland to the other, reporting sermon after sermon that needled the Communists but always stopped short of direct confrontation. We had to attend the sermons personally because the church was denied broadcasting facilities and only accredited foreign correspondents, as opposed to their Polish employees, were allowed to report such non-official news in Poland.

The one time the primate addressed me personally was that same summer of 1966 on learning I had been held by police after taking pictures of a demonstration. "At last you have had a true Polish Catholic experience," he said.

Eastern Europe abounds in newsmakers, potential news sources who "like foreign correspondents very much, but at a distance."

Besides clergymen, they include professors, trade and economic officials, even Communist diplomats and party functionaries. They know things that can be vital in expanding and making sense of the uninformative official output of East European governments and Communist party newspapers. Unlike the Polish cardinal, some will talk in confidence. But the reporter must be prepared to keep his distance. Too open contact with the western press, regarded as the imperialist enemy, can jeopardize the source's position. (Even as this is being written in Prague, the hardline Communists are boasting in print that the honeymoon of western journalism in Czechoslovakia has ended and that the foreign press no longer will be able to get inside information about the party.)

Getting behind the handouts in such conditions is the main challenge. Old-fashioned reporting basics apply, plus all possible patience and ingenuity.

Protection of a cooperative source is imperative. Expulsion normally is the worst that can happen to a reporter these days in eastern Europe, but livelihood and even freedom can be at stake for the local citizen who is friendly with a foreigner. The source is seldom if ever named when his information is checked with other sources or friendly diplomats. By common consent, reporters and diplomats in eastern Europe accept this as the only sure way to protect confidences, particularly since the walls have ears. It sounds over-dramatic to newcomers, but there is something to those tales of "bugged" rooms and telephones.

During my first night in Warsaw, I was invited to a diplomat's home. As soon as the talk turned to Polish personalities, the host reached for a notepad. The conversation continued with gaps of scribbling that later was burned and flushed down the toilet. Sound spooky? In the years
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that followed, I have interviewed diplomats and East European sources against the background of extra-loud music (experts say this is not enough to keep Big Brother from hearing) or on walks or streetcar rides taken purely to gain privacy.

Cocktail receptions can be a bore in Washington or Bonn because the reporter sees the same old people to whom he already has access. The diligent East European correspondent takes in all such affairs he can get invited to and lets others do the heavy drinking while he works.

Receptions may be the closest he'll ever get to the top party leaders who, in the East, rarely hold press conferences. More important, receptions are attended by people it is impossible to telephone and would take months to visit by appointment. Communist countries normally require foreign-ministry approval and a list of questions before they arrange newsmen's appointments with, for example, professors or experts in agriculture, finance, transport or urban matters.

Such sources often feel less inhibited talking in crowded ballrooms than in their own offices where the visit is noted and conversation openly or clandestinely monitored. All informal, low-pressure meetings are potentially useful. So once you learn the faces of various sources you find yourself trying to buttonhole them at airports, sports events and in cloakroom queues, where a quick, private exchange can produce more information than the useless, hours-long official "press conference" that preceded it.

A good rule for this kind of newsgathering is to train yourself to memorize what is said. Pulling out a notebook can be enough to stop all but the official-type interview that is long on propaganda and short on fresh information.

I don't regard such tactics as deviousness or trickery so long as the reporter is frank about intending to use the information he gets. Avoiding the use of a notebook merely recognizes the risk taken by a cooperative source in a totalitarian situation—a source who is willing to tip, clarify or explain but cannot afford to be quoted exactly or accused of giving interviews.

Some may argue that this is merely quote-grabbing. Actually, it must be highly intelligent reporting. East Europeans willing to talk are articulate people who will not take risks with anyone they regard as badly informed or superficial. The reporter hoping to get a slant on SOviet-bloc relations with China must know his Marxism and the history of the Moscow-Peking dispute. If East European aid to Hanoi is the question, better have intelligent (as opposed to agreeable) answers ready on the U.S. role in Vietnam. If you're asking about Czechoslovakia's dilemma, know European history since World War I.

