



University of Kentucky
UKnowledge

Theses and Dissertations--History

History

2015

Save Our Republic: Battling John Birch in California's Conservative Cradle

James A. Savage

University of Kentucky, bourbonstreetbrawl@gmail.com

[Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.](#)

Recommended Citation

Savage, James A., "Save Our Republic: Battling John Birch in California's Conservative Cradle" (2015).
Theses and Dissertations--History. 25.
https://uknowledge.uky.edu/history_etds/25

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the History at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations--History by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

STUDENT AGREEMENT:

I represent that my thesis or dissertation and abstract are my original work. Proper attribution has been given to all outside sources. I understand that I am solely responsible for obtaining any needed copyright permissions. I have obtained needed written permission statement(s) from the owner(s) of each third-party copyrighted matter to be included in my work, allowing electronic distribution (if such use is not permitted by the fair use doctrine) which will be submitted to UKnowledge as Additional File.

I hereby grant to The University of Kentucky and its agents the irrevocable, non-exclusive, and royalty-free license to archive and make accessible my work in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known. I agree that the document mentioned above may be made available immediately for worldwide access unless an embargo applies.

I retain all other ownership rights to the copyright of my work. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of my work. I understand that I am free to register the copyright to my work.

REVIEW, APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE

The document mentioned above has been reviewed and accepted by the student's advisor, on behalf of the advisory committee, and by the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), on behalf of the program; we verify that this is the final, approved version of the student's thesis including all changes required by the advisory committee. The undersigned agree to abide by the statements above.

James A. Savage, Student

Dr. Tracy A. Campbell, Major Professor

Dr. David E. Hamilton, Director of Graduate Studies

SAVE OUR REPUBLIC: BATTLING JOHN BIRCH
IN CALIFORNIA'S CONSERVATIVE CRADLE

DISSERTATION

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
College of Arts and Sciences
at the University of Kentucky

By
James Savage

Lexington, Kentucky

Director: Dr. Tracy Campbell, Professor of History

Lexington, Kentucky

2014

Copyright © James Savage 2014

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

SAVE OUR REPUBLIC: BATTLING JOHN BIRCH IN CALIFORNIA'S CONSERVATIVE CRADLE

Previous accounts of the development of the New American Right have demonstrated the popularity and resonance of the ideology in Southern California. However, these studies have not shown how contention surrounded conservatism's ascendancy even in regions where it found eager disciples. "Save Our Republic" uses one conservative Southern California community as a vehicle to better understand the foundations of a wider movement and argues the growth of conservatism was not nearly as smooth as earlier studies have suggested. Santa Barbara, California, experienced a much more contentious introduction to the same conservative elements and exemplifies the larger ideological clash that occurred nationwide during the late 1950s and early 1960s between "establishment," moderate Republicans and the party's right flank. In California's cradle of conservatism, the ideology's birth was not an easy one.

Santa Barbara should have provided a bonanza of support for the John Birch Society, a staunchly anticommunist organization founded in 1958 by retired businessman Robert H.W. Welch. Instead, its presence there in the early 1960s divided the city and inspired the sort of suspicion that ultimately hobbled the group's reputation nationally. Rather than thriving in the city, the JBS impaled itself in a series of self-inflicted wounds that only worsened the effect these characterizations had on the group's national reputation. Disseminated to a nationwide audience by local newspaper publisher Thomas M. Storke, who declared his intention to banish the organization from the city, the events that occurred in Santa Barbara throughout 1961 alerted other cities of the potential disruption the JBS could inspire in their communities. The JBS would forever bear the battle scars it earned in Santa Barbara.

"Save Our Republic" argues the events in Santa Barbara exemplify the more pronounced political battle that was occurring throughout the nation in the 1960s as conservatives grappled to determine the bounds of their ideology. The threat from the right that caused so much handwringing in the halls of conservative power had an equally unsettling effect in the city's parlors, churches, schoolhouses and newsrooms.

KEYWORDS: Conservatism, Anticommunism, John Birch Society, Thomas M. Storke,
California

James Savage
Student's Signature

July 14, 2014
Date

SAVE OUR REPUBLIC: BATTLING JOHN BIRCH
IN CALIFORNIA'S CONSERVATIVE CRADLE

By

James Savage

Dr. Tracy A. Campbell

Director of Dissertation

Dr. David E. Hamilton

Director of Graduate Studies

July 14, 2014

Date

In memory of Tony J. Morrow and Dora Polozola Morrow

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Tracy Campbell asked two questions when I proposed this dissertation. “Are you sure you want to do a *California* topic?” was the first. He realized then as I did that doing the sort of research a dissertation—not to mention my own obsessive nature—demanded would be simpler if the sources were closer to home. He then asked, “How can I help?” and nearly six years later, he’s still helping. He delivers letters of support as easily as he does a joke, and his incredible humor, exacting eye, and plain good sense have made this process easier and much more fulfilling.

The University of Kentucky History Department has also eased my path. Dr. David Hamilton and Dr. James Albisetti helped secure internal and external funding, including a Dissertation Enhancement Award that allowed me to research for five weeks along the West Coast. Dr. Hamilton initiated my nomination for a Dissertation Year Fellowship from the UK Graduate School that facilitated an entire year of writing and research uninterrupted by teaching. Dr. Karen Petrone wrote letters of support, gave stellar personal and professional advice, and pushed me to think more globally. Dr. JoAnne Pope Melish joined my committee at a particularly critical juncture, as did Dean Terry Birdwhistell. Both managed to find value in places where I saw only confusion.

Dr. Ronald Eller’s gentle manner and praise during my first semester in Kentucky guided my return from a life of daily news deadlines to graduate study. Like Dr. Campbell, Dr. Eller exemplifies the kind of mentor I’d like some day to be, while Dr. Mark W. Summers sets a standard for teaching that one can only aspire to reach. He *performs* history for his students, who flock to class for the theater, but learn during the show. It was my pleasure to serve a year as his teaching assistant.

I met Mandy Higgins during my first semester at UK. We found each other, shall we say, unlikeable. But last December, I joined her family and closest friends to celebrate her graduation. Mandy had become Dr. Higgins—and one of the best friends I’ll ever have. She, her husband Matt, and her parents Paula and Dave Duncan, personify what is so great about Kentucky—it welcomes all strays, teaches them about bourbon, bridles and basketball, and reminds them they’ll always have a home in the Bluegrass. More important, my unlikely friendship with Mandy shows how wrong first impressions can be and how a person risks missing out on truly great things if he’s implacable.

I can’t imagine what the last six years would have been like without Mandy or the other extraordinary people I’ve befriended during my time here—Stephanie and Anthony Miller, Julia and Robert Turpin, Rachel Hogg, Amy and Robert Murray, Jeremiah Nelson, Adam Spease, and Daren Neel. My time here would have been far less fun if our paths had not crossed.

I once described Dr. Mary Farmer-Kaiser as “extraordinary.” To that, I now add incomparable. Mary did not pack boxes or drive the truck, but more than any other person she influenced my move to Kentucky and pursuit of a doctorate. She still guides me, just as she guided my master’s thesis at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. Even from this distance, she is incomparably extraordinary.

I am fortunate that the repositories that housed my research employed such wonderful staffs. Some toiled in cheerful anonymity, and I never did learn their names. Others never failed to answer an e-mail or happily pull yet another box to satisfy my obsessions. Although they may never see this record of my gratitude, I must thank the archivists at the University of California, Berkeley’s Bancroft Library, especially David

Kessler; UC Santa Barbara's Department of Special Collections, especially Ed Fields; the Library of Congress' Manuscript Division, which employs more supportive and knowledgeable people than I could possibly list; the National Archives in College Park, Maryland, especially Doris Jackson; the University of Oregon's Special Collections and University Archives, especially Shelley Wallace; the California Judicial Center Library's Martha Noble; the California State Archives' Jessica Herrick; Amanda Neal and Brent Field at the Santa Barbara Public Library; and the Santa Barbara Historical Museum's Michael Redmon. Closer to home, the Interlibrary Loan staff at W.T. Young Library performed a thousand miracles and then, when asked, performed a thousand more.

In Santa Barbara, Barney Brantingham shared memories of Thomas M. Storke, while Kristine Power and George Goodall reminisced about the First Presbyterian Church's contentious interactions with the John Birch Society. The Rev. Peter Buehler provided a detailed, unofficial church history that was immensely helpful. Editor Nick Welsh of the *Santa Barbara Independent* shared insights into Santa Barbara's political culture. Thomas Storke Menzies, Charles A. Storke III and Carol E. Storke gave remarkably unvarnished appraisals of their grandfather that opened new avenues of inquiry. Michael Stephens shared stories about his brother David Alan Arnold, while Linda Larsson and Steven Haldeman reminisced about their mother Ellen Haldeman. Hans Engh welcomed me into his Sacramento home where I enjoyed a Sunday afternoon discussing Norwegian politics, iPhones, and his exchanges with members of the John Birch Society when he was a reporter in Santa Barbara more than a half century ago.

My family came to my aid so many times and probably never knew it. Like firefighters in a Keystone comedy, they collectively held a life net that allowed me to jump to safety whenever I needed rescue or reassurance.

Memories of two extraordinary people unite my family. The first recollection I have of education is skipping school with the aid of my grandfather. More than a few mornings, the van that took me to preschool never came, and I would spend the day with Grandpa Tony tinkering in his shop and garden. I discovered later that he let me sleep until after the van left, then took me outside where we waited for a half hour or so. We waved at passersby and talked about the cows that grazed on the levee. Eventually, he announced that the van wasn't coming and we went inside. Any man who would conspire to keep his grandson out of school so they could spend the day together.

He was quiet, and let his actions speak for him, which at times infuriated my Grandma Dora, who was never speechless. Yet fate—like a combination lock whose tumblers have to align perfectly before it will open—brought them together. They valued hardheadedness, hard work and humor, and found happiness in simple things—hammers and nails, duct tape, a Ray Price song, homemade bread on a rainy afternoon, a Cajun two-step, and the smiles of their grandchildren (and great-grandchildren, and for a very special, but all too brief moment, a great-great-grandchild.). They laid a foundation so strong that one day their grandson, despite an inauspicious introduction to education, could earn a doctorate and (perhaps) teach others, if that's what he wanted to do.

Grandpa died sixteen years ago. Grandma joined him last year. It is to their memories that I dedicate this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements iii

Chapter One: “If Mommy is a Commie” 1

Chapter Two: “Santa Barbara is Not Going to Change” 21

Chapter Three: “Who are the Good Guys?” 46

Chapter Four: “You Can’t Kill a Rat with a Featherduster” 94

Chapter Five: “Politicians Use Me. I Don’t Use Them” 148

Chapter Six: “The Society Needed a Symbol—It Chose Me” 194

Chapter Seven: “Its Unrolling Psychosis of Conspiracy” 241

Bibliography 263

Vita 301

CHAPTER ONE “IF MOMMY IS A COMMIE”

On a Sunday morning in September 1959, the Southern Pacific Railroad delivered evil to paradise. Nikita S. Khrushchev alighted from his special, eighteen-car train at the Santa Barbara station, squinted as his eyes adjusted to the Southern California sun, and beheld a wall of people. Some carried signs welcoming the Soviet premier. Others, there merely to satisfy curiosity, glared, but scowls did not stop Khrushchev from gleefully wading into the crowd.¹ He hugged children, pinned miniature hammer-and-sickles on men, and alternately waved and clapped. Like a glad-handing ward politician, he thrived on the adulation. Khrushchev paid no attention to the armed security officers who lined the roofs of nearby buildings and did not acknowledge the occasional hostile placard. In the distance, church bells pealed. The Soviet leader might have mistaken the clangor for a greeting, but several churches had decided to ring their bells simultaneously to protest the purported mistreatment of Christians behind the Iron Curtain. Inside, congregants recited prayers for peace and for the souls of fellow Santa Barbarans who, instead of occupying pews that Sunday morning, were welcoming a butcher to the city.²

Seven months later, Robert H.W. Welch, a retired candy manufacturer from Belmont, Massachusetts, stepped off an airplane at Santa Barbara’s airport to a far different welcome. A half-dozen people waited for the slight, middle-age man. There

¹ “Nikita Gets Big Welcome,” *Chicago Tribune*, September 21, 1959; Henry Brandon, “‘All Change’ at Santa Barbara,” *Sunday (London) Times*, September 27, 1959; and Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., *The Storm Has Many Eyes* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1973), 168.

² “Bells Will Toll As Mr. K Train Arrives in City,” and “Go to Church, Don’t See Train: Cvetic,” September 18, 1959, “Khrushchev Is Given Friendly Greeting Here,” September 21, 1959, all in *Santa Barbara News-Press [SBNP]*; Aleksandr Fursenko and Timothy Naftali, *Khrushchev’s Cold War: The Inside Story of an American Adversary* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006), 235; Nikita Khrushchev, *Khrushchev Remembers: The Last Testament* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1974), 390n25; and Peter Carlson, *K Blows Top: A Cold War Comic Interlude Starring Nikita Khrushchev, America’s Most Unlikely Tourist* (New York: Public Affairs, 2009), 178-79.

were no photographers to snap his picture, no ringing church bells, no reporters shouting questions, no placards welcoming him or telling him to go home. But the anonymity Welch enjoyed that day on the tarmac in Santa Barbara would soon end. In his valise, he carried pamphlets for an organization he had founded in late 1958 to combat the perils of communism, and he had come to Santa Barbara to welcome new chapters into his John Birch Society. Welch named the organization for an Army intelligence officer and Christian missionary killed by communist Chinese soldiers just days following the end of the Second World War. Welch considered the martyred Birch the first casualty of a global conflict against communism. He inaugurated the JBS in December 1958, during a two-day, invitation-only meeting in Indianapolis. In August, when President Dwight D. Eisenhower invited Khrushchev to visit the United States, Welch, ever the businessman with an astute eye for promotion, found a recruitment campaign for his young society.³

Nikita Khrushchev is one of the founding fathers of the John Birch Society—although he did not know it and Welch never acknowledged it. But Khrushchev’s American tour was the young society’s best recruiting tool. Its first public campaign, a front organization called the Committee Against Summit Entanglements, sought to dissuade Eisenhower from meeting with Khrushchev in the United States or anywhere else for that matter. In the months preceding the visit, *The New York Times* and more than 100 daily and weekly newspapers across the country printed an advertisement that labeled Khrushchev an “enemy of freedom.” It entreated readers to use an attached petition to collect signatures in their communities and mail them to the president. More

³ Robert H.W. Welch, *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, 8th ed. (Belmont, Mass.: Western Island Publishers, 1961), 1-2; and “Santa Barbara Activities of the John Birch Society and Presentation Film by Robert Welch,” April 18, 1960, Los Angeles Field Office, FBI file no. 100-59001, Ernie Lazar Freedom of Information Act Collection, John Birch Society, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Los_Angeles-1[hereafter cited as Lazar FOIA Collection].

than 1,600 signatures on 128 petitions arrived in one month alone, and letters of support appeared in nearly 2,500 newspapers. While the campaign did not stop Khrushchev's visit, it demonstrated the discontent that existed among some Americans about their government's cooperation with the Soviet Union. Welch believed the JBS could exploit this grassroots dissatisfaction and place residents in cities such as Santa Barbara on the front lines of a global struggle between communism and democracy, between oppression and capitalism, between evil and good.⁴

Santa Barbara should have provided a bonanza of support for the JBS. Instead, its presence there divided the city and inspired the sort of suspicion that ultimately hobbled the group's reputation nationally. The story of the John Birch Society in Santa Barbara is a tale of missteps and missed chances that were truly indicative of the group's early years. The JBS' message of anticommunism, smaller government, and limited international engagement found resonance among Santa Barbara's wealthier, conservative residents, but its inability to describe its aims in tangible, rational terms to the general public fueled mistrust among others who saw the group as shadowy, sinister and secretive. In a Cold War America indoctrinated by Joseph McCarthy and others into believing that "secret" equaled "subversion," the JBS floundered. Without a coherent public message, the group found itself on the defensive, snarling at what it opposed rather than explaining what it advocated. The society's members wanted to be perceived as frontline soldiers in the war against communism; instead, in Santa Barbara and elsewhere, the press deputized them as boogeymen, more harmful than any communist.

⁴ Lodge, *The Storm Has Many Eyes*, 169-70; "Russian's Visit Fought," August 3, 1959; "Americans Exhorted to Greet Khrushchev with 'Civil Silence,'" August 24, 1959; "Please, President Eisenhower, Don't!" August 30, 1959; and "Anti-Red Groups Here Press Protests against Khrushchev," September 11, 1959, all in *New York Times* [NYT]; and Welch, *Blue Book*, 71-112.

Rather than thriving in the city, the JBS impaled itself in a series of self-inflicted wounds that only worsened the effect these characterizations had on the group's national reputation. Disseminated to a nationwide audience by local newspaper publisher Thomas M. Storke, who declared his intention to banish the organization from the city, the events that occurred in Santa Barbara throughout 1961 alerted other cities of the potential disruption the JBS could inspire in their communities as well. The national media seized on images of hysterical anticommunists who had invaded paradise and separated it into warring camps.⁵ The JBS would forever bear the battle scars it earned in Santa Barbara. Some were by its own hand. Others were not.

“Save Our Republic” might be subtitled “The Troubled Birth of American Conservatism.” Previous accounts of the development of the New American Right have demonstrated the popularity and resonance of the ideology in Southern California. This study does not dispute that. What it does dispute, however, is the widely accepted view that this ideology won disciples throughout the region—and then throughout the country—with little or no contention. Like Lisa McGirr's *Suburban Warriors*, “Save Our Republic” uses one conservative Southern California community as a vehicle to better understand the foundations of a wider movement, yet argues the growth of conservatism was not nearly as smooth as earlier studies have suggested. Orange County and Southern California, McGirr writes, formed “the nucleus of a broader conservative matrix evolving in the Sunbelt and the West that eventually propelled assertive and unapologetic

⁵ Hans Engh, “The John Birch Society,” *The Nation*, March 11, 1961, 209-211; 9; Barbara Bundschu, United Press International, “Nationwide Look at Birch Society,” March 29, 1961; “Views on Birch Group's Methods,” March 30, 1961; and “Birch Views on Some National Figures,” March 31, 1961, all in *SBNP*; “Birch Group Lists Units in 34 States,” *NYT*, April 2, 1961; John D. Weaver, “Santa Barbara: Dilemma in Paradise,” *Holiday*, June 1961, 84; “King Storke,” *Time*, November 17, 1961, 40; and Charles A. Sprague, “It Seems to Me,” (*Salem*) *Oregon Statesman*, March 13, 1962.

conservatives to nationwide significance.”⁶ Only 120 miles up the Pacific coast, however, Santa Barbara experienced a far different and much more contentious introduction to the same conservative elements. What separates Santa Barbara and Orange County’s experiences—and ultimately what separates this study from *Suburban Warriors*—is the conflict that arose in Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara illustrates not the mobilization that McGirr details, but the ideological clash at the movement’s core. By focusing on this contention, “Save Our Republic” argues that Santa Barbara exemplifies the larger struggle that occurred nationwide during the late 1950s and early 1960s between “establishment,” moderate Republicans and the party’s right flank represented by conservative politicians and grassroots activists in the South and West. In California’s cradle of conservatism, the pangs of the ideology’s birth continued into its infancy and intermittently plagued it as it grew and strengthened.

The areas’ distinct development patterns were the major differentiating factor in how each confronted conservatism’s rise. Southern California’s postwar development was not homogenous; neither was conservatism’s growth. More isolated than the suburban enclaves south of Los Angeles, Santa Barbara had long viewed itself as a part of the United States but wholly unlike any other American city. As a result, while other areas of Southern California boomed with new residents who brought with them an amalgam of political ideologies, varying degrees of wealth, and distinctive cultural backgrounds, Santa Barbara remained an exclusive enclave of the affluent intent on preserving the city’s hallmark distinctiveness by severely restricting its growth and industrial base. A commentator once branded Santa Barbara, “the western front of the

⁶ Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4-5.

Eastern establishment,” a prescient remark that identifies the heart of the contention that existed between the city’s hierarchy and the insurgent JBS.⁷ Its distinctive character had lured the wealthy to Santa Barbara since the Gilded Age, but the city’s climate in the early 1960s was anything but inviting as conservatives clashed over the parameters of their ideology.

California was important to the John Birch Society and to conservatism as a whole, and as the decade progressed, the state would often define—then redefine—national political issues and figures. As a political cradle, the state was certainly the most important battleground the young JBS had in the western United States, if not the nation as a whole. While the society reported strong membership in Texas, Arizona, and Tennessee, Southern California began as its most significant bailiwick and remained so for nearly a decade.⁸ In 1961, California was a year away from surpassing New York as the nation’s most populous state. As such, the balance of political power would shift westward for the first time in the nation’s history.⁹

If the JBS could make inroads in California, it could influence political dynamics nationwide. California’s gubernatorial and senatorial elections, and presidential primaries throughout the decade would be closely watched as early indicators of what might come to the nation as a whole as growing rifts between left and right eviscerated the moderation of the postwar political consensus. The density of California’s population—by 1962, the state gained an estimated 1,000 new residents a day—worked to the JBS’

⁷ Cleveland Armory, quoted in Kelly Tunney, “Santa Barbara: Old Guard and New Lifestyle,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 28, 1969.

⁸ Jonathan Bell, *California Crucible: The Forging of Modern American Liberalism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); and McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 76-79.

