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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

During World War I an organization entitled the Montana Council for Defense was the nucleus of government in the state. This organization had broad powers and authority. The men who held office in it were themselves influential in the affairs of Montana before the Council for Defense was organized.

The content and behavior of the Council will be analyzed in terms of the nature and membership of the Montana Councils for Defense and their place in the social structure of Montana. The connections between members as representatives of a distinct social group are important, for they reveal motives for much of the behavior of the Council. In placing these persons in perspective, the statistical and value components of class identification must be examined. The important statistical components are social status, education, wealth, vocation or profession, and political participation. The characteristics enumerated point out enough similarities of the Council membership to demonstrate that they are within the bounds of a social stratum (class) clearly enough defined to be dealt with as a particular class. Some characteristics are more important than others, but no one characteristic can be relied upon in full to explain social behavior. The lesser categories help to fill in the portrait of a man or group of men and their social inter-relationships.

The second component of class identification is values. Values are intangibles which cannot be measured, but can be determined with reasonable accuracy. Interactions of individuals with other individuals and groups
is the key. Although values are a set of personal beliefs or convictions, these are rarely stated. Values are most often indicated by behavior. For example, if a person acts to protect civil rights in the face of public opinion, then civil rights are probably valued more than popularity. In a very real sense, values operate in a priority order. The most deeply held values will be most stoutly defended.

The relevance of values to class identification is a matter of shared values, i.e., regardless of the statistical placement of an individual, if he tends to act as a member of a particular class, then he may be said to share the values of that class. He may also be said to share the same consciousness or class image.

The need to incorporate values into class identification is a product of American social mobility. It was possible to change status in American society both upward and downward. Movement from lower to middle class status rests largely on property. Only the exercise of middle class values such as frugality could enable property accumulation. The aspiring lower class person had to internalize and practice middle class values. Attainment of a similar consciousness to the middle class was possible in spite of a statistical deficiency. This explains the ability of a worker to side with the middle class even outside times of national emergency. In the opinion of the Council for Defense, the lower class member who did not share this consciousness, or who placed status or the national interest below immediate economic questions was potentially dangerous. Before going further with the Council itself, the raison d'être of the Council must be explored to place it properly within the framework of national and Montana history.

Understanding the national conditions of 1917-18 is essential to an understanding of the Council, since the Council arose out of national need.
While the experience of the Montana Council for Defense may well be unique in and of itself, it was part of a national organization and syndrome not unique to Montana. Yet the character of Montana in economics, geographical position and the temperament of its people lend their own particular flavor to the Montana Council for Defense.

The ideological basis of the Council must also be examined. No organization with political power and purpose can be considered absolutely neutral in every sense. The Council was one of the least neutral governments imaginable, though it advertised both itself and its mission as nonpartisan. Some could accept that designation as factual, and others saw it as ignorance or deception. Those inclined to see the Council as political were the people, organizations and ideologies with which the Council came into conflict. And conflict was quite evident in every sense of the word. On personal, moral, economic, and political grounds a highly complex and fluid struggle took place which was only finally resolved in the early 1920's. World War I was to prove the decisive factor in this long standing conflict which outlived the active phase of the Council for Defense.

Aside from the ideology of the Council, its legitimate and implied powers and behavior are important in demonstrating the nature and extent of the conflict, and the contradictions in which the Council placed itself. An organization which in an attempt to save some value important to its society, destroys that same value, has placed itself in a paradoxical situation. These paradoxes reveal the irrational and cynical facets of the Council membership and its class. Since material gains were not the ultimate concern of the members of the Council and their class, a totally rational explanation for the actions of the Council in creating these paradoxes is not acceptable. Cynical behavior in both politics and economics was present but does not provide a complete explanation. Ideology will help to demonstrate
the actual concerns of the Council in relation to other political and ideological groups.

In order to examine all these factors the origins of the Council and its operation as an autocratic government must be studied. Its organization and acceptance measures the extent to which the national emergency of World War I was felt statewide. Its reorganization in 1918 will provide further clues to the concerns of its membership and true constituency. Its operation on state, county and local levels discloses the actual source of and extent of the Council's power and the ends those powers were used to further.

Nancy Fritz states in her MA thesis, "The Montana Councils for Defense,"² that the Council was an extremely efficient and tightly organized body responsible for both the Montana contributions to the national war effort and the negation of civil rights during World War I. Fritz demonstrates the efficiency of the Council by supplying statistics in terms of men and money contributed to the war, the efforts to adjust the labor supply and in the increase in food production. The repression of individual liberties consumes the larger part of her paper. Fritz outlines the modus operandi of the Council in dealing with "slackers" and "seditionists". Her excerpts of investigations the Council held reveals the style of the Council. They dealt with those held in disfavor by a combination of harassment and intimidation, often backed up by local authorities all too willing to ignore the letter and spirit of law in order to bring recalcitrant citizens into line or at the very least to silence opposition.

Specific groups as well as individuals received special attention from the Council. Socialists or suspected socialists, pacifists and persons of German-speaking ancestry were the usual targets. In particular, the Mennonites were singled out. Mennonites were a pacifist communal religious
community that had originated in Germany and retained the languages and customs of their heritage throughout several migrations. The Mennonites were not only foreign, but also pacifists, which was worse, and German and German-speaking. They were harassed unmercifully in spite of their long history of devout religious convictions and their peaceful nature. Many packed up and left the state, moving to Canada and other Western and Midwestern states where attitudes were slightly more tolerant.

Fritz also dwells on the plight of the German-Russians. The state Council ordered the immediate prohibition of the German language in the state, whether written, printed or spoken. Under this order the older of the German-speaking Russian immigrants could not understand the services of their Lutheran faith which then were held in English. Pastors and immigrants appealed to the Council repeatedly, but to no avail. Some pastors took to preaching in private homes in German, but were found out even there. The German language order was not repealed until late 1919. This occurred even though the German-Russian community had participated fervently in contributions and war services of patriotic nature.

The taint of anything German was considered dangerous. Textbooks considered pro-German were censored and banned in the schools of the state. Students and faculty participated in book burning at the University of Montana. Likewise, any non-Anglo-Saxon or recent immigrant was suspect. The only way to avoid the attention of the self-styled patriots and possible vigilante activity was to conform to and demonstrate such standards of patriotism and 100 percent Americanism that the "best" people felt were sufficient proof of good citizenship and respectable Americanism.

Fritz notes the Council's immediate concern with agricultural production and war boosting in 1917 and the change of emphasis in the fall and winter to concern with disloyalty, sabotage, sedition and treason (otherwise
known as labor problems). Investigations and sedition trials increased with the degree of attention to the internal security of the state.

In her conclusions Fritz reiterates the high degree of efficiency and organization the Council attained in a relatively short time. The power of public opinion in enabling this accomplishment is mentioned. The huge increase in agricultural production is commended as is the work the Council did, apart from its means, in exceeding war quotas.

Regarding the Council's often flagrant disregard for civil rights and human dignity, she allows that criticisms which some historians have dealt the Council have considerable justification. Yet she feels that much of it is too harsh. Some qualification is necessary. For example, the Council did not persecute everyone rumored to be pro-German. The county councils often found accusations of seditious acts or speech to be based on personal quarrels, and dealt with these matters in a fair manner after investigation to determine the facts in the case. Normally good citizens who made indiscrete remarks were educated by the Council with no coercion necessary in many cases, and the matter would be dropped. (The people in the Council and patriotic organizations did many unkind and lawless things, but it is important to remember that they were people with attendant human traits, cruelty and kindness among them.)

The writer is indebted to Fritz for her general survey of the Council, which pointed the way to the further research done here. Her brief portrait of the Council stimulated a desire to see if the portrait was similar through the membership of the county councils and also to compare it with the patriotic organizations. A brief hint as to political and economic motivations for patriotic activity led to further examination of the conflict between super-patriots and socialists.

Fritz uses the term "super-patriot" often, and as it is a good one
and distinct from the normal usage of patriot it will be used in this paper. Fritz applies "super-patriot" to persons and organizations which acted in an extreme fashion. This category includes both those who acted for cynical reasons and those who were genuinely convinced that German culture, or socialism, or free speech were deadly threats to American traditions. The simple designation of "patriot" applies to the reform socialists who supported the war personally but not as an organization. Some distinction is needed to select out the most extreme nationalist groups and individuals--types who would speak and act in extreme and sometimes violent terms. (Then keeping both cynics and true believers together does not create a confusion.) Remember that the behavior of the person or group leads to the designation as super-patriot. The super-patriot's behavior was extreme and tended to be self-righteously moralistic. They often dealt in absolutes and bordered on the irrational as they twisted the law of the land to their own ends.

By mention of class and and class comparisons, the reader may receive impression that a purely Marxist analysis of the Council for Defense is to be presented. Such is not the case. Although economic motivations were indeed a factor, that type of analysis cannot deal with the whole question of the Council for Defense. More variables are involved than economics. This is evident in the variety of groups repressed by the middle class during World War I. An economic rationale for repression seems logical until one attempts to stretch the fabric of the argument to apply to the suppression of the German-speaking and Mennonite communities. Something more is necessary to fill in the puzzle.

Economic analysis does not account for the evident sincerity and moral righteousness with which the Council and super-patriots pursued the cause of patriotism as they defined it. Examination of social values
and public opinion with respect to their effect on the Council and the thought and deed of its patriotic allies is necessary. The character of the media is important also as a prime mover in the formation of public opinion. The nature of paranoid political activity will be explained in order to picture fully the degrees of emotion which the Council embodied in a political structure.

I will demonstrate that the Council for Defense was at best an undemocratic organization. Further, I will show that the membership of the Council for Defense in the state of Montana was the empowered and legitimized epitome of dominant values and social mores of the Montana social structure, and that the behavior of the Council and its class was in all ways an attempt to reinforce and maintain these values by legal, quasi-legal, and sometimes illegal means.

Chapter II
MONTANA AND AMERICA, 1917-1918

And then Billy Bunny took a little red, white and blue flag out of his knapsack and waved it in the air and shouted:

Hip, hip hurrah for every star,  
And every bar of red,  
Johnny get your gun and  
Hustle for the Hun,  
And shoot him til he's dead,  
dead, dead.¹

The Councils for Defense arose from a presidential request to prepare the nation for war. The Council was the direct product of an international situation and not some event internal to the United States or Montana. At the same time, the need for this particular type of organization may well have been unique to America, and its form not traceable to external politics.

In 1917, World War I was into its third year. All the nations involved were suffering the effects of total commitment to the war. The overall situation in Western Europe had been a stalemate since the winter of 1914. In the East, Czarist Russia was weakening quickly. By May 1917, Russia would be wracked with revolution and counter-revolution from which the Bolsheviks would emerge dominant.

The Bolsheviks, as part of the international socialist movement, would be the anti-war party in Russia, eventually defeating the pro-war social-democratic forces. In keeping Russia out of the war, the Bolsheviks were considered an ally to the Germans. The association of the Bolsheviks, both with Germany and with anarchy and disorder would have serious consequences for American radical politics, both during and after the war. All
socialists would be labeled Bolsheviks and the public would be alarmed by the presence of radical individuals and organizations in their midst.

Before entry into the War, business was good in the United States. America was the larder and armory of the Entente Forces. The United States furnished billions of dollars worth of munitions and agricultural products to the warring parties. Yet, neutral trade became more and more hazardous, since both Great Britain and Germany sought to restrict or halt wartime trade with the other. Many German-speaking immigrants populated America during the 19th Century. Many more had arrived since 1890 from countries in or allied to the Triple Alliance. Pro-allied sentiment was not universal. Pro-German sentiments were frequent in some areas of the United States and were openly expressed.

The American Socialist Party opposed the war entirely. They considered it a commercial conflict over trade rights and colonies in which the working man had no place. But socialists had internal party conflicts about the war even before America's entry. This and the professed ideals of Wilson would later split the movement significantly and lend an aura of legitimate socialist support to the American war policy.

Many more Americans of no particular ideology simply opposed American entry into the hostilities because they could not see how the European War concerned them. It was a European problem and many Americans thought that the United States should avoid direct involvement.

America prospered from the demand of foreign markets. Labor enjoyed an increase in real income in spite of an inflation rate of 100 percent from 1914 to 1919. Fixed income and salaried persons lost purchasing power, but organized labor received not only higher wages but many considerations previously denied them. The European conflict dramatically reduced immigration, which provided American laborers with additional strength and advantage in
labor-management disputes during the war. This advantage was to increase with American entry and need for troops as well as increased production.

In spite of decreased immigration during the war, the character of immigration at the turn of the century troubled persons who considered themselves established, respectable Americans. The middle and upper classes of Northern Europeans, those who as an ethnic group had arrived previous to 1890 or were second generation Americans, noticed that the nature of the immigrations had changed. No longer was the influx dominated by light-skinned Northern European Protestants. Lately the flood had been peasants from Southern and Eastern Europe. These people were swarthy, dark haired, largely unskilled and illiterate, and between them spoke a multitude of tongues and dialects. Their culture and living conditions were very different. They often worked for lower wages than native Americans and lived on the proceeds better than they had before. Their religious backgrounds were Catholic, Greek Orthodox or Jewish.

Aggravating this noticeable change was the lack of social policy in regard to immigration. Indeed, the United States lacked any social policy at all. The immigrants were expected to fend for themselves, as all previous Americans had. In doing so the new immigrants often grouped together for self protection and comfort in an alien urban and industrial environment. Often it was a hostile environment. This literal "Balkanisation" of American cities affected Western cities nearly as much as Eastern cities.

In Montana, Butte and Anaconda are good examples of this change. The entire character of this twin community altered in the period from 1900 to 1916. The area metamorphosed from a resistant homogenous Wasp and Irish Catholic mine and mill town into a conglomerative of ethnic communities. The lumber camps of the West and Northwest took on similar
character to the mining towns of the Rockies. These immigrants also made up a large part of the migrant farm labor. It had become difficult to tell who was an American. Men would no longer identify themselves as Americans, but as Hungarian or Greek.

The insular nature of this new immigrant also prevented easy acculturation and tenement communities reinforced the cultural patterns that comforted the immigrant. Ethnic background became more important in social relations. Even more significant, it became highly visible. The newcomers unsettled those who considered themselves Americans, those who had arrived a generation or more ago. The older groups, or rather the upper class of them, controlled the economic and political destiny of America. The new immigrant tended to bring ideas antithetical to the dominance of the established economic and political order. Often times the immigrant had left or been expelled from his native country for activities of just this sort. The trade unions were feeling the pressure of the unskilled immigrants. Skilled trades were being replaced by machines and other jobs by the immigrant unskilled who would work for less. The "American" found himself displaced by a foreign element.

During this time the abuses of the laissez faire economic system had become manifold and grossly evident. Even middle class Americans became concerned. The progressive movement had been fueled by the muckrakers and outraged middle class morality and was gathering momentum steadily. Socialist organizations and labor unions gathered strength with them. They often captured city governments and affected the balance of power in state legislatures. Butte elected a Socialist mayor and city council in 1911-12.

All this time the socialists were continuing to criticize the system itself. They refused to be satisfied with progressive panaceas and
benevolent charity. Their form of militant unionism combined with political action was a direct threat to the laissez faire system. Industrial unionism in the form of the Industrial Workers of the World was on the rise. Industrial unionism appealed to the unskilled and the migrant worker, who did not have a craft or skill and could not gain entry to the trade unions. The industrial union entered into direct conflict with the capitalist exploiter of labor, by organizing an entire industry of workers and using the strike and boycott. They often came into conflict with the trade unions whom they considered traitors to the working class for their support of capitalism and private property.

The capitalists and industrialists felt themselves to be under attack. Not only was their fitness to be the leaders of the new order they had created being challenged, but some elements were questioning the very system that sustained them. Reform legislation helped to ameliorate this condition. Often the victim of the system was not helped, but capitalists felt less besieged by this faceless thing—public opinion—which was capable of wresting political control of the country away from them. The capitalists began organizing to present a united front to their enemies. Noted capitalists joined the progressive movement, leaving only the hard core of laissez faire conservatives to fight the losing battle. By steering the National Progressive movement and using their great influence in government, the progressive capitalists could turn this reform movement to their own advantage. But they never quite restored the faith in business that had originally existed. The chance for that came during the war, when businessmen and industry supplied the expertise and goods to put the United States on a war footing.

When on April 4, 1917, America declared war on Germany, the nation was virtually unprepared. On August 26, 1916, a miniscule attempt at preparedness by Congress had resulted in the Army Appropriations Act. While
providing money for expansion of the Army and Navy the act also allowed the establishment of a Council for National Defense. Under the terms of this provision Wilson formally established the National Council and then asked on April 7, 1917, that all governors establish state councils to cooperate with the National Council.