East Europeans, Communists and non-Communists have a term for western newsmen who fail these tests. It is "non-serious." To be "non-serious" can be almost as grave as breaking a confidence.

A Voice That Would Rasp a Saw Mill

Helena is dull, painfully dull. The First National bank failure hurt a great many people. Some well-to-do men, or supposedly well-to-do men, are said to be cramped even for the necessities of life. Next to the session of the legislature, nothing could be more opportune for Helena than the mildness of the weather. The absence of any amusements in town is distressing. There is nothing to do of an evening but hang around the hotels, the club or the saloons. At the upper end of Main street is a one-horse beer hall, called by courtesy a concert garden, where a pianist and violinist have performed so far without getting shot. Occasionally a woman, whose face would stop a freight train and a voice that would rasp a saw mill, comes out and assists the pianist and violinist in increasing the agony. The saloon men recall with fond recollections the palmy days of the session of 1893, when it was nothing unusual for certain members who had been properly seen to blow in from $100 to $200 a night apiece. For the next generation by some men in Helena every legislature will be gauged by its saloon propensities, the famous session of '93 being taken as the standard of perfection. But while there are no attractions at the theatre, it should be said in defense of Helena that there is promise of amusements galore in the immediate future. For next week a church sociable is announced. As soon as enough snow falls sleigh rides will probably be arranged, and there is talk of a candy pull and a neck-tie party. The gay season at the state capital is a little slow in arriving this winter, but when it comes it is expected to come with a rush.

From the Anaconda (Mont.) Standard, Jan. 10, 1897, during the controversy over the location of the permanent state capital.
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News Dissemination in Helena

By FRANK WALSH

Mr. Walsh earned a B.A. in 1962 and an M.A. in 1972 at the Montana School of Journalism. He was editor of the student daily, the Montana Kaimin, in 1961-62, and he worked as a reporter for the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian and the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News and as editor of the weekly Valley Star in Twin Falls. In 1965 he joined the public-relations staff of Pacific Telephone and from July, 1969, to September, 1970, was a public-relations staff supervisor for Pacific Telephone in California. Mr. Walsh is a student in the School of Law at the University of Montana. This article is based on his M.A. thesis, "News Dissemination in a State Capital." His comments are based on interviews with government reporters in Helena and representatives of major state agencies.

With government reorganization and passage of a new constitution, Helena is a state capital in transition. And as the pattern of government changes, so does the pace of news dissemination in Helena, with the press taking the lead and state agencies slow to follow.

The turn toward aggressive reporting of the state government began in 1959 when the Anaconda Company sold its eight Montana dailies to Lee Enterprises Inc. Previously, only four reporters covered capital affairs. One worked for the Company daily in Helena and two, reporting governmental news part time, worked for the Associated Press and United Press International. A full-time capital reporter was employed by the Great Falls Tribune, the only major Montana daily not owned by the Company.

In 1972 seven reporters covered the capital full time. Both AP and UPI have a state-government newsman. The Great Falls Tribune expanded its Helena staff to two. And the Lee Newspapers State Bureau, formed Sept. 5, 1961, has three reporters.

While the press has developed a corps of reporters to cover state government, state agencies in 1972 were just beginning to form a professional group of public-information officers. Only seven state agencies of 31 surveyed employed PIOs.

The Department of Institutions, with 11 facilities including the state prison, did not employ a full-time PIO. Its director said: "I don't think we could justify a full-time public-information officer. . . . The job just isn't that big."

In 1967 capital reporters, seeking information about an inmate who had died in the prison's solitary-confinement cell or "hole," hired an attorney and prepared to take legal action against the Department of Institutions. One reporter said: "The information wasn't as important when we got it as was the impact on state government. I found things opening up a lot more since they found the reporters are going to fight this sort of thing."

