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CHAPTER 1
Their Contemporaries

In 1889 the territory of Montana was admitted to the Union as the forty-first state. With this act Montana now had to concern herself with the elections of public officials and the selection of a location for the capital. For the next twelve years these political issues would provide the battleground for two men, fighting for supremacy in the state; two men having contributed considerably to the development of Montana (prior to 1889) would now subject her to twelve years of political corruption. William Andrew Clark, a migrant from Pennsylvania, craved the power which would be his if he were to become the senator from Montana. In opposition stood Marcus Daly, an immigrant from Ireland, who sought not the limelight and glory of public office, but the control of the politicians who did.

Prior to 1888 Clark and Daly had been partners in various business enterprises. There was no visible rift between them, but on the occasion of the 1888 elections for territorial delegate to Congress, Daly suddenly swung his support from Clark, a Democrat, to Thomas Carter, a Republican. This last minute crossing of party lines made victory possible for Carter. Clark, realizing the reason for his defeat, was now more determined than ever to become "Senator Clark". The antagonism which arose between Clark and Daly caused both men to fight tooth and nail committing thousands of dollars to a fight
which included, bribes, mudslinging, threats and counter threats. Only the death of Marcus Daly brought an end to the controversy.

What kind of men would change from partners to bitter enemies in a matter of days? It was not an ordinary brawl but a fight to the death in which there could be but one winner. In fact, how did the fight end? Did either participant win?

In trying to answer these questions, I will study the personality of each man. I will refer to the comments which their contemporaries and historians have made. Reflecting on these sources together with letters written by each man, and words spoken by them, I will formulate my opinion concerning these two Montana Pioneers. Following my evaluation of each man, I will discuss whether Clark and/or Daly were able to fulfill their life's ambitions before their deaths.

Their contemporaries provide us with views formulated during the lifetimes of Clark and Daly. These reporters either knew them or knew of them. Those who knew Clark and Daly by reputation alone, present us with a study reflecting the general attitudes of the population towards each man. Friends of Clark and Daly give us their personal feelings which provide insight to the two men themselves.

In reading their contemporaries, one must remember that their thoughts show Clark and Daly as they stood at a particular time in their lives. Contemporaries have prejudices and

---

In the year following Marcus Daly's death his widow had many of his records and much of his correspondence burned. The primary material on Daly is therefore limited.
recognizing them, so we are not blindly led, we can gain much from them.

A man who knew William Clark and Marcus Daly was C. P. Connolly. He has handed down to us descriptions of both Clark and Daly. Concerning Clark he said:

an undersized man wiry of figure and rather delicately built, fond of art, judge of good pictures and a student, studied law, spoke French, traveled much, loved flattery and adulation of women...his intelligence would have won him respect had it not been offset by a cold and treacherous temperament and a certain narrowness and selfishness.  

Daly, he describes as

a splendid, full rounded head topped a well knit body. His eye was marvelously clear and his voice, in conversation was low and mellow. His feet were small and his hands despite the hardships of his early life were delicate and shapely as a woman.

Connolly obviously favored Daly. This is not surprising since Connolly was a friend of Daly. Once at a Daly banquet, following the 1895 Senate elections, Connolly had the honor of serving as toastmaster. On that occasion Connolly toasted all the members of the Legislature who returned home poor, considering that they had rejected Clark's bribes.  

Clark did attempt to bribe members of the Legislature, a fact which can be proven. People who participated in the Legislatures in the 1890's were poorly paid, but following the 1895

---

2 C. P. Connolly, "The Story of Montana", McClures Magazine XXVII (September 1906), 453.
3 Ibid., 455.
elections several members who had abruptly switched to Clark's side, returned home several thousand dollars richer. What about the bribes Daly offered? Connolly, in his work, confirmed that Daly did resort to bribery. Connolly however points out that Daly was not caught and insinuates that due to this reason one cannot denounce him.\(^5\)

As he progresses in his discussion, Connolly compares Daly and his habit of walking among the miners, with Clark who remained aloof. This statement is probably true but alone it is misleading. One must remember that Daly came to Butte in 1876 as a miner so it would have been easy for him to talk to miners. On the other hand, Clark had come to Butte as a banker. He was never a miner. For Clark to cross class lines would have been difficult.

In reading Connolly's article one cannot avoid recognizing his prejudices against Clark. He attacked Clark, claiming that Clark lacked the energy, the magnetism, and the wit possessed by Daly. Even when he credited Clark with the quality of never being a quitter his description is not one of praise. Of Clark Connolly said that, "He was a man of quiet earnest persistence and when forced to the wall rarely gave up the struggle without showing fighting teeth and leaving a trail of havoc."\(^6\) This statement does describe someone who never gives up, but it also describes a ruthless man.