⁹ Felix Morley, “Californians Prepare to Capitalize on New Political Power,” *Nation’s Business*, May 1961, 27-28; “Which State is King?” *Christian Science Monitor*, January 3, 1963; “Two ‘Empire States’—How They Compare,” *U.S. News & World Report*, December 24, 1962, 44-49; and “The No. 1 State: Booming, Beautiful California,” *Newsweek*, September 10, 1962, 29-32.

advantage, particularly in Southern California.¹⁰ An organization built on small, neighborhood meetings, word-of-mouth advertising, and the hand-to-hand dissemination of printed information benefited from a dense population. Newcomers looked to social organizations for a feeling of intimacy and belonging. Churches provided one level of comfort in unfamiliar settings; patriotic organizations that preached Americanism also cut across geographic lines and provided friendships and a sense of shared purpose. These groups rooted members in their new communities.¹¹

Certain beliefs united JBS members with other activists within the emergent postwar conservative movement. Historian Samuel Brenner borrowed Welch's own description of his membership and its allies as "Americanist" to describe a strong belief in anticommunism, limitations on federal power, religious devotion, and libertarianism, the belief that government should have no part in social welfare programs or in regulating the nation's economy.¹² Except for its insistence of the scope of communist infiltration in America, the JBS' brand of conservatism differed little from that of the emerging conservative movement within the Republican Party—a rejection of New Deal-era centralized authority, a celebration of states' rights, the promotion of individualism and laissez-faire economic policies, defense of traditional, *status quo* social values, and an

¹⁰ Kevin Starr, *Golden Dreams: California in the Age of Abundance, 1950-1963* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 413-15; and George B. Leonard, "California: A Promised Land for Millions of Migrating Americans," *Look*, September 25, 1962, 30. By 1966, California attracted 400,000 new residents a year; its population had ballooned to 19 million. See William Graves, "California: The Golden Magnet," *National Geographic*, May 1966, 595.

¹¹ McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 76-78; Jonathan W. Schoenwald, "We Are An Action Group: The John Birch Society and the Conservative Movement in the 1960s," in David Farber and Jeff Roche, ed., *The Conservative Sixties* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), 22; and Pamela Oliver and Mark Furman, "Contradictions between National and Local Organizational Strength: The Case of the John Birch Society," *International Social Movement Research* 2 (1989), 157-61.

¹² Samuel Brenner, "Fellow Travelers: Overlap between 'Mainstream' and 'Extremist' Conservatives in the Early 1960s," in Laura Jane Gifford and Daniel K. Williams, ed., *The Right Side of the Sixties: Reexamining Conservatism's Decade of Transformation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2012), 83-84, 87-90; and Welch, *Blue Book*, 139.

abhorrence of mass democracy. JBS members and their conservative brethren feared a host of –isms—socialism, collectivism, statism and internationalism—because these ideologies eroded another –ism, individualism, and the freedom they believed accompanied it. T. Coleman Andrews, a member of the JBS’ National Council, explained in early 1961 that the organization aimed “to bring about, if possible ‘less government and more personal responsibility.’” He continued: “We are anti-communist because . . . the communists glorify the state and downgrade the individual. [Our] program is based upon the fundamental American idea that the individual is all important and that he will remain so only so long as he is able to make the state do his bidding. . . . The John Birch Society . . . puts the individual above the state.”¹³

Conservative values drew people to the John Birch Society, but its insistence that a vast communist conspiracy threatened American freedom repelled other potential members and exposed the group to public derision. Yet the organization exemplifies a dynamic of shared fear at the heart of the American Cold War experience. In the years following the Second World War, leaders such as Joseph McCarthy, J. Edgar Hoover, and members of the House Un-American Activities Committee told Americans that communism lurked within the nation’s institutions. Fear of communism created one level of anxiety, but fear of anticommunist excesses created another. While the John Birch Society fanned Cold War anxieties for its very existence, the group’s members—long

¹³ Brenner, “Fellow Travelers,” 87-89. This broad definition of conservatism draws from several sources and reflects continued scholarly disagreement over the nature of American conservatism in the early 1960s. In general, see George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America since 1945* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), xii-xv; Jonathan M. Schoenwald, *A Time for Choosing: The Rise of Modern American Conservatism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 4-5; Gregory L. Schneider, *The Conservative Century: From Reaction to Revolution* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009), 99-101; and Patrick Allitt, *The Conservatives: Ideas and Personalities throughout American History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 2-5, 168-69, 278-80. See also T. Coleman Andrews to Laura Weber, April 26, 1961, binder “April-June 1961,” box 9, T. Coleman Andrews Papers, Collection 119, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene.

portrayed as unconscionable zealots who substituted loving one's neighbor with suspecting him of subversion—did not corner the market on fear. Individuals who opposed anticommunist activities also dispensed panic with equal venom.¹⁴

Largely absent from the historiography of American anticommunism is discussion of reciprocal fear. As Santa Barbara's experience with the John Birch Society shows, however, individuals who decried McCarthyism's tactics also employed them. Publisher Thomas M. Storke declared war against the JBS in Santa Barbara and used every weapon in his arsenal to repel the group from his native city and to damage its national reputation. This included bugged meetings, threats against JBS members and supporters, and a daily diet of vitriol in his newspaper's pages. More than any other figure, Storke carried ridicule of the JBS nationwide. He became a national spokesman against the group who held up Santa Barbara as an example of the kind of uproar the society could inspire. By the mid-1960s, when scholars began to study the JBS' place in American politics, they based some of their characterizations on the news reports that had emanated from Santa Barbara. As a result, much of what the public knew—or thought it knew—about the group grew out of a climate in which suspicion outpaced reason. These reports did not describe how Storke's clandestine work deepened a growing sense of panic in the city where any aberration was blamed on "Birchers," regardless of validity. While Storke's efforts earned the nation's highest journalism awards and allowed him to portray himself as a civil libertarian, there is no hero in this story. There are only individuals who passed fear along for their own purposes.¹⁵

¹⁴ Larry Ceplair, *Anti-Communism in Twentieth Century America* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: Praeger, 2011), 77.

¹⁵ Thomas M. Storke, *I Write for Freedom*, with a foreword by Adlai Stevenson (Fresno, Calif.: McNally and Loftin, 1962), 1-5, 142-65; Ralph McGill, "Exposing a Danger," *Atlanta Constitution*, April 2, 1961; "A Courageous Editor," *NYT*, November 2, 1961; Kimmis Hendrick, "Absorbing Orchids," *Christian*

Storke is this dissertation's ubiquitous figure, and this reflects the position he assumed as the events described here unfolded. Storke began his newspaper career in Santa Barbara in 1901 by declaring himself independent of political forces, but by the 1960s, he himself was a political force, a self-described autocrat whose newspaper, more than any institution in the city, established Santa Barbara's conservative tenor. Storke's conservatism was so engrained that friends and associates, not to mention readers, often believed the publisher, a lifelong Democrat, was a Republican.¹⁶

For much of the twentieth century, Santa Barbarans and readers in two other Southern California counties received news through the conservative filter that Storke provided.¹⁷ Like all newspaper publishers, he was a gatekeeper, ringmaster, and advocate, and his personal prejudices defined news coverage and editorial support. Historian Kevin Starr described Storke as "a William Randolph Hearst who stayed home and achieved a localized but comparable mode of power and influence." Like Hearst, Storke believed that newspapers superseded the role of elected officials in determining a community's future. Storke envisioned his newspaper as indispensable; while presidents, governors, and mayors were transient functionaries, newspapers remained a community's (or a nation's) permanent conscience. Government therefore existed only to police aberrations that might upend societal order and to enact dictates demanded by unelected publishers

Science Monitor, November 22, 1961; and Storke, "How Some Birchers Were Birched," *New York Times Magazine*, December 10, 1961, 100-102.

¹⁶ Thomas M. Storke [TMS] to Gordon Macker, March 15, 1962, folder "Miscellany M," box 19; and TMS to Jenny Walker, December 23, 1964, folder "W Miscellany Wa," box 36, both in Thomas More Storke Papers, BANC MSS 73/72 c, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley [hereafter cited as TMS Papers, Berkeley]; and Clark Kerr, *Academic Triumphs*, vol. 1, *The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the University of California, 1949-1967* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 309.

¹⁷ The *News-Press*' daily circulation in 1960 was 30,444; in 1961, 31,466. These figures do not take into account rack sales or pass-alongs, when people share a newspaper. The *News-Press* circulated in Santa Barbara, Ventura and San Luis Obispo counties. See the *Editor & Publisher International Year Book* (1961 and 1962 editions), pages 46 and 44, respectively.

armed with printing presses instead of electoral mandates. Pet projects and favored politicians received unabashed support; ideas a publisher deemed bad earned no ink or garnered only withering criticism. After the JBS campaign elevated the publisher to national prominence, *Time* magazine called Storke “a benevolent tyrant who has played king of Santa Barbara for 61 years.” In the same article a resident conceded, “If I was ever quoted as saying something against T.M., I’d lose my job the next day.”¹⁸

Storke’s irascibility, stubbornness, and complete confidence in his own vision for Santa Barbara were in full plume when he confronted the John Birch Society in the last decade of his life. Ultimately, it is the resistance marshaled by Storke and his newspaper that differentiates Santa Barbara’s experience with the John Birch Society from other places where the organization established chapters in its early years. Santa Barbara, with a wealthy, older population, and an overriding conservative demeanor, should have embraced the JBS. But for Storke’s *News-Press*, it might have.

The story of the John Birch Society’s early years inspires many ahistorical questions. What if, for instance, the JBS had not attempted to establish itself in Santa Barbara? Would the perceptions that have endured of the group over the past half century have been the same? A larger “what if?” involves the major reason for the JBS’ stillbirth—Robert Welch’s authorship of *The Politician*, the 300-hundred page “letter” in which he depicted Dwight D. Eisenhower as “a dedicated, conscious agent of the communist conspiracy.”¹⁹ The introduction to Welch’s manuscript ended with a stunning

¹⁸ Kevin Starr, *Material Dreams: Southern California through the 1920s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 289; Ben Procter, *William Randolph Hearst: The Early Years, 1863-1910* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 136-37, 143-48; and “King Storke,” *Time*, November 17, 1961, 42.

¹⁹ This phrase does not appear in the version of *The Politician* Welch published for public consumption in 1963. The citation here is to an earlier, unpublished version available online as part of the Lazar FOIA Collection, https://archive.org/details/foia_Welch_Robert-The_Word_Is_Treason-1958.pdf. See pages 266-67 of this version. Subsequent citations are to the published version unless otherwise noted.

declaration: “[T]here is only one possible word to describe his purposes and actions. That word is treason.” In four words, Welch indicted Eisenhower—the Supreme Allied Commander who led the fight to liberate Europe from fascism during the Second World War and the president of the United States who, according to historian William H. Chafe, “enjoyed more moral authority and political strength than any president since Franklin Roosevelt at the beginning of the New Deal.” Welch held Eisenhower and Roosevelt in the same contempt; both men had contributed to the creeping collectivism of the postwar world. Eisenhower refused to dismantle New Deal hallmarks such as Social Security, and he and other moderate Republicans believed the federal government held responsibility for social welfare. Equally troubling to Eisenhower’s critics were the president’s peace and economic overtures to the Soviet Union, then involved in post-Stalinist reforms that stressed peaceful coexistence, but whose leadership they believed was as dedicated as ever to strengthening the communist state’s global influence.²⁰

Eisenhower’s collusion with communists, according to Welch, included the appointments he made as president and his choice of advisers. Welch’s list of collaborators (there were more than forty names altogether) included Eisenhower’s brother Milton, his mentor George C. Marshall, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and Chief Justice Earl Warren. The president’s use of troops to integrate Little Rock Central High School in 1957 further demonstrated his eagerness to impose the will of the state over its people—at gunpoint if necessary.²¹ While many conservatives dismissed

²⁰ Robert H.W. Welch, *The Politician* (Belmont, Mass.: Belmont Publishing Co., 1963), 6, 215-50; and William H. Chafe, *The Unfinished Journey: America since World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 147.

²¹ Geoffrey Kabaservice, *Rule and Ruin: The Downfall of Moderation and the Destruction of the Republican Party from Eisenhower to the Tea Party* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 10-16; and Nicol C. Rae, *The Decline and Fall of the Liberal Republicans: From 1952 to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 39-45.

Eisenhower's politics—indeed, a rejection of his “modern Republicanism” and its seeming embrace of New Deal-style bureaucracy was instrumental in the emergence of the nationwide conservative movement—no one took the criticism to the extremes that Welch did. By portraying Eisenhower as a traitor, Welch damned any organization with which he was affiliated. The John Birch Society's founder was also its greatest liability.

Welch's failure to finesse the media or to adequately distance the JBS from his earlier writings guaranteed the derision the organization endured in its early years has lingered through the decades. These rebukes came from official and cultural sources alike. California Attorney General Stanley Mosk's sarcastic characterization of the JBS membership as “little old ladies in tennis shoes” invariably appears whenever the organization is mentioned in print. Bob Dylan mocked the group in his “Talkin' John Birch Paranoid Blues,” and the Chad Mitchell Trio offered this lampoon in “The John Birch Society”:

Do you want Justice Warren for your Commissar?
Do you want Mrs. Khrushchev in with the DAR?
You cannot trust your neighbor or even next of kin
If mommy is a commie then you gotta turn her in
Oh, we're the John Birch Society, the John Birch Society
Fighting for the right to fight the right fight for the Right.

There were also ersatz organizations that belittled the JBS. Cartoonist Walt Kelly, best known for his “Pogo” comic strip, invented the Jack Acid Society whose membership included the blind Molester Mole and the sanctimonious Deacon Mushrat. Other imitators included the Orange County, California-based Webster Quimmley Society, whose hero “chickened out on the Santa Ana Freeway.” Jazz icon Dizzy Gillespie—whose real name was John Birks Gillespie—organized John Birks Societies in twenty-five states and made a satirical run for president in 1964. Mass-marketed

paperback “exposés” published during the society’s formative years also condemned the JBS to public scorn.²²

Mockery obscured mobilization, however. The JBS, despite negative publicity, gave people a sense of communal purpose. Many members said the JBS awakened them to the Cold War dangers confronting the country from both external and internal forces. A woman from Alabama wrote in April 1961 that she had “lost faith in the survival of the free world” until she discovered the group. “Today, I find that I am not alone. Others have deep concern also and we have a leader in the John Birch Society. It gives each of us an opportunity as an individual, free American to fight communism.” She concluded starkly: “I prefer death for me and my children than a day of life under communism.” Urgency punctuated the society’s mission, another member suggested. “We fully understand that, if things continue as they have, we will not be enjoying the American way of life for long. We are therefore determined, never yielding or compromising, to do everything in our power to stop the systematic destruction of our freedom. If God is willing—and we know he is—we shall not fail.” No organization since the country’s founding “has put so much into their work” or was as “devoted,” another member suggested. “At this moment, from coast to coast, there are literally thousands of dedicated people working against the Communist and Socialist parties. They are acting to return our

²² Stanley Mosk and Howard H. Jewel, “The Birch Phenomenon Analyzed,” *New York Times Magazine*, August 20, 1961, 12, 89; Michael Brown, “The John Birch Society,” *The Chad Mitchell Trio* (Kapp 457, 1962); Bob Dylan, “Talkin’ John Birch Paranoid Blues,” *The Bootleg Series, Vols. 1-3* (Columbia Records, 1991); Walt Kelly, *The Jack Acid Society Black Book* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962); “Boil at Reds, Birchers? Join ‘Webster Quimmley Society,’” *SBNP*, August 20, 1961; and Sean Wilentz, “Confounding Fathers,” *The New Yorker*, October 18, 2010, 35. See also Gene Grove, *Inside the John Birch Society* (Greenwich, Conn. Gold Medal Books, 1961); Mike Newberry, *The Fascist Revival: The Inside Story of the John Birch Society* (New York: New Century Publishers, 1961); and Richard Vahan, *The Truth about the John Birch Society* (New York: Macfadden-Bartell, 1962).

government to its original form. . . . Since this is true, we have come under condemnation by the press and the left-wing liberals with smears, innuendos and lies.”²³

While Welch has received a lion’s share of ridicule—perhaps rightfully so—this attention has unfairly detracted from his followers who, in spite of Welch, not because of him, furthered a conservative message that eventually met electoral success. “You know, we conservatives are a rugged, individualistic bunch,” two JBS members wrote in early 1961. “Don’t underestimate our strength. A few strong-minded individuals can accomplish more than a whole crowd of complacent conformists.”²⁴ The voices of these activists have only recently found their way into scholarship of the postwar conservative movement. Earlier portrayals of the society had relied heavily on press stories that more often than not painted Welch and his membership with the same tainted brush.

According to these contemporary accounts, the JBS had no clear identity, and was defined by suspicion, economic self-interest, racism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, nativism, and psychological instability. Questions about the mental health of JBS members and Welch were a common theme. In *The Strange Tactics of Extremism*, authors Harry and Bonaro Overstreet diagnosed society rhetoric—and indeed rhetoric throughout the far right—as symptomatic of mental illness. Mark Sherwin’s *The Extremists* offered a similar characterization, and his diagnosis carried shades of historian Richard Hofstadter’s earlier “status anxiety” thesis. Sherwin depicted people who joined Americanist organizations such as the JBS as “inadequate personalities” who were “frightened that what they have may be taken from them or that what they seek may be

²³ Betty Madison to James J. Kilpatrick [JJK], April 23, 1961, folder 4; F.V. Vinklerek to George Sokolsky [GS], February 28, 1961, folder 2; and Richard E. Neale to JJK, February 7, 1961, folder 1, all in box 1, James J. Kilpatrick Papers, MSS 6626-a, Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville [hereinafter cited as Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia].

²⁴ Mr. and Mrs. Perry Fleagle to GS, February 4, 1961, folder 1, box 1, Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia.

snatched out of their reach.” Inferiority and the search for scapegoats on which to pin their shortcomings united far right organizations, he concluded.²⁵

Sherwin’s analysis offered a cause-and-effect relationship between status inferiority and conspiratorial beliefs, which became the most recognizable trait of the John Birch Society and other far right groups. A belief in a communist conspiracy that pervaded all levels of American life and government was interwoven throughout the society’s rhetoric, commentator Alan F. Westin noted in 1961. Westin placed the JBS between two poles of the American right: the “hate right,” which included groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, and the “respectable right,” such as the Daughters of the American Revolution. The JBS included elements of both, he concluded, but infused its rhetoric with conspiratorial notions about shadowy political control and un-Americanism, which they traced back to an international communist conspiracy. Writing in 1964, researchers Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein added that the irrational belief in conspiracies remained the only unifying factor of the far right; as a result, neither the JBS nor its brethren “should be regarded as part of this nation’s political fabric.”²⁶

None of these early commentators—despite their attempts to relegate the JBS to the far fringes of the American political experience—could deny its effectiveness. Milton A. Waldor characterized the JBS as the “most successful confederation of the fearful in recent American history.” Scholar J. Allen Broyles offered a counter argument. Most JBS members identified themselves politically as Republicans, were educated, and middle

²⁵ Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, *The Strange Tactics of Extremism* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1964), 269; Mark Sherwin, *The Extremists* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1963), 227; and Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966; reprint, New York: Vintage Books, 2008), 62-63, 66-67 [citations are to the reprint edition].

²⁶ Alan F. Westin, “The John Birch Society: Fundamentalism on the Right,” *Commentary* 32 (August 1961): 94; and Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, *Danger on the Right* (New York: Random House, 1964), xv-xvi. Epstein and Forster further explored the JBS and the Radical Right in *The Radical Right: Report on the John Birch Society and its Allies* (New York: Random House, 1967).

class—hardly fringe elements or paranoid deviants, Broyles wrote in *The John Birch Society: Anatomy of a Protest*, the first scholarly examination of the JBS. Broyles’ sociological study examined the group by first “granting the possibility that the ideology of the Society may be rational.” Although Broyles conceded that the JBS based much of its ideology on abstract concepts and conspiracism, he also found that members championed politically conservative ideas that represented a “‘central syllogism’—a core idea that has all the trappings of logic.”²⁷

Unlike other writers who studied the JBS in its early years, Broyles refused to label the JBS as unstable paranoiacs on the political fringe who posed a danger to the communities in which they operated.²⁸ For more than three decades after its publication, his book remained the most balanced scholarly analysis of the organization, yet few paid attention to it. As late as the 1990s, commentators dismissed the JBS as having had no “significant, enduring effect . . . upon the United States.”²⁹ In the last twenty years, however, historians, spurred by Alan Brinkley’s oft-quoted depiction of twentieth-century American conservatism as “something of an orphan,” have begun an earnest re-evaluation of the wider conservative movement that differentiates between Welch’s irrational rhetoric and his membership’s dedicated mobilization. In *Suburban Warriors*, Lisa McGirr depicted members of the John Birch Society and their Americanist kin as “the ground forces of a conservative revival—one that transformed conservatism from a marginal force preoccupied with communism in the early 1960s to a viable electoral

²⁷ Milton A. Waldor, *Peddlers of Fear: The John Birch Society* (Newark, N.J.: Lynnross, 1966), 135; and J. Allen Broyles, *The John Birch Society: Anatomy of a Protest* (Boston, Beacon Press, 1966), 139-40, 143.

²⁸ Forster and Epstein, *Danger on the Right*, 12-14; and Waldor, *Peddlers of Fear*, 10-11.

²⁹ John George and Laird Wilcox, *American Extremists: Militias, Supremacists, Klansmen, Communists, & Others* (Amherst, Mass.: Prometheus Books, 1996), 195. See also David Bennett, *The Party of Fear* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 323.

contender by decade's end."³⁰ Similarly, Jonathan M. Schoenwald's *A Time for Choosing* argued that the JBS played a complex and understated role in the emergence of postwar American conservatism. "Typically dismissed as a collection of 'kooks,' the JBS performed much like a third party: it forced the GOP, the Democrats, and conservatives of all types to respond to its agenda," Schoenwald writes. "In neighborhoods and small towns . . . the JBS helped develop a conservative movement culture. . . . Rallies, letter drives, social events, a variety of local projects all help Birchers hone their skills, spread the word of conservatism, and become more deeply invested in American politics. For some members the society was an end unto itself, while for others it was a starting point, an introduction that led to more."³¹

This dissertation examines the John Birch Society's presence in Santa Barbara, and makes no claim that the organization's experience there was typical. To the contrary, the atypical nature of what transpired in Santa Barbara demonstrated that the conservative movement developed in a frenetic and confrontational manner during the postwar years. The consequences for the JBS' national reputation and for the conservative movement in general drive this study, which began, rather incongruously, outside Birmingham, Alabama, almost six years ago. Facing a deserted steel mill, a billboard sponsored by a local chapter of the John Birch Society entreated passersby to support limits on immigration. As I drove passed, I thought it was a relic of a bygone era when the JBS erected such signs along the nation's highways to urge impeachment of the chief justice

³⁰ Alan Brinkley, "The Problem of American Conservatism," *American Historical Review* 99 (April 1994): 409; and McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 4. See also Donald T. Critchlow, *The Conservative Ascendancy: How the GOP Right Made Political History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 55-61, 63-66; and Brenner, "Fellow Travelers," 83-86.