Other large institutions not employing PIOs were the Department of Welfare, Railroad and Public Service Commission, State Board of Health and the State Board of Equalization.

Several agencies employed part-time or "when necessary" PIOs, but they uniformly said they devoted little time to informing the public.

Other responses to the survey further indicated that public-information work commands a low priority in Montana government. Reporters said they often were met with silence and a lack of information. Moreover, answers to questions about communication techniques indicated much misunderstanding and ignorance among agency officials responsible for informing the public. Those officials also failed to distinguish between the needs of general-assignment reporters from the wire services and political reporters from the Lee and Tribune bureaus.

Many agency PIOs used the news release as their primary tool. . . .
method to inform the public. They did not think interviews, background conferences or news conferences were needed. Several part-time PIOs confined their activities to the news release.

Reporters considered the news release the least desirable tool to communicate with the public. One, representing a bureau, expressed the reporters’ general attitude: “It’s just getting the information out the way the agency officials want it put out. We don’t mess with news releases too much. Most are about routine events, and we usually let the Associated Press pick them up and grind them out. Of course, we always pick up every news release we can because we are looking behind the news release.”

Reporters preferred to get information through the interview, which permits them to obtain exclusive stories and in-depth reports. Additionally, the reporters said interviews enabled them to seek a “good news peg,” ask the questions they want and demand answers.

About half of the PIOs were aware that the reporters favored interviews to get information. One PIO said he would want to attend any interviews with agency officials so he could monitor and guide them. He added: “If I found the interview getting into matters no longer germane, I would try to turn it back onto a proper course. I would try to end it if we got into tender areas that would have no real meaning to the public.”

After the interview, the reporters preferred the news leak because it provided them with exclusive information. They held that opinion despite their awareness that the news leak is not fully accepted as an information tool and involves additional risks.

The PIOs did not regard the news leak as an appropriate device for releasing information. Nor did they have much enthusiasm for the press conference; more than half said they never had conducted one for themselves or agency officials.

One part-time PIO, who also is chairman of the agency’s board of directors, said he would call a press conference only “if all the reporters just happened to be in the building at the same time. Then I’d be glad to have them sit down and talk.”

role of media viewed differently

The reporters and the PIOs also expressed differences about the function of the news media. While both thought the media should inform the public, the reporters thought they also should serve as a watchdog of government. The PIOs indicated they seriously questioned such a watchdog role. One said the reporter’s job is to “understand what we are trying to say, then repeat it accurately.”

The PIOs seemed to equate accuracy with exact duplication of the information they disseminated, while the reporters thought accuracy meant a true representation of what happened.

The reporters and the PIOs also responded differently to questions about withholding information. The PIOs said the public had a right to know about its government and they did not withhold information that the public had a right to know. But the reporters said they had problems with agency representatives who withheld information, and they cited as examples what they termed violations of Montana’s two freedom-of-information statutes.

The state’s open-records law is broad in scope, while the open-meetings law lists six exceptions that permit boards or commissions to meet in executive session. Reporters complained that they were unable to determine if agency members meeting in closed sessions restricted the subjects to those specifically mentioned in the six exceptions. They also said boards or commissions had held executive sessions at a motel or at lunch while the official meeting was open.

All of the reporters knew about the statutes and most could list the six exceptions. Some carried copies of the statutes in their wallets to show to officials if necessary. In contrast, half of the PIOs knew an open-meetings law existed but none knew about the open-records law. One PIO said he didn’t know about any freedom-of-information statutes but believed it was his “responsibility to comply with the Bill of Rights.”

A few state agencies have information personnel who understand both the needs of their offices and the news media. The Highway Commission, Highway Patrol, Fish and Game Commission and the University system all employ professional information staffs, and several other agencies in 1972 were considering additional PIOs.

The fact that only seven of the 31 agencies surveyed employ PIOs hides a developing awareness among agency officials that better communication with the public is needed. The growth of public-information positions in state agencies illustrates that awareness. Of the seven information posts, five were created during the past three years. One has existed 25 years, the other 13 years.