The National Council consisted of six cabinet members. It had an advisory committee of seven appointees, each headed by a respected businessman. The advisory committee was the active executive board of the Council. In April 16, 1917, a special State Council Section was formed to cooperate with the states. This Section recommended to the states that their councils be formed by legislative action and that the members be non-partisan and representative of the various sectors of the state economy.

The national and state councils were to organize the efforts of business and government to place the country on a war footing as soon as possible. Another function was to disseminate public information about the war effort. Publicity was necessary due to the controversy over American participation in a European war. Most socialists were completely against it. Many immigrants did not want to be at war with their former homelands, and many citizens persisted in opposing war on principle. The American public's need for education was obvious. This phenomenon was quite widespread and certainly was not foreign to Montana. The Montana Council for Defense immediately established its own publicity campaigns.

Samuel V. Stewart was the governor of Montana from 1916 to 1920. He was a Democrat of conservative tenor. He first set up the State Council with himself as ex officio chairman and S. J. Greenfield, the secretary of publicity and agriculture, as ex officio secretary. The other members were W. A. Campbell, editor of the Helena Independent; C. J. Kelly, a banker from Butte; N. T. Lease, a Great Falls contractor; S. M. Logan, attorney; E. C.
Elliot, chancellor of the university system; Norman Holter, a Helena
merchant, and J. E. Edwards and B. C. White, both prosperous farmers.
The governor then appointed the members of the county councils. The re-
sponse to appointments was positive in the overwhelming majority of the
cases.

His appointments were conservative men who shared his views. The
reorganized Council for Defense of 1918 was no different. The governor
described his appointment policy in a letter to W. A. Campbell:

The Council during the term of the war, will be the most important
and influential body within the state. I have been very careful to
make only such appointments as may be considered thoroughly represen-
tative of the best citizenship of the state and the various industries
and sections of the state. The national Council wanted the state and county councils to be representa-
tive of the area. When Stewart needed to have a farmer for a county council,
he asked that a "good legitimate farmer" be recommended---"not some wild-eyed
radical." Radical activity by farmers was prevalent at the time. When the
governor needed to replace B. C. White on the state Council, he was more
specific. He wrote to White, "I do not want a political farmer or a radical
... let me have the name of some good reputable, clean cut farmer." J. E. Lane of the same county received a similar request, "If you know of
some good, live, wide awake, reputable farmer, not one of the wild non-
partisan type, let me know so I can put him on." Eventually a prosperous
farmer named C. V. Peck was selected and appointed.

In 1917, ample doubt existed among the Council members themselves
as to their legitimacy and actual powers. The first Council for Defense
was constituted only on the authority of the governor. The county members
at the grass roots especially were at a loss. This rarely prevented their
attemping any measure they felt appropriate but left them frustrated when
a Council request or order was ignored. Greenfield said that public opinion and the force of "moral suasion" should suffice, but noted public opinion was not always effective. One of his alternate solutions was to print the name and offense of the miscreant in the newspapers, thereby further mobilizing public opinion against him.\(^1\)

The effectiveness of the Council can be measured by the accomplishments of the state. In Liberty Bonds, Thrift Stamps and contributions to the Red Cross, Montana consistently exceeded its quotas. The Council for Defense started military recruiting, food conservation and helped establish and manage the draft boards. Montana always met its quota of men. The Council was directly responsible for a 30 percent increase in food production by Montana. The Council found seed grain and made sure it was available where it was short. The Council persuaded local banks to "make exceptions to lending norms."\(^1\)

Complaints and problems still occurred. Credit limitations had already been reached by some homesteaders.\(^i\)\(^\text{14}\) Often patents\(^i\)\(^\text{15}\) would be delayed months and sometimes years, leaving the farmer in a low credit position. Farmers also complained about appraisals for loan purposes. The farmers objected to "swivel chair"\(^i\)\(^\text{16}\) appraisals of loan requests. Many farmers went to private companies for larger loans at higher interest. The legal interest rates for banks and private companies were six and eight percent.\(^i\)\(^\text{17}\) The usual rates were 10 or 12 percent, with rates of 50 percent not unheard of.\(^i\)\(^\text{18}\) In regard to this situation, the Council for Defense did not enable the state to reach its full potential in food production. Had credit been more available—and it would have had to be handled by a government agency of some type—twice as much acreage could have been planted. "Lending norms"\(^i\)\(^\text{19}\) could not be stretched to cover that acreage even if bankers were willing, for the money and credit simply were not available. The Council for Defense
kept government and business separate, even though the war effort suffered. Keeping government out of the domain of private enterprise was proper middle class policy.

Visible middle class response to patriotic measures was immediate and widespread. Mere days after the declaration of war patriotic parades and other displays of nationalistic fervor took place in towns and cities. These displays seemed the more immediate and intense in places where immigrants constituted a large portion of population—Butte and Missoula especially. Not only were these two cities major business and urban centers in Montana, but centers of radical activity. Butte was the hub of unionism and Montana socialism. Missoula was of long acquaintance with the International Workers of the World.

Likewise, the need for publicity measures such as local speakers like the "Four Minute Men" are an indication of a need to boost the war to those who did not yet share the enthusiasm of the middle class. The subsequent growth of patriotic organizations with intent to investigate disloyalty was also indicative of some dissident response to the Council's patriotic program. The extent of "vigilante" activity was another indicator. There were enough spontaneous demonstrations of enmity toward individuals and groups to indicate that a difference of opinion existed. The number of dissidents requiring attention was considerable. A day did not go by in some communities, notably, Butte, where anti-war sentiments were not expressed. In the early days of American involvement, actual as opposed to imagined pro-German expressions were also frequent. While reaction to extreme patriotism, the war and war groups was evident, none appeared to be directed toward the official Council for Defense in 1917.

Strikes occurred in the summer of 1917 in the mines and lumber camps of Montana. The Butte strike was sparked by the Speculator Mine disaster.
The other strikes were purely related to working conditions and wages. During and after these strikes the emphasis of Council activity changed from agriculture and war boosting to concern with radical activity and the security of the state.

Soon it became obvious that the state did not have the legal tools to deal with radical activity. People were being arrested for behavior which was not defined in law as criminal. Judge George M. Bourquin of the Federal District Court was throwing cases out of court for lack of evidence to indict. Laws were needed which would define and outlaw acts and speech of the radical and anti-war nature.

Other legislative needs began cropping up. The governor had resisted suggestions in late 1917 to call a special session of the legislature. On December 24, 1917, Governor Stewart wrote to Thomas Arthur of Billings: "I think the seed situation can be met without a special session of the legislature." By late January of 1918 he had changed his mind. The banks simply could not meet the demand for money even on their conservative collateral terms. The drought had killed even the winter seed and more money was needed. It had to come from somewhere and state help was the quickest of the available sources. Yet as late as February 11, 1918, a few days before the Special Session, Stewart wrote a petitioning group "the government will not furnish seed or feed to the farmers of the country." The state government had arranged to purchase seed and hold it so it was available and that was considered sufficient. But it was not sufficient. The farmer could not purchase seed even if it was available if he did not have the money. The banks were extended to their limit and counties were having trouble selling bonds even to the legal limit of their indebtedness. The money trouble was explained in a letter from D. Livingston, of a South Dakota machinery firm, to Frank Kell, Director of the Federal Reserve Bank at Minneapolis:
I am informed that owing to the war Eastern investors do not care to take on or finance such county bonds and in some localities the local banks will not be able to furnish the money, in which case there may be considerable acreage that will not be planted. Montana, I am informed, is in practically the same condition.  

The pressure of the list of needs was too great to ignore. Counties were at their legal limit of indebtedness. Farmers could not increase production without capital for machinery, seed and other supplies. The Council for Defense needed unequivocal power, authority, and funding. 

Legislation was needed to discourage sedition, sabotage, and criminal syndicalism. The Sedition Bill was a general law concerned with dissenting speech and publicity about the war. The latter two were direct measures intended to provide tools to take care of radical activities in the state. These were the main reasons for the legislative session. The governor also had in mind ratification of prohibition, absentee balloting for servicemen, and legalizing the Home Guards. 

The Fifteenth Extraordinary Session began the period of most intense patriotic activity. With the legalization of the Council and the special war statutes the super-patriots now had the tools they needed to crush dissent. This phase of most intense activity lasted through the summer of 1918. Many sedition trials were held. Sometimes three or four persons were charged with sedition each week. Many more were attacked as disloyal. For example, the Council for Defense was instrumental in publicizing B. K. Wheelers' continued lack of cooperation with state and local authorities as a disloyal attitude. The publicity Wheeler received turned public opinion against him and he eventually resigned. Wheeler's disloyalty consisted of professional and objective conduct in his capacity as Federal District Attorney. He continually refused to indict in sedition cases. None of these cases were covered under the sedition law, and Wheeler could not legally make a case against the "offenders". This perversity on his part earned
him the reputation of an IWW sympathizer and friend of the NPL and any other sort of radical "degenerate" influence.

County attorneys were indicting in nearly every case and convictions were frequent. A great number of these convictions were later reversed by the Montana Supreme Court for the same reasons that Wheeler had decided not to prosecute. The most notable was the conviction of W. F. Dunne, a noted Butte socialist and outspoken opponent of the Council and the class of persons it represented. The Court noted in 1921, among other objections, that the evidence did not sustain the indictment.

The sedition law was well used to silence Pro-German or anti-war sentiment. The threat of prosecution alone had an inhibiting effect on free speech, especially as applied on the local level. Statements that were not definitely pro-war could be construed by the overzealous as sedition. A good example of this is the letter Simon Schnieder wrote to the Mineral County Liberty Loan Committee in October, 1918. His statements were considered pro-German: "If Wilson makes England give back all the territories she has taken from Germany, I will buy one cow's worth (of Liberty Bonds), if not you will have to be satisfied with five dollars for the Red Cross." By the time the County Council for Defense was finished, Schneider had contributed far more than the worth of a cow.

The very charges carried an ill effect that few cared to risk. One man was so damaged by sedition charges that after being cleared, he filed suit. He stated in the action that:

... friends hearing of his arrest refused to do business with him ... his business has been seriously damaged, and also (his) good name and reputation. News of his arrest was widely publicized in newspapers. 28

The seed grain law was widely applauded as a wise move. It was well administered and little red tape accompanied the money. The majority
of it was spent, but only then by allowing farmers to use it to purchase grain to feed livestock. Montana agriculture was in deeper trouble at the time than the seed grain law could remedy.

1917 was the first year of a four-year drought that affected large portions of the state. Small farmers were most affected. These were by and large the homesteaders and new farmers who had flooded into Montana under the United States Enlarged Homestead Act of 1909. The acreage needs of dry land farming caused the acreage of a homestead to be raised to 320. That was not enough in itself to sustain a dry land farmer, but was the most that could be obtained. In 1912 Congress reduced proveup time from five to three years and allowed the homesteader to be absent for five months of the year. The dream of free land plus high profits to be turned from dry land grain farming brought a horde of settlers to Montana. The state businesses and railroads encouraged this and publicized Montana in a manner calculated to make it somehow appear a dry land farmer's garden of Eden. Fortunes were being made in real estate and merchandising. Lending institutions proliferated. Between 1909 and 1918, 70-80,000 people came into the state. By 1922 60,000 of them had left. The drought had beaten most of them.

The drought did not affect the whole state and it came to different areas in different years. Other problems existed for the farmer than mere drought, grasshoppers and worms. The business methods of the times as practiced against the farmers of the Northern Plains could only be considered predatory at best. Even in the best years, some farmers finished deeper in debt than the last. Merchants, bankers, money lenders, mill and elevator operators, railroads and speculators all had a hand in the farmer's pocket. He not only struggled in a system where as a small capitalist he was at a disadvantage, he was subjected to practices that cheated him legally of the benefit of his labor and produce and often cheated him illegally in addition.
Radical activity on the part of farmers began in direct response to these business problems and was aggravated by the drought.

Up to a point Governor Stewart thought the situation with the drought could be handled on the state level. Finally he asked for federal help. He not only asked for help, but had realized that the situation had gone beyond the means of private enterprise to handle it. The governor wrote to Senator Walsh on July 23, 1918:

Sentiment unanimous that plan to furnish money to farmers will fail entirely to afford adequate relief if same contemplates banks loaning to farmers and endorsing notes to reserve bank. Banks are loaded to the limit and their credit is already strained and it will be impossible under that plan to loan on any but bankable risks. Parties requiring aid cannot give bankable notes. The money should be made available through some other agency than banks and unless it is on other than bankable terms it will be useless to pursue the matter.31

Secretary of Agriculture Greenfield seconded the governor:

It is our opinion that twenty percent or more will actually leave the land for want of food and seed if they are not given positive assurance of relief immediately.32

The Federal Reserve Plan of relief was instituted. The farmer did not get the help he needed and many did leave Montana. No amount of money or credit could cure the lack of rainfall. Without a direct relief program the homesteader simply could not survive. When homesteaders failed, so did their communities in many instances. 1918 was the first year of the exodus.

It is doubtful if the governor expected more. Social policy at the time was extremely laissez-faire. The individual was responsible for himself. Only when actual destitution had set in would charity be extended, and then by private organizations such as churches.

The Council wasn't active long enough to see this problem out to the end. Once the war was over the Council virtually disbanded itself. People wanted to get back to business as usual all over the country and
Montana was no exception. Council members had served without pay and in the beginning of a downward economic picture their businesses needed attention. The State Council was still in action in 1919 but a paper entity thereafter. Its remaining duties centered around the readjustment of returning servicemen to civilian life. Usually that meant finding them employment and taking care of claims against them that had arisen during their service time. The Council itself was disbanded on July 30, 1921, by Governor Joseph Dixon. The legislation creating it had provided that it exist until the end of hostilities, and the United States had finally signed a treaty with Germany.

Strangely enough, the Montana Council for Defense and the extremist patriotism declined in a period when the rest of the nation was engaged in a radical witch hunt of giant proportions. Fears built up in the war with Germany turned to fear of radical groups—especially Bolshevik types. During the war the International Workers of the World (IWW) had been directly equated with Bolshevism and the socialists, and the Non Partisan League (NPL) had been connected by association and propaganda, most of which was wholly or partially false. At the close of World War I, Montana papers were treating the Bolsheviks as a greater threat than Germany.

On November 20, 1918, the Record-Herald showed a cartoon with a menacing "Bolshevik type" threatening a baby in a cradle labeled "peace of the world". The caption read, "Next Candidate for Elimination". The arsenal of the Bolshevik included a red flag, assassin's dagger, anarchist's bomb, and an IWW torch.\(^34\) Previously, on August 26, 1918, the Herald featured Col T. Roosevelt's speech at Springfield, Illinois, of that same day. Roosevelt spoke first of the need to speed the war and establish 100 percent Americanism. He then dwelt on continuing preparedness for war and "the task of preparing for the social and industrial problems that
conflict will leave."  

Apparently social and industrial conflict were to become the paramount problems after the war. The Montana Employers Association, an organization of businessmen in Montana, felt likewise. Activity of some sort against radicals after the war was anticipated by some before the war's end. Roosevelt likely thought it was inevitable given the destructive nature of the radical type. He was not alone in his sentiments. Patriotism might not have quite the spark left in Montana that it had in 1917 and 1918, but 100 percent Americanism provided fuel for a new crusade.

In his book, *The Red Scare*, Robert K. Murray attributes the episode of hysteria to a moral failure on the part of the American people and leaders to deal with crucial social issues and to keep faith in the principles of democracy and freedom for which they had just fought a war. The government especially is criticized by Murray for its indiscriminate use of propaganda. During the war the government-sponsored National Civic Foundation (NCF) set an example of appealing to hate, prejudice and 100 percent Americanism. This was outright demagogery on a national scale. Anything the NCF distributed had the label of government approval. The public press followed this lead and that of several other educational national organizations, bombarding the public with scare stories, misinformation and distortion. Murray quotes Frank Cobb, editor of the *New York World*:

Government conscripted public opinion . . . they dealt with it as they dealt with other raw recruits. They put it in charge of drill sergeants, they goose stepped it. They taught it to stand at attention and salute.  

Murray also notes that by the end of the war the national patriotic societies and associations were in the hands of men using them to reinstate
conservative power rather than to build a patriotism based on the principle of democracy.

That those principles should be abandoned in the war was one matter, and perhaps understandable. To abandon them in peace time was another. Yet the stage had been set for that very situation. The nation suspended democracy in order to save it. The publicity that radicals and immigrants had received during the war period made them an imagined threat to society all out of proportion to their size and intentions.

The Red Scare of 1919 and 1920 did not build to the peak in Montana that it did elsewhere. There was a genuine concern for the fear of Bolshevism but most of the vigilante-type violence and blatant abuse of authority had abated. The Council for Defense and the patriots had gone back to their businesses, and with Montana in economic trouble, especially in the small towns where super-patriotic activity had once reached its peak, businesses required close attention. There was little time to spend chasing radicals.