\(^5\) Connolly, "The Story of Montana", McClures Magazine XXVII (September 1906), 455.
\(^6\) Ibid., 456
There can be a distinct difference between the two but in Clark's case Connolly makes no such distinction.

Connolly talked about both Clark and Daly in his work, and he sees Daly as friendly and clever while he considers Clark to be cold and treacherous. Connolly's stand, however, was common during the 1890's. Most people in this period were either in Daly's camp or Clark's, and the hatred between these factions was immense.

Another man, who found himself vigorously defending one of these camps, was P. A. O'Farrell. His work, *Butte Its Copper Mines and Copper Kings*, is very negative towards Daly. O'Farrell placed the blame for the entire feud on Daly's shoulders. He said Daly bribes forced Clark to resort to the same tactics. The initial blame is Daly's, though not the complete blame. Concerning the 1888 elections for territorial delegates to Congress there are no reports showing that Clark used bribes however the records clearly show that Daly did.\(^7\) Daly did initiate the bribes but that does not absolve Clark who used the same method when he retaliated.

O'Farrell continued his treatment of Daly by accusing him of supporting Anaconda in the capital fight so he could increase his financial holdings. He said that Daly wanted to sell Anaconda to the Rothschilds and that a state capital

---

\(^7\) Kenneth Ross Toole in "A Study of Business in Politics" (M.A. Thesis, Montana State University, 1948) and in "The Genesis of the Clark-Daly Feud", Montana, The Magazine of Western History (April 1951) and H. Shoebottom in Anaconda, Life of Marcus Daly, The Copper King (Harrisburg, PA., 1956) both say that Daly coerced and bribed, by means of whiskey, his workers to vote for Carter.
might attract them.8 This accusation is questionable for no one else had made the same statement. Besides, Anaconda was Daly's city and it was still growing. As long as it prospered it reflected Daly's greatness. If Anaconda had won the capital fight Daly would have been "the man" in Montana, both in power and money. Why would he give it up? Financially he did not need the money he would have gained from the sale of Anaconda. When he finally did sell in 1898, it was only after it became apparent that Anaconda was destined to be merely a smelter town. Her days of unlimited prosperity had drawn to a close.

Near the end of his discussion on Daly, O'Farrell referred to the merger between Daly and the Standard Oil Company. Following this merger he saw Daly as a mere agent serving the whims of Standard Oil. I think this particular issue is supposed to produce a comparison between Daly and Clark. Clark had avoided trusts and mergers. Clark remained in strict control of his interests. Because Daly did not he was condemned.

O'Farrell, like Connolly, did not distribute the guilt of the corruption. The guilt must be shared equally by both Clark and Daly. O'Farrell and Connolly provide a good comparison. Both men vigorously supported their side and both carried this support to extremes. Was any man able to examine Clark and Daly impartially?

One man who attempted to was Jerre C. Murphy. He gave an objective evaluation of each man in *The Comical History of Montana*. He called both men "very extraordinary". Truer words have seldom been spoken. Both men entered Montana with little, but in time they built their own fortunes along with the fortunes of Montana. Clark built Butte and Daly built Anaconda. Truly, these men were unique.

Continuing in his comparison he said:

> The virtues and faults of both have been grossly exaggerated by the friends or enemies of each in consequence of the long continued warfare in which the public press and the ordinary as well as the extraordinary mediums of publicity became mere weapons in the fray.

The earlier presentation on the views of Connolly and O'Farrell indicates the validity of the first part of the quote. In respect to the second part of the quote, as the feud progressed, Daly and Clark bought as many newspapers as possible to carry on their fight. These newspapers became tools for each man and in the feud this media lost its credibility as it participated in acts of mudslinging.

In his work Murphy sympathized with Clark. He presented Clark as a victim of Daly's malice. He also mentioned that Clark refrained from becoming involved in trusts while Daly merged with Standard Oil. At the same time Murphy does not abstain from pointing to Clark's questionable acts. He reminds the reader that the Congressional investigating committee

---

10 Ibid., 22.
(who investigated the legitimacy of Clark's 1898 election) had little praise for either Clark or Daly but it did voice much condemnation of them. Of all the contemporaries of Clark and Daly whom I have studied Murphy presents the fairest view. He considers their constructive contributions to Montana as well as their destructive influence. He did blame Daly for initiating the fight but he did not condone Clark's illegal reactions. Others treat Daly and Clark equally but they consider only the positive or the negative contributions of each man. Only Murphy looks at both aspects jointly.