Walter Lippmann has suggested that the news media and government agencies have different responsibilities in informing the public. Public institutions have the primary responsibility to provide a constant “information light of their own.” The news media, “like a searchlight,” complement the light of the institutions by attracting attention to episodes and incidents. Only when both agencies and the media do their complementary jobs will situations become “intelligible enough for popular decisions.”

Recent developments in Montana indicate the news media and, to a lesser extent, the state agencies are making distinct efforts to improve their communication with the public and to fulfill their particular responsibilities.
Evaluating Editorial Pages

By SAM REYNOLDS

The writer, editorial-page editor of the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian, is a visiting lecturer at the Montana School of Journalism. He has a master's degree in Russian history from the University of Wisconsin and a master's degree from the Graduate School of Journalism at Columbia University. From 1959 to 1964, he was an education and political writer for the Wisconsin State Journal at Madison. Mr. Reynolds has contributed three other articles to Montana Journalism Review—"Newspapers and Paranoid Readers" in the 1967 issue, "A Newspaper Laid Out" in 1968 and "The Demise of Press Credibility" in 1970. He also has contributed articles to The Masthead, official publication of the National Conference of Editorial Writers.

An editorial page is like minestrone — it has many elements that combined must please many palates. Its elements are definable, but judging the parts and the whole is largely a subjective exercise.

There are quality guidelines for editorial pages, but there is danger in defining them in idealistic, Boy Scout Oath terms that will spin off into Never-Never Land emptiness. Thus an editorial page must be forceful, well-written, artistically laid out, touch a broad spectrum of interests, express strong opinions, and be fair, factual, thoughtful, literate and accurate.

Most publishers and most editorial-page editors believe they do all those things already, given the resources at hand. So while those terms are comforting to bandy about, merely listing them brings a dead end.

A critique form drafted for the Northwest Editorial Writers tries to define some qualities that editorial pages should possess. Its usefulness can best be realized by applying it to your own page and, even better, imagining how others would apply it to your page.

The critique:

1. Layout:
   Is it attractive and varied day-by-day? Does it reflect each day a news-type judgment on the relative importance of the material presented, including cartoons? Is the reader's eye directed to important material?

2. Page content (excluding editorials):
   Does the page contain ample and varied letters and other local material? (This is the key to determining whether the page is reaching the public. If the public responds, it is.)
   Do the columns reflect various shades of opinion?
   Are the cartoons well-drawn and pointed?
   Does the page as a whole seem to encourage expression of dissent from the paper's own policies and even dissent from preponderant public opinion? (Participation in a newspaper's editorial page means reading it and responding to it. Opinions excluded from a page will also exclude potential readers holding those opinions. Thus blacks and rebellious young, often frozen out of a paper, will refuse to respond when the paper most needs them to respond—perhaps cool it—at crucial moments. So it is vital that an editorial page provide an outlet for all shades of opinion, including those the editor finds outrageous, dangerous or revolting.)

3. Editorials (the heart of the matter):
   Are they concerned with a variety of topics?
   Do they reflect courage and integrity? Are they informed and accurate?
   Are they persuasive, tightly written, forceful? Do they reach definite conclusions expressed in clear opinions and recommendations?
   (The crucial test here: Does the paper take concrete
stands on the really tough local issues? If it fails to do that, it fails at the heart and guts of the reason for its existence. Castro doesn’t give a damn what the Podunk Press says about him. If Podunk’s mayor can ignore the editorial page, what reason is there for that page to exist? I can think of none.

4. General Comments:

Is this an editorial page you would want to read every day? Does it project a clearly expressed philosophy or personality? Does it convey a concern for the public interest? Does it appear to provide community leadership?

Again, the usefulness of this critique form derives from applying it to yourself or—perhaps best of all—imagining or having a tough and experienced editorial-page editor applying it to your own page. The stirring of uneasiness or guilt from this exercise surely would prompt improvement.