A goodly part of the reason for this calm is that the IWW and socialists were now relatively powerless in Montana. There would be a few more short strikes, but no widespread activity as in the summer of 1917. The one radical organization left with considerable strength was the NPL. Partisan politicians had been careful with the NPL once it had shown its initial strength. One reason was that its members were capitalists like themselves. The political leadership of Montana continually expressed its support and respect for farmers while casting doubt in and ferociously attacking the NPL leadership and their organizers.

The Montana Council for Defense could well close shop with confidence in a job well done, both for their country and their class. In order to show that their activity was class-oriented it is necessary to examine
the membership of the Council in some detail, along with an examination of the social structure of the state.
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Chapter III
PROFILE OF THE COUNCIL FOR DEFENSE

ATTORNEY GENERAL

ASSAULTED BY MOB

All Defendants in Kidnapping Case are Dismissed—McGlynn Held Incommunicado.

Great Falls, Montana, May 14, 1918,
Producer's News, Plentywood, Montana.

By Wire

Kidnappers of McGlynn trial held yesterday at Miles City. The Case was dismissed on motion of the defendants.

Officials are drunk with power.

People in Court Room yelled, stamped, and cheered, crying, "Put the skids under FORD, go get MISS RANKIN," etc.

One of the defendants struck Assistant Attorney General, knocking him down and breaking his glasses.

The officials joined in and encouraged lawlessness.

They grabbed all League Organizers present and threw them in jail, the charges are not known. I just barely escaped the mob myself.

Attorney Palmer's home was painted yellow last night by the mob.

The jailer refused to let McGlynn come to phone today. Letter follows.

D. C. Dorman, State Supt. NPL
The membership of the Council for Defense was extremely homogenous. The meaning of homogeneity in this case applies to persons with like views and politics, who have similar background and aspirations, and generally associate with one another or with personalities like themselves. This homogeneity did not apply only to the State Council but extended to the county councils as well. In addition, those persons who were not Council members but active in war work also fit comfortably into the same niche as the typical Council member.

This niche is a function of a state of mind as well as prestige and wealth. I.e., if an individual considers himself to be a part of a group of a particular type, and behaves as if he were one of that group, then it is reasonable to place him within that group for the purpose of discussion. The case of Mortimer M. Donohue of Butte illustrates the point. He could possibly be considered an exception to the business-oriented middle-class Council member. But he was definitely not a radical and was friendly to business. As president of the Montana Federation of Labor (MFL) he was the representative of "responsible" labor on the State Council for Defense. Sanders' History of Montana describes Donohue: "He is not a radical. He seeks to uplift the working man and asks for justice and no more."²

Radical labor leaders also asked for justice to the working man. Yet it is plain that Donohue's conception of justice did not go so far as theirs. The American Federation of Labor (AFL)³ opposed socialist radicals and their far-reaching demands for social change in the name of justice. The AFL wanted only the justice that left the economic and political status quo intact.⁴

In addition there is no indication that Donohue disagreed with the Council on more than one occasion, and in this he prevailed.⁵ Donohue
was "safe" and responsible and "not a radical". Donohue was not a token representative of labor in all senses. One labor member of a council of eleven is a token numerical relationship in comparison to the laboring population of Montana. Bank directors alone numbered four on the State Council. But Donohue's advice was heeded when given in opposition to the rest of the Council's opinion, so he was a participating member of the Council and not a mere cipher or sop to the feelings of organized labor.

Donohue in his function as president of the AFL viewed himself and labor as part of the existing system, and aspired to a part in it. So long as he shared the values of the Council and acted in accordance with those values, he and others very like him cannot be separated from it, and do not constitute an exception to the rule.

The values of this group that Donohue adhered to are many. The most basic and dominant are: democracy, Judeo-Christian morality, individualism, the middle class ethic of self-improvement, private property and profit, respectability and, the 1917 addition, patriotism. Patriotism, democracy, individualism, private property and respectability were the most dominant. Though deserving of mention, the middle class ethic of thrift and industry, self improvement, and Judeo-Christian morality as variously interpreted through the Protestant sects constitutes respectability in the social structure of the time. These lesser values also buttress private property and laissez faire individualism.

The middle class attitude toward patriotism was aptly expressed by Samuel Gompers, president of the AFL, "Time for discussion whether the war should be entered upon was properly before the declaration. After that decision . . . that subject is not further under discussion. We are at war with the Imperial Government of Germany." Gompers did act in the knowledge that cooperation with the government could be of benefit to
labor, but his patriotism was genuine and the statement describes the "non-partisan" approach many Montanans took toward the war. There was no longer time to discuss the justice of the matter, this country was at war and it deserved their wholehearted support. These people were not dragooned into this attitude. They devoutly believed that America was morally right and much of the official propaganda later centered around this theme.

Those who suggested otherwise were not treated lightly. Individualism, as in being different, practically disappeared during the war. Actually, the middle class, individualism by 1900 was used to justify laissez faire business principles and conservative politics. Individualism no longer existed in the eccentric sense it once did. One could no longer carry on like a Thoreau and remain respectable. Strange dress, behavior or thought were not viewed with approval.

Democracy was one of the main principles America entered the war to protect. Montanans were pledged to this principle. But the middle class modified it slightly for the duration of the war. Theoretically, democracy does not mean only that all males over 21 could vote in elections. It meant freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and other rights necessary to the meaningful operation of a democratic system. Any of the Council, asked if they believed in these rights and in democracy might have answered, "Yes . . . except for the disloyal and radicals who are trying to destroy our country." An editorial in the Helena Record-Herald expressed these sentiments:

War talk should be encouraged by every good American. There is only one kind of war talk for Americans, the good old American brand. Other kinds is treason. The man who hangs up a sign prohibiting American war talk at once places himself under suspicion as lacking in the right kind of Americanism.
Those who opposed the war were disloyal and had to be silenced. Those persons trying to change the industrial and political system while America was in danger were not entitled to protection for their persons or views. Partisan politics during wartime were disloyal. Later the feeling came to be that any who tried to change a system did not deserve the protection of that system. Nevertheless, the Council strongly defended democracy, and would never have abandoned it, no matter how twisted it became in their hands.

Private property was of great concern to the Council. Much of their effort centered around the protection of property and maintenance of profit. The justification was the necessity of war production. But any infringement on private property was opposed, regardless of its merits or whether it had to do with the war effort. In fact, property was protected, along with the free enterprise system, even to the detriment of the war effort. No amount of discussion could have separated the Council membership from this position. Their whole conception of society rested upon it. Indeed their conception of themselves and their superior status in society depended upon it. Change in the nature of free enterprise, private property, or the search for profit were resisted bitterly, while democracy waned and individualism disappeared.

If absolutely necessary, the government could and did enter the realm of private enterprise. The only justification for this was an emergency situation. But any action the government took did not interfere with basic property rights or profit—these were guaranteed. The federal, state or local governments only greased the wheels of the existing system to accomplish a temporary policy when free enterprise failed to meet national or local needs. The Montana drought of 1918 to 1922 was one case, and the railroads in World War I was another.
The nationalization of the railroads by President Wilson disturbed business circles, but this measure received general approval.

... all the lines should be operated by practical railroad managers rather than men trained primarily as financiers. For the present everybody concerned may as well recognize that we have a railroad dictatorship, and must have it while the war lasts.

But the railroads and their stock holders were not suffering. The railroads had just been given one billion dollars in capital by the government for improvements, three times what they spent normally. Plus, "... new rates are recognized as necessary." Cost and "interest and dividends have to be paid." Stock holders were guaranteed a six percent return while the government managed the railroads. While accepting temporarily the railroad dictatorship, the press kept the public aware that government interference in industry created waste and inefficiency.

Respectability was sought nearly as frantically as profit. The "best" citizens were respectable, married respectable middle class women, lived in nice homes and kept respectable employment and associates. Their politics were respectable. Their children (boys and girls) went to the university or the best that could be afforded. Even recreation was taken in a respectable manner.

In Montana newspaper cartoons of 1917-1918, the average citizen conformed to an image that varied little from paper to paper. The frontier aspect of Montana was avoided. Although people spoke of frontier ancestry with pride, they avoided connecting the "romance" of the period with themselves. In the many volumes of biographical sketches available, only a photographs showed Montana citizens in less than a business suit and celluloid collar. From the urban newspaper cartoons, it would be difficult to tell whether the paper was the Helena Independent or the New York World. In the year 1918, the Record-Herald caricatured farmers or laborers only
three or four times. Their opposite number, the "degenerate" radical, received far more coverage than the law-abiding lower class citizen.11

This average citizen of the cartoon was a man of middle years, with thinning or receding hair, dressed in suit and tie. He worked in an office while his wife remained at home. He played golf, or visited the neighbors for recreation. His wife was highly concerned with their social image. Quite likely they had a maid or cook. He was patriotic and a war booster. He would exclaim "Damn the Kaiser!" but never "Damn the War!".12 In all things the image of respectability was maintained.

The Judeo-Christian morality, middle class ethic and self-improvement all contributed to the image of respectability. One's support for property also lent to respectability, patriotism and "responsible" political behavior. This overriding concern with respectability led the middle class to develop a monolithic conformity. In this decline of eccentric individualism and the need for conformity, the middle class became highly suspect and intolerant of those who were different.

In an essay on the radical right (pseudo-conservatives), Richard Hofstader mentions this demand for conformity within a political context. This need for conformity is unique to America. Social and geographic mobility are injected into the political arena in the form of status politics. The pseudo-conservative dwells in the domain of status politics as opposed to the more positive form of "interest" or economic politics.13 World War I provided pseudo-conservatives an opportunity to coalesce their status concerns into a viable political issue. Patriotism allowed the normally submissive pseudo-conservative to express his dissatisfaction with American society in an extreme and autocratic manner. This behavior was directed against the different, the weak and those who did not conform to his values in an absolute sense.
The values that dominated Montana society and were adhered to by the prestigious, powerful and wealthy (i.e., the men with status) were those of the Northern European. The core of those values were white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, as was the core of the population of the first elite. Later Irish, Germans and Scandinavians internalized these values. Northern (and Western) European better describes the majority of pre-1875 Americans than the term Wasp, and leaves less confusion. The basic values, however, are still those of the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant despite the more inclusive designation. The early Irish, later to be referred to as the "better class" of Irish, did not give up Catholicism. They merely modified their values to conform with the native Protestants.14

There are several categories to be considered in making a comparison of these men. They are: cultural and social, i.e., the ethnic nationality of the man and his upbringing, whether he be of English or Italian parentage and where and how his childhood was spent. This provides clues to the values he internalized as a youth. Closely related to these but important enough for a separate category is his education. This is not only an indication of his class but of his parent's economic status. Only relatively wealthy parents could send their children to college. The relationship of social and economic status to education had been recognized by 1920.

It is probable, however, that the decidedly higher proportions for the native stock, 14 and over, are due in part to the better economic and social position of this class of population. Attendance at school, college, or any other educational institution at the older school ages is more clearly indicative of a higher economic level than school attendance at the younger ages, when local facilities and legal requirements are dominant factors.15

In a graph, the fourteenth census showed a drastic drop-off for all categories at ages 12 and 13, indicating that an eighth or ninth grade education was probably the norm in 1920. Culture also determined how much
schooling a child received, but economics was the dominant factor. A good education was also an indication that a man was more secure economically and more likely to be self-employed.

Social associations indicate whom a man's acquaintances were outside work, and also discloses something about his economic status or point of view. Religion is included here. Politics is a different matter. The designation of Republican or Democrat would be meaningless in itself without qualifications. In Montana politics of the time, conservatives and liberals populated both parties. Republican and Democrat as parties were not ideologically distinct. Individual party members might think differently on any issue. For example, in the 1920 Montana gubernatorial election B. K. Wheeler, a liberal Democrat with radical support, lost to Joseph Dixon, a progressive Republican with a platform similar to Wheeler's. They had both defeated hard-core conservatives in their primaries.16

It is useful to examine the scope of an individual's political activity. As a general rule the wealthier he was the more active he was politically. His financial position allowed him time away from other duties and political activity often tended to be in his financial interest. Some men never held a political office, yet they could be quite active behind the scenes politically and be quite powerful. For that reason, this factor is not an absolutely reliable indicator.

Vocation is as important an indicator as wealth. While wealthy persons tend to be higher in social status, a professional need not be wealthy to acquire the same degree of prestige. For example, a minister or doctor might reach a very influential position without being considered rich. Of course, professionals rarely live in poverty either.

All the above factors are contained in the charts in Appendix A. The following analysis of these charts will validate the position that
The members of the Council were a homogenous group.

The first obvious conclusion is that the overwhelming majority of these men had Northern European cultural backgrounds. This implies a Wasp set of values and in fact, most of them were Protestant. Their educations are far above average and professional training is common. This would imply that their families had been generally well off. Perhaps the most surprising statistic is that most were from rural backgrounds, and only a slightly smaller number were from the rural midwest.

The "comfortable" range is far enough above subsistence to allow placing revenue into investments other than home or a small business. For example: any farmer who was well enough off to have stock in a bank was in an enviable position at that time. He is definitely not in the homesteader or working classes. All of the county councilmen were at least comfortable financially.¹⁷ None lived at the subsistence level common to laborers or homesteaders, although a few may have in the past. The economic balance of the Council lies in the very comfortable range, and some were wealthy. B. C. White, for example, was supposed to have $30,000 worth of buildings on his ranch alone.¹⁸

Political activity is quite mixed. For instance, state councilman Charles J. Kelly has none listed. Yet the Anaconda Copper Mining Company (ACM) kept their offices in the sixth floor of the Hennessy Mercantile Company of which he was president, and in which the company had an investment. ACM was very active politically. At any rate, for a man of status and wealth, a complete disinterest in politics was abnormal at this time.

In ten sample counties, vocational data could be found on 23 county council members. Six were bankers; merchants were next with four; farmers, three; lawyers, three; real estate had two; two were editors; one a doctor, and three other men in salaried executive positions. The closest labor
came to being mentioned was the editor of an AFL labor newspaper from Silver Bow County. The farmers were still out numbered by businessmen.

It may be significant at this time to note a close correspondence between this vocational list and one gathered by Gabriel Kolko in his book on political capitalism.

The vocational list of the county councils strongly resembles that of the National Progressive Party Convention in 1912.

The leaders of the new party... were not likely to be excessively radical, and all too many have confused their enthusiasm in early August with their politics. A good two-thirds were businessmen of consequence and lawyers, and hardly any farmers or workers could be found in important positions in the party. Professionals and editors composed the remainder, and the top echelons of the Progressives, on the whole, were urban, upper middle-class, Anglo-Saxon Protestant refugees from the Republican party... The large bulk were psychologically committed to clean, efficient government compatible with their class interests. Their reform sentiments were flexible within the larger bounds of capitalism.

The only apparent differences of these men from the Montana Councils was that they were Republican, although apparently not enough so to keep them from bolting the party. And there were more farmers or "banker-farmers" on the Montana Council for Defense.

Masonry and Protestantism generally coincided. Membership in the Elks, Shriners and Montana Club were more than common. If these men were not associates, then at least their ideas of status symbols and proper organizations to belong to were similar.

Most Council members were born in the years 1860 to 1870. That places them between fifth and sixty years of age in World War I. That is not an average. Some were much younger and some much older, but most of the Council members fell in that range. They were old enough to be successful, but young enough to be active, and also too old to start over or move again.

Generalizing, the Council man is a native American of North
European stock. He comes from a rural midwest background and has been extremely mobile geographically. He is fifty-five years old, prosperous, Protestant, and well educated. He is entrenched in his community and does not adhere to radical politics. The goals of radical politics would tend to damage his position in society in terms of wealth and status.

Bankers, merchants, lawyers, and farmers all tend to be conservative in most respects. All are capitalists or rely on the capitalist system for a living. All of them had some sort of status in their community and the Montana social structure. In spite of their differences the Council for Defense is a homogenous group, and they acted as a group when questions of basic values were at stake. No member of the Council opposed patriotism, democracy for the loyal, property or social respectability.

In addition, the Council membership was extremely sensitive to criticism. E. C. Baxter wrote to Governor Stewart on July 26, 1917, from Harlowton:

A certain element in our county object to the action taken by our defense committee . . . . a resolution along that line (was) adopted at an equity picnic held recently under the auspices of the county committee criticizing the members of the defense committee.

Apparantly the program of the local Council for Defense had not met with the approval of a group of radical farmers. Baxter accused the county commissioners of approving of this dissent. But Baxter was not writing to the governor for advice. He did not want to improve relations with the farmers. He just wanted the criticism stopped.