Senator Thomas Walsh looked at Clark and Daly in relation to their political escapades. While Senator Walsh found himself siding with either Clark or Daly on several occasions, it was always the issue which determined his stand. Generally speaking however he held both men in disdain. He said, "Clark and Daly saw the institutions of Montana as instruments in their campaign for personal primacy." Senator Walsh dealt with both men purely on the political scene when both were engaged in their share of corruption. There, he saw both men as detrimental to Montana. When he made this statement he was only thinking about the present (1890's) and at that time Clark and Daly were definitely hurting Montana. Their positive contributions were past history to Walsh, a man who spoke of the present.

While Walsh talked about them when they were at their zenith of corruption, J. A. MacKnight viewed Daly and Clark at the high point of their contributions. He looked solely at their positive contributions to Montana. To him Clark was the builder of Butte. A man who had an interest in Butte's electric street railroad, electric light company, water works, telegraph lines connecting Butte with the Canadian Pacific System and the "Butte Miner" (Clark's newspaper). Just twenty-six miles from Clark and Butte, MacKnight surveyed Daly and his city, Anaconda. He talked of its fine hotel, its smelter, its electric cars, its splendid lighting, its pure water and its law and order.

This work is very important for it reminds us of the positive side of Clark and Daly. Too often people tend to look only at their involvement in politics, condemning one or both, and forget their positive achievements.

Another important contemporary to be considered is Bryon E. Cooney, the editor of "The Montana American" (a Butte newspaper), and a friend of Clark. Newspapers of the time should not be considered objective sources due to the fact that almost all of them were owned by either a Daly or Clark faction and they all practiced mudslinging at its best. The following article has been included because it was written in 1925, more than two decades after the fight had ended and by

13 Ibid., 77 - 78.
that time the mudslinging was over. The article was written shortly after Clark’s death and therefore excesses of glorification must be avoided. One such example is Cooney’s claim that Clark always walked the streets socializing with the miners. Cooney stands alone with this claim and it is doubtful that Clark did this regularly, if he did it at all. No other person made this claim. In fact most said Clark remained detached from the miners.

More importantly, Cooney does mention things which Clark did do. He said that Clark believed in philanthropy for such public causes as the Columbia Gardens and the Paul Clark Home. Clark built the Columbia Gardens for the people of Butte. Cooney quotes Clark as saying, "The Columbia Gardens is my monument, of my many business enterprises it is the one I love best and it is practically the only one on which I lose money." 14 Cooney claimed that Clark wanted to live on in the hearts of people after he died and the Gardens, along with the Paul Clark Home, an orphanage named for his son, would do this. The man Bryon Cooney interviewed was the man who in 1901 had gained his sole obsession, a Senatorship. Now Clark just wanted to be remembered by the people for his philanthropy. In addition to the Gardens and the Home Cooney also referred to Clark’s art collection. A superb collection Clark supposedly accumulated for Americans. 15 This article almost canonizes

14 The Montana American, March 6, 1925, 8. A copy may be found at the Montana Historical Society Library, Helena, Montana. It is in a large manila envelope numbered B/C54 and titled Clark, William A..

15 The Montana American, March 6, 1925, 8. Ibid.
Clark but it does show that Clark possessed warmth and spent money for other people. Clark might have spent thousands illegally in his quest for a seat in the Senate but he also gave money to help provide for those less fortunate than he.

Other contemporary articles have not been considered because their bias is obvious. Lacking objectivity, they tend only to glorify or damn either Clark or Daly. For example an article by F. W. Wells on Clark appeared in the Idaho Magazine (January 1904) and it raved about Clark's perfect life, including his marriage. It failed, however, to mention that he had separated from his wife several years preceding her death. In 1904 Clark was a member of the Irrigation Commission and Idaho needed the Commission's support so it went after Clark with flattery. It was difficult to separate fact from fiction in these articles.

From this survey of their contemporaries emerges a feeling for the times in which Daly and Clark lived and for the view which contemporaries had of them. Reactions to both men that were recorded before the feud, during the feud and in Clark's case, after the feud have been examined. From this I was shown that the times influence the reactions of people. Both men were praised prior to the feud when Montanans knew them as the builders of Montana. A few years later, when they were both deeply involved in the fight, they were damned by some, praised by others and impartially criticized by a few.

One obstacle I faced in my study was the fact that Daly was not alive following the feud. It was his death which ended
it. For this reason post-feud commentaries of Daly, like Cooney's article on Clark, are nonexistent. Our last look at Daly shows him involved in corruption.\textsuperscript{16} On the other hand our last glance at Clark found him helping others. The historians will help clear away this obstacle by analyzing each man's entire life before they return their verdict. From the historian an analysis is needed which surveys Clark's and Daly's entire life - an analysis which weighs noble deeds against sinister ones.