³¹ Schoenwald, *A Time for Choosing*, 98-99. See also Schoenwald, "We Are an Action Group," 21-36.

in order to “Save Our Republic.” The billboard perplexed me. I thought the JBS had died years before, a victim of its own hysteria.

At its core, this dissertation asks why that image has persevered, and it unearths the roots of a bad reputation that persists despite recent efforts to differentiate between Welch’s words and his members’ work. The search for an answer to the simplistic question of “How did I know what I thought I knew about the John Birch Society?” led from an Alabama highway to the shores of California. The story begins in Santa Barbara, which, as the following chapter details, had a somewhat contentious view of modern life. It considers the city’s reaction to the JBS against the backdrop of its development and its at-times combative relationship with the world beyond the Santa Ynez Mountains that ring the city and give it its distinctive climate and allure.

Chapter three chronicles the missteps and miscalculations that epitomized the JBS’ crucial early years and portrays Santa Barbara as a city divided by a shared emotion, fear. It also demonstrates how the JBS disseminated—or attempted to—existing conservative ideas to its grassroots audience. Chapter four shows how publisher Thomas M. Storke used the blunders the JBS made in Santa Barbara to become a national spokesman against the society, while chapter five examines how Storke gained enough power—and gumption—to think he could exile an entire group from the city.

Like chapter 3, chapter 6 demonstrates how Welch and his membership served as a crucial bridge between conservative ideas and conservative mobilization. Like other recent studies of the JBS, these chapters do not portray the organization as a font of conservative ideology, but rather show how it tapped into existing ideas and organized grassroots efforts around them. Chapter 6 explores how the JBS’ most-famous effort, the

impeachment drive against Chief Justice Earl Warren, confirmed the depth of public antipathy toward the court that politicians such as Ronald Reagan and Richard M. Nixon would capitalize on during their respective electoral campaigns in the latter half of the 1960s.

“Save Our Republic” concludes by suggesting that what occurred in Santa Barbara was reflective of a larger, more pronounced political battle that was occurring nationwide. The struggle there was not between left and right. It pitted conservatives against themselves as they attempted to sort out their ideological boundaries; it is a struggle that continues today with the rise of the Tea Party, which has drawn natural—if at times inexact—comparisons to the JBS. The threat from the John Birch Society that caused so much handwringing in the halls of conservative power had an equal effect in the parlors, churches, schoolhouses and newsrooms of at least one American community. For many Santa Barbarans, what took place there was nothing less than a battle for the ideological soul of a city that billed itself as an Eden. At stake was whether the American paradise would be maintained or lost.

The John Birch Society was fighting for exactly the same thing.

CHAPTER TWO “SANTA BARBARA IS NOT GOING TO CHANGE”

San Felipe, California, was a “listless” city that treasured an ersatz past. “Each year, when the moon hit full for the first time in August,” wrote author Gordon Forbes, “San Felipe fled eagerly back to an era of conquistadores and hidalgos and tonsured monks and strutting dons—to an age it made up in a dream factory. None of it had ever existed the way San Felipe chose to remember it.” When Forbes published *Too Near the Sun* in 1955, the book indicted San Felipe as a city whose citizens worked too little and squandered their talents in pursuit of an easy life. Its leaders were an inert oligarchy who had built a cloistered society that thrived on sex, booze, and intrigue, and that rabidly rejected outsiders as meddling interlopers.¹

The residents of San Felipe met this withering portrait with unsurprising silence—unsurprising because the city did not exist. But Santa Barbara, where Forbes had lived just long enough to collect bits of stories and gossip about the city’s leading citizens, was outraged. *Too Near the Sun* was a thinly disguised portrait of a city where class consciousness and conformity were civic religions. Normally staid Santa Barbara, its world-renowned gentility under attack, cried havoc, but a parlor game emerged where a hostess would produce the *roman à clef* and her guests would argue over the true identities of Forbes’ characters. Soon, *Too Near the Sun* became hard to find in Santa Barbara. Amid an outcry over its contents, the public library pulled it from its shelves. Librarians kept it under lock and key, the same treatment accorded more-racier fare, until the early 1970s. Local bookstores would not sell it. In its review, the weekly *Santa Barbara Star* called *Too Near the Sun* “lousy” and described Forbes as “a spiteful little

¹ Gordon Forbes, *Too Near the Sun* (New York: Dell, 1955), 23.

boy who had a lot of mean things to say about his schoolmates.” *Santa Barbara News-Press* publisher Thomas M. Storke banned any mention of the book from his newspaper, because his son Charles was among those it skewered. In Forbes’ telling, the newspaper scion was a pompous draft dodger sympathetic to fascism. The publisher also did not escape Forbes’ rapier. Although the author made his fictional newspaper owner a woman, like Storke, she was a rancher who always wore a big hat that made her instantly recognizable. Few in Santa Barbara missed the allusion.²

Forbes’ novel hit a little too close to home for many Santa Barbarans and the author became *persona non grata* among the city’s elite who had once welcomed him into their parlors and patios. Forbes’ exile from Santa Barbara, while extreme, was not atypical. Any outsider—Forbes was a New Jersey native—who questioned the conformist harmony the city had cultivated might find himself similarly shunned, if not physically, then certainly socially. Santa Barbara had maintained a schizophrenic relationship with the outside world for much of the twentieth century. It needed external business investment and counted on the philanthropy of wealthy Eastern benefactors to sustain its arts and music communities and to help preserve its Spanish heritage sites. It also relied on tourists who wanted to experience the year-round postcard perfect weather of the city that billed itself as America’s Riviera. But for many Santa Barbarans, the world beyond the Santa Ynez Mountains posed a threat that could upend the delicate ambiance they fiercely guarded. By welcoming the outside world, even out of economic necessity, the city risked losing something—heritage, isolation, distinctiveness, control of

² Ibid., 26-27; “‘Too Near the Sun’ Represents Slug’s-Eye View of Santa Barbara’s Cabana Set,” *Santa Barbara Star*, May 12, 1955; Kelly Tunney, “Santa Barbara: Old Guard and New Life-Style,” *Los Angeles Times [LAT]*, December 28, 1969; and Barney Brantingham, “Eccentrics in the Newsroom,” *Santa Barbara Independent*, March 18, 2010.

its destiny, or a mixture thereof. Simply being Santa Barbara had been the city's main industry for nearly a century. Preserving the atmosphere that drew people—a certain kind of people—to it became something of a mania.

The period following the Second World War inspired anxiety among Santa Barbarans just as it did other Americans. An influx of new residents to California at a rate higher than at any time since the antebellum Gold Rush tested the state's infrastructure, its schools, its water resources, and its housing. For much of California, change had been the one permanent feature of life in the Golden State—but not in Santa Barbara. In the 1960s, as California stood on the precipice of becoming the nation's most populated state, newspapers and magazines highlighted Santa Barbara's reluctant embrace of the twentieth century. Like the remainder of the state, the city had experienced a surge in population between 1950 and 1960. Despite a smaller increase—Santa Barbara's population had grown 30 percent compared to 49 percent statewide—even the slightest change inspired worries that the city could not retain its distinctiveness in such a rapidly evolving and expanding environment.³ With its white adobe structures and red-tiled roofs, near perfect weather and reputation as a playground for the wealthy, Santa Barbara billed itself as a community wholly unlike anywhere else in the country. As such, it seemed to harbor residents who were slightly—indeed, proudly—out of touch with the modern realities the remainder of the country encountered and embraced. A national magazine depicted some Santa Barbarans as suffering from “psychological unemployment.” Residents, some of whom the *New York Times* portrayed as being

³ Santa Barbara's population between 1950 and 1960 grew from 44,913 to 58,768 residents. California's population increased from 10.6 million to 15.7 million. U.S. Department of Commerce, *U.S. Census of Population, 1960: United States Summary* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961), 1-51, 1-71.

unaware of the year, struggled “to modernize paradise without disturbing its beauty.” Lamented one hostess: “We are in the throes of a social revolution. But isn’t everybody?”⁴

While revolutions historically were periods of unrestrained and ungovernable upheaval, Santa Barbara had established the boundaries of its insurrection and therefore limited its potency. Unlike other areas of California and the United States, Santa Barbara entered the 1960s—a period that brought into sharp focus the inequity that spared few areas of American life—by clinging to the isolation, both geographic and ideological, that had defined the city for nearly a century. In a period when people nationwide were demanding inclusion, Santa Barbara remained exclusive. Unlike many areas of California that seemed to welcome everyone, Santa Barbara embraced the twentieth century just as it had the nineteenth—on its own qualitative terms. When the city established itself as a haven for convalescents and then a playground for the privileged in the 1870s, it had similarly limited the kinds of people it would welcome—white, upper class industrialists who posed no threat to the city’s domestic tranquility. The trend continued in subsequent generations. In 1957, the city for the first time initiated a zoning classification for research firms. These smokeless industries would move into the city, expand its tax base, and produce ideas but not pollute the air. Companies that located to Santa Barbara were “forbidden to manufacture so much as a door handle,” a magazine reported. By 1960, the city had recruited General Electric, Raytheon, Hoffman and other firms. Santa Barbara

⁴ Kimmis Hendrick, “Space-Age Zoning Puzzle,” October 6, 1960; and Hendrick, “Future: Santa Barbara at Crossroads,” October 25, 1960, both in *Christian Science Monitor*; John D. Weaver, “Santa Barbara: Dilemma in Paradise,” *Holiday*, June 1961, 84, 86; Charlotte Curtis, “Santa Barbara is Adjusting to an Influx of Intellectuals,” *New York Times [NYT]*, October 25, 1963; and Michael R. Adamson, “The Makings of a Fine Prosperity: Thomas M. Storke, the *Santa Barbara News-Press*, and the Campaign to Approve the Cachuma Project,” *Journal of Urban History* 30 (January 2004): 191-95.

greeted its new residents with the same suspicion with which it had welcomed past newcomers and worried whether they would conform or push the community toward a true social revolution. “It’s not the intimate little town it used to be,” lamented one hostess at decade’s end. “You read social accounts in the newspaper about people you’ve never heard of before.” Insisted another: “I want Santa Barbara to stay only for those who love Santa Barbara. I don’t want anything commercial. The new people want lights. Lights and curbs in Montecito? We’ve never had lights and curbs. Established families don’t want that change. Established people want it the same way, the way it’s been for generations.”⁵

The John Birch Society established chapters in Santa Barbara during this period of civic hand-wringing, and the eventual exposure of the organization’s presence in the city deepened many residents’ fear about the ideological change that accompanied physical change. Yet by envisioning the city as it had over the past nine decades, Santa Barbara had fostered a conservative social and political environment where a group like the JBS might thrive, particularly in the organization’s early years when it relied heavily on affluent people with disposable income and spare time who feared the dangers communism and statism posed in the postwar United States. *News-Press* associate editor Ronald D. Scofield noted in September 1961 that the decades-long campaign of qualitative growth had nurtured an older population that exerted “conservative but enlightened influence” and resisted “‘welfare’ trends.”⁶ Two months later, *Time* magazine described Santa Barbara as “a natural harbor for old bones. There, under a

⁵ Weaver, “Santa Barbara: Dilemma in Paradise,” 84; Hendrick, “Space-Age Zoning Puzzle”; and Tunney, “Santa Barbara: Old Guard and New Life-Style.”

⁶ Ronald D. Scofield to Dr. Joel Smith, September 22, 1961, folder “D Miscellany, Di-Du,” box 8, Thomas More Storke Papers, BANC MSS 73/72 c, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley [hereafter cited as TMS Papers, Berkeley].

gentle sun, the retired well-to-do live out their twilight years, nourishing a vehement conservative concern for the state of the nation.”⁷ The 1960 Census supported both Scofield and *Time*’s characterizations of Santa Barbara’s population as older and affluent. Nearly 40 percent of the city’s residents were at least 45 years old; in neighboring Montecito, a prosperous enclave critics associated (whether fairly or not) with the John Birch Society, 45 percent of residents were 45 or older. The median price for a house in Montecito was more than \$35,000 (\$280,321 today) and families who lived there reported an annual income of \$9,496 (\$76,055.25 today). In Santa Barbara proper, the median home price was \$18,300 (\$145,568 in 2014) and the median family income was \$6,477 (\$51,875).⁸

The Census indicated ages and wealth, but voting patterns truly underscored the county’s conservatism. Compared to Orange County, which historian Lisa McGirr depicts as the yardstick for the emerging conservative movement nationwide, Santa Barbara was equally as strident in its conservatism throughout the twentieth century; given the impotence of the state’s Democratic Party for nearly fifty years, much of California might be characterized the same way. However, in the 1950s, as parties renewed their importance in California politics, Republican support remained high in Santa Barbara, although Democrats held a slight registration advantage and would throughout the 1960s. In eighteen presidential, United States senatorial, and gubernatorial elections between 1952 and 1972, Santa Barbara County tipped Democratic only once, in the 1964 presidential contest between Lyndon B. Johnson and Barry M. Goldwater. In the

⁷ “King Storke,” *Time*, November 17, 1961, 40.

⁸ U.S. Bureau of the Census, *State and Small Areas, California, U.S. Census of Housing, 1960*, vol. 7 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962), 184; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 1960, Census Tracts, Final Report PHC (1)-139* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962), 13, 15, 17, 20, 35-36.

1958 governor's race between Republican William F. Knowland and Democrat Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, Santa Barbara County was one of only four counties Knowland carried; Orange County was another. Santa Barbara County supported Richard M. Nixon during his 1960 presidential race, again during his 1962 gubernatorial race, and in both of his White House bids in 1968 and 1972. Ronald Reagan was an even more popular figure in Santa Barbara; he carried 63 percent of the vote during his 1966 gubernatorial bid and received 60 percent when he ran for re-election four years later. By contrast, Nixon's highest total was 55.2 percent in 1972. From 1947 to 1974, Santa Barbara's congressional representatives were also Republican.⁹

The age of its residents, wealth, and engrained conservatism made Santa Barbara "a natural place to organize a cell of the John Birch Society," *Time* opined in late 1961. Because of the large number of retired people who lived there, Santa Barbara's JBS members tended to be older than members in other parts of California. In contrast, a late 1960s study of JBS members in California found that most joined the organization before their fortieth birthdays.¹⁰ In addition to being older, Santa Barbara's members were also believed to be more affluent than average. Because members rarely identified themselves as such, this is harder to verify, but the contemporary perception in Santa Barbara was that local members resided primary in affluent Montecito. "The local Welchers are operating on a Social Register and Blue Book level," one observer insisted, adding that the JBS "appeals to the social climber who wants to be in the swim." An unidentified

⁹ Eugene C. Lee, *California Votes, 1928-1960* (Berkeley: University of California Institute of Government Studies, 1963), A41-A45, A69-A-72; and Eugene C. Lee and Bruce E. Keith. *California Votes, 1960-1972* (Berkeley: University of California Institute of Government Studies, 1974), A17-A23, A28-A37. See also Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

¹⁰ Barbara S. Stone, "The John Birch Society: A Profile," *Journal of Politics* 36 (February 1974): 188-91. See also Stone, "The John Birch Society of California," (Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1968), especially chapter 6.

informant similarly told the FBI that individuals who attended a meeting in April 1960, “were approximately two-thirds composed of the type known as ‘First Families,’ that is mature to elderly people whose position in society is relatively secure, either because of money or family or both.” The remainder of the guest list “could be described as ‘comers’ . . . young people who will probably attain in later years that position in society now held by the First Families.” Ideologically, the guests “were of the political beliefs inaccurately labeled extreme conservatism,” the informant concluded, “and more accurately describable as historic constitutionalists or republican, as distinguishable from Republican as an existing political party.”¹¹

Santa Barbarans who joined the JBS “are your neighbors and mine, many of them reliable and respectable folks [who] felt they were taking a step forward while their fellow man floundered in the mire of indecision,” one observer noted, continuing: “The people who are attracted to the [JBS] are these older folks who want to do something about communism, and saw in this organization a movement that they could support and aid financially or physically toward stemming the tide of communism that appears ready to engulf us.”¹² In January 1961, the month the JBS confirmed its presence in the city, three incidents underscored just how much fear communism engendered among residents and indicate how the tenor of the times might result in people seeking guidance in the JBS’ ranks. An adult education class on communism devolved into chaos because the teacher denounced Senator Joseph McCarthy and urged a “sane and intelligent”

¹¹ Arthur Menken to TMS, February 26, 1961, folder “JBS, Request for Materials, M-N,” carton 2, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and “Santa Barbara Activities of the John Birch Society and Presentation Film by Robert Welch,” April 18, 1960, Los Angeles Field Office, John Birch Society, FBI file no. 100-59001, Ernie Lazar Freedom of Information Act Collection, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Los_Angeles-1 [hereafter cited as Lazar FOIA Collection].

¹² “King Storke,” 40; and Fred Hand, letter to the editor, *Santa Barbara News-Press* [SBNP], March 9, 1961.

anticommunism based on education. That same month, a local American Legion post pressured library trustees to pull *New World Review*, an opinion magazine legion members characterized as “blatant communist propaganda.” In addition, a county grand jury urged a review of American history textbooks, some of which jurors believed “present evidence of hostility to true American principles, bias, and collectivist thinking and class warfare ideology.”¹³

There were more visible sources of fear as well. Downtown Santa Barbara was less than seventy miles from Vandenberg Air Force Base, a site of vital military importance to America’s peacetime defense.¹⁴ The Air Force began test launching intercontinental ballistic missiles from Vandenberg in 1958, and the spectacle in the western skies inspired awe and anxiety. Launches from Vandenberg became a source of family entertainment. Residents gathered in their yards and watched the night skies for light flashes from the direction of the base. Some felt protected by American military might. Others realized that the base made coastal California a prime military target. There was precedent for fear of a military attack. In February 1942, less than three months after

¹³ “Communism Series Opener Attended by Large Audience,” January 12, 1961; “Communists Fight Established Order, Dr. Merkl Reports,” January 19, 1961; “Lecturer on Reds Hits ‘Lie’ Campaign,” January 26, 1961; “Grand Jury Urges Review of School History Books,” January 13, 1961; and “School Officials Reply to Report,” January 13, 1961, all in *SBNP*; and Everett T. Moore, “For Reference Only,” *American Library Association Bulletin* 55 (January 1961): 19-20.

¹⁴ Vandenberg Air Force Base is located on the site of Camp Cooke, which trained troops during the Second World War and Korean Conflict. The Air Force renamed it in honor of General Hoyt S. Vandenberg, the Air Force chief of staff from 1948 to 1953. He was instrumental in the formation of the Strategic Air Command and the development of the hydrogen bomb. Averam B. Bender, “From Tanks to Missiles: Camp Cooke/Cooke Air Force Base (California), 1941-1958,” *Arizona and the West* 9 (Autumn 1967): 219. See also Philip S. Meilinger, *Hoyt S. Vandenberg: The Life of a General* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989). For the postwar growth of the defense industry in California and the West, see Roger W. Lotchin, *Fortress California, 1910-1961: From Warfare to Welfare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Kevin J. Fernlund, *The Cold War American West, 1945-1989* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998), especially chapters 5 and 6; James L. Clayton, “Defense Spending Key to California’s Growth,” *Western Political Quarterly* 15 (June 1962): 280-93; Clayton, “The Impact of the Cold War on the Economies of California and Utah,” *Pacific Historical Review* 36 (November 1967): 449-73; Seyom Brown, “Southern California’s Precarious One-Crop Economy,” *The Reporter*, January 7, 1960, 25-28; and “California—here they come,” *Business Week*, December 8, 1962, 124-31.

the attack on Pearl Harbor ushered the United States into the Second World War, Japanese submarines had shelled a coastal oil field twelve miles west of the city. Nearly two decades later, longtime residents remembered the thump of the bombs and the lingering fear that something deadly lurked beneath the ocean's surface. After the Second World War, mock drills, in which a theoretical hydrogen bomb destroyed Vandenberg, were held annually to emphasize the need for residents to engage in civil defense preparedness. The 1959 exercises—staged on the anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack—“would have killed half a million people from fallout alone,” in Santa Barbara, the *News-Press* estimated. Radiation would have killed a million more statewide; no one bothered to estimate how many residents would have died in the initial explosion. Two years later, the *Los Angeles Times* published a half-page map that depicted a ten-megaton hydrogen blast leveling Vandenberg. Santa Barbara's residents, those who survived, would have no more than an hour to seek refuge from the fallout. The Santa Ynez Mountains, which had protected it from invaders for centuries, would be powerless to shield Santa Barbara from the horrors of twentieth-century weaponry.¹⁵

Santa Barbara's love-hate relationship with the outside world was not just a modern phenomenon, but a consistent dynamic that went back epochs. Santa Barbara, a city so tied to a romantic notion of its past, could easily find examples where outside forces had altered the destiny of people who had formerly called the area home. A few residents in 1960 could remember the remnants of the region's indigenous culture that

¹⁵ “CD Will ‘Bomb’ VAFB on Monday,” December 3, 1959; “Mock Attack ‘Brings Death to Thousands,’” December 7, 1959, both in *SBNP*; “Red Alert! What If H-Bomb Hits Los Angeles?” *LAT*, March 12, 1961; Thomas M. Storke, *California Editor*, with a foreword by Earl Warren (Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1958), 417-18; “Refinery Fired On,” and “Inn Owner Tells of Shelling,” both in *NYT*, February 24, 1942; “Pioneering Family Has Role in Atlas Mission,” *Lompoc (Calif.) Record*, July 31, 2012; Dan Cragg, *Guide to Military Installations*, 5th ed. (Mechanicsburg, Pa.: Stackpole Books, 1997), 31; and Paul R. Klock, ed., *Western Space and Missile Center: Vandenberg Air Force Base, California* (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Air Force, 1990), 8.

had once thrived in the area an estimated 13,000 years before the arrival of the Spanish. The last group of natives to live in the region was the Chumash, who built one of the most advanced native civilizations in North America. Shielded by the Santa Ynez Mountains and fortified by the Santa Barbara Channel to the south, the Chumash flourished in isolation. They were expert fishermen and mariners; their frameless plank canoes allowed swift travel over long stretches of open seas. Their population may have reached 18,000 people before the Spanish mission system forever decimated their ranks by the nineteenth century.¹⁶

The Chumash's interaction with European explorers began when they greeted Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo, a Portuguese explorer for the Spanish monarchy who landed off the Channel Islands in 1542. Another sixty years passed before Sebastián Vizcaíno arrived on the mainland on December 2, 1602, the Feast of Santa Barbara; a friar aboard one of his ships named the area and the channel after the early Christian martyr. These brief interactions with the Europeans affected the natives little. The Chumash, confident in their numerical superiority, were unafraid of the newcomers, and their nation continued to thrive until the Spanish cemented their hold on the region in the late eighteenth century. Spain established a Royal Presidio at Santa Barbara in 1782. Mission Santa Barbara, which would become the city's most visible landmark, was christened four years later. The permanency of the Spanish presence in the region took its toll on the Chumash. Disease, the mission labor system (under which the Franciscan friars forced

¹⁶ Yolanda Broyles-Gonzalez and Pilulaw Khus, *Earth Wisdom: A California Chumash Woman* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2011), 59-71; Kevin Starr, *Material Dreams: Southern California through the 1920s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 232, 235; Leif C.W. Landberg, *The Chumash Indians of Southern California* (Los Angeles: Southwest Museum, 1965), 1-5; William S. Simmons, "Indian Peoples of California," *California History* 76 (Summer/Fall 1997): 53-54; and Walter A. Hawley, *The Early Days of Santa Barbara, California* (Santa Barbara: Schauer Printing Studio, 1920), 12, 43.

the native people to leave their own communities and become wards of the church), cramped living conditions, and violence thinned the population. By the 1850s, about 1,000 Chumash remained in the region. By 1880, only a few dozen survived.¹⁷

The Chumash provided only one cautionary tale. By the 1850s, Santa Barbara and the rest of California were parts of the United States. Between 1800 and 1848, three flags had flown over California—that of Spain, then Mexico after 1821, and finally, the United States.¹⁸ The cession of control by one power resulted in the assumption of power by another. Turmoil accompanied each. Santa Barbara, isolated though it was by geography, felt the effects firsthand. As more Americans entered Santa Barbara following the end of the Mexican-American War and California's entrance into the Union in 1850, racial tensions mounted. Americans looked down upon the Mexican community; though a minority, they also determined they would seize political power from the predominately Hispanic oligarchy, especially the de la Guerra family, whose connections with the Spanish monarchy had allowed them to wield power in Santa Barbara practically since the presidio's founding. Eventually, postbellum American immigration displaced the old families. The Yankee Barbareños, among them Charles Albert Storke, Thomas M. Storke's father, assumed social and cultural dominance of the city and decided to exploit its isolation.¹⁹

¹⁷ Starr, *Material Dreams*, 231-33, 251-53, 288-90; and Albert Camarillo, *Chicanos in a Changing Society: From Mexican Pueblos to American Barrios in Santa Barbara and Southern California, 1848-1930* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 6-8.