When the Council was criticized more was at stake than individual reputation or governmental efficiency. The direction of the criticism was not important. The heart of the matter was criticism in itself. In the search for status the Northern European culture had been set up as the standard for good citizenship and the truly American set of values. To criticize the Council as a whole, or its values, ideology and acts became
a serious offense. To criticize the Council for Defense was to criticize America. That could not be tolerated. The values upon which the Council membership had rested their status and acquired their wealth had been entrusted to them for safekeeping, in the opinion of the Council. Their trust was the values of America, and those values were sacred.

This is how property came to be sacred and the key to its relationship with patriotism. Private property and free enterprise were seen as distinctly American traits. Protection of property and profit was not just profitable, it was the American way. Additionally, protection of property relationships would maintain the status quo--keeping intact present status (that of the Council member) and economic relationships as well as social expectations and aspirations. From the point of view of the 100 percent American, this attitude was morally justified.

Stimulated by this attitude, the Council type often behaved in a manner which created many paradoxes. In any event, rational examination of their own behavior would have shaken their conception of themselves as 100 percent Americans. At their most extreme the Council was motivated more by fear than by rationality.

The Council members condoned acts of legal and physical violence, curtailed freedom of speech, press and assembly, extorted money, protected property to the detriment of the war effort, and subscribed to an hysterical brand of patriotism. Yet upon examination the typical Council member is revealed as a pillar of the community, the "best" of citizens, and a normal middle class person.

World War I was not just any war, but an American crusade to establish the moral superiority of American ideals. To criticize the Council was to criticize the war which was the raison d'être for the Council. And to criticize the war was to criticize the Idea of America.
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Chapter IV
THE PARALLEL GOVERNMENT

During the Special Session the Montana Legislature gave statutory existence to what constituted a parallel and autocratic government of representative only of the middle class of Montana. Senate Bill No. 1 signed by Governor S. V. Stewart in February of 1918 placed the Montana Council for Defense in legal existence. Section 9 provided $25,000 in funds to the Council. The bill also made disobedience of the Council a misdemeanor punishable by a $1000 fine, one year in jail or both. Senate Bill No. 18 placed $500,000 at the disposal of the Council as they saw fit for the good of the war effort. The intention was that it be used for low-cost loans to farmers to purchase seed grain.¹

No one was fooled by or unappreciative of the significance of this legislation. The implications were plain. Record-Herald subscribers were told that:

"The law creating the State Council invested it with more sweeping power and authority than was ever before given to any body of men in the state."²

The Council had "infinitely more power than any elective official"³ and could do anything not inconsistent with the United States or Montana Constitutions. Any act necessary for the defense of Montana or the United States and prosecution of the war as seen by the judgment of the Council was legal.

The legislation defining the duties of the Council consisted merely of an elastic clause under which the Council could do virtually anything.
and provided penalties for any who opposed the actions of the Council. The Council became a dictatorship by committee, forming its own legislative and executive branches. Supposedly the Council was restrained by constitutional law, but these were times of little restraint. Some of the members of the Council were also known for lack of restraint. This trait was in clear evidence when in August of 1917 a man was lynched in Butte. He was Frank Little, an IWW leader and organizer, there in connection with an ongoing miners' strike. A group of men dragged Little out of his room and out of town, and hung him from a railroad trestle. W. A. Campbell, the editor of the Independent and a State Council member, expressed his gratitude to the committee for their good work. Then he prescribed a summary arrest and firing squad for all those like Little in the state. Evidently his remarks met with general approval. No legislator had spoken against Campbell or this kind of attitude during the Special Session.

This same legislature provided for Council appointments on both the state and county level to be made by the governor. There was no provision for legislative review of the appointments. Actually, a form of review may have already taken place. The governor had made the 1917 appointments in April and May, a good ten months before the Special Session. Since the legislature left appointments in the hands of the governor, that implied that the governor's choices of 1917 were satisfactory to the legislature as a whole. Most of the 1918 Council members had been on the Council in 1917.

Some changes did take place in the composition of the State Council. J. E. Edwards and B. C. White left after Attorney General Samuel C. Ford ruled that state legislators could not hold State Council seats. (This did not apply to county Councils for Defense--one county Councilman tried to resign for that reason, but Governor Stewart did not accept his resignation.)
E. C. Elliott and Norman Holter left for other reasons. The new appointees were M. M. Donohue, Sam Sansburn, G. V. Peck and I. D. O'Donnell.

The removal of the two legislators took the State Council for Defense membership completely out of the hands of the electorate. Governor Stewart was the only elected official, but this was his second term and he could not succeed himself in office. Perhaps Stewart could be held responsible, but he was not politically accountable. None of the individuals could be brought to an accounting for the acts of the Council by the electorate of Montana. Public opinion was the only limitation, and the Council kept a firm grip on it.

The new members did alleviate somewhat the bias toward business shown in the first State Council roster. M. M. Donohue was the representative of labor. Labor now constituted just under ten percent of the Council membership, although in the population as a whole laborers were a much larger percentage. Sansburn, Peck and O'Donnell were brought in as farmer members. Farmers now constituted just over 25 percent of the Council membership, even though there were thousands of farmers in Montana as opposed to 800 practicing lawyers. Lawyers alone had two members on the Council counting the governor. All classes of businessmen and professionals had six members, constituting a majority.

An example of the effect of a business orientation on the Council was Council Order No. 9, preventing the burning of brush in the forests of Montana. This measure came about directly in answer to fears of lumber industry people that burning would cause fires and destroy timber. Small farmers began to protest immediately that they were now prevented from clearing the land they needed to increase production or start new farms. The Council had to make an adjustment in the order, allowing county councils to issue permits to burn.
In the case of one of the farmer members, I. D. O'Donnell, apparently some questioned whether he might really be a farmer, or at least act like one in the Council. He was "interested in so many business enterprises in the city (Billings) that one begins to doubt the validity of his reputation as a farmer." Farming was his main source of income, and he was considered one of the model irrigation farms of the area. But farming probably took the least of his time considering the amount of his involvement in business and community activity. The other two farmer members were also prosperous and well established, hardly representative of the homesteaders who had flocked into Montana by thousands in the previous decade.

Labor was given some special attention other than M. M. Donohue's appointment. A labor sub-committee to the State Council was created (one of many sub-committees). Donohue was given the chair of this committee, but of the eleven members only four were labor representatives and these were conservative trade unionists. The rest of the Committee were employers of labor and one government official, the Commissioner of Labor.

Women's representation was minimal. Only one woman served in the entire Council, Mrs. Tylar B. Thompson of Missoula. She was present on the State Council in her capacity as president of Montana Women's Clubs. She resigned in 1918 due to illness in her family.

Three large segments of the population of Montana and its electorate were under-represented. Farmers fared best of these, while labor and women had token representation. Professionals and businessmen held the balance of power during the life of the Council. The lower class of homesteaders and laborers had no real representation whatsoever.

This same condition holds at the county level. The only labor possibility in ten sample counties is F. A. Bigelow of the Silver Bow County Council for Defense. He was the editor of an AFL newspaper and the AFL
was basically conservative and preferred to cooperate with business. Three men on these county councils were definitely farmers but they had extensive interests outside farming.

The National Council for Defense had asked the states to make sure county councils represented all elements of society, suggesting a banker, merchant and farmer. Apparently no labor representation was considered necessary. Many of the men appointed could have easily fit into all three categories. One of these was G. T. Paul of the Beaverhead County Council. He owned and operated a furniture store, was president of the Beaverhead State Bank and owned and operated several thousand acres of land, raising both grain and livestock. He held other interests in mining and oil. In spite of Mr. Paul's extensive ranch holdings it is difficult to consider him the average farmer. He more properly belongs in the category of businessman and employer of labor. The other two members of the Beaverhead Council were also officers of banks. Neither of them were found to have farm property. Evidently, Paul is the "farmer" member of the Beaverhead Council.

C. S. Einsel of Carter County is another good example. He originally came to Piniele with $500 capital as a homesteader. Yet Einsel was ambitious to be more than a farmer. His was the nature of the speculator. His father had founded two towns, and had been active in ranching, banking and speculating in real estate. E. S. Einsel followed the elder's example. He was instrumental in the growth of Piniele as a town. He also kept a hand in real estate as the value of his holdings grew with the town. In 1920 Einsel was publisher of a small newspaper, cashier of the Piniele Bank and vice president of the Powder River Bank. His land holdings were labeled as "extensive".
The appointments of Governor Stewart did not represent all elements in Montana society even though the governor had made an effort to follow to the letter the 1918 National Council guidelines. The business orientation of the state and county councils leaves no doubt about the element of society that Governor Stewart favored. The Council was not representative and it was arbitrarily chosen by the governor.

The rationale for the governor's choices was inherent in the tenets of Classical Liberalism, the dominant ideology of the time. Classical Liberalism was the basis of free enterprise as a social theory. The idea was that each man working for his own interests would ultimately benefit society as a whole. This was the method of politics as well as business and was theorized to lead to the best possible society. But if all elements of society are not afforded a political input, the result of self interest will not be the best for the whole society, but for the part that is represented. The Council was not representative and, therefore, society even under the dominant ideology was not equitably represented. Each industry was represented by its "best" men. Those who had risen to the top were considered the most fit to lead.

Neither was the Council for Defense accountable for its actions. By February 1918, no state officer accountable to the public remained on the State Council. The situation was nearly the same at the county level. Out of the total of 127 members of the county councils in 1918, only four were state legislators. Three percent is hardly a significant proportion.17

Out of 30 Council for Defense members of ten sample counties only two, or seven percent, held county elective office.18 One was county treasurer and the other was a county commissioner. In a list of all Montana county elected officers, except county commissioners who were not chairmen, only one, the county treasurer previously mentioned, was found to be a
county council member. As a general rule the Council could not be held accountable individually or collectively at the polls in late 1918 for their behavior as Council officials.

No indication exists in the Council papers or history whether this particular condition was by design or accident. Attorney General Ford's ruling that no state legislator could serve on the state Council aggravated the condition, but he was acting properly in concert with the law of Montana by ruling that no person could hold two state offices. The responsibility rests with Governor Stewart as he made the appointments. Another part of the rationale for his choices may be seen that the Council members received no pay. Therefore, the councilmen had to be able to take time from farm or business to do this work. Those who were most able were the most prosperous, and naturally those who had easiest access to communication, transportation and each other. That meant farmers and businessmen who were well off and nearest to or in towns. Many members had residences in the county seat. Yet in spite of this, the letters in reply to appointments were usually acceptances, indicating that the governor did not ask citizens who were not able to undertake these duties.

The local councils for defense established under the county councils were much more democratic. They were open to any who were loyal and agreed with the national policy on the war. These councils were established in towns, school districts, and election precincts and wards. These local councils were powerless by themselves, however, and had been given no legal status in legislation.

The state and county councils wherein power resided constituted a parallel government. That is, this was a government separate from and superior to that which existed before and correlated to it in organizational form. The separation from the constitutionally established government of
Montana took place in the appointment of men who were not a part of the existing structure. That is not to say that this was a class of men who were unelectable or who did not usually wish to serve in their community or government. A quick review of the charts of the sample Council members reveals that 18 of 30 held state or local elective offices between the time of their birth and about 1920. Many more held part office or state appointments. This was not an uninvolved class of men.

From a modern standpoint the most ideal man for chairman of the county council would have been that county's senator or perhaps one of the representatives. Certainly he would have had the time if he had the time to be a state legislator. He would already be familiar with government and its operation. He also would have been accountable to the electorate and, so, responsive to their needs and desires.

Perhaps the reason more legislators were not appointed lay in the character of the legislature. For example, on February 25, 1918, the last day of the Special Session, the legislature refused by a vote of 33-30 to pass a resolution asking B. K. Wheeler to resign his position as Federal District Attorney. Wheeler had long been a thorn in the side of the super-patriots. The same resolution later passed a joint session of the Montana Council for Defense, 25-7.

That the councils were superior in authority and jurisdiction to the established government was evident from the broad granting of powers, (which were soon extended to the county councils) and the oversight function of the Council with respect to local officials. In 1918 the county councils were delegated the authority to make orders from themselves subject to review by the State Council. The power of the State Council to take any measures deemed necessary and not contravening the constitutions of the United States and Montana was conferred on the county councils. The
county councils soon assumed the power to investigate and hold hearings. Hearing procedures of the county councils were numerous.24

Another of the functions of the county councils was to oversee local officials and insure that they performed their duties properly. Any backsliding would be reported to the State Council for action. The councils were to actively cooperate with local officials to coordinate war support activities and enforce the law. Part of the rationale for legalizing the councils was to curb the rising wave of vigilante activity which had swept the state in the months previous to the Special Session. Attorney General Ford reiterated this point, among others, in his notable message to the joint session of the Council for Defense on May 27, 1918. He stated emphatically:

The right of free speech and the right to make public addresses have been denied individuals in the counties . . . by and in direct violation of the law, and the denial has been affected by intimidation and forcible coercion. Furthermore, it is common knowledge that in many cases members of County Councils for Defense have participated in these proceedings. The cases have been rather numerous . . . .

The sole reason for the creation of the State Council for Defense and the County Council for Defense in respect to their police powers, was to add to the existing authorities an extraordinary body charged especially with the duty of upholding the law . . . .

I wish to urge with all possible emphasis that the State Council for Defense through its own action and that of the county councils cooperate to the fullest extent of its powers with the ordinarily constituted authorities and myself in the suppression of lawlessness.25

The Council attempted to "file" this message but it was already in the papers. Ford had released it before he delivered it. It was carried in the press the same day.26

The county councils were subsequently instructed not to handle sedition cases themselves, but to report them to local authorities for action. This would have been a definite reprimand had the State Council not also granted the county councils more power and authority on the same date.27 That was an ambivalent response to the Ford message on the part of the State Council. Jeanette Rankin, Montana Congresswoman, was not
allowed to speak in Deer Lodge three days later because of her radical tendencies.28

Most local authorities were quite cooperative with the councils but one almost "tender" evaluation of a county attorney stands out. B. E. Vaill, chairman of the Mineral County Council for Defense, wrote to the governor on April 26, 1918, concerning IWW activity in his county, and added further comments on the county attorney whom he identified as a socialist. Vaill said:

He is trying to do his duty and would like to do it, still his education and environment and ideas are all along socialists lines and in a way unfit him to prosecute cases of this kind,29

Vaill also requested advice on a special problem with one suspected IWW. The Council for Defense and local authorities did not know what to charge him with as "we can’t allege sedition". He was being held as a "slacker". Vaill wanted to know how to handle this and also requested that a special prosecutor be sent to Mineral County to handle these cases as the one they had certainly was not adequate. The governor replied that he could not help and preferred to leave the matter in local hands (something Stewart did almost exclusively) but advised Vaill to threaten the county attorney with a complaint to the State Council for Defense if necessary.30

The tendency of the Council for Defense to become separate from the constitutionally established government and to become a law unto itself was ameliorated by the presence and prestige of the courts. The Council was definitely wary of the courts. They even respected Attorney General Ford’s opinion that the Council would probably be in violation of the constitution if it tried to fix wages.31 When asked precisely what the powers of the Council for Defense were, the governor admitted he was not perfectly sure, but he referred to attorney Sidney Logan’s opinion (the governor was also an attorney of note) saying, "His (Logan’s) construction of the law
was that the Council for Defense should proceed to do "what was right" regardless and later some judge could construe it." The governor thought that Logan's opinion was correct.

Evidently the Council recognized that the courts would have the last say on any legal matter and respected that forum, whether they thought it "right" or not. This was not an unusual or contradictory position to take, especially for a legal mind. Uppermost on the minds of the prosperous middle class was a need for social stability. Often stability was dearer than personal liberty, or at least other persons' liberty, to differ from the established view of society. Much of the anti-radical propaganda painted immigrants and socialists as threats to social stability.

The courts were and are an extremely strong and conservative force for stability, or at least an orderly process of change. The federal court and the attorney general had expressed their concern with social stability and respect for law in their attention to the lawlessness of the super patriots. The obstructions the judicial system placed in the way of lawless patriotic activity were not disregarded. Pains were taken to circumvent judicial obstructions. When necessary, a de facto suppression of civil liberties was maintained.

The official activities of this parallel government went beyond mere harassment and intimidation. On the county levels secret police were employed, and the idea of establishing dossiers on citizens was entertained. The State Council for Defense was on one occasion asked for two armed detectives to be sent incognito amongst a suspected IWW railroad crew to collect evidence of sedition. The local Council for Defense had already secured the cooperation of the railroad. The governor declined to participate on the state level at that time, although he specifically did not rule it out. The governor was hoping that the Chicago trial of IWW
leaders by the federal government for sedition would break their strength and that detectives would not be needed.35

The idea of keeping files on citizens came into the governor's office rather late in the war, when the conflict was obviously nearing a successful conclusion and interest was slackening. The idea was to keep a file on loyal citizens and how much war work they did and what their contributions were. This is only a step from keeping files on the opposite kind of citizen.36

The same kind of idea had already been suggested by the Record-Herald. On May 29, 1918, and later, the Herald had printed lists of contributions to the Red Cross by name and amount. Numerous threats had been made in Montana newspapers and elsewhere to publish the names of those who did not subscribe to any of the patriotic funds such as the Red Cross and Liberty Bonds. In a period when a feature of an ad for bonds was "No Mercy for Bond Shirkers" and accusing those who did not buy them of being traitors and enemies of humanity, that was not an idle threat.37 It is a small step from publishing a list to keeping it in a file.