\textsuperscript{16} Jerre Murphy and Thomas Walsh both wrote about the Marcus Daly who lived in the 1890's. They discussed the Daly they had known last. They voiced their reactions shortly after his death. Murphy's and Walsh's reactions can be found on pages 7 and 8 of this text.
CHAPTER 2

History's Viewpoint

Historians view Clark and Daly in a spectrum which spans most of their adult life, consequently historians should weigh both men's positive and negative contributions before passing judgement.

In his work, The War of the Copper Kings, C. B. Glasscock treats both Clark and Daly, and it quickly becomes evident that he favors Daly. He raises the issue of the gambling attitude of each man. Glasscock saw Daly as a gambler in his businesses. He points out that Daly built the smelter and had faith in the Butte hill when many said both projects were unsound. He argues that Daly's willingness to gamble brought him success. On the other hand, Glasscock does not consider Clark to be a gambler. To support the point Glasscock presents Clark's lack of faith in the Mayflower mine after its initial vein ran out. Clark's foreman wanted to continue but Clark ordered it closed. A new vein was found a few days later when the foreman disobeyed Clark and continued to work.

Glasscock is right when he contends that Clark was not the gambler and that Daly was. Clark was a wealthy man. His wealth had been built by way of different industries. Although he may not have been a gambler, he was successful. Senator Robert LaFollette called him one of the hundred men
who owned America.1

Continuing in his comparison of these two men, Glasscock discusses the social habits of each. According to Glasscock, Daly continually mingled with the miners while Clark remained detached from them. Not much more can be said concerning this, except that the consensus of the historians is that this particular point is true.

Glasscock also examines Clark and Daly separately. Clark appeared to Glasscock to be a very ambitious man. He claims that Clark's appearance as the Montana Orator at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia together with the recognition he received for his part in the Nez Perce escapade and for his part in the 1884 Constitutional Convention served to nurture that ambition. Glasscock examines this ambition as it grows. He sees it to be dangerous to Montana. In Glasscock's opinion Clark was interested only in himself. He did not care that Montana suffered. It is because of this view that Glasscock sees Daly as the hero who rose up to fight Clark.

Glasscock praises Daly for his stand against Clark and for his philanthropy. One story he tells concerns Daly's repayment of an old debt. Daly learned that a man, who had given him a grubstake years before, has died leaving his family helpless. Daly made arrangements to support them. Glasscock contends that such action was typical and here as elsewhere he has only praise for Daly.

Glasscock is unfair in his evaluation of Clark and Daly. He paints a faultless Daly who was neither ambitious nor corrupt but only interested in protecting Montana from Clark. On the other hand, he views Clark as an overly ambitious politician, a man who would do anything to win. He condemns Clark, a successful industrialist, because he was not a gambler. Because of his bias Glasscock fails to survey each man's entire life before passing judgement.

Someone who looked at both Clark and Daly impartially was Kenneth Ross Toole and he holds both men guilty of using their wealth to expand themselves politically. He argues that both men contributed to the establishment of bribery and coercion in Montana politics. It should be noted however that a debate concerning whether Daly and Clark were guilty of political corruption is a waste of time. The evidence definitely implicates both men. The historian who does not accept that point should be suspect. Toole does and for this reason if for no other I believe that he has made an objective study.

Toole sees Daly as something of a mystery. He points out that Daly was a man who did not share confidence, who did not talk about himself and who did not leave the details of the history of his life behind him. Daly was a man who stayed behind the scenes and allowed his newspapers to speak for him. This together with the burning of his personal papers hinders a study of him.

The few aspects of Daly which we do know, according to Toole, are that he resented polished graduates and technical men. This is understandable since Daly was not a formally educated man and he might have felt uncomfortable with highly educated people.

In his relations with the people of Anaconda, Toole said that Daly was a very popular employer. Daly had built Anaconda and he had equipped it with many conveniences. Daly also paid his workers at his smelter top wages. For these reasons a person in Anaconda lived comfortably in a modern town, and it is easy to see why Daly was popular.

On the other side, Toole views Clark as a very proud man. He saw Clark as vain, a man swayed by the adulation of the crowd. Clark was a proud man and he had many reasons to be. He represented Montana in 1876 at the Centennial in Philadelphia and he served as chairman at the 1884 and 1888 State Constitutional Convention. His only problem was that he allowed his pride to dominate his actions as he engaged in the illegal use of money in politics.

Toole considers both men together and separately and I believe his evaluations are correct. He allows each man to carry his own guilt.

Toole and Glasscock are the only two historians who give equal time to both Clark and Daly. I realize that Glasscock is unfair in his study. However his work The War of the Copper Kings is well known and was used to point out that famous works can be misleading. I have referred to Toole because of the
objectivity of his work. The remaining historians considered in this study look only at one of the men.