¹⁸ Kevin Starr, *Americans and the California Dream, 1850-1915* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 21. For American influence in California, particularly during and after the Gold Rush, see also Brian Roberts, *American Alchemy: The California Gold Rush and Middle-Class Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); and Malcolm J. Rohrbough, *Days of Gold: The California Gold Rush and the American Nation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

¹⁹ Camarillo, *Chicanos in a Changing Society*, 13-32; Richard B. Rice, William A. Burrough, and Richard J. Orsi, *The Elusive Eden: A New History of California*, 2nd edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996), 86-100; Walker A. Tompkins, *The Yankee Barbareños: The Americanization of Santa Barbara County, 1796-*

During the Gilded Age, Santa Barbara capitalized on its climate.²⁰ Surrounded by mountains, the city was an amphitheater of health located on a sixteen square-mile sliver of land that, unlike other sections of the California coastline, faced south rather than west. The mountains, nearly 4,000 feet in height, screened the city from temperature swings brought by northern and westerly winds. The Channel Islands, three rugged landmasses sixteen miles offshore, bore the brunt of Pacific storms and similarly shielded the city.²¹ The president of the United States Medical Association said in 1872 that nature had conspired to give the city “all the prerequisites of health . . . in measures so profuse that I would be accused of poetic extravagance were they duly portrayed.”²² Other writers were less restrained, and the city—attempting to promote itself as a sanctuary for convalescents—benefited from effusive scribes who compared Santa Barbara to resorts along the French Riviera. The city’s pleasantness, most agreed, surpassed its Mediterranean counterpart. Santa Barbara, wrote one, “probably has no superior on the globe!” Said another, “Nowhere else have we seen nature so lavish of her best gifts, so profuse of her bestowment of all that is good.”²³ One writer could not limit his comparison to just one destination. “It combines the beauties of three countries. With the Swiss suggestiveness of the mountains is the Scottish flavor of the valley, while the bay

1925 (Ventura, Calif.: Movini Press, 2003), 230-32, 241, 243; and Louise Pubols, *The Father of All: The de la Guerra Family, Power, and Patriarchy in Mexican California* (Berkeley: Published for the Huntington-USC Institute on California and the West by University of California Press and Huntington Library, 2009), 291-94.

²⁰ Glenn S. Dumke, *The Boom of the Eighties in Southern California* (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1944), 160-66; and John E. Baur, *The Health Seekers of Southern California, 1870-1900* (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1959), 6, 17, 65-72.

²¹ Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration, *A Guide to the Channel City and Its Environs* (New York: Hastings House, 1941), 60-61; and Karl Baedeker, ed., *The United States with an Excursion into Mexico*, 2nd ed. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1899), 497.

²² E.N. Wood, *Guide to Santa Barbara, Town and County* (Santa Barbara: Wood & Sefton, 1872), 36-37.

²³ Joseph J. Perkins, *Business Man’s Estimate of Santa Barbara County, California* (Santa Barbara: Daily Press Steam Printing House, 1881), 27; and Wood, *Guide to Santa Barbara*, 45. See also Charles Dudley Warner, *Our Italy* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1891), 137; and Santa Barbara County Commission to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, *Santa Barbara, California* (Santa Barbara: C.L. Donohoe, 1904), 27.

is that of Naples, blue, bright and bounded by the crescent shore.” Health seekers, inspired by such sweeping characterizations, flocked to the city throughout the Gilded Age; many stayed, built seasonal homes and transitioned the city from a place where invalids sought health to a playground where the healthy—and the rich—sought fun. “Heaven was a very comfortable place to live in,” one travel writer concluded, “and very desirable to those who couldn’t stay in Santa Barbara.”²⁴

One visitor described Santa Barbara as “resting her head upon the Santa Ynez Mountains and bathing her feet in the blue Pacific.”²⁵ Yet the mountains that regulated Santa Barbara’s climate also limited its development and isolated it from the rest of Southern California. The protection provided by the mountains that had allowed the Chumash natives to build their bustling civilization threatened the region’s growth in the years before the Southern Pacific Railroad connected Santa Barbara to Los Angeles in 1887. Visitors endured long sea voyages or overland journeys to reach the city through perilous mountain passes; even after the railroad’s completion, travelers faced a risky trip. “The hills and mountains hug the sea so closely that the railroad is obliged to run almost upon the ocean,” one weary tourist wrote in 1888. “At times, on looking from one side of the car, nothing can be seen but the deep-blue sea, and it takes but a slight stretch of imagination for the traveler to believe that he is out on the ocean sailing. The ocean-surf can be heard beating under the train as though it were against the sides of a ship.”²⁶

²⁴ Edwards Roberts, *Santa Barbara and Around There* (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1886), 25-26; and Mary Cone, *Two Years in California* (Chicago: S.C. Griggs, 1876), 81.

²⁵ Charles A. Stoddard, *Beyond the Rockies: A Spring Journey in California* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1884), 82.

²⁶ Walter Lindley and J.P. Widney, *California of the South: Its Physical Geography, Climate, Resources, Routes of Travel, and Health-Resorts: Being a Complete Guide-Book to Southern California* (New York: D. Appleton, 1888), 283; and T. Addison Richards, *Appleton’s Companion Handbook of Travel* (New York: D. Appleton, 1866), 263-64, 266.

Nevertheless, the climate and its seemingly magical benefits to visitors' well-being continued to draw people to the region.

The remoteness that made the city first a convalescent refuge then a resort for the wealthy in the nineteenth century would continue to benefit Santa Barbara in the first decades of the twentieth. City leaders, like their nineteenth century counterparts, saw this isolation as an asset because it marked Santa Barbara as different from other cities in Southern California. They only need look one hundred miles east to determine what they did not want their city to become. Los Angeles by the 1920s had exploded in an unregulated whirl, so quickly and frenetically that journalist Carey McWilliams compared the city's growth to "one long drunken orgy, one protracted debauch." For those such as journalist Charles Fletcher Lummis who fled Los Angeles to make his home in the Santa Barbara's more quiet environs, "the worst curse that could befall Santa Barbara would be the craze of GET BIG! Why big? Run down to Los Angeles for a few days—see that madhouse! You'd hate to live there!" In the 1920s, Los Angeles became more than "a mere city," concluded author Morrow Mayo. "It is a *commodity*, something to be advertised and sold to the people of the United States like automobiles, cigarettes, and mouth washes."²⁷

Los Angeles represented the twentieth century, and Santa Barbara's leaders wanted no part of it. "If Los Angeles embodied growth, industry, an eclectic urbanism, and most important, the future," wrote California historian Kevin Starr, "Santa Barbara

²⁷ Carey McWilliams, *Southern California: An Island on the Land* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1946; reprint, Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1973), ix-x, 114, 136 [page numbers are to the reprint edition]; McWilliams, *The Education of Carey McWilliams* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978), 42-45; Tom Sitton and William Deverell, ed., *Metropolis in the Making: Los Angeles in the 1920s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 1-3; Charles Fletcher Lummis, quoted in Adamson, "The Makings of a Fine Prosperity," 195; and Morrow Mayo, *Los Angeles* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1933), 319.

represented refinement, self-imposed limits, the past. Los Angeles was sprawling, brassy, democratically inclusive. Santa Barbara was selective and genteel.”²⁸ If Los Angeles destroyed its history in the name of modernity, Santa Barbara would recreate—and embellish—its past. Its leaders, many of them the children of the American émigrés who had attempted in the 1870s to erase the vestiges of the city’s Spanish heritage, recreated the very atmosphere their parents had destroyed. Tourism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century bolstered Southern California’s economy. Cities throughout the region, Santa Barbara among them, emphasized the state’s royal Spanish heritage rather than its years as part of Mexico. As William Deverell and other scholars have shown, “ugly reflexive characterizations” of Mexicans inspired this choice; if Mexicans were dirty and lazy, the Spanish represented dignified conquerors possessed by unbridled bravery. Boosters created a “Spanish fantasy past” that emphasized grandeur but ignored unpleasant realities such as the complicated relationships between the Europeans and indigenous people.²⁹ Sentiment was good for business, and Santa Barbarans realized that the city’s relative small size would allow it to capitalize fully on its Spanish past.

Following the First World War, the city’s Community Arts Association, a collection of influential citizens that included the formidable Pearl Chase, used its political muscle to impose restrictive zoning and building regulations and began the

²⁸ Starr, *Material Dreams*, 231.

²⁹ William Deverell, *Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of Its Mexican Past* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 11; and Deverell, “Privileging the Mission over the Mexican: The Rise of Regional Identity in Southern California,” in David M. Wrobel and Michael C. Steiner, ed., *Many Wests: Place, Culture and Regional Identity* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997), 248-49. On the tourism and California’s recreated Spanish heritage, see also Phoebe S. Kropp, *California Vieja: Culture and Memory in a Modern American Place* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); and James J. Rawls, “The California Mission as Symbol and Myth,” *California History* 71 (Fall 1992): 342-61.

process of mandating a unified architectural style throughout the city.³⁰ When a massive earthquake in 1925 destroyed a fourteen-block area of downtown, the city created the nation's first architectural review board and forced property owners to rebuild in the Spanish colonial architectural style that mirrored the iconic Santa Barbara Mission. City leaders envisioned "Santa Barbara as a Spanish dream city, beyond the gritty realities of American life," Starr wrote. White adobe walls, low-pitched tile roofs and patios replaced Victorian structures that had before the earthquake given the city an incongruent air of an Midwestern town. No more. Santa Barbara had reclaimed a romanticized version of its past, and many residents, Thomas Storke among them, hired researchers to determine if ancestry linked them with the region's Spanish colonial—but not its Mexican—antecedents. "As the blood of Castille represented the highest culture of Old Spain," Lummis told a crowd in Santa Barbara during the period, "so the blood of the early Santa Barbara . . . families represents the highest aristocracy of California."³¹ Lummis' depiction fit neatly with how the city wanted to be viewed by the outside world—of California, but a purer version of California than what was represented by cities like Los Angeles. With a leadership that could boast ties to the historic Carrillo, Ortega, and de la Guerra families, the city promoted itself over the next half century as something distinct from an America too eager to embrace modernity. A visitor to the city in 1930 marveled at the quickness with which it had rebuilt following the earthquake, but remarked that

³⁰ Starr, *Material Dreams*, 279-80, 284-88. Pearl Chase was the driving force behind the re-creation of Santa Barbara's Spanish past and would remain one of the city's most influential preservationists and boosters until her death in 1979. See Lee M.A. Simpson, *Selling the City: Gender, Class, and the California Growth Machine, 1880-1940* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), especially chapter 6, 133-67; and Roseanne M. Barker, "Small-Town Progressivism: Pearl Chase and Female Activism in Santa Barbara, California, 1911-1918," *Southern California Quarterly* 79 (Spring 1997): 47-100.

³¹ Lummis, quoted in Pubols, *The Father of All*, 294-95.

“Santa Barbara is a little confusing—every building is a mission. You feel like removing your hat when you drive into a service station.”³²

As the city whitewashed its Mexican past and privileged its Spanish colonial roots, a mania for conformity emerged. Santa Barbara demanded that its residents adhere to certain prescribed architectural regulations. It made similar demands of visitors and new residents. Diversity—either in thought or in population—was a casualty of maintaining a distinctive society. A city such as Santa Barbara that billed itself as a playground for the privileged could not risk attracting the unwashed; underlying this notion were definite ideas about race and class. Just as the city had distinguished between its Spanish and Mexican pasts, leisure similarly was a demarcation of race and class, “separating the leisured from the laboring,” one recent historian noted. In Santa Barbara, conformity dictated exclusion of individuals and inspired a reluctance to change. For example, when the Great Depression threatened Santa Barbara’s tourist industry and its economic survival, leaders debated applying for federal unemployment funds because they feared attracting transients, who, the head of the local Salvation Army reported were “in an ugly and despondent mood, damning capital in particular and society in general; they have listened to and have been influenced by radicals.” Once in the city, it might be difficult to dislodge the riffraff or to prevent violence against residents whose wealth represented capitalism at its most ostentatious.³³

³² Starr, *Material Dreams*, 231, 281; Federal Writers Project, *Guide to the Channel City*, 45-47; David Gebhard, “The Spanish Colonial Revival in Southern California, 1895-1930,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 26 (May 1967): 132, 138-40; Roberto Lint Sagarena, “Building California’s Past: Mission Revival Architecture and Regional Identity,” *Journal of Urban History* 28 (May 2002): 429-30; and Patricia Gebhard, *George Washington Smith: Architect of the Spanish Colonial Revival* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 2005), 38-39.

³³ Lawrence Culver, *The Frontier of Leisure: Southern California and the Making of Modern America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 8-10; and Ronald L. Nye, “The Challenge of Philanthropy:

This conformist culture extended to physical change as well. Following the Second World War, nothing inspired more furor in Santa Barbara than proposals that might change the landscape. Preservationists opposed parking meters on State Street, the city's main thoroughfare, and fought power lines that might obscure views of the mountains. No billboards lined U.S. Route 101 in Santa Barbara, and the speed limit was kept at a leisurely 25 miles per hour. It was one of the last cities in the country to install traffic lights and did so only as a reluctant safety measure. The city mandated trash receptacles and mailboxes adhere to the Spanish Colonial style.³⁴ This aversion to change added to the city's already implacable social conservatism; its insistence that the past held a better, more sustainable roadmap for the future seemed almost a civic religion that sought converts and hunted heretics. "We are trying to hold on to something precious here, our heritage," said Storke, whose newspaper had for nearly six decades supported a conformist, conservative vision for the city. "Some of our new people become good Santa Barbarans overnight. Others live here a lifetime and never come to appreciate what we are fighting to preserve."³⁵

No one personified Santa Barbara's implacable devotion to its past more than Storke, and the newspaper publisher made clear there was a difference between newcomers who arrived in Santa Barbara and accepted the city as is and those who

Unemployment Relief in Santa Barbara, 1930-1932," *California Historical Quarterly* 56 (Winter 1977/1978): 320.

³⁴ Sagarena, "Building California's Past," 429; Charles W. Morton, "Accent on Living," *The Atlantic*, November 1961, 154, and December 1961, 79. A tertiary inspection of *SBNP* editions for December 1959 and January 1960 exemplified how controversial physical change was in Santa Barbara. See "The People Should Decide about the Power Line," December 24, 1959; "Power Line Should Follow a Less Damaging Route," January 14, 1960; "Power Lines Spell New, Much-Needed Progress," January 19, 1960; "Council to Consider Beach Oil Drilling," January 20, 1960; "Realty Board, Women Voters Protesting City's Oil Plans," January 22, 1960; Tom Kleveland, "City Planning: A Lost Cause?" January 24, 1960; "Council Calls off Study of Beach Oil," January 26, 1960; "New Gas Station Design Approved," January 26, 1960; and "Let's Keep Our 'Progress in Character,'" January 30, 1960.

³⁵ Weaver, "Santa Barbara: Dilemma in Paradise," 154, 157.

arrived and demanded it change. Through his mother, Storke traced his lineage to Jose Francisco Ortega, the first commandant of the city's Spanish colonial presidio. Storke had not always worn his ancestry as proudly, but as the city began to emphasize its heritage in the 1920s and it became politically and socially advantageous to trace one's lineage back to the Spanish colonial era, the publisher assumed qualities reminiscent of a Spanish colonial don. It was therefore no accident that Storke choose de la Guerra Plaza as a permanent home for his newspaper. It was the center of authority throughout the colonial era, and the publisher operated not unlike a colonial viceroy, whose connections to the king—or in Storke's case, presidents, governors and members of Congress—reaped innumerable benefits for his colony. Born in Santa Barbara in 1876, the publisher's roots there went back eight generations, and in a state with a large population of people who were born elsewhere, Storke treated his native status as currency. Over time Storke become indistinguishable from his native city. Friends called him "Mr. Santa Barbara," and Storke never discouraged the nickname nor surrendered the power he thought accompanied it. Like many native Westerners, Storke rejected Eastern assertions of cultural and economic dominance, particularly in the postwar years as the West grew in population and therefore in political might.³⁶ Intense regionalism and a rejection of the image of the West as a colony of the East fueled his determination to banish the JBS from Santa Barbara. He displayed these traits at other junctures of his career as well.³⁷

³⁶ Richard W. Etulain and Michael P. Malone, *The American West: A Modern History, 1900 to the Present*, 2nd ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), 215-17; Robert G. Athearn, *The Mythic West in Twentieth Century America* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1986), 107-109, 115-16; and Richard W. Etulain, "Prologue: A New Historiographical Frontier: The Twentieth-Century West," in Gerald Nash and Richard W. Etulain, ed., *The Twentieth-Century West: Historical Interpretations* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989), 7-9.

³⁷ Storke, *California Editor*, 15-21; Ray Hebert, "Early Spanish Heritage Kept by Santa Barbara County," *LAT*, December 14, 1958; and Carol E. Storke, e-mail to author, August 23, 2013.

The first half of the twentieth century included the turmoil of two world wars that bookended a worldwide economic depression. Each of these events revived Storke's regionalist prejudices. He would not tolerate any threat, whether real or perceived, to the stability of his city. As a newspaper publisher, whose livelihood depended on advertising revenue, subscriptions, and a robust local economy, any aberration could strike at his bottom line. Late in the Great Depression, during which an estimated 1,000 migrants entered California every day, Storke—who by late 1938 had been appointed to the U.S. Senate seat vacated by William Gibbs McAdoo—declared the state closed to newcomers.³⁸ He believed the federal government should aid the unemployed, but only if these “undesirables” remained in their states of origin. Three decades later, Storke continued to think “there are too many Iowans and Texans coming into California. From Los Angeles south, it is no more California than Nebraska.”³⁹ By the 1960s, émigrés had troubled Storke for a half century.

This was particularly true in wartime. During the First World War, Storke joined the American Protective League, a Justice Department-affiliated group with an ambiguous legal status.⁴⁰ Like the John Birch Society four decades later, the APL pursued “100 percent Americanism,” one historian concluded; also like the JBS, critics

³⁸ Robert E. Burke, *Olson's New Deal for California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953), 15-17, 24-29. On the Great Depression in California, see also James N. Gregory, *American Exodus: The Dust Bowl Migration and Okie Culture in California* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Kevin Starr, *Endangered Dreams: The Great Depression in California* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); and Carey McWilliams, *Factories in the Field: The Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1939).

³⁹ “Curb Sighted on Migrants,” *LAT*, December 14, 1938; “Senator Storke's Job,” *Oakland Tribune*, November 17, 1938; “Olson on Way to Washington,” *SBNP*, December 15, 1938; and “Publisher Considers Hanging in Effigy an Honor,” *San Jose Mercury-News*, November 22, 1964.