The extent to which pro-war sentiment distorted the concept of civil liberty found its ultimate in a decision by a state court in Forsyth during a sedition trial. The court ruled that a man was convictable of disloyal statements made before the law was enacted which made them disloyal. That is a clear contradiction of Article Six of the Bill of Rights.38 The man in question was sentenced to two to four years in prison for statements he made before and after the law was enacted.39

The Council for Defense did not necessarily commit lawless acts in their official capacity. They more often simply condoned them by inaction, allowing super-patriotic organizations to do "what was right". This activity was condoned because the membership of the super-patriotic
organizations was of the same class and was often interchangeable with the Council for Defense. Super patriotic organizations were numerous.

Business committees, commercial clubs and chambers of commerce were all different names for the same type of local businessman's organization. These committees often provided the cutting edge of super patriot activity. An example of business committee behavior was the men who assaulted J. A. McGlynn, an NPL organizer, in Miles City on April 7, 1918. They were identified as prominent men of the community. McGlynn's superior wrote him later that a

... number of the leading citizens, so called, of Miles City have been arrested in connection with the reception which they gave you while in their city... If we can get a few of these self-styled super patriots up against a dose of their own medicine, maybe they will hesitate to use their political prejudice in the guise of patriotism.41

Such was not to be the case, as the local county attorney and justice of the peace easily confused the judicial process and no one was ever indicted.42

Another example of super patriotic activity by business men was outlined in a guest editorial to the Record-Herald. A Belgrade farmer stated that a business committee had run an NPL speaker out of town before he could speak to the farmers. The farmer's tone was bitter toward business and corporations.43

Home Guards, a type of informal urban militia, were responsible for similar acts. On May 20, Wibaux citizens of the Home Guard informed three NPL organizers to leave or violence might result.44 Local people as well as outsiders were intimidated. H. L. Carver, a native of Wibaux County and a "league organizer of some note,"45 complained to the governor about the Home Guard. He said he not only had been pressured personally but that he knew the situation in several communities from his organizing and this Home Guard intimidation was common.46
The governor referred Carver to his local Council for Defense, where he was sure Carver would receive fair treatment. Unfortunately, the attitude of the Wibaux County Council for Defense was little different from the Home Guard, if not identical. R. B. Chappell, chairman of the Wibaux County Council for Defense, wrote the governor on June 24, 1918, concerning an NPL picnic at which some leaders of the NPL were to speak. He was definitely perturbed.

Is there not something that can be done to stop this meeting here, we are doing our level best to keep our people shouting for our country and loyal and to have a bunch like this come in and preach discontent just at this time is very hard for us to swallow. We are determined not to let Townly speak anyway, regardless of the others, for he is under indictment under the Sedition laws, this is, we believe sufficient under the circumstance to warrant us having him refrain from speaking, but what about the others. This Non-Partisan League as far as the leaders are concerned is made up mostly of Socialists, IWWs, Pro-Germans, anarchists, and the like and a great many of the strongest farmer members that we have in this county are of the same elements and it goes against the grain to be compelled to let them speak and create more discontent and possibly convert some of our good people. They have good speakers, and it is going to take better than the average to undo their work, we are not fearful of election providing we can stop further organization, we have had this bunch on the run down here, but when such fellows as are billed present themselves we cannot resort to anything that is absolutely not within the law for we may bet into trouble and we don't want it, (italics mine)\(^48\)

Carver could expect little in the way of fair treatment from the same people who had him "on the run".

The Montana Masons created a council to aid in the war effort on all levels. A committee was established in every town of any size in Montana, and Governor Stewart headed the Advisory Committee.\(^49\) A glance at the associations column of the charts reveals the probable character of the membership of the Masonic National Defense and War Relief Council. The Council for Defense would have applauded the Masonic program:

The distribution of patriotic propaganda throughout this entire country.
The rigid application of the Sedition and Sabotage Laws, National and State, and the orders of the National, State and County Councils for Defense, must have the unqualified support of all.

The influence of the Masonic fraternity must be behind all movements that will prevent suspension of industrial activities necessary to win the war.

The steadying influence of the Fraternity should be exerted to secure conditions preventing activities along political lines which attempt radical action and alleged by their exponents to be reformatory in character and corrective of conditions which have no immediate bearing upon the ending of the war.50

The Masons were also deeply involved in fund raising. They cooperated with local Liberty Committees in promoting thrift stamps, Liberty Bonds, and war-oriented volunteer organizations like the Red Cross.

Local Liberty Committees were numerous. B. K. Wheeler described them accurately in his autobiography.

In the fall of 1917 so-called "Liberty Committees" were organized in most of the small towns or the state to deal directly with anyone accused of being pro-German or who refused to buy the number of Liberty Bonds that these communities would assess against an individual as his "quota".

According to the Anaconda Standard, a so-called "third-degree committee" in Billings rounded up "pro-Germans and financial slackers" there in November 1917. A city council member was forced to resign his job and carry an American flag through the streets. The owner of a meat market who had torn up his Liberty Loan subscription blank was forced to kiss the flag. In Red Lodge, a coal mining center, the Helena Independent reported that "two Finnish IWW leaders were beaten and strung up by members of the Liberty Committee."51

Farmers were not immune from these activities. A farmer named Flannery protested to the governor that he was pro-war and loyal and understood the need for unity "but hounding grain growers, telling them the government will take their homesteads away from them to scare them into buying bonds as is sometimes done is not the intention of our government."52

The county councils often engaged in just this sort of coercion in their fund-raising capacity. Often their "hearings" were blatant attempts to coerce citizens into meeting their quotas. One of these "hearings" held in Butte is particularly interesting. It demonstrates
the style of Council activity and also sheds some light on F. A. Bigelow, the one sample County Councilman who could possibly be connected to labor. This particular case involved Alma Swift, evidently a department store employee until she ran afoul of Bigelow. The matter she was not accused of that led to her dismissal from employment and a subsequent hearing was refusal to subscribe to the Red Cross on the grounds that the funds would be used for vivisection. She also refused to buy a Liberty Bond, although she had done so previously. This is a portion of the statement made by F. A. Bigelow concerning her case on November 23, 1918. Bigelow identified himself as the secretary of the Silver Bow County Council for Defense and vice chairman of the Fourth Liberty Loan Committee.

(On October 3, 1918) we discussed the matter with Mr. Coleman at some length, and, as I recall the matter, Mr. Coleman said "What would you recommend?" I replied that "I would not have a person of that kind in my employ, if I were in charge of this institution." Mr. Coleman said he would discharge her.

The following are excerpts of a meeting of the Council for Defense in the office of the Silver Bow County Attorney on November 1, 1918. A Justice Department investigator was present.

Miss Swift: ... which members of the County Council for Defense asked Mr. Coleman for my discharge?

Mr. Bigelow: The County Council for Defense had nothing to do with your discharge. . . .

Mrs. Kennedy: Our husbands and sons are within the conscription age. Wives, daughters and girls are in these stores. I do not have to tell this body that if this girl is allowed to be dismissed without protest from anyone, you can imagine the rest of them not being able to open their mouths. She has not committed any crime. She has Liberty Bonds.

Mrs. Kennedy: How did you get her dismissed if you did not accuse her?

Mr. Bigelow: We are not going to try her here. I never met Miss Swift until today. I was acting, not as a member of
the County Council for Defense, but as a member of the Fourth Liberty Loan Committee. The County Council for Defense had nothing to do with it, but I, as a member of the Loan Committee, . . .

Mrs. Kennedy: I would like to know her accusers, Mr. Bigelow.

Mr. Bigelow: She has no accusers. 57

Council for Defense cooperation with other super patriotic organizations was not always so intimate, but usually as effective.

In Missoula the American Defense Society was active in suppressing "dangerous elements". The society was composed of 800 of the "best citizens" 58 of Missoula. The scheduled appearance of S. B. Martin, an NFL organizer, at the Missoula Public Forum, was strongly opposed by the Defense Society. The Forum was an educational association that invited speakers on various subjects to lecture. The Forum dissented from the opinion of the Society and telegraphed the governor.

The Missoula Public Forum, whose advisory committee is composed of representative people including president and three professors State University, President Chamber of Commerce, having had none but conservative speakers including above mentioned and Chairman of Missoula Liberty Loan Committee is preemptorily ordered to discontinue during the war by a committee of the local defense society; not council, the occasion is the announcement for Sunday of Nonpartisan League speaker authorized by McAdoo 59 to boost the Liberty Loan, we ask for protection. 60

Whether Martin was patriotic or not, the Defense Society was not about to let a man speak who disagreed with their economic and social philosophy and who was dangerous to them politically. Their defense of America constituted a defense of their own interests to the detriment of the Liberty Loan campaign. The tone of the Defense Society was violent. As H. S. McLeod of the Missoula County Council for Defense explained it, "the Defense society . . . feel it (Forum) is unnecessary as it serve (sic) no very useful purpose, and it is a place for people to speak who feel that they have a grievance and who are dissatisfied with the general condition of affairs (economic and political status quo) as they exist
The Missoula Council for Defense found a solution in delivering control of the Forum into the hands of a new advisory committee of "very conservative gentlemen." The State Council was asked to decide the ultimate fate of the Forum but McLeod did not think the new committee would resist if it were eliminated altogether. McLeod did not defend the Forum and also expressed some personal reservations.

The people connected with the Forum are all law-abiding citizens, and I think will gladly obey the decision of the State Council of Defense, whatever it may be, . . . In this organization there are a few people who, I am of the opinion, would not forgo the right of free speech if they could help it, no matter if that free speech might be very detrimental to the country. I understand that one of the members of the Forum made the statement that American (sic) has two fights to make— one in France fighting the Germans, and another in America, fighting for the right of free speech. . . . It does seem to me at times that there are a lot of people who are not willing to sacrifice what they believe are their rights for the big thing we have on our hands at the present time, that is, the conquering of our enemies.

The scheduled meeting of the Forum was canceled.

Perhaps one of the most powerful patriotic organizations was the Loyalty League. This league had been formed statewide with the intent to investigate and root out sedition, disloyalty and pro-Germanism. The president of the Loyalty League was C. V. Peck. W. A. Campbell, Sidney Logan and Sam Sansburn were all vice presidents. Since they were all members of the State Council, the State Council's desire to restrain this organization was questionable. Additionally, its executives could act with the power and authority of the Council behind them. Other members of the Loyalty League were Rev. J. F. McNemee of Helena, Joseph Smith of Deer Lodge, J. A. Gilluly of Lewistown and B. C. White of Buffalo.

Another less important but interesting organization was the Next of Kin League. It is interesting from two aspects. First, the use of the
word "league" was an obvious ploy against the Non-Partisan League label. The Next of Kin League was organized by the Loyalty League for political purposes. The Next of Kin League was organized for "seeing that persons elected to public office will be of the type that will be zealous in looking after the interests of the fighting men in France by doing everything in their power to support those measures looking toward the winning of the war."  

The nature of this League bears a distinct resemblance to the Good Government League of North Dakota, which was set up by conservatives in that state in political opposition to the NPL. The second interesting element is its membership. The officers of the Next of Kin League were G. V. Peck, chairman; W. A. Campbell, secretary-treasurer, and the vice presidents were Joseph Smith, Sidney Logan, Sam Sansburn, Rev. J. F. McNemee, and J. A. Gilluly.  

The Record-Herald criticized the Loyalty League for restricting membership of the Next of Kin League to members of the Councils for Defense and the next of kin to American soldiers. Snelson of the Herald was much in favor of the concept but felt it should be open to all loyal citizens. He did not care for the undemocratic procedures that were being used to mobilize patriotism in politics.

The Loyalty League, Business Committees and the Council for Defense can all be tied together as organizations through their direct connections to the Employer's Association of Montana. The Employers' Association was a statewide business committee of 2000 members, working in close harmony with the local committees. It helped to organize Loyalty Leagues in seven counties. The Association was "recognized by the State Council of Defense as official organization for fighting and exposing IWW and kindred elements. Called to testify in hearing against Bulletin."
Represented State Council for Defense before Department of Justice at Washing D. C., in seeking authority to suppress certain disloyal and agitating literature." It also directed and advised employers during strikes and lockouts. 69

Specifically the Association "succeeded in having practically all advertising support withdrawn from a disloyal paper, which has been widely distributed throughout labor circles of the state, creating class hatred and manufacturing anarchists." 70

The last statement identified the conservative nature of the Association. Conservatives still insisted that radicals had "manufactured" discontent. Progressives were often willing to agree with the Socialists that conditions were the source of discontent. The progressives were still very conservative, but their solution was not an absolute defense of the status quo. They were willing to change conditions just enough so that support for the socialists (and, therefore, organized dissent) would evaporate.

Another organization deserves mention here. This was the State Executive Committee of the Montana Council for Defense. 71 With the proliferation of organizations and committees of all types and kinds for many different war purposes, much duplication of effort and inefficiency had developed. The State Executive Committee was devised to bring central order to this chaos of duplication. Its purpose was to coordinate all war activities, disseminate patriotic literature, and work with the state and county councils. 72 The movement toward this body was not grass roots, but it was organized.

Apparently the idea originated with T. A. Marlow, an important banker and power in the Republican party of the state. As early as April 10, 1918, the governor had received communication on the idea. The governor
replied to a battery of ten letters on this date, with the clear indication from him that a movement of some sort was afoot. Evidently a letter-writing campaign of some sort had been instituted. All the letters but one were to County Council for Defense members, including Marlow.

Centralization of all war activities under the Council for Defense would collectivize the total Montana war effort entirely into the hands of the Council membership. The Executive Committee was organized on June 13, 1918, with T. A. Marlow as chairman. The other members were Stephenson, a banker, attorney and capitalist from Great Falls; M. M. Donohue; C. A. Weil, a lumberman from Eureka, and B. C. White. This committee was authorized by the heads of various war bodies meeting in conference with the State Council for Defense on May 27, 28 and 29, 1918. The State Executive Committee encountered opposition to its formation very early. In a letter to Justin Smith of Bozeman, another attorney, Governor Stewart explained, "The NPL people began to make some capital out of it. I thought it wise under the circumstances to let the matter lie dormant a little while so that any more that is made may be accomplished without any just criticism that it is political." Evidently the NPL charges of political motivation were justified at the time.

The reason may be found both in the membership and control of the organization. All the members held highly critical views of the NPL, along with other radicals as a disturbing influence. Additionally the public was notified of the backing of the Executive Committee.

It is understood that the new body will be financed by the large industries and public spirited citizens of the state who wish to see Montana do its full share in the war and at the same time protect its people and industrial and business activities from the unpatriotic and disintegrating influences that are working against both interests."
This State Executive Committee was the high point in the development of the autocratic rule of the Council for Defense. It now controlled all war activities, had oversight power over local elected officials including the police functions, could investigate any behavior or speech it did not care for, and was unanswerable to the electorate. The parallel government had fully established its dominance over nearly every aspect of the political, social and economic life of the State of Montana.
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Chapter V

DISLOYAL PATRIOTS

You (who profit from war) must make this arrangement, that when we give our lives, all that we have, this nation will take first of your profits and then of your property you have got, if the property is not enough; and after the war is over we will give back, as you give back our lives, as much as is left, and no more . . .

A. C. Townley

Resistance to the Council for Defense came from many sections of Montana society. All classes and occupations contained a certain number of individuals who resisted particular acts or policies of the Council on an individual basis. B. K. Wheeler and Judge George M. Bourquin were two of those. Their personal scruples and their knowledge of law and its purpose inevitable placed them at odds with the Council. But the overwhelming force of law, public opinion and cohesive action the Council and super patriots developed allowed individuals to be "converted" through necessity or simply silenced. Those who shared the Council's view of the best society and who exercised this "guaranteed" right to criticize the Council or the war soon found they had no rights.

The combination of the Council for Defense and its allied super-patriot organizations plus the force of public opinion mobilized within the middle class could not be resisted by any one individual. If the Council was not successful in suppressing an individual, "public opinion," sometimes in the form of mob violence, would nearly always break resistance to Council and middle class policy.

The middle class citizen would not generally argue with the motives of the Council but with their lawless methods. The middle class
dissidents could hardly organize to combat their own class. All the "best" citizens would have been against them and to ally with the "natural" enemies of the middle class, the lower class and socialists, would have endangered their social status. Additionally, they would be opposing legally constituted authority, placing themselves in an outlaw status of sorts. Only the most powerful or courageous would defend justice to this point. It was easier to go along.