John Lindsay in The Amazing Experiences of a Judge devotes several chapters to Daly. He portrays Daly as a very concerned person. He cites the time Daly was informed of the great fire in the Anaconda and St. Lawrence mines. His first question concerned the well-being of the families of the lost miners. He was always one to take good care of his workers and their families. Daly paid his men well as long as their work was good. He never forgot any one who served him faithfully.

Lindsay contends that Daly was the wellspring of Montana, his power was titanic and with it he could and did swerve the people. This description of Daly is very appropriate. It describes Daly's relationship with Montana, exactly.

Another historian who looked only at Daly was Hugh Daly (no relation to Marcus Daly). He wrote a biography of Daly for the thirty-fourth anniversary of his death. Much of the work is spent in the glorification of Daly. Such praise included the claim that every enterprise Daly backed proved successful. He goes on in his praise calling Daly a great loyal American. It is beyond the scope of this study to determine whether or not Daly ever backed a losing enterprise, but I do question whether he was a "great loyal American." Would such a person subject his home state to twelve years

---

3 John Lindsay, Amazing Experiences of a Judge, (Philadelphia, 1939) 77.
4 Ibid., 77.
of political corruption? Hugh Daly however does touch on a very important point. He sees Daly as an individual of strong convictions. This point is true. When Daly was convinced that the Butte hill was rich, he pursued his goal even when most said it was worthless. He built his smelter over the cries which claimed such a venture was not feasible. Finally he fought against Clark for twelve years, subjecting Montana to political hell, convinced his rule would be better. Hugh Daly does patronize Daly but he also presents an important aspect of his character: his strong convictions.

Historians treat Daly kindly. Many admit that he participated in political corruption but at the same time they emphasize Daly's positive contributions to Montana. Do Clark's historians afford him the same courteous treatment?

Clayton Farrington looks at Clark from a wide angle. He sees Clark as a man primarily interested in politics for personal glory. He does however clarify this statement so it applies to the Clark who lived after 1890. Farrington sees the Clark of the 1880's as a man interested in Montana's needs. He cites Clark's impartial chairmanships at the 1884 and 1888 State Constitutional Convention as examples. This clarification is very important. When one criticizes Clark for his selfish actions of the 1890's one must remember that at one time he held the needs of Montana above his own personal ambition.

---

Once Farrington makes this distinction he looks at Clark in relationship to the 1890's and he sees a selfish man, a man who would resort to any method that would achieve victory. Farrington refers to the bribes Clark allegedly paid, but even more damning he accuses Clark of being an accessory to murder. On election day in 1898 two men tried to steal a ballot box from a pro-Daly precinct, before the votes could be counted. The election judges resisted and one of the would be robbers killed a judge. The two men fled leaving the box. No one was ever arrested for this crime and witnesses only saw a large diamond ring on the left hand of one of the murderers. Clark's son, Charles, wore a ring on his left hand. Farrington accuses Clark of being indirectly responsible. The two men were probably Clarks's men because the facts point that way. First the ballot box was in a pro-Daly precinct and definitely it would have contained many votes against Clark. Secondly, Charles Clark handled most of William Clark's campaign. Many hold the position that Charles Clark was the instigator of the bribes offered to legislators if they would vote for Clark. Stories concerning the 1898 election campaign show Charles Clark to be a person who would pursue victory at any cost. Was William Clark directly involved? I do not think so. I believe that Clark was in the same position Richard M. Nixon was in at the time of the Watergate breakin. Probably neither man knew the exact nature of the actions of their election committees. Surely however they

6 Ibid., Appendix IX
realized that their election committees were not staying within the law. To remain safe they each preferred to remain ignorant. From Farrington, Clark receives that praise and condemnation due him.

Another man who deals fairly with Clark was Forrest Foor who covers Clark from 1898 to 1901, centering on the investigation of the legality of Clark's 1898 election to the Senate. Foor considers the question concerning whether or not the Clark faction offered bribes to be elementary. He contends that Clark probably gave his committee the money without asking its destination.⁷ Foor cites that the Senate investigating committee was unable to connect William Clark directly with the bribes.

Foor, however, does link Clark directly to several attempts made at influencing a judge reviewing John B. Wellcome's disbarment.⁸ Wellcome was Clark's personal lawyer as well as personal friend. Wellcome was accused of using money illegally in the 1898 Senatorial elections. Clark's actions in this case were illegal but they do show that he cared for his friends. Foor argues that Clark did not run his 1898 Senatorial campaign by himself. He allowed his son, Charles, to direct it. Clark is accused of the sin of ignorance by Foor and I believe that Foor is justified in his accusation.