⁴⁰ Irvin J. Muma to A.M. Briggs, June 15, 1917, folder “Los Angeles, California, 1917” box 2, Records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Record Group 65, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Md. [hereafter cited as FBI, NARA]; Robert S. Hyde to A.M. Briggs, January 29, 1918, folder “Santa Barbara, California,” box 3, FBI, NARA; and C.L. Keep to Frank Selover, June 15, 1918, folder “U Miscellaneous U-U.S. Department of Justice,” box 35, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

equated the APL's activities to those of the Ku Klux Klan. This included passing on information to officials about alleged subversives or simply rounding up purported slackers and traitors themselves as a quasi-legal vigilante group.⁴¹ Storke joined the APL in June 1917, and was commissioned a captain. The APL in Santa Barbara had 132 members and conducted 104 investigations before the Justice Department disbanded it at war's end, but the league left a troubling legacy.⁴² One historian concluded it "had converted thousands of otherwise reasonable and sane Americans into super-patriots and self-styled spy-chasers Under the guidance of their leaders, these organizations often used 'Americanism' merely to blacken the reputation and character of persons and groups whose opinions they hated and feared." He continued: "The homefront, unable personally to lay hands on the hated Huns, had made scapegoats of the 'draft-dodger,' the 'slacker,' and anyone else who did not conform."⁴³

Conformity in wartime and themes of Americanism were important to Storke. During the Second World War, he published a signed, front-page editorial that demanded displaced Europeans who had taken refuge in Santa Barbara remember, "You are our guests. We expect you to learn and observe American ways, American courtesies and American manners. . . . Unless you do this, it will be you yourselves—the refugees—who

⁴¹ Christopher Capozzola, *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 42-43, 212. On the APL, see also William H. Thomas Jr. *Unsafe for Democracy: World War I and the U.S. Justice Department's Covert Campaign to Suppress Dissent* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008), 37, 85-86; John P. Roche, *The Quest for the Dream: The Development of Civil Rights and Human Relations in Modern America* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), 43-45; Harold M. Hyman, *To Try Men's Souls: Loyalty Tests in American History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), 271-97; Joan M. Jensen, *The Price of Vigilance* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968), 148-49; and Emerson Hough, *The Web* (Chicago: Reilly & Lee, 1919), 14, 163. *The Web*, the "authorized" history of the APL, is a thoroughly unreliable, though entertaining, account of the APL's activities in Santa Barbara and nationally.

⁴² Irvine J. Muma to A.M. Briggs, October 10, 1917, folder "Los Angeles, California, 1917," box 2; and "Final Receipt of Department Agent," February 11, 1919, folder "Santa Barbara, California," box 3, both in FBI, NARA.

⁴³ Robert K. Murray, *Red Scare: A Study in National Hysteria, 1919-1920* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955), 12-13.

will suffer through breeding a resentment which we will sooner or later feel impelled to express.” While Storke did not single out any particular group for denunciation—he purposely addressed his denouncement to “Jew, Gentile and Mohammedan”—writers who congratulated him showed no such restraint. Correspondents criticized instances they alleged to have observed of “She-Jews” and “plain kikes” acting out of turn, “unassimilated and unassimilable” immigrants who had infested country clubs throughout Southern California.⁴⁴ Enjoying the renowned the editorial brought him, Storke penned a second, equally strident editorial in which he denounced people who spoke in “very broken English” who had the temerity to criticize his earlier editorial. “THEN THE SHOE FITS AND YOU MAY WEAR IT,” he answered his critics, some of whom leveled accusations against him similar to those Storke would fire at the JBS two decades later. “The only practical effect of your broadsides against the refugees is to stir up bad feelings,” one detractor wrote from Inglewood. “There have always been a minority of our people who have labored under the impression that because they belonged to some particular race, religious faith, or nationality, or because they have been in the country longer than others, they are the real Americans.” He concluded: “I assume you do not belong to this group of self-appointed spokesman for the country, and that you are motivated by patriotic but misguided zeal.” Storke responded by writing the Inglewood newspaper publisher and asked him “to tell me who this man is, give me some of his background. If he is a ‘nut,’ I will make no reply.”⁴⁵

⁴⁴ “An Open Letter to Refugees Who Are Guests in Our City,” *SBNP*, August 14, 1943; and Ambrose Gherini to TMS, August 18, 1943; C.N. Bohler to TMS, August 19, 1943; and Hidden Valley Ranch to TMS, August 26, 1943, all in folder “Refugee editorials,” box 3, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁴⁵ “Another Open Letter to the Refugees Who Are Our Guests,” *SBNP*, August 17, 1943; and John W. Houston to TMS, September 11, 1943; and TMS to J.L. Rosenberg, September 15, 1943, both in folder “Refugee editorials,” box 3, TMS Papers, Berkeley. See also Felix Guggenheim to TMS, September 6, 1943, same folder.

Storke did not confine his disdain for outsiders to times of declared conflict, but his activities during the world wars indicated his willingness to target people who he deemed disruptive and disregard any charges of fear-mongering those activities might inspire. Accordingly, he labelled every critic who wrote him during his JBS campaign and afterward as a member of the society, and often demanded they leave the city. “I am sure there is a place in Scranton for your return,” he wrote a local dentist who identified himself as a native of Pennsylvania. “The Santa Barbara area will not miss you.” To another, Storke wrote, “You are not listed in the city directory, nor in the Telephone Directory This leads me to believe that you are pretty much ‘a stranger in our midst.’”⁴⁶

When an entrepreneur complained to Storke about his failed attempt to start a business in Santa Barbara, the publisher replied that perhaps the man should try again—in another city. “Santa Barbara is not going to change to any great extent,” he said.⁴⁷ By 1962, Storke’s sentiment had become something of a city motto. For nearly nine decades, Santa Barbara’s entire existence had relied on being different than anywhere else in the country. Try as it might to keep the world at bay, Santa Barbara could no more escape the twentieth century than it could stop the waves from hitting its shores. Some in Santa Barbara saw the John Birch Society as yet another threat from outsiders. But the city had created a socially conservative environment that welcomed affluent people, some of whom found comfort in a conservative anticommunist organization that purported to hold the answer to what lay at the root of a whole host of problems. In the end, Santa Barbara

⁴⁶ TMS to Frank Nash, March 10, 1964, folder “JBS Request for Materials, M-N”; and TMS to Owen S. Payne, January 13, 1964, folder “JBS Request for Materials, O-R,” both in carton 2, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁴⁷ TMS to E.L. Kenworthy, March 19, 1962, folder “K-Miscellany, Ke,” box 15, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

and the John Birch Society were not so different from each other. Both feared the intrusion of the outside world.

CHAPTER THREE “WHO ARE THE GOOD GUYS?”

By all appearances, it was a typical meeting of a typical student organization. The undergraduates chatted amicably among themselves as they filed into the room. It was March 31, 1961, and spring break was approaching, but the students had exams and assignments to complete before that happy respite. When the meeting began, members discussed a speaker the group was bringing to campus. They would need to arrange promotion—fliers, or perhaps an advertisement in the student newspaper—to ensure a large crowd for Ronald Reagan, an actor whose speeches on behalf of General Electric were making him popular in conservative political circles. With preliminary business out of the way, the tone of the meeting soon changed, and it became clear that this was anything but a typical student organization. When taking over the country, the communists would round up businessmen, march them out of town, and force them to dig their own graves. Water supplies would be poisoned and the media overtaken. Soviet agents posing as American soldiers would reveal their true identities and seize control of the nation’s military from within. The elimination of the United States, group leader Chet Merriam told the dumbstruck students gathered at the University of California’s Santa Barbara campus, was no more than four years away.¹

¹ This description is based on two sources. *Santa Barbara News-Press* publisher Thomas M. Storke took notes as he listened to a secret recording David Alan Arnold arranged of the March 31, 1961, meeting of the UCSB Freedom Club. Arnold also later recounted the gathering for a *Los Angeles Examiner* reporter. Although the *News-Press* purportedly made a transcription of the recording, it is not known to exist. Storke’s handwritten notes are in folder “Thomas M. Storke-Miscellaneous,” box 8, Thomas M. Storke Collection, SBHC MSS 37, Department of Special Collections, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara. See also David Arnold and James Peck, “Hysterical Prophecy of Red Rule Told,” *Los Angeles Examiner*, April 9, 1961; and Paul Veblen to Stanley Mosk, April 8, 1961, folder 6, “John Birch Society, 1961,” Professional Papers—Attorney General—Subject Files, Stanley Mosk Papers, California Judicial Center Library, San Francisco [hereafter cited as Mosk Papers, CJCL].

The group called itself the Freedom Club, but it was little more than a front for the John Birch Society. If critics of the JBS such as Thomas M. Storke and his *Santa Barbara News-Press* needed further evidence that the organization was a disruptive force, its secret presence on the UCSB campus was it.² Since January 1961, when Storke's newspaper published two articles that exposed the organization's presence in the city, residents reported feeling as if the community was being pulled between two ideological poles. One man told an FBI agent that he thought Santa Barbara was "being divided as a result of . . . the John Birch Society." Another said activities described in the newspaper as being the fault of the JBS "have been causing people to become suspicious of each other" and had "resulted in a division of thought in the Santa Barbara community." Telephone threats, which were almost impossible to trace but that were regularly blamed on the JBS, were a major factor in this unease. When the newspaper published an anti-JBS letter, its author might receive a threatening phone call.³ Storke and executive editor Paul Veblen received similar late-night calls. So did UCSB's chancellor, and the caller warned of communists on the faculty. A reporter who wrote a story about the JBS had his car tires slashed.⁴

JBS members and supporters also claimed they were victimized. "One sure way to get your ears 'knocked down' these days," one Santa Barbaran lamented, "is to take a

² James Peck, "Birch Recruiting in Schools Bared by Youth Leader," *Los Angeles Examiner*, April 8, 1961; and Paul Veblen, "The Pros Lend a Hand," *The Quill* 50 (January 1962), 20-21.

³ Memorandum, [redacted] to Special Agent in Charge, Los Angeles Field Office, "The John Birch Society," February 10, 1961, FBI file no. 100-59001, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Los_Angeles-1; and Air-Tel, SAC to Director J. Edgar Hoover, "John Birch Society," March 29, 1961, FBI file no. 100-59001, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Los_Angeles-2, both in Ernie Lazar Freedom of Information Act Collection, John Birch Society [hereinafter cited as Lazar FOIA Collection].

⁴ Benjamin Epstein and Arnold Forster, *The Radical Right: Report on the John Birch Society and Its Allies* (New York: Random House, 1967), 169; "Telephone Call Threatens Editor," *SBNP*, March 7, 1961; and Paul Veblen to Frank Kelly, November 28, 1989, folder "John Birch Society," box 1, Paul Veblen Collection, SBHC Mss. 69, Department of Special Collections, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara.

favorable stand on some of the John Birch Society's objectives." Members whom the newspaper identified reported late-night, threatening calls as well. A woman who was not a member but who had expressed support for the society had her car pelted with eggs. "That this should have happened to Santa Barbara, of all places" lamented one resident at the height of these activities, "is like something out of a bad dream—a plot from *Twilight Zone*." Said another: "It's so horrible to sit down to dinner with old friends and find a wall of suspicion between you."⁵

In early 1962, the author of a letter to the *News-Press* reviewed the ideological tug-of-war that consumed the preceding year and asked simply, "Who are the good guys?" Heroes were hard to find. There were only individuals who, to combat fear, weaponized anxiety. When Storke later won a trifecta of the nation's highest journalism prizes for the *News-Press*' stance against the JBS, his peers lauded him as a civil libertarian, yet the publisher often exacerbated tensions among his readers. While the initial stories that appeared in the *News-Press* were straightforward and allowed equal time to JBS members—at least those who would identify themselves as such—other tactics Storke employed were less than savory.⁶ He arranged for the UCSB Freedom Club meeting to be wiretapped, and then distributed a copy of the tape to media contacts, law enforcement and friends. He dispatched reporters to the homes of purported JBS members to ask them if they had located any communists in Santa Barbara, then mocked them by publishing their denials and names. He decried the JBS as inheritors of the

⁵ Ellen Haldeman, "Communism on the Campus," *Carpinteria (Calif.) Herald*, January 12, 1961; Arthur Menken, letter to the editor, February 1, 1961, and Fred Hand, letter to the editor, March 9, 1961, both in *Santa Barbara News-Press* [SBNP]; and John D. Weaver, "Santa Barbara: Dilemma in Paradise," *Holiday*, June 1961, 84, 86.

⁶ Herb Kohrs, letter to the editor, February 14, 1962; Hans Engh, "John Birch Society: What Is It, Why?" January 22, 1961; and Engh, "Birch Society Members Discuss Anti-Red Aims," January 23, 1961, all in SBNP.

mantle of McCarthyism, but threatened to smear anyone who either joined the organization or supported it.⁷

Every anticommunist was a Bircher, every aberrant event the fault of the JBS. Santa Barbarans catalogued a litany of real and perceived sins against the group throughout 1961. The UCSB Freedom Club front was one, but there were others—broad­sides against local church leaders and educators, targeted slurs against think tanks the city attracted, and boycotts of money drives for less-fortunate children. No one was ever charged with any crime and the real culprits were never identified. Yet complicity was not hard to prove. Critics needed only review the writings of JBS founder Robert H.W. Welch to find confirmation. Surely a man who had once called President Dwight D. Eisenhower a communist agent would have no trouble attacking preachers, intellectuals and children. Tainted by the ravings of its founder, the group had no credibility on which to base denials. One JBS supporter in Santa Barbara lamented that society members were “stigmatized simply because [Welch] was indiscreet in uttering words that have ricocheted, not against him but the entire local organization. It is too bad.” With an older, conservative, and wealthy population, Santa Barbara seemed a natural sanctuary for a group such as the JBS. Yet its leadership, unable to rebut a nearly daily diet of press criticism, self-immolated. Rather than thrive in the city, Santa Barbara was a paradise lost for the John Birch Society.⁸

An overriding fear that nothing was as it seemed to be touched nearly every institution in the city. Among the first affected was, incongruously, a church. The

⁷ Thomas M. Storke [TMS] to Robert S. Allen, September 26, 1961, folder “Robert S. Allen,” box 1, Thomas More Storke Papers, BANC MSS 73/72 c, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley [hereafter cited as TMS Papers, Berkeley]; and Hans Engh, “What about Communism Locally?” *SBNP*, March 12, 1961.

⁸ Fred Hand, letter to the editor, *SBNP*, March 9, 1961.

National Council of Churches rejected the black-and-white, all-or-nothing doctrine at the heart of American anticommunism and, as a result, faced the wrath of many conservatives, including members of the John Birch Society. Fervent cold warriors imagined the fight against communism as a religious crusade that pitted a Godly society against an atheistic foe whose devotion to an ideology subverted religious piety and rendered it nonexistent.⁹ Communists saw their ideology as a religion that demanded heroic sacrifice and suffering, and in Cold War America, few contemporaries saw these qualities as admirable. *Life* magazine characterized communism as “Satan in action.” A paperback distributed in churches and at Bible studies featured cover art of Satan happily painting the globe red; it was appropriately titled *The Red Devil of Communism*. Newspapers carried stories that depicted Soviet citizens melting church bells, indoctrinating children as atheists, burning religious icons, and stripping art of religious imagery. Reality complicated this narrative—if the media chose to confront reality, which it often did not. As scholars have shown, the Soviet government, despite efforts of secularization, recognized that belief in God was “simply too ubiquitous to erase.” As a factor of comfort in bleak times and as a unifying force, religion served some private purpose, although publicly, “the Soviet regime turned religion into a political enemy.”¹⁰ As officials in the Soviet Union and other communist nations pushed God away (at least publicly), Americans embraced expressions of state religious piety. The Eisenhower

⁹ Jill K. Gill, *Embattled Ecumenism: The National Council of Churches, the Vietnam War, and the Trials of the Protestant Left* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2011), 40-41.

¹⁰ Paul Froese, *The Plot to Kill God: Findings from the Soviet Experiment in Secularization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 198-99; E.J. Daniels, *The Red Devil of Communism* (Orlando: Christ for the World Publishers, 1954); Catherine Wanner, ed., *State Secularism and Lived Religion in the Soviet Union and Ukraine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 12-23; and Sabrina Petra Ramet, *Religious Policy in the Soviet Union* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 16-23, 324-27.

administration applauded the addition of “under God” to the Pledge of Allegiance and endorsed a stamp for international use that carried the slogan “In God We Trust.”¹¹

Such actions offered government sanction to religious anticommunism and put churches on the front lines of a moral, global struggle. The Catholic Church, Jewish groups, and Protestant denominations cooperated by “arming the faithful with spiritual weapons . . . to fight for their country and its culture,” because “the threat of communism affected all American religions,” one historian concluded.¹² Cross-denominational alliances demonstrated American pluralism and religious harmony to a communist enemy that understood only rigid doctrine and implacable collectivism. Yet this cooperation, it seemed, only worked when the unified front advocated communism’s defeat. When the ecumenical National Council of Churches espoused cooperation with communists, conservative critics countered that such cooperation bordered on treason. Nevertheless, the organization’s pluralistic mission downplayed theological differences between its thirty-four member churches (with a total membership of 39 million Protestants in 1961) and advocated internationalism and racial cooperation.¹³

Conservative critics equated cooperation with capitulation. Members of the John Birch Society were particularly critical because such collaboration would be a betrayal of the Cold War martyr the group honored. In addition to his role as a U.S. Army

¹¹ James A. Morone, *Hellfire Nation: The Politics of Sin in American History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 380-82; James F. Findlay Jr., *Church People in the Struggle: The National Council of Churches and the Black Freedom Movement, 1950-1970* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 28; and Patrick Allitt, *Religion in America since 1946: A History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 20-21. See also Jason W. Stevens, *God-Fearing and Free: A Spiritual History of America’s Cold War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), especially part 4.

¹² Jonathan P. Herzog, *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex: America’s Religious Battle against Communism in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 59-60, 65-67.

¹³ Findlay, *Church People in the Struggle*, 5-6; Frank Lambert, *Religion in American Politics: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 137-38; and Rev. J. Lawrence Plumley, “Report on the National Council of Churches,” *Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier*, April 22, 1961.

intelligence officer, John Birch was a Baptist missionary killed by Chinese communists just days after the Second World War ended. His death, society founder Robert Welch said, was the first casualty of the Cold War, a struggle he described as “between light and darkness, between freedom and slavery, between the spirit of Christianity and the spirit of anti-Christ for the souls and bodies of men.” For giving his life for his nation and for his God, John Birch was nothing less than a martyr whose death proved Americans would not “stand passively on the sidelines and allow crimes against the codes of Christian civilization.” The Cold War, Welch concluded, was “a struggle from which either communist or Christian-style civilization must emerge with one completely triumphant and the other completely destroyed.”¹⁴

Welch believed internal subversion threatened every facet of American life, and as he looked at the National Council of Churches’ ecumenical doctrine that eradicated religious differences and preached mutual respect and understanding, he believed there was no clearer indication that religion itself was similarly imperiled. Welch pointed to a report produced by a Shreveport, Louisiana, Episcopal cleric that indicted the council as “a national and international propaganda machine” that “instead of fostering Christian love and unity” involved itself in political matters that ultimately eroded confidence in Protestant clergy. The report concluded that the council favored “more government control of the lives and liberties of individuals. Thus, in the pretense of seeking One Christian World, it actually is seeking One Political World.”¹⁵

¹⁴ Herzog, *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex*, 204-205; Robert H.W. Welch, *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, 8th printing (Belmont, Mass.: Western Island Publishers, 1961), 39; and Welch, *The Life of John Birch* (Chicago: Regnery, 1954), 86, 91, 99, 109-10.

¹⁵ Plumley, “Report on the National Council of Churches”; and *JBS Bulletin*, August 1, 1961, 9.

Such charges against the National Council of Churches had been circulating for nearly a decade. Critics such as radio evangelist Carl J. McIntire likened anticommunism to a holy war but would not tolerate the duplicity of the “apostate” National Council of Churches. “I am deeply concerned about the development of the ‘one world church’ and the drive to bring about some form of ‘world government,’” represented by the National Council of Churches, McIntire wrote to a critic in 1962. “I am not a bitter man. The stand which I have taken . . . I have done so out of my love for God and country.”¹⁶ The John Birch Society did not create anticommunist conservatives’ suspicions about the council, but by tapping into anxiety and fears that had existed for nearly a decade, it exacerbated these tensions. While it is unlikely that Welch explicitly directed any ground-level assault on local churches that were members of the National Council, his writings certainly encouraged such activities. In spring 1960, Welch told members who were congregants at National Council churches to demand their ministers sever connections with the organization. “For as long as your church gives moral and financial support to the National Council of Churches . . . you are helping the enemy.” He concluded: “Now is the time to bring this whole thing out into the open; and to start a determined drive to eliminate communist influences from control over Christian churches. Our Protestant members should be able and willing to take the lead in that long overdue crusade in their respective communities—despite the very dirty undercover opposition they may run up against—unless they are absolutely sure their church is not part of the problem.”¹⁷

¹⁶ Heather Hendershot, *What’s Fair on the Air? Cold War Right Wing Broadcasting and the Public Interest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 104-105; and Carl McIntire to TMS, March 14, 1962, folder “Mc Miscellany,” box 19, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹⁷ JBS *Bulletin*, March 31, 1960, 18-19.

Yet it was the JBS, at Welch's behest, that went undercover. While he never prescribed what methods his members might use in exposing communists in churches, those who were the targets of such activities would classify them as very dirty indeed. Among the first congregations nationwide that found itself under assault was Santa Barbara's First Presbyterian Church. It was a member of the United Presbyterian Church of the United States, which was in turn a member of the National Council of Churches. In Santa Barbara, unknown individuals purchased a church directory and mailed congregants a circular that detailed eight questions about the national council. "Did you know," a typical question asked, "that many of the pronouncements of the National Council . . . are extremely socialistic and radical in concept, and that these pronouncements are made in your name even if you disagree?" The remaining questions similarly emphasized that the national council's decisions robbed members of their individuality and that such an ecumenical organization sought to collectivize religion in an attempt to eradicate it all together.¹⁸

To some congregants at Santa Barbara's First Presbyterian, it seemed as if religious freedom itself—their ability to worship as they wished, where they wished—was under assault, not from communists but from the JBS. Suspicions escalated as a result of the circular; a few congregants chose to leave the church while others remained and found comfort in their faith.¹⁹ It was deeply unsettling, but what was playing out in Santa Barbara reflected the importance religion had assumed in Cold War America as a

¹⁸ Lawrence E. Fisher, "An Incomplete History of the First Presbyterian Church, Santa Barbara, California" (1980), 15; "Presbyterian Leader Hits Birch Group Slurs," *LAT*, March 20, 1961; "Key Church Role in Red Fight Told," and "Presbyterian Leader Airs Crucial Issues," both in *SBNP*, March 20, 1961.