The organized resistance was another matter. The socialists and their organizations had previously evolved as adversaries to the middle class values and dominance of society. It was far easier for them to resist because they had been in opposition to the class the Council represented for years. The socialists criticized property, profit and the laissez faire ideology as fundamentally unjust and the root of all social evil. For the Council for Defense member also, the critical value in this conflict was property. The issue of patriotism was not only a value but the best weapon for the Council for Defense and the middle class in this conflict. All organizations or persons who opposed property or profit were targets for repression on grounds of disloyalty no matter how loyal they actually were. Whether a socialist organization was pro-war or anti-war they were accused of disloyalty and suppressed both legally and illegally on that basis. Loyalty was more than patriotism, and patriotism meant more than love of country. The patriotism and loyalty the Council stood for was a conformist adherence to an economic ideology and middle class identity as well as a nationalism. That combination was known as Americanism.

The Council reaction to socialist opposition in Montana vividly illustrates this point. There were three strong socialist-type organizations in Montana in 1917. They were the IWW, the Socialist Party and
militant labor unions, and the Nonpartisan League. The AFL and trade union type of organizations are not included here except those few AFL unions which were socialist controlled or engaged temporarily in militant activity. The AFL early reached an accommodation with the Wilson Administration. They supported the war in return for gains for labor. The government helped obtain these goals in return for loyalty and industrial peace.1

But the key to Council for Defense and middle class acceptance of the AFL unions was two-fold. An important element was the wartime necessity for social stability and guaranteed production. In the same spirit as railroads were nationalized so were the unions in a sense. It was a necessary war measure. The reversal by government and business to an anti-labor and anti-union sentiment soon after the war is evidence of the temporary nature of this accommodation. The other element was that the AFL did not challenge any of the middle class values outlined in Chapter Three. Most important, the AFL did not challenge the justice of the profit system or private property.

Yet the position of the AFL union was precarious in Montana. As long as they took what management offered they were "good unions". As soon as they attempted to determine their own destinies and exercise power by strikes or boycotts, they became "bad unions". The strike was the favorite IWW tactic and only IWWs would strike in wartime when national "unity" was so vital.

The miners' strike in Butte in the summer of 1917 is the best example of the thin line the AFL walked. The strike was sparked by the Speculator Mine disaster.2 The miners also had serious and long-standing grievances over wages, working conditions, and especially the "rustling card". The strike spread rapidly from ACM properties to all mines in
Butte. W. F. Dunne described the occurrence as: "as near spontaneous as any strike I ever saw. There was not an IWW local in Butte at the time of the strike nor for a month afterward."4

Eventually AFL unions joined, and at one time 15,000 men were idle. The company-owned press was outraged at this disloyal activity. During the strike very few IWW cardholders were present in Butte,5 but the press called in an IWW strike and a direct threat to the American war effort. As seen by the ACM newspapers, in a few weeks the IWW had gained 14,500 members. No longer were the AFL unions good unions. They had joined the ranks of the disloyal—those who placed themselves in an adversary position to their employer. Eventually the AFL unions settled for minimal gains and went back to work. The "IWW" strike was broken and labor had returned to the ranks of the loyal.

The IWW was well known and feared in Montana. In his Billings speech Teddy Roosevelt declared the IWW a "menace" to mining, lumber and farming in the state.6 The IWW had organized heavily in all these industries. The idea of industrial unionism and "direct action" rather than mediation appealed to the more recent immigrant and unskilled workers who populated these occupations. The IWW ideology flirted with anarchy. They did not believe that government really could or would help the people. They were also at odds with trade unions and the incremental approach to a better life for workers. The IWW also hesitated to found strong local unions, hoping to unite all industrial workers in "one big union".

But as much as it was feared, the IWW was extremely vulnerable in World War I. Their rhetoric of direct action was turned against them and they were made to seem violent, mindless anarchists.

They (the IWW) put spikes in saw logs to bring death to innocent men, put poison in wells to kill innocent women and children, and take any other "direct action" that seems likely to serve their temporary selfish ends.7
The strike and other direct methods of waging "industrial war" with employers became "industrial sabotage" after April 1917. Advocating strikes in vital war industries such as metals, lumber and farming became a crime in 1918 in Montana.

Their militant form of organizing based on industrial unions (syndicalism) also became criminal. Syndicalism is a form of organization of all workers into an economic weapon. If one worker were exploited all would go on strike, paralyzing a city/state/nation/world. The workers would have all real power. The criminal syndicalism law made teaching or discussion of this form of organization a criminal offense. The only way it could be discussed was in negative terms. This law forbade the teaching or advocacy of any "doctrine which advocates crime . . . or other unlawful acts or methods as a means of effecting industrial or political revolution." The penalty for violation was one to five years in prison and a $200 to $1000 fine.8

Repression of the IWW had been tried before. It had often failed. The IWW could bring great pressure against local governments. The Missoula Free Speech Fight (1909) was an example of this. After an ordinance was passed prohibiting the IWW from speaking, IWWs from all over the West flooded into Missoula to be jailed. Eventually the city made peace on IWW terms. The whole incident had been marked by pacifism on the part of the IWW in spite of the violence done to them.

The war, however, was a national issue and war production a national concern. The IWW might overwhelm a local government, but not the state or federal governments. These units had the resources to take care of as many IWWs or other persons as necessary to keep order, and they were committed to using them. Troops were used in northwest Montana to help break the lumber strikes there. In Chicago in 1918, 100 IWWs charged with
sedition went on trial together in a federal court. The IWW respected this power and toned down its activities to stay within the law. The IWW as an organization did not take a position on the war, but many individual IWWs were anti-war and said so. Their ideology opposed them to war per se and especially to World War I, as they and other socialists saw it as a war over colonies and trade rights. By the time the war was over there was little difference in behavior between an IWW and a militant AFL unionist.

The IWW could not organize openly and their brand of war talk was not 100 percent American and, therefore, was not permitted. Any time an IWW spoke against the war he could be indicted for sedition. Any time an IWW advocated a strike he could be indicted for sabotage. Any time an IWW advocated flooding the jails to bring public attention to injustice, he could be indicted for criminal syndicalism. Now, civil disobedience itself had been made illegal. The IWW was involved in several unsuccessful strikes in Montana in 1917 and 1918. They were still a force at war's end, but more a middle class bogeyman than the powerful element they had once been.

Much of the IWW's decline was due to the harassment they endured. This harassment was condoned by the State Council for Defense and local councils were often the agencies responsible. The governor's attitude toward the IWW can be summed up neatly in his own words in 1917.

Last night I got a telegram from one of the IWW officials at Spokane warning me that a lynching was contemplated at Troy, in your county. It seems that these fellows are all getting pretty well wrought up. (Alludes to Little lynching.) If it tends to scare them out of the state, so much the better.°

And in 1918:

I feel sure that if we keep right after these fellows, even though we do not convict them it will make it so interesting for them they will get out and stay out.¹
Militant unionism has already been mentioned regarding the AFL. Its appearance was met with charges of disloyalty and no discussion of grievances ever took place. Butte was the Montana center of this activity and socialists had considerable strength there. They were influential in the leadership of both the 1917 and 1918 strikes. Socialists could lead a strike effectively because of their organizational and tactical skills. W. F. Dunne, contributing editor of the Butte Bulletin, was one of these.\(^\text{11}\)

But socialists were also in a bind. The Socialist Party openly opposed the war both after and before its declaration. Some socialists went on record as pro-war and aided the administration. These were a minority, but the administration made much of their presence in order to demonstrate broad support for its policy and undercut war resistance.\(^\text{12}\)

The anti-war socialist did not receive such harsh treatment as the IWW because they were not connected with the image of anarchy. Socialists wanted stable government and preferred to work through the political system to achieve their ends. They were pictured as misguided, and disloyal opportunists whose only interest was self-aggrandisement through control of class politics. They did not always share in the image of the bestial revolutionary attached to the IWW. Nevertheless, many socialists were jailed for sedition. W. F. Dunne and many like him carefully avoided making any statement that could be considered as seditious.

During the war the socialist type of militant unionism was broken in Montana, and the loyalty issue was the single largest factor in that defeat. It was used to obscure both the actual basis for the strikes and the motives of the employers. It turned public opinion against the workers.

Both in 1917 and 1918 federal troops were used to prevent violence which was expected of the workers. But the Butte Bulletin and Judge Bourquin viewed the situation differently. The Bulletin accused the troops...
of harassing miners and protecting company gunmen. According to the 
Bulletin, the strikers were careful to be non-violent and the Bulletin 
urged them to continue the practice. The Company papers headlined 
imminent violence daily but only isolated incidents could be reported. 
The Bulletin blamed most of these incidents on company hirelings and gun-
men trying to incite the workers to violence. Judge Bourquin noted that 
in regard to violence in the Butte situation: "There was no disorder save 
by the raiders," referring to raids on radical and worker halls and presses 
ordered by the Silver Bow County Council for Defense in 1918.

Another aspect of the 1918 strike was B. K. Wheeler’s continuing 
interference with patriotic employers. He wrote Dan Kelly, attorney for 
AQM, at the end of September that the strike had been incited by paid agents 
of the company. He noted those agents were the most radical and violence 
oriented among the strikers, and Wheeler told Kelly that if he wasn’t aware 
of that he should check the reports to the company made by its detective 
agencies. Kelly saw fit to reply calling the Federal District Attorney 
either a “liar or slacker” and saying in part “every effort of the AQM has 
been toward the stamping out of that organization (IWW) . . . “ Kelly knew 
the real motive of the strikers also: “These so-called strikes which have 
really been efforts to obstruct the proper conduct of the war . . . “ Kelly 
accused Wheeler of attempting to “becloud the issue with this attack”. The 
strike was an IWW plot against the war, according to Kelly and others, and 
not the result of miners’ grievances against their employers. Kelly also 
declared the AQM in the business of “stamping out” opposing organizations.

After the strikes of 1918, all but AFL unions were inactive in 
Montana. Workers still had political strength if they could use their 
ballets but their union strength was nil. That left only one viable radical 
organization in Montana.
The Non-Partisan League had gained support steadily in Montana through 1917. It would continue to gain in spite of the intense pressure placed on it by harassment and charges of disloyalty. Labor would find in association with the NFL a way to use their ballot. The NFL was eager to add labor to their voting block. W. F. Dunne, in fact, went to the state legislature in 1918 as an NFL-endorsed Democrat.

The NFL had originated in North Dakota in 1915. Its mentor, A. C. Townley, had started by organizing farmers for the Socialist Party there. He was so successful that the socialists put him on his own in January of 1915. During the winter of 1917 and 1918 in Montana the League was beginning to attract considerable attention.

On February 14, 1918, the Fergus County Democrat editorialized:

Who are the directing forces and what motives animate them in their propaganda of dissatisfaction which they are charged with so industriously, and successfully, fathering?

A few men in North Dakota decided that the farmers of their state were not receiving an adequate return for the labor expended in growing wheat. They concluded from their investigation that the wheat growers were being robbed of some of the legitimate fruits of their toil by speculators who gathered a lion’s share of the profits by deftly manipulating the grain market and they set forth to correct that evil. They conceived the idea that since the grain farmers constitute the social and industrial foundation of the state, those same grain farmers should administer the political affairs of the state.

Contrary to their usual custom, the farmers loyally stood by on election day and their ticket swept the state. The farmers obtained full and complete control of the government of North Dakota.

For the last six months, they have been voraciously canvassing the farmers of Montana and, if reports which have reached us are reliable, have succeeded in securing a membership of between twenty and thirty-five thousand in this state.

Those who are opposing the Non-partisan League in Montana base their opposition on three major premises. First, the entire trend of the movement is socialistic. Second, the organization is being directed by men who are wholly selfish, insincere and dishonest. Third, some of the leaders are preachers of disloyalty and are encouraging opposition to the government in its war operations.

Direct opposition to the NFL in Montana did not occur until it became strong
enough to be a political threat. This correlation of the rise of opposition with the rise of power was not unique to Montana but had followed a similar pattern elsewhere. The increase in strength of the NPL coincided with the drought and the rising pressure for a special legislative session to enact state war legislation. While agriculture was the object of a large part of the session, concern with criminal and radical activity was more prevalent. Of 21 measures enacted the farmers were the object of six while criminal activity was described in seven. The criminal measures were also a good deal more effective than the laws to help farmers.

Three of the special session bills dealt directly with the farmer grievances accelerating the NPL growth. They were mild reforms at best and did not help the poorest farmers who needed help most. In June of 1919 another special session enacted more comprehensive laws paralleling the League program. These laws attempted both to steal the League platform and to help the then disastrous drought situation in eastern Montana. In all these measures private property and free enterprise were assiduously protected.

Basically the League program was to restore the government to the control of the people and then use the government to develop the state "for the benefit of its citizens and to prevent exploitation" by outside interests. The NPL used the primary system to nominate like-minded candidates in both parties. An indication of NPL success with this tactic is that in several states including Montana attempts were made to abolish the direct primary system. Once NPL candidates were elected they were committed to a program including state hail insurance, state owned grain elevators and mills, state grading standards and tests for grain, rural credit laws to give farmers low interest loans, and regulated railroad rate structures. Radical measures like these were as bitterly opposed in Montana as elsewhere.
By spring of 1918 the Council for Defense had been legalized, criminal syndicalism and sedition laws enacted, and the most intense period of repression had begun. Consistently, the major reason given by the middle class opposition to the NPL was that they were not loyal. The patriotism of the NPL, or at least its leadership, was always the central question. The opposition would cast doubt about the League and its leadership while praising the general farming population. It never dealt with the problems addressed by the League and the source of its strength. Many times the farmers' plight was referred to as the result of ignorance or a defect in character.

The central concern of the League's opposition was economic ideology. The political strategy for the opposition was to avoid engaging the NPL on the economic issues. The NPL proposed real solutions to the grievances of the farmers. They were not afraid to involve the government in the economy and use its resources to aid the distressed in a direct fashion. On the economic issues the middle class could propose only solutions which would keep the present system intact. But farmers whose stock were dying and whose families faced starvation had little respect for ideology or middle class values. One such farmer was Ted Stevens of Bozeman. Charged with disloyalty, Stevens was confronted with the question: "I suppose you would like to come under that government (Germany)?" His answer was to the point: "I don't care what I come under, they won't allow me to feed my pigs and chickens now."  

Even those of the middle class who were willing to attempt reform did not want to restrict private enterprise or involve government as a participant in the private sector. Since the middle class could not offer real solutions to men like Ted Stevens, they had to defeat the NPL in a different arena. They accused the League leadership of disloyalty and of
being venal, unchristian and un-American. These accusations were supported by outright fabrications, exaggerations and linking any sensational remark every made by any socialist or anarchist to the NPL and its intentions. Since the middle class controlled the media the Montana public was treated to a one-sided view of the NPL.\textsuperscript{31} To this was added harassment, intimidation and repression of civil liberties.

The Montana situation was not unique. Compare the portions of this letter from a Minnesota legislator to his governor with Attorney General Ford's message to the Montana Council for Defense in Chapter IV.

Law abiding citizens . . . have been publicly and falsely vilified and accused of crime, and have been openly threatened with violence, torture and death.

Public officials have joined in this carnival of intimidation and oppression . . . .

Men have been coerced, assaulted, kidnapped; law has been denied; passion has supplanted reason; riot has been invited; the process of social order has been menaced by the approach of anarchy.\textsuperscript{43}

The legislator was not referring to IWW "anarchists" but to the "best" citizens of Minnesota.

Repression of the NPL in Montana was little more sophisticated than in Minnesota, but it was less violent. Governor Stewart was apparently more predisposed to the use of the courts than his Minnesota counterpart, J. A. Burnquist. In North Dakota the emphasis had been on charges that the leadership was lining its own pockets,\textsuperscript{33} and was pro-German and anti-war. In Montana the charges of misappropriation of the farmers' money were more alluded to and insinuated than direct. The charges of disloyalty were also more indirectly applied, but no less vehemently.

A Montana editor laid out his objections to the NPL while commenting favorably on the Leagues' patriotic stance. He reviewed a speech made by R. B. Martin, NPL speaker, at Glendive. The editor's main points were that "the most rabid opponent of the new party\textsuperscript{34} could not possibly find anything objectionable" in the NPL position. The NPL political orientation
stimulated two objections. One, he did not like "class" politics, whether the farmer class or any other. He maintained that no class should take over the functions of government. Secondly, "all political controversy should be religiously eschewed while the war is in progress ... inequities do exist," but citizens should wait until after the war to do something about it. The opinion of the Fergus County Democrat was nearly identical: "Every domestic political controversy should, in all decency, be stilled while we make this life and death right for civilization and Christianity." 35

O. M. Lanstrum, the Republican nominee for U. S. Senator in 1918, spoke more harshly. He alleged that the farmers were patriotic and had just grievances and went on to say:

The leadership of this League is in dangerous hands ... a group of radical, selfish and demagogical Socialists with A. C. Townley at the head ... leading thousands of worthy citizens blindly into a morass of socialism ... Such doctrines ... are subversive of anything that conserves public good ... opposed to all principles on which this government was founded. The conduct of their leaders immediately before and after the beginning of the war was such as to expose them to charges of disloyalty. 36

The last sentence was apparently a selective application of the criteria for disloyalty. George Creel, the head of the Committee on Public Information and an important man in the Wilson administration, recalled the situation at the beginning of the war.