Unlike Daly, Clark does have a historian who does nothing but denounce him. William Mangam wrote The Clarks of Montana.

⁷ Forrest Foor, "The Senatorial Aspirations of William Andrew Clark", 59.
⁸ Ibid., 126 - 127.
and he is unmerciful in his treatment of Clark. He views Clark as one who based everything on the power of money. He said Clark sought three things: to be Montana's richest man, to be a Montana senator, to be the United States Ambassador to France. Clark, according to Mangam, felt that money was his ticket to all three. Clark did place tremendous faith in money evidenced by his expenditures in his campaigns for Senator. Clark however did give money to those less fortunate than himself, a fact Mangam conveniently overlooked.

Mangam accused Clark of being a man without principles. He said Clark would have stayed out of the 1894 capital fight if Daly had kept out of the 1893 Senatorial race, in spite of the deal he (Clark) made with S. T. Hauser in 1892. Samuel T. Hauser was a giant on Montana's economic and political scene. He controlled Helena. In that deal Hauser agreed to support Clark in his try for senator, if Clark would support Helena's bid to become the capital in 1899. The claim that Clark had no principles appears to have credibility since Clark did not enter the capital fight until the last month. Some sources say that Clark was trying to deal with Daly again in the summer of 1894. On that occasion if Daly had promised to stay out of the next Senate elections Clark would have refrained from supporting Helena. These sources hold that Clark gave up trying to deal with Daly a month before the capital election. What Mangam and others hold is that Clark was

---

willing to break his agreement with S. T. Hauser. From the correspondence written by Clark to Hauser there appears to be a definite friendship. Clark respected Hauser and continually asked for his advice. It seems unreasonable that Clark would have abandoned Hauser, once Hauser had fulfilled his part of the bargain. But at the same time I cannot explain why it took Clark so long to honor his pledge.

Mangam closes his discussion on Clark saying, "he walked by his choosing in a deep and narrow world of his own". I agree, Clark did walk in a world of his own choosing, we all do, but I do not think his was narrow. Because Clark did not associate with miners, people saw him as aloof. Clark was never a miner, he was banker and then an industrialist. He was in a minority class. Clark had friends in Montana but they were few because his class of people was small in numbers. Clark had many friends outside of Montana. His friends were other industrialists and politicians who lived throughout the United States and Europe. Clark's world was not lonely and dark.

There are more commentaries on Clark and Daly written by historians but they are either superficial or totally unfair. One such work is F. Edwards' Uncolored History. In
it he says of Clark:

[he] was not only an obscured and protected gangster but also one of the greatest contributors to countless intrigues, the aggregate of which, is blamable for this nations economic plight. 13

This statement is totally unfounded. How can one tie Clark's political corruption in Montana, an insignificant state in relation to the Nation's problems, to the economic problems of the United States? If Edwards is trying to blame Clark for the recession of the 1890's, he is totally wrong.

The historians look at Clark and Daly from a perspective wider than that which contemporaries used. With the exception of Glasscock and Mangam they have done so. Having surveyed the feelings of Clark's and Daly's contemporaries and the historians of the two men, I will now turn my analysis to their personal letters and statements by each man.

13 F. J. Edwards, Uncolored History (n.d.), It is a pamphlet which may be found in the Montana Historical Society Library, Helena, Montana. It is numbered B C54E.
CHAPTER 3
Correspondence and Personal Reflections

An investigation of the correspondence of Clark and Daly adds further insight into the character of each man. Their own words often validate the claim of others. I have noted elsewhere in this paper that Clark sought the public eye while Daly was satisfied to remain behind the scenes. Daly himself explains why he preferred it that way.

I know my shortcomings. In the Senate I would be out of my element. When the business magnates of the country cross the continent they run their private cars into Anaconda to call on me. They respect me in my sphere. This is enough satisfaction for a man who started out in the world with as little capital as I had.\footnote{Christopher P. Connolly, \textit{The Devil Learns to Vote} (New York, 1938), 96.}

From a statement such as this it becomes quite apparent that Daly was contented with his life style. Daly was not a well educated man. He probably would have felt ill at ease if he had to deal with businessmen and politicians on unfamiliar ground. Anaconda was his home court and he was king there.