The basic purpose of an editorial page is to get things done—not in a selfish or narrowly defined mold, but in the general public interest as closely as that ever can be defined.

To get things done involves keeping lines of communication open to all elements of the community, including those one has clashed with or despises. That requires an editor and a publisher blessed with patience, tolerance and concern, and in practice it means—again it must be said—permitting minority and/or dissenting views to appear on the editorial page, even encouraging such views. Nothing else the paper does can better nurture an image of fairness and make the public’s mind receptive to the paper’s own editorial pitches, thus helping it get things done.

The crucial element in creating an effective editorial page is the publisher. As with everything else at the paper, the buck stops with him. Generally, publishers hire editorial-page editors who reflect crucial elements in the publisher. I have met many editorial-page editors from throughout the country at meetings of the National Conference of Editorial Writers, and I am confident whereof I speak.

A publisher who wants a strong page must delegate most important decisions to his editorial-page editor. He must understand that taking heat from those whose toes are trod on is part of the price he pays for the satisfaction of having a high-quality page. The heat is further mitigated by the compliments that a good page will evoke.

It isn’t easy. Perhaps the publisher’s role could be summarized in two words: He must grant his editor “restrained liberation.” He must liberate his editorial-page editor so that editor can realize the best in himself. At the same time, there are recognizable limits to tolerance, and an editor who seeks to reject all restraints, all controls, should find another job. Rational people can resolve this problem. But the key initiative must rest with the publisher. He must make the decision to delegate responsibility. A publisher who tightly holds onto editorial decision-making must force employ a cipher as an editor. An obvious way around this is to employ an editorial-page editor who sees eye-to-eye with the publisher, then turn him loose and say, “you’re liberated.”

A weak page will reflect the publisher’s weaknesses. To get best results a publisher should:

—Employ a strong editor and pretty much leave him alone, or
—Employ an editorial-page editor with whom he is in constant, cordial ferment—a situation in which differences are frequent but in which both parties practice sensible restraint and respect each other, so restrained liberation prevails.

Lastly, why have editorial pages at all? The reason is to fill a public leadership function granted by the First Amendment and jealously guarded by the press. A weak editorial page justifies both the underground papers, which deal with tough issues and “tell it like it is,” and the malformed diatribes of some establishment critics.

The public knows when it is being cheated by a weak editorial page. It does not always know exactly why, but it has an uneasy sense that it is not receiving proper return on the vital freedom it has been granted. Weak editorial pages give the First Amendment a bad name.
The Frontier Journalist in Montana

By ROBERT L. HOUSMAN

It must be kept in mind always that the pioneer newspapermen in Montana were frontiersmen first (they were young men going west) and journalists afterward; young men attracted out of an old world into a new world; a world to be built; a world of uncounted possibilities and, perhaps, of untold adventure and fortune. They all followed dreams. Some lost their dreams; others simply changed them for new ones as they grew into the frontier. Some grubbed for gold first, then went into journalism; others went into journalism, then searched for the more material El Dorado. But they all were frontiersmen living their dreams and developing frontier traits and characteristics with the world about them.

That world represented an historically "significant event" of their time—the Northwestern frontier. But they were intrinsically men out of the world we call commonplace; they were of "the men we call commonplace" and men (as Croce would have it) without reference to whom "great men and significant events would lose all meaning."

And therein, to the student, lies their value.

When the Civil War ended, the great figures of the Golden Age of American journalism—Dana, Greeley, Bennett—were about to pass from the stage. It was about that time that Montana Territory saw its first newspaper issued regularly. Montana territorial journalism was influenced by those great figures; at least they bequeathed it their mannerisms—those forms of newspaper articulation that gave name to that thing called "personal journalism."