¹⁹ Author's interviews with George Goodall and Kristine Power, May 31, 2012, Santa Barbara, Calif.; and Fisher, "An Incomplete History of the First Presbyterian Church," 15. Goodall is a longtime member of the congregation of Santa Barbara's First Presbyterian. Power is the daughter of the late Reverend Lawrence Fisher.

front line defense against communism. Both sides felt persecuted—and wholly more Christian as a result. Congregants believed their faith was being tested; anticommunists, the JBS among them, felt internal subversion was robbing churches and the nation as a whole of individual liberty. “Welch and his people are genuinely afraid,” the Reverend John A. Crane told the congregation at Santa Barbara’s Unitarian Church. “They are driven by an almost wild fear of a persistent and pervasive sort. . . [Everywhere] they look, they seen signs of an incredibly devious subversion.”²⁰

Crane was among the first Santa Barbarans to come to the defense of the First Presbyterian Church. His Unitarian congregation was not a member of the National Council of Churches, but his sermon would invite similar attacks by the JBS. His sermon characterized Welch as a “marvelously gifted demagogue” and the JBS as “an unmistakable menace.” Yet he urged understanding. “We ought to try not to hate them, be disgusted with them, shout and snarl at them We ought to be as patient as we can, realizing that the people are doing what they feel they must do. They are as much to be pitied as censured. They are terribly frightened. Everywhere they look, they see communists. They don’t know whom to trust, to depend on.”²¹

The attack on the First Presbyterian Church inspired similar fears among its congregation, but the church’s pastor, the Reverend Lawrence Fisher, knew to whom he could turn. Eugene Carson Blake was the stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church of the United States and a former president of the National Council of Churches; he was also Fisher’s former neighbor and a favorite target of religious conservatives. Edgar C. Bundy’s Church League of America regularly distributed pictures of Blake with the

²⁰ John A. Crane, sermon, Unitarian Church of Santa Barbara, February 19, 1961, reprinted as “Thoughts on the Birch Society,” *SBNP*, February 26, 1961.

²¹ *Ibid.*

Soviet clerics he met during a tour of Moscow. Blake agreed to answer the circulars' charges in a series of tense, extraordinary sessions at the Santa Barbara church on March 19, 1961. Church elders set up recording equipment to tape Blake's answers so that nothing he said could be misconstrued. They stood along the church's walls, watched warily as people they did not know filled the pews, and worried that these strangers might have weapons.²² The National Council of Churches was not ashamed of its inclusive record on civil rights, its support for socialized medicine, or its internationalist ties, Blake said. But these stances had invited a "campaign of false witness. . . . I challenge this congregation to wake up to what is happening to you under the guise of anticommunism. Don't let your Americanism and your Presbyterianism be corrupted by those who would substitute a 'fuehrer' for our free society."²³

Fisher distributed Blake's recorded answers to other Presbyterian congregations, and although anonymous callers threatened his life in the wake of Blake's appearance in Santa Barbara, Fisher later said he felt the presentation had eased the attacks on his church.²⁴ Yet the JBS whisper campaign against Protestant churches continued elsewhere, and much of the reaction from the public and church leaders alike focused on what role, if any, religion should play in determining American foreign policy. Should America push a Godly agenda that dictated piety to other nations rather than inspire cooperation? Was a policy of understanding advocated by groups like the National Council of Churches evidence of communist devotion or adherence to the Christian

²² Fisher, "An Incomplete History of the First Presbyterian Church," 15; and "Bundy Says Reds Busy in Churches," *SBNP*, March 16, 1961.

²³ "Presbyterian Leader Hits Birch Group Slurs," *LAT*, March 20, 1961.

²⁴ Fisher, "An Incomplete History of the First Presbyterian Church," 15; "Pastor Receives Threatening Call," *SBNP*, March 23, 1961; and Power and Goodall interviews.

principles of loving one's neighbor and his flaws?²⁵ Welch held no such love—and minced no words when he declared that 7,000 communist sympathizers served as Protestant ministers in the United States and could not continue to occupy pulpits. “Protestant ministers do not become communists,” Welch told a Los Angeles audience, “but communists do become Protestant ministers.”²⁶ Welch’s comments brought an immediate rebuke from clergy nationwide.²⁷ Welch, many concluded, was doing a far greater disservice to religion than any internal subversion. *Ava Maria*, a Jesuit publication, called the JBS “a dangerously unchristian movement which bodes no good for the cause of true anti-communism.” The diocesan newspaper in Fresno, California, said the JBS advocated “supermarket patriotism,” and urged Catholic anticommunists to stay away. The *Carolina Israelite* insisted the JBS practiced vigilantism, “the most heinous crime against human freedom.”²⁸ Despite these cross-denominational admonitions, Welch continued to insist that anticommunism was a moral, religious crusade. “Communism is not only innately and profoundly evil,” he wrote. “The communists depend on the gradual acceptance of evil as the prevailing final factor in enabling them to subjugate the world.”²⁹

²⁵ George J. Hall, “Religion Also Positive Answer to Communism,” November 14, 1961, and Raymond C. Jarnet, “Factors An Obstacle,” November 17, 1961, both in *SBNP*.

²⁶ “Clergymen Smeared by Welch, Senate Told,” *LAT*, April 13, 1961; and “Welch Rips Clergy,” *SBNP*, April 15, 1961.

²⁷ “Clerics Answer Birch Chief,” *LAT*, April 16, 1961; “New York Methodists Assail Birch Society,” *LAT*, May 8, 1961; and “Ohio Methodists Rap Birch Society,” *SBNP*, June 11, 1961.

²⁸ “2 Catholic Magazines Assail Birch Group,” *New York Journal-American*, April [?], 1961; “Statement on the John Birch Society,” *America: National Catholic Weekly Review*, June 3, 1961; David Baxter, “The John Birch Society,” *Extension: National Catholic Monthly* (July 1961); “True Anti-Communism,” *Ava Maria*, April 8, 1961; Gerard E. Sherry, “Un-American Activities Clothed in Patriotism,” *Central California Register*, May 12, 1961; and “The John Birch Society,” *Carolina Israelite*, March-April 1961, all in folder “John Birch Society,” box 42, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions / Princeton University Files, Mss 253, Department of Special Collections, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara [hereafter cited as CSDI/PU Files, UCSB].

²⁹ *JBS Bulletin*, September 1, 1961, 7-8.

However, the JBS' participation in a campaign to limit contributions to an international organization dedicated to helping impoverished children undercut its insistence that its anticommunist fervor was grounded in religious bedrock. The United Nations General Assembly established the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) in 1946 to rescue European children from privation in the wake of the Second World War. By 1962, UNICEF had provided food and clothing for nearly 56 million children and mothers; it ensured medical care for 176 million more in nearly 19,000 health centers. "It is doing something about more childish pain than the ordinary human being can bear to think about," opined *The Nation*.³⁰ While money from participating countries provided the bulk of UNICEF's budget, it also asked trick-or-treaters to solicit donations from the homes they visited at Halloween and raised additional funds through the annual sale of Christmas cards.³¹ Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, conservative groups and politicians boycotted both activities because the money raised might be allocated to communist nations. Welch considered UNICEF's purposes "nefarious," and urged his members to neither purchase the greeting cards nor accept them from others because they were "designed to help our enemies break down our most honored traditions and our spiritual values."³²

The JBS' campaign against UNICEF reflected distrust among some conservatives of the United Nations. Anything to do with the international body, even a subsidiary that aided children, was suspicious. To conservative anticommunists who feared

³⁰ David Cort, "The War on UNICEF," *The Nation*, January 27, 1962, 77-78. See also Esther W. Hymer, "UNICEF: Santa Claus to children around the world," *Independent Woman* (December 1951), 356-38; and "They're Changing Halloween from a Pest to a Project," *Saturday Evening Post* (October 12, 1957), 10.

³¹ "Trick or Treat for UNICEF," *Christian Century*, October 17, 1962, 1249.

³² *JBS Bulletin*, November 1, 1960, 11-12; and *JBS Bulletin*, November 1961, 10-11. See also Hubert Kregeloh, "Don't Send Me a UNICEF Greeting Card," *American Opinion*, November 1960, 24-27.

internationalism above all, an organization that aimed to negotiate differences between nations in order to maintain peace suggested that the United States might surrender its unilateral foreign policy to other nations. That the communist Soviet Union could ostensibly have a say in American foreign policy was simply too much to bear.

Isolationist conservatives in the United States had a long history of such rhetoric; their opposition had blocked American involvement in the League of Nations following the First World War, and the United States' absence effectively neutered the organization in its infancy.³³

After its founding in 1946, the United Nations inspired fear and fury in American isolationists that ultimately contributed to the destruction of the Second World War alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union. Scholar Edward C. Luck argued that conservatives viewed the UN as “an institutional Frankenstein” and “the breeding ground for potentially harmful un-American activities.” The UN’s New York City headquarters was a “modern day Trojan horse, offering a means for spies and subversives to infiltrate American soil and even its foreign policy elites.” The United States controlled 40 percent of the UN’s budget, and the power of the purse gave some politicians an entrée to investigate the organization and its potential subversive influence. These investigations found little to no evidence of communist infiltration, an outcome that hardly surprised some more conspiratorial-minded conservatives who believed communists would know how to escape detection. Congressional Republicans nevertheless continued to chip away at the nation’s foreign aid budget throughout the 1950s, and the Eisenhower administration, with the help of Democratic U.S. Senator

³³ David McKenzie, *A World Beyond Borders: An Introduction to the History of International Organizations* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 11-14; and Landon R. Y. Storrs, *The Second Red Scare and the Unmaking of the New Deal Left* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 208, 219.

Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, defeated the Bricker Amendment. Proposed by Senator John Bricker of Ohio, the legislation aimed to limit the president's foreign policy portfolio and counter alleged UN subversion of American sovereignty. Witch hunts, budgetary battles, and failed legislation deepened suspicions between member nations and the United States, and cast a pall over the organization's activities. Secretary of State Dean Acheson later concluded that the investigations inspired a "highly unfavorable opinion of the United Nations in the United States and of the United States in the United Nations."³⁴

If the United States' absence had undermined the League of Nations' effectiveness, then American fixation on communist subversion similarly rendered the United Nations impotent. The UN was a creature of the Cold War, but beyond humanitarian efforts, David McKenzie argued, the organization could do little to restrain "two heavily armed, ideologically opposed, and mutually hostile and suspicious camps." Two organizations, the United Nations Economic, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and UNICEF, were sterling examples of the UN's potential for nurturing understanding and cooperation among nations. UNESCO focused on education for children and adults alike; UNICEF met the medical and nourishment needs of impoverished people. Conservatives pilloried the efforts of both throughout the 1950s and 1960s, and the JBS furthered that resentment by repeating incorrect claims that 75

³⁴ Storrs, *The Second Red Scare*, 219; Edward C. Luck, *Mixed Messages: American Politics and International Organization, 1919-1999* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999), 83-85; Thomas G. Weiss, et al., *UN Voices: The Struggle for Development and Social Justice* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 166; Earl Latham, *The Communist Controversy in Washington: From the New Deal to McCarthy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), 353; Justus D. Doenecke, *Not to the Swift: The Old Isolationists in the Cold War Era* (Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 1979), 44-50; Ronald E. Powaski, *Toward an Entangling Alliance: American Isolationism, Internationalism, and Europe* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 192-94; and George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 657-58.

percent of American donations to UNICEF went to communist nations with no oversight as to how individual governments spent the money and on whom; the lie was further spread by groups like the Daughters of the American Revolution, who increased the supposed allotment to 80 percent. American children should not be asked to solicit funds for totalitarian governments to squander, they argued, and good Americans should not send Christmas cards that further the aims of godless communists.³⁵

When Welch announced in January 1962, the JBS' new campaign to "get the US out of the UN and the UN out of the US," he was tapping into conservative distrust of international cooperation that had existed for more than four decades. The difference was that this program would, as all JBS programs did, organize that resentment at the grassroots and attempt to force action through a demonstration of intense public sentiment. The UN, Welch said, "should not be reformed, but abolished. You don't reform the rats and fleas that spread the bubonic plague, you wipe 'em out. . . . The UN is at the very heart of commUNism. Let's get rid of both." The new initiative came two months after yet another round of bad publicity for the JBS that again emanated from Santa Barbara.³⁶

Santa Barbara's conservatives shared the antipathy others nationwide felt about American membership in the United Nations, so what transpired in Santa Barbara during Halloween 1961 was not so much an aberration as it was the continuance of a theme.³⁷

³⁵ McKenzie, *A World Beyond Borders*, 57; Maggie Black, *Children First: The Story of UNICEF, Past and Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 10; Sven Bernhard Gareis and Johannes Varwick, *The United Nations: An Introduction* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 149; Cort, "The War on UNICEF," 78-79; "Trick or Treat for UNICEF," 1249; and "Greetings to a Child," *NYT*, November 26, 1961.

³⁶ *JBS Bulletin*, January 1962, 16-17.

³⁷ See for example, letters from Granville F. Knight, June 11, 1960; Chet Merriam, May 17 and May 21, 1960, and May 21, 1960, all in *SBNP*. The letters are among dozens of anti- and pro-UN clippings in folder

Santa Barbara's children had participated in the UNICEF trick-or-treat drive since its inception in 1952. Local dairies provided milk cartons for children to use to collect donations, but in 1961, insinuations from local conservatives that they would stage an economic boycott resulted in all three of the dairies refusing to participate. A local television station, facing a similar boycott threat, pulled advertisements for UNICEF. The *News-Press* chastised local businesses for allowing "a fanatical minority" to thwart their support for "an organization devoted to the welfare of children regardless of race, color, religion, or political ideology." Whether the JBS directed these activities is not clear, but the organization—and Welch's writings—certainly fostered an environment where such things found a ready audience; furthermore, the same people who voiced support for the JBS during the preceding eleven months—the *News-Press* called them the JBS' "spiritual brethren" because they refused to disclose their membership—proudly announced their direction of the boycott.³⁸

Rightly or not, the JBS bore the brunt of the public outcry, and the nation's media again focused on Santa Barbara as an example of the turmoil the organization could inspire. "When the witch hunters take over from the witches, it is a sad Halloween," concluded *The Nation*.³⁹ In Santa Barbara, the publicity was good for UNICEF, but bad for the JBS. A Santa Barbara woman donated \$5,000 to the organization; children

14, box 3, Jean Storke Menzies Collection, SBHC Mss 34, Department of Special Collections, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara.

³⁸ "UNICEF Plans Shaped Up Here," October 25, 1961; "Dairies Refuse to Distribute UNICEF Data After Protests," October 27, 1961; "PTA Council Won't Back Anti-UNICEF Campaign Here," October 28, 1961; "UNICEF 'Spots' Halted by KEYT," October 29, 1961; "Children to Turn Halloween Fun into Aiding Unfortunate," October 29, 1961; "3rd Firm Declines UNICEF Data," October 30, 1961; and "UNICEF and the Truth," October 30, 1961, all in *SBNP*.

³⁹ "Business Unharmful by Birch Pressure," *SBNP*, November 2, 1961; and "The Anti-Children Crusade," *The Nation*, November 25, 1961, 415.

collected an additional \$6,413. The previous year's total was \$4,341.⁴⁰ The JBS and its acolytes continued to defend themselves against charges the organization was against children, even those in communist nations. They argued that UNICEF lacked accountability; ultimately, these critics couched their opposition to UNICEF in the conservative delineation between government action and private enterprise. Private charities could better direct help to those in need without the bureaucratic overhead of quasi-government organizations like UNICEF.⁴¹ The failing of the JBS, however, was that it never explained its opposition in such terms.

The JBS' lack of a public relations plan fueled accusations that it was a secret group. Secrecy—whether real or perceived—invited further problems in Santa Barbara. Welch had devised an organizational chart with power resting firmly with him, he said, to avoid communist infiltration of the group's leadership, but there were no safeguards against subversion at the local level, from communists or any other curious soul who—for want of adventure or simply driven by outrage over what he had read about the society—might try to penetrate the group's ranks. David Alan Arnold was an 18-year-old political science major at the University of California's Santa Barbara campus who had followed closely revelations in the local press about the JBS' activities in Santa Barbara. Out of curiosity, he visited the group's downtown American Opinion Library in early February 1961. He emerged as a double agent.⁴²

⁴⁰ "Collections for UNICEF Soar Above '60 Totals," November 5, 1961; and "\$5,000 Gift for UNICEF," December 14, 1961, both in *SBNP*. These totals today would be worth \$38,900, \$50,400, and \$34,100, respectively.

⁴¹ "Two Views on UNICEF," *LAT*, November 18, 1961; and "Letters," *Carpinteria Herald*, November 6, 1961.

⁴² James Peck, "Birch Recruiting in Schools Bared by Youth Leader," April 8, 1961; and Peck, "Fast Friends—Really Fast," April 9, 1961, both in *Los Angeles Examiner*.

The bookstore's very existence provided the JBS a rebuttal to charges it was a secret group, and many curious residents visited to find out more about the society. While the public might not be invited to meetings, it could peruse and purchase officially sanctioned publications that ranged from Rosalie Gordon's polemic *Nine Men against America* (an attack on the Supreme Court) and J. Edgar Hoover's *Masters of Deceit*. Yet visitors who thought the "library" would offer a balanced appraisal of communism came away disappointed. One visitor complained its shelves were sparsely stocked and contained books and pamphlets that detailed a massive communist conspiracy and little else. "Now, if one were to read only [these] books, one would get the impression that one's wife was a communist," he said. A reporter visited the library a year later and similarly concluded that it offered a gloomy assessment of the country's future. Both visitors went away with far more questions than answers about the society's aims.⁴³

Chet Merriam could answer such critics. A bleak, apocalyptic future was exactly what awaited the country if and when the communists assumed control. Merriam was a 26-year-old member of the John Birch Society. Early in 1961, Welch hired the self-styled anticommunist "evangelist" who occasionally referred to himself as "Reverend" as the group's youth coordinator in Southern California.⁴⁴ Merriam's job was to recruit college and high school students to the anticommunist cause. When Arnold visited the American Opinion Library, Merriam greeted him and began his recruitment pitch. He told Arnold he should join the UCSB Freedom Club, which was affiliated with Young Americans for Freedom, an organization of young conservatives that had been formed the previous year

⁴³ Ronald S. Ripley, letter to the editor, *SNBP*, February 9, 1961; and Gilbert Moore, letter to the editor, *Goleta (Calif.) Gazette-Citizen*, January [?] 1962, in envelope "Birch 1962," box 85, Thomas M. Storke Collection, Gledhill Library, Santa Barbara Historical Museum.

⁴⁴ James Peck, "Birch Recruiting in Schools Bared by Youth Leader," *Los Angeles Examiner*, April 8, 1961.

in Sharon, Connecticut. Arnold asked Merriam if the Freedom Club was affiliated with the John Birch Society. It was a natural question to ask; after all, they were talking in the JBS' library. Merriam denied any connection—but Arnold was suspicious. He joined the Freedom Club and Merriam soon conceded that the Freedom Club used Young Americans for Freedom as a front. Its true affiliation was with the John Birch Society. Within two months, Arnold had assumed a youth leadership role in a local JBS chapter and was vice president-elect of the Freedom Club. He was also leading a secret effort to discredit both.⁴⁵

Arnold later detailed his double life in a week-long series published in the *Los Angeles Examiner*. In two months' time, the UCSB freshman was both coordinating efforts to expose the JBS' campus connection and attending meetings of the city's top JBS leaders to discuss the ramifications of such exposure. It was not hard to find details that damned the society. Arnold was put in charge of mailing recruitment materials to the homes of local high school students. He used the same mailing list to send a counter message to parents in which he exposed the first message as a JBS effort to recruit and indoctrinate their children. He signed the second message "Publius," the name used by John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and James Madison when they authored the *Federalist Papers*. Using the Publius *nom-de-plume*, Arnold and four of his friends began to distribute information across campus and publish letters in the student newspaper that alleged a connection between the Freedom Club's activities and the John Birch Society.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ David Arnold and James Peck, "'Front' Lines—How Battle is Fought," April 10, 1961; Arnold and Peck, "'Publius' Was a Retreat to Sanity," April 12, 1961, both in *Los Angeles Examiner*; and "Freedom Club News," undated, in folder "John Birch Society, 1961," box 45, Public Information Office Subject Files, UARCH 12, Special Collections, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara.

⁴⁶ James Schermerhorn, "Collegian Tells Dual Birch Role," *SBNP*, April 7, 1961; Gene Blake, "Leader Who Infiltrated Campus Birchers Quits," *LAT*, April 8, 1961; Arnold and Peck, "Concocted 'Smear'

The cloak-and-dagger ended when Arnold resigned from the Freedom Club. Typing his resignation letter on a JBS form, Arnold revealed his two-month role as a double agent. “With all these meetings . . . I have not been eating properly,” he admitted, “and have not kept in training for track meets. I have been neglecting my school work.” He then added, almost as an aside: “Being Publius has taken a lot of time, too.”⁴⁷ Before resigning, however, Arnold helped Storke and the *News-Press* to obtain the secret tape of the Freedom Club meeting in which Merriam detailed his visions of a world under communist domination.⁴⁸ That Welch had hired such a man—whose prophecies could only be described as hysterical and whose sole mission was to recruit young people to the anticommunist cause—left the public, and more than a few society members, indignant. Merriam had allowed Arnold to infiltrate and expose activities that could be called nothing less than indoctrination. Local JBS members demanded Welch discipline or fire Merriam.⁴⁹ Welch did neither, but the UCSB Freedom Club disbanded shortly after Arnold’s revelations.⁵⁰

The JBS faced accusations that its presence on campus and its plans to infiltrate local high schools was an assault on academic freedom. It was an ironic turn of events; conservative groups like the JBS had long alleged communist infiltration of education endangered American youth and later in the 1960s, again would blame leftist agitators for

Sparks Grave Secret Conference,” *Los Angeles Examiner*, April 13, 1961; and “UCSB Club Makes High School Bid,” *SBNP*, April 5, 1961.

⁴⁷ “UCSB Student Reveals Double Life in Birch Society Controversy,” *El Gaucho* [UCSB student newspaper], April 7, 1961.

⁴⁸ Arnold and Peck, “Hysterical Prophecy of Red Rule Told,” April 9, 1961; and Arnold and Peck, “Birch Group Says It Could ‘Save U.S.’,” April 11, 1961, both in *Los Angeles Examiner*.

⁴⁹ See for example David B. Burnham to Tom Hill, August 8, 1961, folder 4, box 3, Knight Papers, Oregon.