These beliefs (opinions against the war) ... were not particular to the Non-Partisan League, but were held by great groups of workers and farmers of the Western states. It was not a condition that should have caused any wonder. During the long period of America's neutrality, press and politicians alike were divided on the issues involved ... 37

The NPL was loyal in one sense, that of support for the government and national policy. But it was disloyal in that it "created" discontent and class conflict. The disloyalty of the NPL was in its adherence to the tenets of socialism. Its crime was to use those tenets successfully in challenging the established economic and political powers.
The established powers—the middle class—felt that socialism was an un-American concept imported from Europe, specifically Germany, whose culture was proven decadent by its recent atrocities against civilization. The NPL leaders were socialists, and as socialists they had opposed the war before America's entry. Many socialists were still anti-war, therefore, all socialists were anti-war, pro-German and disloyal. The existence of pro-war Socialists in the Wilson administration was conveniently ignored.

A Loyalty League publication, *The Montana Loyalist,* tied the leadership of the NPL to the anti-war socialists by questionable methods. It used a letter from Arthur LeSeur, an attorney for the NPL, to Bill Haywood, an IWW leader, in convicting Townley of sedition by ideological association. The stationery was marked with the logo of the People's College of Kansas. Eugene V. Debs was Chancellor of the college and LeSeur was also an officer. Debs was a Socialist Party leader under indictment for sedition. LeSeur was a socialist and connected to Debs. Townley was a socialist and connected to LeSeur. Therefore, Townley was as guilty of sedition as Debs and should be considered as such.

No effort was spared to identify the NPL leadership as socialist. They were equated with disloyalty in the same manner as the IWW was equated with German agents and saboteurs. The *Loyalist* also made much of the fact that the letter from LeSeur was to Bill Haywood of the IWW. This alone was considered sure indication of Townley's guilt. Neither the Montana Loyalty League or any other super patriots would allow a socialist to be loyal. George Creel, however, was not fooled by this posture.

What stood clear in my mind then, as it stands clear today, is that Democrats and Republicans alike feared the political power of the Non-Partisan League and did not want it to be given any reputation for loyalty. In plain words they preferred that the Non-Partisan League should be disloyal rather than loyal, in order that they might be provided with a campaign weapon.
The super patriots propagandized that all socialist organizations were dictatorships and the fifth column of German autocracy. By including the IWW in this category the middle class press developed a clever paradox, managing to state that anarchy and autocracy were one and the same.\textsuperscript{41}

The statements of George Creel and of the NPL leadership and press leave no doubt as to the official League position on the war. George Creel was unequivocal in his reflections on the situation.

I took him (Townley) to the President (Wilson) himself, and the interview removed every doubt as to the necessity of the war and the high purpose of America. And after that I took Mr. Townley to the office of Mr. Herbert Hoover (Federal Food Administration) and for three hours the two men fought out disputed points. When Mr. Townley left Washington he had not only pledged the full support of his organization to the war, but he had struck hands with Mr. Hoover and promised every cooperative effort. These pledges were kept . . . .

I am not familiar with the purposes of the Non-Partisan League. For all I know they may be good or they may be bad, but what I do know is that the League itself had a better war record than that of many organizations operating in the name of 100 percent patriotism . . . .\textsuperscript{42}

From the beginning of America’s entry into World War I, the League had supported increased war production.\textsuperscript{43} The war record of North Dakota, the League state, was excellent.\textsuperscript{44} On March 20, 1918, the League sent a telegram from its national headquarters at St. Paul, Minnesota, to President Wilson.

... endorse whole heartedly your statement of the war aims of the United States and unequivocally pledge you our united support until those aims are accomplished. . . .

We have urged all farmers and workers to keep up their splendid efforts at increased production and conservation of food supplies, and to generously support the Liberty Loans and all other war activities calculated to aid our boys at war.\textsuperscript{45}

Once they had been given a chance to speak to the ordinary citizen, the League was usually well received. R. B. Martin in a speech at Lewistown "referred to the people of Big Timber and Columbus and their refusal to let him speak, saying he had no censure for them. . . . (they) had misunderstood the situation. He told of his reception at Billings and of
his call to reappear in that city at an earlier date for another talk."46

The League was for 100 percent victory in the war, but had strong criticisms to make and A. C. Townley did not hesitate to make them.

It is absolute insanity for us to lead ourselves to believe that this nation can succeed in war when hundreds of thousands of parasites, the gamblers in the necessities of life, use the war only for the purpose of exacting exorbitant profits.

(We) demand that this nation take over . . . the railroads and the distribution of foods and kick the gamblers into the sea or send them to war so that when you gentlemen . . . shall produce an immense crop, you will be sure that crop will arrive at the camp where your boy is fighting for his country without your having to pay for it at that end four times what you received for it at this end. . . .

Is this treason?
Demanding a measure that will enable us to succeed in the war cannot be treason, can it?47

The Council for Defense of Montana was well aware of their problem. They could not openly repress a loyal political organization without creating ammunition against themselves for the League and its press. Repression was not unusual, but the governor worked to moderate this behavior. Additionally, attacking them on a purely political basis would not help. The NPL had the initiative.

The League had a set of solutions, a program to enact them, and the means to do so all placed at the disposal of the farmer (and the worker). If the loyalty and Americanism issue were dropped the conservatives would have no weapon against the League and its politics. The NPL could possibly repeat the North Dakota experience, a disaster for conservative politics. As it was, Montana conservatives were forced to enact progressive reform measures out of political and economic necessity.

Governor Stewart was intimately involved with this quandry. He had to uphold the law and yet he was definitely opposed to the politics of the NPL. All he could do was urge moderation and legal counter measures. He also prescribed the use of the law to the fullest extent if the NPL could be caught in a disloyal act.
On May 2, 1918, the governor wrote to J. B. Collins, chairman of the Custer County Council for Defense, in answer to Collins' telegram of the same date.

... I note what you say about the possible visit of McGlynn (NPL) to your city. I hardly know how to advise you in this matter as it is a very difficult proposition. My own idea is that these fellows should not be stopped from speaking as long as they do not utter sedition .... I do not think there is anything to be gained by violence. All I can tell you is that you should talk with McGlynn and warn him of the danger .... The State Council for Defense has never issued any orders against the Non-Partisan League ....

May 3, Collins replied:

On the 2nd inst. I wired you as follows: "It is rumored that McGlynn, organizer of the Nonpartisan League will be here to address our people on the 7th. Under existing feelings here we fear for his safety. Would respectfully ask that you use your influence to have him called off. We do not exaggerate conditions when we say the people of this section will not stand his presence. We are law abiding and want to uphold the law but in the present state of feelings, conditions are beyond our control."

In reply to the above I have your esteemed favor of the 2nd inst. and note same with interest. Your suggestion as to the best means of handling this individual is exactly what was done when he visited here April 7th last.49 No violence whatever was committed upon him, on the contrary, the action was done to prevent any violence being committed on him and to preserve his safety.50 (italics mine)

Collins was likely as dissatisfied with the governor's reply as was C. H. McLeod, chairman of the Council for Defense in Missoula who received this advice after he tried to pass the buck to the State Council for Defense on whether Townley should speak at Missoula.

... They (Council for Defense) all agree with me that there is no ground upon which we can forbid Mr. Townley, or any of the Non-Partisan League speakers, coming to Montana or speaking in the State. It is no doubt true that these people do stir up class hatred and strife ... Loyal citizens object to statements that insult their intelligence and patriotism, even though these statements do not go far enough to be seditious or unlawful. There will be no question about prosecutions if any of the speakers commit acts or give voice to unlawful or seditious sentiments ... I am sorry that I cannot give you any better advice on the subject but the fact remains, as a cold-blooded proposition, we have to right to assume that any speaker will be guilty of a violation of the law.51
The State Council for Defense would not take the responsibility for keeping Townley from speaking. The Missoula County Council for Defense had to find another means of preventing the meeting. They used a method employed often in North Dakota and Minnesota, denying the use of facilities that could accommodate a meeting.

The city of Missoula denied its park, the county commissioners said no to using the fairgrounds, and the State Education Board denied the University campus. Finally the NPL obtained permission from authorities at Fort Missoula to use their facilities. A telegram was sent to the United States Adjutant General in protest on the grounds that the speakers were "persons who have repeatedly evidenced their character as disturbers of the public mind in time of war." The telegram was signed by the Chairman of the Missoula Council for Defense, the mayor of Missoula, the sheriff and the president of the Missoula American Defense Society. Permission to use Fort Missoula was rescinded.

The "disturbers of the public mind" were Lynn J. Frazier, governor of North Dakota; Jeanette Rankin, U. S. Congresswoman from Montana; A. C. Townley, head of the Non-Partisan League. The meeting was finally held on July 16 on a ranch outside Missoula. The disturbing message delivered there was that the League was patriotic and also sought to eliminate industrial autocracy.

The authorities also kept close watch on the NPL for evidence of disloyalty or seditious talk as a matter of procedure. A Bozeman NPL picnic on July 15, 1918, featured, in addition to 3,000 farmers, the county attorney, and sheriff with a court reporter to copy the speeches. The Bozeman news source also mentioned that "special efforts to make it a patriotic rally were made." He implied that the patriotism was a facade and the presence of the officials was the real proof of disloyalty.
The State Council did not stay completely aloof from this struggle. The *Producer's News*, an NPL newspaper, discussed the political attitude of the State Council for Defense with respect to the NPL and suspected strongly that the Council for Defense was hostile. At the instigation of the Montana Employers Association, the Council was organizing a Bureau of Information to "combat NPL and labor propaganda".56

No matter how often the League professed its patriotism and behaved in every way patriotically, the super-patriots of the middle class and the Council for Defense did not let up their campaign against them. Presumably, after the war was over the patriotism issue would become a moot point. Being loyal or disloyal could not be relevant if there was no Cause.

But the super patriots had no other effective weapon against the NPL. Their tactics did not change. They simply expanded the range of their accusations. A later Montana Loyalty League publication outlined the program of the NPL for the public.

A. State ownership of farms
B. Patriotism unnecessary
C. Fight Christianity
D. Abolish marriage
E. Promote revolution (implied violent means)

All five points were categorically false. At the same time the Loyalty League stated that it "will not criticise the farmers who compose the NPL" and "... will heartily cooperate with every farmer and labor organization whose object is not Socialism."57

The end of World War I brought a decrease in super-patriotic behavior in Montana. Relief campaigns to aid the victims of the conflict could not bring public emotion to a fever pitch. People began assessing their situation in more local, immediate terms. But the damage had already been done. Socialists had been successfully smeared as un-American and the
seeds of distrust planted. The general public was less tolerant of radical politics and super-patriotic propaganda was still credible. The Montana gubernatorial election of 1920 would be fought (and won) by conservatives on the issue of "Americanism vs. State Socialism". Meanwhile, the citizens whose super-patriotic behavior was more due to war fever turned to personal interests, leaving super-patriotism to those with other motives.
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Chapter VI

CHARYBDIS, THE INNOCENTS AND SCYLLA

This country is to be a nation, not a polyglot boarding house.
T. Roosevelt

There are a lot of people who are not willing to sacrifice their rights for the conquering of our enemies.
C. H. McLeod

I can't feed my pigs and chickens.
Ted Stevens

The year 1918 was filled with paradoxes for Montana. Men destroyed democracy and civil liberties in order to save them. Men lied and slandered to protect Christianity. Farmers became radicals and the most extreme radicals were on their best behavior. Conformism was enforced in the name of freedom. Businessmen branded the Industrial Workers of the World as dangerous criminals, while workers and farmers saw businessmen as criminals, the "I Want Wealth Wobblies". Men persecuted their allies more thoroughly than their enemies. The formerly strong suddenly were rendered weak. The rule of law was surrendered to the mob, and the rabble was composed of and led by the "best" of the community. The highest political officer of the state gave protection to those who were the most dangerous to his way of life while tacitly approving the persecution of those who were least dangerous. Men asked for protection and were delivered into the hands of their persecutors. The lower classes lived in poverty, while the middle classes were prospering as never before. One American class fought another American class with the political rhetoric that class politics was un-American.
These were but a few of the strange contradictions that arose. The period was indeed complex. But tools exist to unravel the tangle of rhetoric and behavior. With these tools even the irrational can be understood in an overall sense.

One of these tools is class identification. The other is Hofstader's dynamic of status politics and interest (economic) politics. Hofstader says that:

... in times of depression and economic discontent--and by and large in times of acute national emergency--politics is more clearly a matter of interests, although... status considerations are still present. In times of prosperity and general well-being in the national plane, status considerations among the masses can become much more influential in our politics.²

I.e., one of the two conditions will be more dominant at any one time in American political history. I submit that although this analysis is correct, World War I in Montana constitutes a qualified exception to this guideline.

In 1918 Montana both political modes were dominant in the minds of the public. This reads as a contradiction until the tool of class identification is taken into account. There is an opportunity for two antithetical modes to be dominant simultaneously because there were two classes, the lower and the middle. For the middle class, status politics were the motivating factor, while for the lower class, interest politics were of greatest importance.

One must realize that periods of economic unrest may or may not extend across class lines as did the Great Depression. In any event, the higher classes will feel an economic decline much less seriously than the lower classes. Additionally, the middle class was mostly Anglo-Saxon, Protestant and other Northern Europeans who had internalized their values. Anglo-Saxons tend more to status politics when they are losing their position in society.³ That loss is relative. The lower class may move up,
causing the Anglo-Saxon Protestant to lose position, or the Anglo-Saxon Protestant may move down, creating the same effect. The latter may explain the ambivalent reaction of the lower middle classes, especially those most economically dependent on the lower classes, the petit bourgeois. A few would go over to the radicals and turn to economic politics while most would stay with status politics. The reason for the dichotomy of types of politics is that both prosperity and poverty were increasing in Montana at this time. World War I was a tremendous stimulant to production and prices rose significantly in lumber, metals, coal and farm products. All of these were Montana exports. Corporations were making record profits and even small businesses were often making as much profit in one war year as they had in the ten previous.

But the "trickledown" effect was not working. Workers were given minimal pay raises which were not enough to keep up with inflation. Companies wanted more production and working conditions declined. The scarcity of labor did little good for workers when employers would not hesitate to lynch labor organizers, or to use federal troops to break strikes as was done. Militant organizing activity was suppressed by the loyalty issue and worker unity necessary to strikes was not present. In any event, idle men could be forced to work under State Council for Defense Order No. 2, which prescribed that each able-bodied man do at least eight hours of work, five days a week. The local councils could even decide that some occupations were nonessential and place men elsewhere. Terrorism and labor weakness kept metal, coal and lumber workers cowed and as low paid as ever. Meanwhile, troublesome radicals were making sure that workers were aware that this was a period of great prosperity, at least for their employers.

The lower class farmer's basic situation was the same for different reasons. They were self-employed and did not sell their labor to an employer,
but sold products in the market system. That system "farmed" farmers so well that good years often left them deeper in debt. Farmers did not expect to get rich on 640 acres, but they did expect a fair return for their investment of labor and capital. The farmers had suspicions near to certainty that they were being cheated. All that was needed was an organization to channel this discontent into action.

Then came the drought. For many farmers, chances of recovering economically became nil. A political solution was their only hope. The story of the NPL in Montana might have been different without the drought and the war. While the drought undoubtedly accelerated the rapid increase in membership, it also siphoned off many members after they were ruined economically. Without an immediate victory, which the NPL did not obtain, they could not be saved and were lost to the NPL and to Montana.

Both political modes, status and interest, were dominant at the same time, but within different classes. This is one reason why there seemed so little middle ground between the middle class and the radicals. When they infrequently spoke to one another, a lack of understanding was obvious. The priorities and concerns of the ruling class were entirely out of synch with those of the lower classes. The lower classes were talking bread and butter, while the middle classes were concerned with patriotism and nationalism and retention of their social position in the face of a radical threat.

The middle class had been concerned with the new and "foreign" character of the immigration previous to the war. Also, powerful new ideas were being promulgated in the wake of the abuses of capitalism. Progressives and radicals both had unsettled the system and altered old political balances. The economic program of the radicals was an unknown. While the program of the NPL was quite moderate, in fact conservative with regard
to farmer-capitalism, the opposition created in it the threat of disloyal and anarchist Bolsheviks taking over state government.