So this journalistic heritage of the time influenced early Montana newspapers and newspapermen only as a distant memory will influence the action of any individual or group removed from older established social conditions. But it served its purpose. It became a garment, the cloak of urbanity that covered (yet emphasized the roughness of the thing it covered) frontier traits. "That coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and acquisitiveness; that practical, inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients; that masterful grasp of material things; lacking in the artistic but powerful to effect great ends; that restless, nervous energy; and that dominant individualism, working for good and for evil, and withal that buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom" were all there beneath the polite journalism of the time.

That journalism reflected itself and the world about it. No paradox is implied when one says that from the newspapers of the time one gets a reflection—a mirror—of that time and still insists that the writing in these newspapers, like the literary writings of that period, was polite; that each journalist did report in the main as a "good and respectable man" should report; that he only reported what "he sought to experience and believe" and that he thus gave us a certain necessary knowledge of himself as an individual.

Such knowledge is one of the instruments that one uses to strip that integument of politeness from the truth. Besides, the frontier journalist himself was good at tearing off that surface cutaneous membrane, particularly when a newspaper contemporary was on the other side of the political fence. He was a surrealist on those occasions. At such times he was still very much in the era of personal journalism—and exulted in it.

In other words, the early territorial journalist was after all a frontiersman and reacted as such. The personal and the public were confused in his effort to model his journalism after that which he left behind. So his newspaper reflected him and the world about him more freely than he knew.

Journalists and other frontiersmen—they felt the same things. Only the journalist was the professional articulator of his time and the people about him. For instance, they all felt an instinctive desire to keep old values, old mores. They articulated the desire logically. But the life, sometimes dangerous and cruel, confronting them had to be lived. The dangers, the cruelty and the crudeness became merged within the cultural habits they had brought with them. The result was that "the life that had actually to be lived was terribly at variance with the moral theories not insincerely expressed."

Of course, the realization of all this is dependent on analysis. And the frontiersman had no time—really could waste no energy—for anything other than surging toward that physical progress and security which the moment pressingly demanded.

Professor Hauser was a member of the Montana journalism faculty from 1925 to 1943. In 1934 the University of Missouri awarded him the first Ph.D. in journalism in the United States. These comments are based on the introduction to his dissertation, "Early Montana Territorial Journalism as a Reflection of the American Frontier in the New Northwest." Professor Hauser was in 1962.
The Journalism Faculty

NATHAN BLUMBERG
Professor
B.A., M.A., University of Colorado; Ph.D., Oxford University, England. A Rhodes Scholar, Professor Blumberg is the author of the book *One-Party Press* and coeditor of the anthology *A Century of Montana Journalism*. He has worked for the Associated Press, the *Denver Post*, as assistant city editor of the *Washington (D.C.) Post*, and associate editor of the *Lincoln (Neb.) Star* and the *Akhland (Neb.) Gazette*. He taught at the University of Nebraska and Michigan State University before coming to the University of Montana in 1956 as dean, a position he held until his resignation in 1968. He has served as a visiting professor at Pennsylvania State University, Northwestern University and the University of California at Berkeley and as an American Specialist for the Department of State in Thailand and in the Caribbean area.

WARREN J. BRIER
Dean and Professor
B.A., University of Washington; M.S., Columbia University; Ph.D., University of Iowa. Dean Brier's experience includes work as a newsman for the Associated Press in Los Angeles, Seattle, New York and Helena, a reporter for the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, and a copyreader for the *Seattle Times*. He has taught at San Diego State College and the University of Southern California. Dean Brier is the author of the book *The Frightful Punishment*, coauthor with Howard C. Heyn of the text *Writing for Newspapers and News Services* and coeditor of the anthology *A Century of Montana Journalism*.

EDWARD B. DUGAN
Professor
B.J., M.A., University of Missouri. Before joining the University of Montana faculty in 1937, Professor Dugan worked as a reporter and editor on dailies and weeklies in Texas, a newsman for the United Press, and as public relations director of Hardin-Simmons University. He teaches public relations in the University's widely known School of Administrative Leadership and serves on staffs of agency in-service training programs. His articles, primarily on advertising, have appeared in several magazines.