⁵⁰ “Birch Unit Reported Disbanded,” *Los Angeles Examiner*, April 11, 1961; and Veblen, “The Pros Lend a Hand,” 20-21.

unrest on college campuses.⁵¹ Now, to combat what they perceived as a left-wing education agenda on the nation's campuses, the JBS offered a right-wing alternative and was summarily pilloried for it. UCSB Chancellor Samuel Gould said the presence of an outside group "infected" his campus with "hate and bigotry." He applauded Arnold as "a youngster dedicated to his ideals and . . . willing to carry them through. He saw a duty and he moved to perform it."⁵² Not everyone agreed with that assessment.

Among Arnold's critics was Ellen Haldeman, a columnist for the weekly *Carpinteria Herald*, a newspaper published in a community ten miles east of Santa Barbara. Like many women in postwar America, Haldeman saw anticommunism as an extension of her duties as a wife and a mother. Haldeman's columns aimed to educate young people about the dangers communism posed; she believed she was offering an alternative to the potentially subversive education students were receiving from left-leaning teachers. For Haldeman, academic freedom—when practiced by communists or their supporters—eroded American freedom. The actions of David Arnold, and the support he received from the media and from the university administration, posed a real danger she believed must be met with a purely Americanist education that inspired a love of country and respect for its institutions. "The student is entitled to know and should be taught," she warned in a column before Arnold's revelations appeared in the press. "The student is invited to ask questions and he should be answered. The student is entitled to take a stand. But when the student starts to do the teaching, then we see the fallacy of our

⁵¹ See W.J. Rorabaugh, *Berkeley at War: The 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Robert Cohen and Reginald E. Zelnik, ed. *The Free Speech Movement: Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Cohen, *Freedom's Orator: Mario Savio and the Radical Legacy of the 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); and Seth Rosenfeld, *Subversives: The FBI's War on Student Radicals, and Reagan's Rise to Power* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2012).

⁵² "College Head Lauds Student in Linking Birch Group, 'Front,'" April 12, 1961; Arnold and Peck, "Expose Stirs Up Campus Politics at UCSB," April 14, 1961, both in *Los Angeles Examiner*; and "Gould Commends Student Prober of Freedom Club," *SBNP*, April 12, 1961.

misguided discipline.” If American women allowed others to teach—or potentially subvert—American values to their children, then the country was doomed from within.⁵³

Haldeman espoused a belief shared by many American women in the postwar era that anticommunism began at home. The American housewife became a cultural icon in the 1950s, historian Michelle Nickerson suggested. During the decade, “homemaking came to represent the ideal, normal and natural role for women,” she wrote. Television sitcoms and advertisements for appliances and other home goods portrayed a woman’s domesticity “as deeply satisfying—the most important tasks a woman could assume to fulfill her needs and those of society.” The televised images of Harriet Nelson and June Cleaver—who never campaigned for a candidate or railed against communism—have obscured the political role many American women assumed during the decade, however. As Nickerson suggested, “‘housewife’ over the 1950s became more than a familial role; it became a form of citizenship status and political identity.” But being a housewife and mother did not mean women confined their activities to the home. Indeed, many pursued activities outside the home as a means of protecting their families.⁵⁴

The postwar world presented unprecedented threats, historian Mary C. Brennan explained, and combating communism, the influence of an overreaching federal government, and moral decay were not the duties of men alone. In conservative causes, women found comfort, and “could explore the potential of doing something more than housework while justifying it as an extension of their duty to the family, Brennan wrote.

⁵³ Ellen Haldeman, “Communism on the Campus,” *Carpinteria Herald*, January 12, 1961, in folder “JBS Research Material, #2,” carton 2, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and Linda Haldeman Larsson, e-mail to author, April 6, 2014.

⁵⁴ Michelle M. Nickerson, “Goldwater’s ‘Moral Mothers’: Miscalculations of Gender in the 1964 Presidential Campaign,” in Elizabeth Tandy Shermer, ed., *Barry Goldwater and the Remaking of the American Political Landscape* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013), 171-72, 176.

Through letter and newspaper column-writing, study groups, coffee klatches, envelope-stuffing, and a host of other activities, conservative women combatted communism by strengthening their families through an emphasis on traditional values that countered the youth culture of the 1950s.⁵⁵ While many conservative women of the era, most notably Phyllis Schlafly, would reject the notion that they were feminist pioneers, the influence they had on postwar American politics could not be denied, particularly in grassroots groups such as the John Birch Society.⁵⁶

Haldeman was a housewife who became an anticommunist cold warrior. Although not a member of the local chapter of the John Birch Society, Haldeman agreed with its objectives and counted many of the members among her friends and social acquaintances. She and her husband, Harry, a dentist, attended several JBS meetings, often with their eldest daughter in tow. Over time, as supporters distributed her anticommunist writings throughout the region, she lectured on radio and taught her own anticommunism courses. Invariably, she became closely associated with the group—and drew harassment as a result.⁵⁷ Haldeman reflected a belief held by many conservative

⁵⁵ Mary C. Brennan, *Wives, Mothers, and the Red Menace: Conservative Women and the Crusade against Communism* (Boulder, University of Colorado Press, 2008), 34. See also June Melby Benowitz, *Days of Discontent: American Women and Right-Wing Politics, 1933-1945* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2002); and Glen Jeansonne, *Women of the Far Right: The Mother's Movement and World War II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

⁵⁶ For more on women in the John Birch Society and the resurgence of postwar American conservatism, see Michelle M. Nickerson, *Mothers of Conservatism: Women and the Postwar Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 138-42; Donald T. Critchlow, *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); and Veronica A. Wilson, "'To Tell All My People,'" in Kathleen M. Blee and Sandra McGee Deutsch, ed., *Women of the Right: Comparisons and Interplay across Borders* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012), 242-56. *Women of the Right* offers a transnational perspective of conservative women's activism, as do Helen Laville, *Cold War Women: The International Activities of American Women's Organisations* (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 2002); and Raffael Scheck, *Mothers of the Nation: Right-Wing Women in Weimar Germany* (New York: Berg, 2004).

⁵⁷ Larsson e-mail; memorandum, Los Angeles Special Agent in Charge from [redacted], April 11, 1961, "Santa Barbara News-Press," Los Angeles Field Office, FBI file no. 100-59001, in Lazar FOIA Collection, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Los_Angeles-2; Granville F. Knight, "Statement Given to

women that a strong home life strengthened the nation's defenses against communists. The home was both a place to defend and a symbol of American fortitude. Haldeman and her husband had five children, whose antics Haldeman recorded in her *Herald* column. Her articles chronicled an idyllic home life that might have been plucked out of *Leave It to Beaver* or *Father Knows Best*. She emphasized family unity, prayer, discipline, and lamented the intrusions of modern life. "Before the advent of TV, I used to bake in the evening," Haldeman wrote in one. "I must admit that more often lately, I am watching *Dragnet* or a late movie. . . . It seems so nice now to just turn that knob, cuddle up in a comfortable chair, watch TV and just let the rest of the world go by." In another, she complained that families no longer gathered "around a big stove in the kitchen or in the parlor" or "spend evenings reading classic, stirring poetry, or the Bible" as her family had done when she was a child. In addition, Haldeman wrote a second column for the *Herald* in which she responded to teenagers' requests for advice, and she similarly emphasized traditional values that countered the prevailing youth culture of the 1950s. Girls should not wear lipstick unless their parents said it was appropriate; similarly, when one teen complained that his parents did not like his "bopping and loud music," Haldeman replied, "Your parents have every right to tell you what kind of music to play in your home and to keep you from bopping."⁵⁸

For more than four years, Haldeman wrote two weekly columns that expressed her desire to maintain—under at times hectic circumstances—a family life not unlike the

the News-Press," December 23, 1960, folder 8, box 8, Knight Papers, Oregon; and "Course on Communism Will Start Tuesday," *Carpinteria Herald*, March 16, 1961.

⁵⁸ "Dr. Harry Haldeman Opens Office Here," June 2, 1960; Ellen Haldeman, "Beaus and Belles," December 27, 1956, January 10, 1957, and May 16, 1957; Haldeman, "Just Musing," September 19, 1957, and September 26, 1958, all in *Carpinteria Herald*. See also Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1998); and, Joanne J. Meyerowitz, ed., *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994).

one she knew. The columns were built almost in total around her family life and they reflected a woman's support her husband and a mother's hope for her children's futures. "I wish for them," she concluded one column, "the finest life has to offer."⁵⁹ In September 1960, Haldeman spoke to the Carpinteria Junior Woman's Club and told the group "that in order for today's women to be happy, she has to find her particular niche, whether it be making beds or writing books."⁶⁰ In the coming months, Haldeman would find her own vocation—as an anticommunist.

By late 1960, Haldeman's columns of advice and family shenanigans appeared only sporadically. More urgent matters were at hand. The *Herald* told its readers that the columnist was attending anticommunism schools and lectures and would use her newfound education to write a series detailing the communist threat and weapons average citizens could use to combat it.⁶¹ The columns appeared in twenty-one installments between December 1960 and May 1961. Supporters reprinted them as handbills distributed at flea markets, grocery stores, and on street corners. The John Birch Society made them available in its American Opinion Library. JBS members believed Haldeman columns countered misinformation and smears published by Storke's *News-Press* and other media outlets, and applauded her emphasis on educating young people about communism. "If our children are to enjoy the freedoms and advantages of our American system that we have known," wrote one supporter, "then we parents had better begin to practice our citizenship responsibilities more than once every four years."⁶²

⁵⁹ Haldeman, "Just Musing," *Carpinteria Herald*, May 14, 1959, and September 3, 1959.

⁶⁰ "Ellen Haldeman Guest Speaker at Junior Women's Club," *Carpinteria Herald*, September 22, 1960.

⁶¹ "Ellen Haldeman to Write Series of Articles on Communism," *Carpinteria Herald*, November 17, 1960.

⁶² Abbie L. Brooks, letter to editor, *Carpinteria Herald*, January 26, 1961.

Haldeman's columns reflected, as did her earlier writings, a belief that religion and family were essential to strengthening American's moral fabric against communism. Haldeman addressed her articles directly to younger readers; after all, she had written a column for nearly four years with teenagers as her primary audience. She also saw young people as frontline participants and potential victims in what she termed "the Third World War."⁶³ In her first column, she warned her young readers that communists aimed their propaganda "right at you." Communists "are the shrewdest and most fanatically clever conspiracy group in the history of mankind."⁶⁴ In successive columns, Haldeman likened Karl Marx to "a beatnik . . . an intellectual bum" and expressed amazement that "such a man would force his way of life on all mankind by brutal force, shrewd propaganda and thought control." Marx and his adherents espoused "intellectual liberalism" that students could counter through the "practice of religious freedom . . . the greatest armor of all."⁶⁵ Haldeman also recommended students join organizations such as the Boy Scouts, purchase and display American flags, and study history.⁶⁶

Haldeman believed collective action—whether fostered in church pews or classrooms—was essential to defeating communism. Although not a member of the John Birch Society, she conceded in an FBI interview that her views aligned her closely with the organization.⁶⁷ When she criticized David Arnold's revelations about the Freedom

⁶³ Haldeman, "Reds Believe Cold War is Real War," *Carpinteria Herald*, January 26, 1961, in folder 4, "John Birch Society, 1961," Mosk Papers, CJCL.

⁶⁴ Haldeman, "The Challenge of Communism," *Carpinteria Herald*, December 1, 1960, in folder 4, "John Birch Society, 1961," Mosk Papers, CJCL.

⁶⁵ Haldeman, "Ellen Haldeman Continues Series on Communistic Influences in Our Society," *Carpinteria Herald*, December 8, 1960.

⁶⁶ Haldeman, "What You Can Do to Fight Communism," *Carpinteria Herald*, January 19, 1961, in folder 4, "John Birch Society, 1961," Mosk Papers, CJCL.

⁶⁷ Haldeman, "What's Happening on the Campus," *Carpinteria Herald*, April 13, 1961; and memorandum, Los Angeles Special Agent in Charge from [redacted], April 11, 1961, "Santa Barbara News-Press," Los

Club in her column—the only explicit mention she made of the JBS during the course of its twenty-one installments—some readers believed she had exposed herself as a member. The Freedom Club, she wrongly insisted, was not a front for the JBS “any more than we would call a Scout Troop organized by a local service club a front for the service club.” Chet Merriam was not, as Arnold and the press had portrayed him, a devious paranoiac. Rather, he was an Air Force veteran, a family man with two children, and a Christian evangelical who “is now giving himself full time in an effort to combat the growth of Communism and . . . the increase of atheistic principles” at UCSB. Haldeman alleged that Arnold—or someone using the name Publius—had called her home weeks earlier and told her “that my every move was being watched and that I should avoid all dark alleys for fear I might not come out of one.” Arnold, she concluded, had concocted much of what appeared in the newspapers. “His entire testimony has been full of misleading half truths,” she wrote.⁶⁸

Haldeman’s defense of Merriam and criticism of Arnold only affirmed to many that she was indeed a JBS member. In the suspicious climate that existed in Santa Barbara throughout 1961, the association was inevitable. After her first articles appeared, anonymous letters accused her of being a fear-monger. Haldeman denied the accusation, although anxiety punctuated each of the twenty-one articles she published. Indeed, the very essence of the column was to make her young readers aware that communism threatened their futures. While Haldeman repeated themes of religion, American pride and sentimentality for family—which she claimed communists considered “the disgusting luxury of the capitalist”—she also encouraged her young readers to monitor

Angeles Field Office, FBI file no. 100-59001, in Lazar FOIA Collection, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Los Angeles-3.

⁶⁸ Haldeman, “What’s Happening on Campus,” *Carpinteria Herald*, April 13, 1961.

school lessons and textbooks for subversive material. She claimed that communists had subjugated “7,000 persons an hour” since the end of the Second World War. “The communists have taken more than seventeen nations and conquered more than 850 million people since 1945 without a single major war,” she concluded. Communism, she continued, “spread to as many people since 1945 as Christianity has spread in 2,000 years.”⁶⁹ The articles won praise from civic groups and from the district’s Republican congressman, Charles Teague.⁷⁰ But they also drew an equal number of detractors. In addition to the threats from “Publius,” Haldeman claimed she had received phone calls that threatened her children. Local police began escorting them to and from school. A mysterious car parked outside their home daily for weeks, sped off when approached, only to return later. Haldeman said her office was broken into and sacked, and the word “reactionary” scrawled repeatedly on the walls. Her car was pelted with eggs and seemingly innocuous salesmen came to her home only to suggest that she “take it easy” in her anticommunist efforts. Haldeman was not deterred. “All I have to say is that if there are any local residents who are worried, pull in your toes because I am not afraid to tread.” Despite the bravado, her husband secreted a handgun in a living room cupboard, just in case.⁷¹

Thomas M. Storke was among those with whom Haldeman tangled. Following the *News-Press*’ editorial denunciation of the JBS, Haldeman wrote a letter to Storke in

⁶⁹ Haldeman, “Ellen Haldeman Continues Series on Communistic Influences in Our Society,” December 8, 1960; “Here’s What Happens When you Tell Facts about Communism,” December 15, 1960; and “What You Can Do to Fight Communism,” January 19, 1961, all in *Carpinteria Herald*.

⁷⁰ Photograph of Haldeman receiving citation from Veterans of Foreign Wars, February 21, 1961; and “Teague Congratulates Ellen Haldeman,” March 9, 1961, both in *Carpinteria Herald*.

⁷¹ Haldeman, “The Challenge of Communism,” December 1, 1960; “Here’s What Happens When you Tell Facts about Communism,” December 15, 1960; and “Communism on the Campus,” January 12, 1961; Paul Barger, “In One Ear,” January 5, 1961, all in *Carpinteria Herald*; Larsson e-mails, April 6 and April 29, 2014; and Steven Haldeman, e-mail to author, March 21, 2014.

which she bravely accused the publisher of attempting to “paralyze any anti-communist movement within our community” through intimidation. “I cannot believe that you are cognizant . . . of the demoralizing effects of these tactics.” Storke replied that the newspaper’s mission was “to rid the city of this alleged element,” but he did not specify whether he meant communists or the JBS. In a later statement to the FBI, Haldeman also claimed Storke threatened during a telephone conversation to expose her as a JBS member. “In addition,” the FBI reported, the publisher said “he is going to prove that all individuals and organizations in Santa Barbara who are working against communism are fronting for the John Birch Society. He stated that ‘Birchism’ is the most dangerous thing in America today.”⁷² Haldeman was not alone in blaming Storke for the atmosphere of distrust that festered in Santa Barbara as the year progressed. One letter writer suggest the publisher was “pitting faction against faction” and depicted the newspaper’s coverage as “inflammatory.” Another suggested the atmosphere the publisher’s anti-JBS stance had created was equally destructive as that forged by the JBS. Both had cast “suspicion on the loyalty or character of citizens whose view differ” from their own.⁷³

After her row with Storke, Haldeman continued to write articles, which were by then syndicated in a number of West Coast publications as well as distributed weekly throughout Santa Barbara in pamphlets and fliers. Anticommunist groups throughout California asked her to address their gatherings and she appeared on radio. The distribution of her column and her radio broadcasts were underwritten by Frank and

⁷² Haldeman to TMS, March 11, 1961; and TMS to Haldeman, March 15, 1961, both in folder “JBS Requests for Materials, H-J,” carton 2, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and memorandum, Los Angeles Special Agent in Charge from [redacted], April 11, 1961, “Santa Barbara News-Press,” Los Angeles Field Office, FBI file no. 100-59001, in Lazar FOIA Collection, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Los-Angeles-3.

⁷³ H.H. Russell and George M. Warner, letters to the editor, both in *SBNP*, March 9, 1961.

Eleanor Ketcham.⁷⁴ Like Haldeman, the Ketchams were not members of the John Birch Society, but were self-professed spiritual brethren. The Ketchams' organization, Americans for Freedom, mirrored the JBS in mission and in methods, and Frank Ketcham praised the society's members as "the most wonderful kind of people." To a California Senate subcommittee that investigated the JBS in 1962, the Ketchams offered the group unsolicited praise: "We have studied carefully their literature and find nothing in its contents we as American citizens do not agree with. What we need, as we see it, [are] 180 million super-patriots who will come forward and stand for God and our free enterprise system."⁷⁵

Capitalism had been good to Frank Ketcham, he liked to recall, and he and Eleanor founded Americans for Freedom "to pour back into the free enterprise system some of the largesse which it has given us." The Ketchams retired to Santa Barbara in the late 1940s to ride horses and to paint after making a fortune in legal and financial printing services. His 20th Century Press started in his native Chicago, but soon expanded to include offices in New York and San Francisco. He sold the company in 1942, but his days of leisurely retirement ended when he and Eleanor chartered Americans for Freedom in 1960—at roughly the same time the John Birch Society arrived in the city. Similarities in message and methods resulted in many residents confusing the two organizations. The goal of Americans for Freedom, Frank Ketcham said, was to "tell our citizens the truth about Communism" and to "help preserve our freedom" from a bloated federal government, social welfare programs, and the creeping influence of socialism.

⁷⁴ Advertisement, "How Communism Affects Our Lives," *SBNP*, February 13, 1961.

⁷⁵ Paul Barger, "Energetic Couple Promotes American Ideals," *Carpinteria Herald*, March 1, 1962; and Frank and Eleanor Ketcham to R.E. Combs, January 13, 1962, folder 10, box 3, Knight Papers, Oregon.

Americans for Freedom consisted only of the Ketchams, their daughter and son-in-law, and the couple funded it completely out-of-pocket.⁷⁶

As with the JBS, the dissemination of information to educate the public was paramount. Americans for Freedom ran a free telephone information service. Callers who dialed Woodland 9-4432 or Woodland 9-4433 would hear “documented material not generally made available through their daily newspapers, radio and television stations” about the threat of Communism. Among the messages it broadcast were excerpted speeches by Clarence Manion, a member of the JBS national council, attacks on UNICEF, and demands that the United States end all foreign aid.⁷⁷ Like the JBS, the Ketchams hosted occasional study groups in their home where guests discussed anticommunist material and strategies for countering subversion. Americans for Freedom maintained a mailing list of 1,000 individuals who regularly received their pamphlets, which included reprints of the Soviet and American Constitutions, articles that praised the House Committee on Un-American Activities and condemned the Council on Foreign Relations, and statements by J. Edgar Hoover.⁷⁸ Haldeman’s columns were distributed free as fliers emblazoned with the slogan “Please Read This and Pass It On. Help Us to Preserve Our Freedom.” They printed and distributed nearly 30,000 automobile bumper stickers. One featured the Statue of Liberty and proclaimed “The Light of Freedom. Keep

⁷⁶ Americans for Freedom brochure, folder “K-Miscellany, Ke,” box 15, TMS Papers, Berkeley; Barger, “Energetic Couple Promotes American Ideals”; and Raymond C. Baker, “A Card-Carrying American,” *Lima (Ohio) News*, January 10, 1964.

⁷⁷ Barger, “Energetic Couple Promotes American Ideals”; and Frank and Eleanor Ketcham, letters to the editor, July 5, 1962, and August 16, 1962, all in *Carpinteria Herald*.