Much of Clark's and Daly's correspondence is addressed to S. T. Hauser who was a friend of both men. As I have previously noted Hauser was a leader in Montana's economic and political affairs. The leading personality in Montana until 1890, he maintained business interests in banks, railroads, ranches, mines and smelters. He served from 1885 to 1887 as Territorial Governor of Montana and in 1894 led his town, Helena, in her successful bid to be the permanent state cap-
ital. Even though he suffered in the 1893 Panic, Hauser maintained considerable influence in Montana until his death in 1914. No wonder Clark and Daly chose to communicate with him. These letters reveal much about the two men. In them Daly appears as a very authoritative person. In several of his letters to Hauser, Daly indicates that he wants to meet with Hauser and he tells, not asks, Hauser to come to Anaconda. Never does Daly volunteer to go to Hauser. The very tone of the letters suggests that Daly considered himself to be without peer in Montana. Clark on the other hand treats Hauser as an equal. He asks for Hauser's advice several times and when he needs to talk with Hauser, he volunteers to travel to Helena. Clark constantly traveled around the country supervising his holdings. The time he spent in Montana was limited and precious but he was quite willing to find time to go to Helena to talk with Hauser. Daly spent most of the time in Anaconda or at his ranch in the Bitterroot Valley. Yet he could not find time to go to Hauser? Daly was selfish in this respect.

Moreover while Clark asked Hauser for advice, Daly attempted to tell Hauser what to do and who to appoint to different offices. He suggests strongly that Hauser appoint specific persons to judgeships, to the office of Collector of

2 Marcus Daly to S. T. Hauser, July 29, 1889, October 5, 1889, S. T. Hauser Collection (Archives, Montana Historical Library).
Revenue or to the Office of Receiver of Public Monies.\textsuperscript{4} There is no indication that Clark asked for or demanded such favors. It was Daly, not Clark, who specialized in controlling public officials.

Indeed Daly's correspondence reveals that he definitely controlled the Democratic Party in Montana. In a letter to Hauser, Daly assures Hauser that despite the fact Hauser has failed to come through for the Democratic Party in certain areas of the state, party members will still support him because Daly has told them that they will.\textsuperscript{5} Daly's control of the party is further substantiated by the fact that he prevented Clark, a Democrat, from winning the Senatorial elections of 1889, 1893 and 1895. Daly saw his control of the party as his ticket to control of the state, its affairs and its two Senators. A behind the scenes man, Daly knew how to manipulate people.

While it can be said that Daly met with much success in politics, it should also be pointed out that he did experience some failures as well. He was not a gracious loser. In 1890, for example, Hauser, although strongly supported by Daly, lost the governor's race. Daly, extremely dismayed, wrote Hauser saying, "I am positively retired from politics, I wish to make my position clear to you."\textsuperscript{6} Daly gave up the chairmanship of

\textsuperscript{4} Daly to Hauser, November 28, 1885, November 11, 1887, October 9, 1885, ibid..
\textsuperscript{5} Daly to Hauser, November 28, 1889, ibid..
\textsuperscript{6} Daly to Hauser, January 6, 1890, ibid..
the Democratic Party then and he moved into the background. He did, however, retain control of the party, a control which would only be relinquished with his death.

In 1898 Clark, opposed by the Daly faction, succeeded in winning the Senate elections. In this case Daly poured money and effort into the campaign to unseat Clark. Daly claimed Clark had bribed his way to victory. Shortly after the election the United States Senate ordered the election investigated. The investigation was concluded in 1900. Just prior to the conclusion of the investigation Daly, in an attempt to further damage Clark's credibility, wrote J. H. Durston, editor of the Anaconda Standard, instructing him to write a story concerning the 1893 Senatorial race which would attack Clark and discredit him. Durston was also instructed to write a story on Augustus Heinze (a rising Copper King who supported Clark) showing Heinze to be a blackmailer, a thief, and a dangerous man for Butte. Defeats came hard to Daly a man accustomed to having his way.

If we now turn to Clark we find a man who held Daly in great disdain. In 1898 Clark considered withdrawing from the Senate race because prospects for victory were bleak. In a letter to Hauser, Clark discusses the fact that he might withdraw but says that "It is very humiliating however to have to give up the state to such miserable curs as Daly and his gang".  

7 Marcus Daly to J. H. Durston, January 19, 1900. This letter can be found in the Montana Historical Society Library, Helena, Montana. Cataloged under SC 63, Marcus Daly.  
8 Clark to Hauser, August 24, 1898, S. T. Hauser Papers.
As events transpired Clark did not withdraw even though he appeared to have little chance of success. It was his hatred for Daly that served as the prime reason for this decision. Clark would never back away from Daly.

Clark's strongest verbal attack on Daly came in his resignation speech to the Senate on May 5, 1900. The committee investigating Clark's 1898 election found that members of his committee used bribery and it suggested that Clark be unseated. Clark resigned before the Senate acted thereby saving himself from such an indignity. In the speech Clark attacked Daly for his part in the 1888 elections for territorial delegates to Congress claiming that Daly was envious of his position. He went on to blame Daly for all his defeats. He claimed that Daly wanted to rule Montana as a Czar. Daly, he said, would only tolerate those who would serve him without hesitation. The speech was full of hatred and Clark did not attempt to disguise it. Daly had plagued his ambitions for more than a decade and Clark hated him for it.