PHILIP J. HESS
Associate Professor
B.A., M.A., University of Iowa. Professor Hess, chairman of the Radio-Television Department, has taught at the University of South Dakota, where he also served as production director of the University's educational television station. He has worked as a producer-director at commercial television stations in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and Portland, Ore., a broadcaster for educational radio stations in Chicago and Iowa City, Iowa, and as a reporter and copy editor for the Missoula (Mont.) *Missoulian*.

JERRY HOLLORON
Visiting Lecturer
B.A., M.A., University of Montana. Mr. Holloron has worked as a reporter for the Hamilton (Mont.) *Daily Ravalli Republican*, the Great Falls (Mont.) *Tribune*, the *Wisconsin State Journal* at Madison and as a reporter and city editor for the Missoula (Mont.) *Missoulian*. He resigned as chief of the Lee Newspapers State Bureau in Helena in April, 1971, to become assistant director and local-government research analyst for the Montana Constitutional Convention.

CHARLES E. HOOD JR.
Assistant Professor
B.A., M.A., University of Montana. As an undergraduate in the School of Journalism, Professor Hood worked summers as a reporter for the Lewistown (Mont.) *Daily News* and as a newsman for the Helena bureau of United Press International. He was graduated in 1961 and joined the staff of the Missoula (Mont.) *Missoulian*. After serving in the Navy, he became a reporter for the Great Falls (Mont.) *Tribune*. Since joining the journalism faculty as an assistant in 1967, Professor Hood has worked summers as a desk editor for the *Missoulian*.

ROBERT C. McGIFFERT
Professor
A.B., Princeton University; M.A., Ohio State University. Professor McGiffert taught journalism at Ohio State for four years before joining the University of Montana faculty in 1966. He worked for the Easton (Pa.) *Daily Express* for 16 years as reporter and city editor. During the summers of 1967 and 1972, he worked in the Sunday department and on the national desk at the *Washington (D.C.) Post*. Professor McGiffert has been active in programs to improve medical and dental writing, serving as a consultant to the American Dental Association and as an instructor at writing seminars sponsored by the ADA and the American Medical Association. He is the author of the text *The Art of Editing the News*, published in 1972.

DONALD C. MILLER
Associate Professor
B.A., M.A., University of South Dakota. Professor Miller has worked as an announcer, newsmen and production director at radio and television stations in South Dakota. During his military service, he was in charge of the Writers Branch of the U.S. Army Europe Pictorial Center. He taught for five years at the University of South Dakota, where he also served as film director and program director of KUSD Radio-TV. During the 1963-64 academic year, he studied at Columbia University as the recipient of a CBS News and Public Affairs Fellowship. From 1964-66, he was program director of an educational television station, WDSE-TV, in Duluth, Minn.

SAM REYNOLDS
Visiting Lecturer
B.S., M.S., University of Wisconsin; M.S., Columbia University. Mr. Reynolds, editorial-page editor of the Missoula (Mont.) *Missoulian* since 1964, also served as a visiting lecturer at the journalism school in 1966-67, 1970-71 and 1971-72. A former reporter for the *Wisconsin State Journal* at Madison, he has contributed articles to the *Masthead* and to *Montana Journalism Review*.

WILLIAM SEIFERT JR.
Visiting Lecturer
B.A., Stanford University; M.S., Columbia University. Mr. Seifert has served with the Peace Corps in Kenya, taught school in Rohnert Park, Calif., and has been an instructor in the Peace Corps Training Program at Columbia University. He was a writer-researcher for the desk at Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism. From 1969 to 1971, he was an instructor in journalism at the University of California at Berkeley.
For me, writing is a slow and painful business. It demands concentration and search and presents the obstacles of dissatisfaction with what could be said better. And there's no immediate reward in putting words on paper. The reward, great but fugitive, is in having written, in having found the word, the line, the paragraph, the chapter that is as good as ever you can make it.

A. B. Guthrie Jr.