On the whole, I do not believe that the super patriots were Machiavellian in their use of disloyalty charges against the socialists. While certainly some, such as large corporations or speculators, had a definite economic interest in suppression of the radicals, most super patriots believed in what they did. Many participated in the hysteria of the moment. But within the super-patriot ranks was a group of true believers. Their beliefs and the extreme and constant form of their activity placed them under the definition of the pseudo-conservative.

The exaggerated fears of the pseudo-conservative were real in one sense. The radicals did intend to change old economic and political relationships, and thusly social relationships, but nothing even close to the wild rhetoric of the pseudo-conservative. The rhetoric of the pseudo-conservative (pervasive, consistent and sensational) was so powerful if only because it was loud. The middle class press devoted itself to excommunication of radicals, the disloyal and "foreign" and un-American influences, all of whom were usually the same people or organizations. The pseudo-conservatives were able to mobilize public opinion behind themselves. Once they had support they could do "what is right" and the law be damned. If a member of the general public opposed the pseudo-conservatives or their tactics, charges of disloyalty could be leveled against him until the "slacker" or traitor came to his senses and joined the majority.

It is important to remember that the ranks of the psuedo-conservatives were not so great as they seemed, but were swelled by well-meaning citizens trying to go along with the loyal "American" program. A few psuedo-conservatives with some basis for their rhetoric were enough at a time of national stress. The combination of psuedo-conservatives with
loyal citizens formed the super patriotic groups. The ranks of the super patriots would swell and decline with the tide of hysteria or need for patriotic expression. Remember that behavior is all that is necessary to be a super patriot. This definition could include the psuedo-conservative, the cynic acting for advantage or the citizen who could find no acceptable alternative to the psuedo-conservative program. But it is the psuedo-conservative who consistently acts like a super patriot.

The war was the key to the effectiveness of the psuedo-conservative. The public had a real enemy in Germany that the psuedo-conservatives could point to and internal allies', the immigrant and radical, who were similarly identified as enemies. The World War I psuedo-conservative followed the pattern of seeing the United States as dominant and invincible on the international scene but riddled with treason and dangerously weak internally. Helped by official nationalistic propaganda, the psuedo-conservative was able to generate a patriotic fervor that bordered on fanaticism. Without such a real issue as the war, the psuedo-conservative-super patriot would not have been so effective. The war did not create the psuedo-conservative. He was there all the time, but not necessarily credible or dominant. The war gave the psuedo-conservatives a viable issue, one which could be used to form public opinion.

Also, there was ample financing for super-patriot organizations and anti-radical material was made available both to organizations that wanted it and the press in quantity. That political opportunists were using the war issue to destroy radical activity is a definite possibility. Many coincidences besides financing point to political motivations directing the anti-radical activity. One of these was the rise and fall in Montana of the intensity of the super-patriot activity. From the legitimation of the Council for Defense (in February 1918 to July 1918) was
the most intense period of super-patriot activity. Once the primary elections were over it fell off. It increased again just prior to the November elections of 1918.

The pseudo-conservative was not the type to stop and start in this fashion, but would keep up intense activity. But he could only sustain in most active repression if he had public support. If the press reduced the number and intensity of articles on radicals, attention to the radical threat would subside. The psuedo-conservative would not have the necessary support to consistently behave at his most extreme. Wherever the press or public supported the radicals, psuedo-conservative and super-patriotic activity was almost non-existent.

The majority of the support for the psuedo-conservative seems to have been conservatives of both major parties. While conservatives would help against radicals like the IWW, they were more careful about the NPL. The IWW could not help or hurt much politically since it was an economic organization, but the NPL was well established in many counties. Conservative men like Governor Stewart insisted that the law be followed in reference to the NPL, while offering tacit approval of lynching where the IWW was concerned. This and other factors left the IWW open to vigorous prosecution. Public opinion, which had turned the tide in their favor in the Missoula Free Speech Fight was now totally with the super patriots. Except where the IWW had popular support, such as in Mineral County, they were easily neutralized or driven underground.

One other aspect of the psuedo-conservative and super patriot is good indication that they were not mere cynical opportunists. Their treatment of loyal citizens other than radicals was perhaps the tragedy of the period. This is the point at which those with economic or political motivations stopped.
The German-speaking population of Montana fared badly under super-patriotic prosecution. The activities of the super patriots knew few bounds and incited by the irrational fears of the pseudo-conservative, the super-patriot attacked German immigrants even though they were loyal and strongly supported the super-patriot's class position. These German-Russian and Mennonite immigrants were not radicals or malcontents.\(^9\)

The German-Russians and Mennonites were identifiable by the pseudo-conservative as "enemy aliens". The pseudo-conservatives' drive for conformism inevitably led them to persecute the German-speaking community. The immigrants' quandary was particularly serious because they could not organize against the super-patriot mobs. They approved of middle class standards and did not belong to the radical camp. State of mind was as important an element in determining class position as wealth or profession. The German-Russians were farmers, small scale capitalists, and Northern European Protestants. These aspirations left them vulnerable to super-patriot activities. They could not resist individually or organize to resist that which they wished to be—that which they had already accepted as good and right. Their inability to act united in the face of persecution as an ethnic group left them few alternatives. All they could do was petition an implacable Council for Defense for protection from mobs of whom local authorities were a part. Typically, the petitioners received the advice that their complaints would be handled on the local level. If they continued as they were they would be intimidated and harassed continually by super-patriot mobs. The only alternative was to abandon completely their previous identity and heritage, wrap themselves in the American flag, and participate in an orgiastic display of conformist patriotism. For them there was no middle ground. They had a choice between the straitjacket of Americanism or continuing persecution.
Only a few of these groups possessed the solidarity to retain their identity and create a viable alternative. Mennonites had endured numerous persecutions before. They had immigrated throughout Europe in search of religious freedom before coming to America. All this time their devout religious convictions had held them together. Religious devotion and family unity provided community strength. From this strength the Mennonites of Chinook, 700 families strong, left their farms in Montana for peace in Canada.\textsuperscript{10}

Of the super patriots who persecuted the German-speaking immigrants, probably only a few were psuedo-conservatives. They gained the attention and leadership of the middle class. Once they were strong they attacked any element of society they saw as unfit and that did not unquestionably conform to their standards. The extreme sensitivity to criticism of the Council for Defense is further evidence that it was largely populated by psuedo-conservatives. Men like Governor Stewart who could admit that criticisms might be valid were not psuedo-conservatives. They were among the conservative allies of the psuedo-conservatives who used the psuedo-conservatives as their shock troops for political advantage. The governor was often dismayed at the unfortunate excesses that occurred, but persons like W. A. Campbell and S. D. Greenfield, and Sidney Logan were usually disappointed that those excesses did not occur more often.

If the loyal German-speaking middle class was the acid test for the psuedo-conservatives and their special brand of patriotism (i.e., hatred) the NPL was the test of the conservative Council for Defense faction. Where the NPL was weak, they allowed the psuedo-conservatives to organize and direct super-patriotic activity in suppression. Where the NPL was strong, conservatives afforded it at least the minimal protection of the law while simultaneously trying to undermine the league and gain its political support.
The conservatives thought themselves as much in the "right" as the pseudo-conservatives, but there was an important difference. In their more lucid moments they were able to detect the paradoxes which were developing. They did not have the same disregard for American traditions, especially democratic traditions, that the pseudo conservatives did. They were willing to compromise and even risk political losses in order to conserve those traditions. Part of the reason for this was surely that their major opposition was farmers, and they not only were generally from a rural background themselves, but realized that the farmers did have a genuine problem, especially with respect to the drought.

Restraining the pseudo-conservatives and the super patriots in places where they were strong proved difficult. Once they had been allowed to dominate the public mind and had obtained powerful positions on the Council for Defense they were often unmanageable. This condition was all the more serious because the Montana Council for Defense was a parallel government of nearly unlimited power. These men were not accountable for actions which affected the whole social structure of Montana.

One of the richest paradoxes of the time was one that neither pseudo-conservatives, progressives or conservatives could see, or perhaps they were unwilling to see. They were so deeply involved that it was not readily apparent. W. F. Dunne placed the paradox in full view in two editorials when he labeled the Council for Defense the "tool" of big business. After the second editorial the State Council for Defense was literally enraged. The Council for Defense subpoenaed him on the first slight pretext so that he could be interrogated. W. F. Dunne with typical boldness, used the opportunity to interrogate the Council for Defense, but in the process explained what he meant in saying they were in the service of big business:
... when I say that a man is a tool of a corporation ... I mean that his feelings are such that he believes honestly and sincerely that the support of the corporation is for his best interests as well as the best interests of his community.13

The State Council did not rebut Dunne, for what he said was true. What they did not understand was how Dunne could argue against their position.

One of the charges most used against the radicals was that no class should take the functions of government to itself, and that they stirred up discontent. But the discontent was present before the radicals came, and the single greatest reason for discontent was the political dominance of the middle class and their laissez faire socio-economic values. During 1917 and 1918 the Montana Council for Defense was the ultimate expression of government of the people by a class and for a class.
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## THE COUNCIL PROFILES

### State Council for Defense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Yr. of Birth</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
<th>Wealth</th>
<th>Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. V. Stewart b. 1872</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state elect</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
<td>director of banks</td>
<td>Protestant Mason, Elks Montana Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>state elect local elect party office</td>
<td></td>
<td>(corporate) banks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. E. Holter b. 1868</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>urban Western</td>
<td>college</td>
<td></td>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>real estate flour mills</td>
<td>Protestant Mason, Elks Commercial Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Campbell b. 1881</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>urban Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td></td>
<td>journalist</td>
<td>real estate 1087 acre farm</td>
<td>Protestant Mason, Elks Commercial Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic Elks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. T. Lease b. 1865</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>telegraph school self-educated</td>
<td>contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td>prosperous gets gov't. contracts</td>
<td>Mason, Elks Shriner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. M. Logan</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>law education</td>
<td>state appt. local elect</td>
<td>attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant Elks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. E. Edwards</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state elect party office</td>
<td>farmer stockman</td>
<td>bank pres. director of 4 banks utilities</td>
<td>Protestant Elks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. White</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Eastern</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state elect state appt</td>
<td>farmer attorney</td>
<td>3400 acres 7000 sheep $30,000 bldgs on ranch</td>
<td>Protestant Mason, Elks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Yr. of Birth</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. C. Elliot</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state elect</td>
<td>Chancellor of University of Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Sansburn</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>state elect</td>
<td>farmer</td>
<td>prosperous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. V. Peck</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>state elect</td>
<td>farmer</td>
<td>4000 acre ranch Mason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. D. Greenfield b. 1857</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>urban Eastern</td>
<td>law clerk</td>
<td>state elect</td>
<td>journalist</td>
<td>father owned shipyard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. D. O'Donnell b. 1860</td>
<td>N. Eur (Canadian) Rural Midwest</td>
<td>public schools form or technology writer</td>
<td>state appt.</td>
<td>farmer</td>
<td>bank director sugar beets 640 irrigated acres Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. M. Donohue b. 1867</td>
<td>N. Eur born in Am. East and Ireland</td>
<td>parochial school in Ireland</td>
<td>Pres. Montana Federation of Labor</td>
<td>labor leader plumber</td>
<td>Catholic Moose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. T. B. Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pres. Mont. Federation of Women's Clubs</td>
<td>husband probably involved in merchandise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Yr. of Birth</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beaverhead County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Gilbert</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>local elect</td>
<td>banker</td>
<td>cashier of bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pres. Mont. Teachers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant Shriner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. T. Paul</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state elect</td>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>banking mining livestock land, oil</td>
<td>Mason Shriner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>state appt.</td>
<td>rancher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>local elect</td>
<td>banker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carter County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Connelly</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>local elect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. A. Dahl b. 1889</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>apprentice</td>
<td>printer self-taught</td>
<td>editor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. S. Einsel</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state elect</td>
<td>banker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>speculator</td>
<td>bank officer</td>
<td>real estate newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deer Lodge County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. J. Bowman</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>local elect</td>
<td>banker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pres. Daly Bank and Trust Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. F. Murphy</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>local elect</td>
<td>railroad superintendent</td>
<td>real estate</td>
<td>Catholic Elks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Yr. of Birth</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Lodge County, Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. P. Wellcome 1860</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>high school local elect self-taught</td>
<td>real estate insurance</td>
<td>city property coal co. pres. real estate and loan co.</td>
<td>Elks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. M. Durfee 1855</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>private school local elect law clerk</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
<td>Catholic Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. A. Hannah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. J. Mershon 1865</td>
<td>rural Midwest electrical worker</td>
<td>state elect power plant superintendent</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. M. Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. F. Clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. F. B. Bogardus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. J. Coffee 1863</td>
<td>N. Eur rural Midwest college state appt. party office pharmacist vice pres. of bank pres. of drug store</td>
<td>Mason, Elk Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Yr. of Birth</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula County, Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert McLeod, b. 1859</td>
<td>N. Eur (Canadian) East</td>
<td>public school</td>
<td>self-taught</td>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>banking merchandise utilities</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Scearce, b. 1877</td>
<td>N. Eur Midwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>farm mercantile store grain elevators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prairie County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W. G. Armstrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Brubaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. E. Kempton, b. 1870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sheridan County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sid Bennet, b. 1878</th>
<th>N. Eur Canada</th>
<th>high school local elect local appt.</th>
<th>real estate real estate lumber co. farming utilities</th>
<th>Mason Shriner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. M. Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. D. Matkin</td>
<td>N. Eur Midwest</td>
<td>self-taught local elect</td>
<td>farmer</td>
<td>owns 5½ sections--leases Mason land vice pres. of merchantile co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Yr. of Birth</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Bow County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. A. Bigelow</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td></td>
<td>college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Carroll</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>urban Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. Davis, Jr. b. 1863</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td></td>
<td>college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toole County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. T. L. Clark</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state elect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. G. Henderson b. 1880</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>local elect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. H. Sands b. 1883</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>local elect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Yr. of Birth</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. G. Johnson 1917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. A. Marlow 1861</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>party office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. B. Miller 1861</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>party office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. L. Varney 1917-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Involved Citizens of L and C County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Wealth</th>
<th>Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John G. Brown</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state appt. lawyer</td>
<td>attorney for railroad and insurance cos. oil cos. and banks</td>
<td>Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Special Attorney to State CD-- censor of pro-German literature)</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. C. Day</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state elect lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant Mason, Elks Montana Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chmn. CD Spkrs. Bureau-- State Chmn. Red Cross and YMCA Funds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>local elect fed appt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lewis and Clark County: A Local Sample, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Yr. of Birth</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
<th>Wealth</th>
<th>Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involved Citizens of L and C County, Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Goza (Chmn, Food Administra- tion and Relief Organizations)</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>insurance</td>
<td>general agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. M. Lanstrum (Active in fund raising and speaking)</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>state elect</td>
<td>doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester Loble (County attorney and on many fund raising committees)</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>local elect</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. McNemee (GD Speaker and fund raiser)</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>local elect</td>
<td>pastor, First Baptist Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1918 County Fuel Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
<th>Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. W. Copenhaver</td>
<td>doctor</td>
<td>Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. E. Pew</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
<td>Mason, Elks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. P. Wood</td>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1918 County Liberty Loan Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
<th>Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. R. Cunningham (President)</td>
<td>state elect</td>
<td>Protestant Mason, Elks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Boyer (Secretary)</td>
<td>life insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
<th>Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lewis and Clark County: A Local Sample, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Year</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
<th>Wealth</th>
<th>Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918 County Liberty Loan Committee, Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Campbell (see data under State Council for Defense above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. C. Day (see data under Involved Citizens of L and C County above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S. Gunn</td>
<td>N. Eur</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>attorney</td>
<td>2 ranches</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>Elks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. M. Lanstrum (see data under Involved Citizens of L and C County above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. A. Marlow (see data under County Council for Defense above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. McKennan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. H. Pickett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key to Charts

Culture -- is either N. Eur (Northern European) or other.

Background -- either rural or urban
    and West, Midwest, Eastern, Southern or a country.

Education -- the best indicator of the highest level attained.

Offices -- state or local elective
    state or local appointive
    or party office if the individual has held one of these.

Vocation -- best indication without regard to other interests. Other
    interests are an indicator of wealth. (See below.)

Wealth -- an office held in a bank, corporation, etc., means that the
    individual has money invested. Other mention is of money
    invested in an enterprise such as banking, mining, etc.

Associations -- religion, whether Protestant, Catholic or other;
    fraternal organizations, it is only important to know
    that these men belong to similar organizations.

All sources for the charts are listed in the biography section of the
bibliography. Also consulted were E. I. Polk and Co. Gazetteer for
Montana, North Dakota and Minnesota, 1917-1920; and E. I Polk and Co.
City Directories, 1912-1920, for Missoula, Helena, Dillon, Anaconda
and Butte.
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