When Daly was near death in the same hotel in which Clark was staying Clark demonstrated no compassion for his adversary. His only comment was: "Marcus Daly is now dying, the victim of his own spleen, he is the most violent tempered man I have ever known". Daly's correspondence reveals a proud man who viewed himself as one without equal. As for Clark while

9 "Personal Explanation - Senator from Montana", May 15, 1900. A copy can be found at the Montana Historical Society Library, Helena, Montana.
10 Kenneth Ross Toole, "The Genesis of the Clark-Daly Feud", Montana: The Magazine of Western History I (April, 1951) 49.
he was not as overbearing as Daly his correspondence reveals him to be a man who could harbor hate.

The final statement from Daly examined for this study appeared in the *Anaconda Standard*, November 5, 1900. Daly appealed to Montanans not to forget their interests when they voted in the upcoming Senate elections. He urged them to vote against Clark. Despite Daly's efforts, Clark won the election. Daly was to die seven days after the elections perhaps happy with the thought that at least he would never have to experience the Senatorial rule of Clark.

The last record of Clark's thoughts, that I found, appeared in the *New York Times*, March 8, 1925. There Clark commented on his life. He said, "I have had a pleasant and successful political career and in that connection have nothing at all to regret." Clark by then, although he lost five Senatorial elections, had won the sixth one. He had become Senator Clark and that was all he wanted.

Were Clark and Daly men of exceptional ability? Definitely they were. Both men arrived in Montana with very little. Clark was a simple merchant in 1863 and Daly was just a prospector in 1876. In less than two decades Clark had become an industrialist. He built his fortune through merchandising, banking, mining and railroads, and these were but a few of his many enterprises. Clark's mansion in Butte was the finest and in 1897 he built an extraordinary mansion in New York.

---

*New York Times*, March 8, 1925. A copy can be found in a manila envelope cataloged under B Clark, William A.
During his lifetime Clark accumulated one of the finest private art collections in the United States. As for Daly, by 1881 he owned valuable mines in Butte and by 1884 his smelter was built and his town, Anaconda, was growing. His personal ranch in the Bitterroot Valley housed among other things a fine stable of thoroughbred horses. Indeed Clark and Daly had become extremely wealthy and they used their wealth to display themselves.

In the field of politics Clark had risen through the ranks and because he had, he led Montana's Constitutional Conventions in 1884 and 1888, and served as one of her Senators. Even as Clark was so involved, Daly was also on the political scene. He served as chairman of the Democratic Party during the 1880's and was leading Democrat in the 1890's. Together Clark and Daly built Montana.

Did Clark and Daly achieve the power they desired? For decades Clark wielded power as a leading industrial executive in the United States. His election to the Senate in 1901 gave him the power that he wanted most: the power of a Senator. Daly's idea of power revolved around the control of public officials. By 1888 he controlled the Democratic Party and by 1889 he controlled his first Senator, Thomas Carter. Through the 1890's he was the most influential person in Montana politics. One would have to say, therefore, that both Clark

---

Daly's stable turned out many fine horses. His most famous horse was Tammany who in fourteen starts finished first nine times, second once and third once. Tammany's total winnings were $117,010. In 1893 Tammany defeated Lamplighter the pride of the East in a match race. Daly-raised horses raced all over the world.
and Daly achieved the power they sought; they were indeed Copper Kings.

Looking at the two men in retrospect, it is apparent that Clark and Daly contributed much to Montana but they also did much to soil the state. They introduced corruption into Montana, in its fullest meaning. Their actions disrupted the activities of the state for more than a decade. Their display of corruption justifies partial condemnation for each of them but total denouncement would be unjust. Indeed, history has been unfair both to Clark and to Daly. With few exceptions historians have failed to consider all aspects of their actions and thus they present their readers with a misleading and inaccurate picture. Only Kenneth Ross Toole, Clayton Farrington and Forrest Foor have looked objectively at Clark and Daly. They clarify their praise and conviction. When more historians follow this lead then people will see the true Clark and Daly. Making a statement about these two men is difficult. However P.A. O'Farrell's summary of Clark is excellent and it reflects my feelings. He writes:

I admire the sturdy pioneer who braved the wilderness and achieved imperishable fame as a founder of the great Commonwealth of Montana. 13

I do not, however, admire Clark the Senator. In my judgement this statement could also be applied to Daly if it was slightly revised. I admire the man who helped to build the great state, Montana, but not the Daly who controlled the Democratic Party.
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