⁷⁸ “Let Freedom Ring,” *SBNP*, January 10, 1962, in folder “Americans for Freedom, 1962,” box 1, CSDI/PU, UCSB; advertisements, *Carpinteria Herald*, December 7, 1961, February 8, 1962, March 1, 1962, and April 13, 1962; memorandum to Los Angeles Special Agent in Charge from Supervisor [redacted], April 7, 1961; and Airtel to Director from Los Angeles SAC, March 24, 1963, both in “Frank W. Ketcham,” FBI file no. 100-60903.

it Burning.” Another identified the car’s driver as “A Card-Carrying American.”⁷⁹ When the Ketchams sent the second sticker to Storke, apparently to nettle him, the publisher indignantly responded: “I don’t need your sticker to be identified as an American. I have ten or more generations behind me—all Americans. Whenever I see this sticker on a car, I must know he is a Bircher. God knows he needs something more than a red sticker to make him even approach being an American. How silly can you be, Frank.”⁸⁰

The Ketchams and Haldeman shared a target with the members of the John Birch Society—the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. For many detractors, the Center, located in a renovated, hilltop mansion overlooking Santa Barbara, was a nest of potentially subversive activity. Its parent organization, the Fund for the Republic, had accrued, according to congressional investigators and critics in the press, a record over the past decade of walking in lockstep with the Communist Party. The Ketchams’ Americans for Freedom distributed a pamphlet that questioned the Fund for the Republic’s tax-exempt status and its “left-wing ideology.” In one column, Haldeman doubted the Center’s commitment to free enterprise. In another unpublished article, Haldeman showed no such restraint. The Center was a hive of “fellow travelers” who were “communist tinged, influenced or maybe dominated.” Granville F. Knight, a member of the John Birch Society’s National Council and a Santa Barbara physician, solicited research on the Fund for the Republic and was advised to compile a dossier on employees, consultants, directors, publications, newspaper columns, government reports—anything that threw “light on the pattern of subversion associated with the

⁷⁹ Paul Barger, “Card Carriers,” June 29, 1961; Gordon Lord, “Free Air,” October 11 and November 13, 1962, all in *Carpinteria Herald*; and Eleanor Ketcham to TMS, June 29, 1961, folder “JBS Requests for Materials, K-L,” carton 2, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁸⁰ TMS to Frank and Eleanor Ketcham, undated [but probably June 1961], folder “JBS Requests for Materials, K-L,” carton 2, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

fund's activities."⁸¹ Some anonymous critics sent mail addressed to the "Committee for the Defense of Fabian Socialism." The Ketchams, Haldeman, Knight and these unsigned critics were convinced the Center's vague descriptions of its work was merely a smokescreen for its real intentions—treason.⁸²

Such criticism had begun almost immediately after the Fund for the Republic's 1959 decision to establish the Center in Santa Barbara. The condemnation was nothing new. Since its inception in 1952 as a result of a \$15 million grant from the Ford Foundation, the Fund for the Republic instilled nothing less than loathing among some conservatives who saw its agenda—"to support the traditional liberties of the American people," in the words of Fund President Robert Maynard Hutchins—as a communist-led counterattack on government-initiated efforts to ferret out traitors.⁸³ The Fund further antagonized its critics when it commissioned projects that probed communist influence in the United States and examined the effectiveness of congressional investigations into alleged subversion. Subsequent reports deemed the investigations far more harmful than the threat of communism itself.⁸⁴

Criticism from the Right haunted the Fund and its progeny, Santa Barbara's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Republican Congressman Carroll B. Reece of Tennessee launched an investigation in 1954 that aimed unsuccessfully to strip

⁸¹ R.H. Frederick to Granville F. Knight, December 1, 1960, folder 16, box 2, Knight Papers, Oregon.

⁸² "An Open Letter," *SBNP*, July 15, 1962, in folder "Americans for Freedom, 1962," box 1, CSDI/PU, UCSB; Haldeman, "What's Happening on Campus," *Carpinteria Herald*, April 13, 1961; and Haldeman, "Only the TRUTH Will Defeat Communism," unpublished, in folder 13, box 8; and Jerry Linz to Granville F. Knight, February 15, 1963, folder 15, box 3, both in Knight Papers, Oregon.

⁸³ Dwight MacDonal, *The Ford Foundation: The Men and the Millions* (New York: Reynal, 1956), 69-73; and "To Help Spend Money," *Time*, August 30, 1954, 40.

⁸⁴ Walter Goodman, "That Dangerous Mr. Hutchins," *New Republic*, October 17, 1955, 9-10; "The 'Controversial' Fund," *Commonweal*, December 2, 1955, 211-12; "An Open Letter to Dr. Hutchins," *America*, October 8, 1955, 37; and "Fund for the Republic Scores Reds in U.S. as Still Conspiratorial," *NYT*, December 10, 1956.

foundations of their tax-exempt status if they engaged in overtly political activities. Reece described the Fund as a “king-sized Civil Rights Congress” run by communists and Socialists who had seized money earned by industrialist Henry Ford “to finance the destruction of capitalism.” Hutchins’ “conception of civil liberties is similar to that of the communists,” Reece concluded, adding “we can be sure that the new Ford Foundation project will aid the communist conspiracy and will try to discredit all who fight it.” Two years later, the House Committee on Un-American Activities also investigated the Fund.⁸⁵ Outside government, critics such as radio commentator Fulton Lewis Jr. insisted “every act of the Fund for the Republic has been aimed directly at stopping all investigations of Communism and . . . at undermining the government’s personnel security program.” For nearly a year, Lewis’ weekly broadcasts included some slam against the Fund. He characterized Hutchins’ views as “verging on the revolutionary” and described Hutchins’ deputy, W.H. “Ping” Ferry, as “a constant dissenter [who would] rebel against everything conventional.” In addition, the national commander of the American Legion said his organization would refuse any money from the Fund (in the unlikely event it would be offered any), and insisted Hutchins and the Fund were “threatening and may succeed in crippling the national security.”⁸⁶ Speaking before the JBS’ inaugural meeting in December 1958, organization founder Robert Welch echoed

⁸⁵ Anna McCarthy, *The Citizen Machine: Governing by Television in 1950s America* (New York: New Press, 2010), 166-67; and Anthony Lewis, “Investigation of Fund for Republic Announced by House Committee,” *NYT*, June 11, 1956. See also René A. Wormser, *Foundations: Their Power and Influence* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1958). Wormser was an investigator for the Reece committee.

⁸⁶ Thomas C. Reeves, *Freedom and the Foundation: The Fund for the Republic in the Era of McCarthyism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), 58; Jay Walz, “Legion Head Proposes Boycott of Fund for Republic Projects,” *NYT*, September 12, 1955; “Hatchet Job on the Fund for the Republic,” *New Republic*, September 26, 1955, 4-5; Fulton Lewis Jr., *The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic* (Washington, D.C.: Special Reports Inc., 1955), 7, 13; and “The Legion and the Fund,” *Commonweal*, September 30, 1955, 637-38. On Fulton Lewis Jr., see also Donald Ritchie, *Reporting from Washington: The History of the Washington Press Corps* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 57-61, 64-68.

these sentiments and suggested the Fund employed communist techniques; in *The Politician*, he similarly characterized the Fund as “that communist-aiding agency.”⁸⁷

The issue of control—who directed the millions of private dollars foundations expended annually on matters of public concern—lay at the heart of the criticism the Fund for the Republic faced during its first decade. After Henry Ford’s death in 1947, his family, in order to avoid massive inheritance taxes, shifted nearly 90 percent of the Ford Motor Company’s non-voting stock into a nonprofit foundation. The Ford family created its foundation “due less to altruism than fiscal perspicacity,” wrote historian Thomas C. Reeves. “With assets of approximately a quarter of a billion dollars, the largest philanthropic organ in the world was now faced with the problem of how to spend, rapidly, and continuously, great sums of money.”⁸⁸

The \$15 million the Ford Foundation endowed to the Fund for the Republic in 1952 was a comparatively small sum. Traditionally, foundations, with their wealthy donors and affluent boards of directors, were more inclined to support endeavors that maintained the status quo. However, from its creation, the Fund for the Republic was different. Its criticism of the nation’s emerging Cold War security state inspired questions about the influence of private funds on determining public issues.⁸⁹ Congressional investigators and critical commentators alike repeated charges throughout the 1950s that less-than-subtly hinted that the Fund’s officers—Hutchins, Ferry, Paul Hoffman, the Fund’s first president, Joseph Lyford, its information officer—and the Ford Foundation board, which included diplomats, journalists, and educators, all had ties to communists.

⁸⁷ Welch, *Blue Book*, 43; and Welch, *The Politician* (Belmont, Mass.: Belmont Publishing Co., 1963), 247.

⁸⁸ Thomas C. Reeves, “The Foundation and Freedoms: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Fund for the Republic,” *Pacific Historical Review* 34 (May 1965): 197-98.

⁸⁹ Thomas C. Reeves, ed., *Foundations under Fire* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1970), 13-14.

The Fund's record, opined the *American Mercury* in August 1959, spoke for itself. "That such an opinion-poisoning organization should continue to enjoy tax-exemption from the American people is a bitter commentary upon our Washington slackness," the magazine concluded. "The Fund for the Republic is a suppurating sore which is infecting American public thinking. It is a beachhead for Khrushchev's long-range designs."⁹⁰

Criticism barely fazed Hutchins, who, one detractor observed, "dreads controversy as Br'er Rabbit dreaded the briar patch."⁹¹ Turmoil saturated Hutchins' career. Yale Law School named him dean when he was 29; the following year, he was chancellor of the University of Chicago. At Chicago, *Newsweek* later observed, Hutchins' name "was synonymous with educational revolution." He believed extracurricular activities such as sports trivialized American higher education. "Football, fraternities, and fun were designed to make a college education palatable for those who shouldn't be there," he mused after disbanding the gridiron squad, his most controversial move. Yet Hutchins' approach to curriculum was equally as radical. He believed a true liberal arts education involved an intense focus on great works of literature and history; universities were not trade schools where students learned professional skills but institutions that provided an intellectual grounding that ultimately benefited a student in whatever profession he chose.⁹² While many of his changes met with internal resistance from faculty and students—indeed, most of Hutchins' programs were rolled back after his departure—his enduring legacy at Chicago was the creation of "an ethos of intellectual

⁹⁰ Harold Lord Varney, "Fund for Whose Republic?" *American Mercury*, August 1959, 10.

⁹¹ MacDonald, *The Ford Foundation*, 76.

⁹² "The Controversial Man," *Newsweek*, November 7, 1955, 65-66; and "Robert M. Hutchins, Long a Leader In Educational Change, Dies at 78," *NYT*, May 16, 1977. Hutchins was not the only member of his family to be a university president. His father, William, a Presbyterian minister, was president of Berea College in Kentucky from 1920 to 1939. His brother Francis was Berea president from 1939 to 1967.

rigor” that encouraged cross-disciplinary cooperation and questioned whether at-times antiquated academic institutions could contribute anything to modern life.⁹³

Hutchins left Chicago in 1951 and became associate director of the Ford Foundation. At the foundation, Hutchins was “guided by the progressive notion that experts were needed to solve public problems.” He became president of the Fund for the Republic in 1954, and inherited an organization that was already facing attacks from across the political spectrum. Hutchins inspired further condemnation and investigations when he suggested during an interview on *Meet the Press* that he would have no qualms with hiring a communist to work at the Fund. But it was the work of the Fund itself that particularly infuriated critics and placed the Fund—and the Ford Foundation—at the center of Cold War, anticommunist hysteria. Of its original \$15 million Ford Foundation endowment, the Fund spent \$7.5 million “on all the things we could think of to help maintain civil rights and civil liberties during the McCarthy era,” Hutchins later recalled. It bestowed \$2 million to organizations concerned with race relations in the South; \$500,000 funded a definitive study of Communism’s influence in the United States; and \$300,000 more went to civil rights initiatives benefiting Native Americans. “What we tried to do during those years was to spot the issue and then spot the way of dealing with it,” Hutchins said. These issues included the federal government’s loyalty-security program, and federal surveillance and investigations of purported subversives. “We did something to maintain the respectability of dissent and independence in the McCarthy

⁹³ Mary Ann Dzuback, *Robert M. Hutchins: Portrait of an Educator* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 227-28. See also Milton Mayer, *Robert Maynard Hutchins: A Memoir* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); and William Hardy McNeill, *Hutchins’ University: A Memoir of the University of Chicago, 1929-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

era. At the time, nobody else was really doing anything in a concerted, deliberate way to counteract McCarthy's influence. . . . We did.”⁹⁴

Hutchins' direction of the Fund inspired poor relations with the Ford Foundation, which found itself under attack for its progeny's positions. The Foundation emphasized the Fund's autonomy to do with its endowment what it wished, but distanced itself from its activities. Hutchins bitterly described the Fund as “a wholly disowned subsidiary of the Ford Foundation.” But Hutchins found himself tiring of the “activist model” as the 1950s drew to an end. The Fund had spent millions to address what it considered the nation's most pressing problems without addressing the issues' root causes. Hutchins proposed that the Fund use the remainder of its endowment and create a retreat—far from its current headquarters in New York City—where experts could come together to discuss the “basic issues” of democracy, religion, economics, communication, government, and law, among other topics. Hutchins imagined a collection of experts who would cross disciplines “to strike with pure reason at the ills besetting the democratic system.” Economists would discuss religion; theologians would explore Wall Street. Journalist Harry S. Ashmore, who later joined the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, said Hutchins envisioned “a modern version of the Lords Spiritual—a body of the wise and the just, armed only with the authority of their collective intellect and moral purpose, who would concern themselves with the manner in which our affluent society seems to be withering our souls while it pampers our bodies.”⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Dzuback, *Robert M. Hutchins*, 231; “Hutchins Condemns Red Party But Would Give Job to Member,” *NYT*, November 8, 1955; “Red Hiring is Defended by Hutchins,” *Washington Post*, November 8, 1955; and John Bainbridge, “Feel Free,” *The New Yorker*, November 9, 1963, 111-12, 115-16.

⁹⁵ Hutchins, quoted in MacDonald, *The Ford Foundation*, 69-70; James Real, “Meanwhile, Back on Mt. Olympus,” *LAT*, October 5, 1969; and Harry S. Ashmore, “The Thinking Man's Shelter,” *Esquire*, April 1962, 109.

Such vague and lofty language did not satisfy sceptics who wondered just what Hutchins was up to. Indeed, that question would be repeated continuously by Santa Barbarans and the Center's staff alike once Hutchins announced the think tank's creation in June 1959. "One of the real hazards we face here is that the hit-and-run visitor seems likely to go away with the impression that we are running some sort of egghead monastery," Ashmore explained. "Another is that it also seems possible to reach the reverse conclusion—that we are an assembly of syndicalists plotting to overthrow the established order. Actually, the Center is just trying to figure out . . . what the hell is going on." Ferry concluded that the Center's critics, "are the people who remember those early days and to whom the menace of domestic communism is very real. There aren't many of these poor folks around, but they are very noisy indeed."⁹⁶

Hutchins expected noise, particularly from among Santa Barbara's population of wealthy, conservative retirees, but he thought that he might be able to reduce some criticism if he first lobbied locals for their support. While still contemplating establishing the Center in Santa Barbara, he approached USCB Chancellor Samuel Gould to discuss potential collaboration between the think tank and the university. Gould advised Hutchins that the approval of Santa Barbara newspaper publisher Thomas M. Storke "was of the utmost importance."⁹⁷ Storke, who was nearing the end of his tenure on the UC Board of Regents, saw the local university as an extension of the fiefdom he had built in Santa Barbara over the preceding six decades. The publisher met with Hutchins and, like many residents, was puzzled by what the former university president was proposing. "Frankly, I

⁹⁶ Bainbridge, "Feel Free," 105; and W.H. Ferry to TMS, March 3, 1960, folder "Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions," carton 1, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁹⁷ Samuel Gould to TMS, February 20, 1959, folder "Samuel Gould," box 11; Hutchins, memo of meeting with Samuel Gould, February 18, 1959; and Hutchins to TMS, February 27, 1959, both in folder "Robert M. Hutchins," box 14, all in TMS Papers, Berkeley.

had some misgivings,” Storke recalled later. “I had concern as to the reception he might receive.” To an interviewer, the publisher further explained, “This is a conservative community and a lot of our stuffed shirts didn’t want Bob Hutchins and his crowd to set up shop here.”⁹⁸ Storke shelved his apprehensions and summoned members of the city’s zoning board to his office to clear the way for the Center to locate its headquarters in the former Hale mansion atop Eucalyptus Hill in nearby Montecito, the wealthy enclave above Santa Barbara that many members of the John Birch Society and quite a few of the Center’s critics called home.”⁹⁹

The *News-Press* welcomed the Center as “an asset of inestimable value to the community.”¹⁰⁰ Not all Santa Barbarans felt that way, and animosity among residents was one reason the John Birch Society found a home in Santa Barbara in 1960. Yet much of their wrath was focused on the Center’s staff, not its work; indeed, most residents remained unsure what the Center’s purpose was but remembered Hutchins’ earlier affiliation with the Fund for the Republic. Hutchins did little to allay their fears when one of the first speeches he gave in Santa Barbara extolled the value of world government, which to the ears of critics sounded much like internationalism, a key tenet of communism. Formation of a world government would reduce Cold War tensions, Hutchins argued, and would produce mutual understanding that would allay fears and distrust. He continued: “We are in no present danger from Russia. We are in no present danger from communism. At present, we are our own worst enemy. The present danger

⁹⁸ TMS to unknown recipient, undated, folder “T.M. Storke, 1963—draft of letter,” box 28, CSDI/PU Files, UCSB; and Bainbridge, “Feel Free,” 105.

⁹⁹ “Fund for the Republic To Be Based Here,” June 4, 1959; “City Approves Hale Estate Use,” June 5, 1959; and “Fund for the Republic Zone Change OKd,” June 24, 1959, all in *SBNP*; Robert M. Hutchins to TMS, June 15, 1959, folder “Robert M. Hutchins,” box 14, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and Harry S. Ashmore, *Unseasonable Truths: The Life of Robert Maynard Hutchins* (Boston: Little Brown, 1989). 412.

¹⁰⁰ “Warm Welcome to ‘Fund for the Republic,’” *SBNP*, June 5, 1959.

to us lies in our own hysteria and inertia.” Days later, in response to an onslaught of negative reactions, a spokesman for the Center said Hutchins was speaking as an individual, not as head of the Center. But for many residents of Santa Barbara, who remained unsure of the Center’s intentions, there was no separating the two. A letter from Ferry published in the *News-Press* in late December that advocated unilateral disarmament further deepened their suspicions. Ferry suggested the United States scrap its nuclear weapons in the hopes that the Soviet Union would do the same. “The worst possible result is that Russia would instantly take advantage of our defenselessness to bomb the U.S. into radioactive rubble,” Ferry suggested. “But this result seems wholly unlikely. It may be better to suppose that Russia does not desire the extinction of the U.S. but its submission as a nation and great production center to communism.”¹⁰¹

Taken together, Hutchins and Ferry’s statements were ill-advised introductions to Santa Barbara. “Many people,” recalled Frank K. Kelly, a vice president at the Center, “preferred to think that there was something mysterious going on at the Center. Because of Hutchins’ reputation . . . the Center was believed to be a conduit for drastic changes in American institutions and a fostering agent for the development of world government.” Hutchins spent much of his early tenure at the Center trying to explain to journalists what the Center’s goals were. It was purely damage control, but Hutchins seemed unable to put into simplistic terms what his intentions were. “We’re the only institution in the world trying to carry on what used to be called a civil conversation,” Hutchins told the *Los Angeles Times*. “The most important aspect of our operation is not so much what we talk about but the fact that we are talking. It is a symbol, a demonstration which we hope will

¹⁰¹ “New Peace Policy Urged by Hutchins,” December 9, 1959; and “A Question about the Fund,” December 16, 1959, both in *SBNP*.

encourage the practice. Essentially, we have here a miniature model of the world of dialogue. . . . You might say that we are trying to achieve the civilization of the dialogue.”¹⁰²

Hutchins’ inability to offer a tangible explanation of the Center’s mission created a vacuum its critics filled with accusations that the Center was a communist front.¹⁰³ The John Birch Society spent much of its first year in Santa Barbara sniping at the Center’s activities and officers.¹⁰⁴ In September 1960, two women who would later be identified closely with the local JBS chapter printed and distributed a four-page pamphlet that capitalized on the uncertainty of the Center’s mission by describing it in purely nefarious terms. One of the women was Shirley Pierce, who had played host to Robert Welch during his April 1960 visit to Santa Barbara.¹⁰⁵ The other was Lillian Drake, soon-to-be publisher of the *Freedom Press* newspaper.

Lillian Drake and her husband William opened their monthly newspaper in Santa Barbara in March 1961, to counter the negative publicity the John Birch Society received nearly daily in Storke’s *News-Press*.¹⁰⁶ The Drakes denied membership in the JBS, although sources indicate they were indeed members until the fall of 1961. Whether members or not, the Drakes and their newspaper found a ready audience among Santa

¹⁰² W.H. Ferry, “Alternatives to Arms Race—Drastic But ‘Thinkable,’” *SBNP*, January 13, 1960; Frank K. Kelly, *Court of Reason: Robert Hutchins and the Fund for the Republic* (New York: Free Press, 1981), 195; James A. Ward, *Ferrytale: The Career of W.H. “Ping” Ferry* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 76-77; and “Hilltop Sages Revive Ancient Art of Conversation,” *LAT*, August 27, 1961.

¹⁰³ TMS to C.R. Ferguson, September 30, 1960, folder “F-Miscellany, F-Fu,” box 9, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹⁰⁴ Granville F. Knight, “Deposition for R.E. Combs, counsel, California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities,” undated, folder 1, box 8, Granville Knight Papers, Collection 82, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene [hereafter cited as Knight Papers, Oregon].

¹⁰⁵ “Santa Barbara Activities of the John Birch Society and Presentation Film by Robert Welch,” April 18, 1960, Los Angeles Field Office, FBI file no. 100-59001, Lazar FOIA Collection, John Birch Society, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Los_Angeles-1.

¹⁰⁶ “‘Freedom Press’ Named Registered,” *SBNP*, April 5, 1961; and *The Freedom Press*, March 1961.

Barbarans and other residents of Southern California who saw local media as hostile to the JBS and other anticommunist groups. From its first issue in March 1961, the *Freedom Press* carried missives that appealed to core conservative tenets of “free enterprise and constitutional government,” which Lillian Drake said was “a side of the news that is rarely emphasized in local and metropolitan newspapers.”¹⁰⁷ Among the newspaper’s favorite targets, however, was the Center. In 1962, Lillian Drake authored a series of articles on tax-exempt foundations that largely repeated the accusations she and Pierce had distributed in their pamphlet two years before. The pamphlet and articles combined critical statements made by Carroll Reece, Fulton Lewis, and the head of the American Legion during the preceding decade with the statements Hutchins and Ferry made after their arrival in Santa Barbara. The Center said it hoped to inspire action on pressing problems throughout unbiased research and conversation, but Drake and Pierce concluded Hutchins’ think tank had revolutionary aims. “Regardless of any smoke screen thrown out to protect the Fund from the facts of its own history,” they wrote, “citizens of the Santa Barbara area are entitled to see the preconceived slant that lies behind its façade of claims to objective scholarship.” In a response, Frank Kelly characterized Drake and Pierce as “among those described by John Foster Dulles ‘who honestly feel that the danger is so imminent that we should impose uniformity of thought, or at least expression, abolishing diversity and tolerance.’”¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷ Lillian Drake, quoted in an advertisement for *The Freedom Press*, *SBNP*, September 20, 1961. The Drakes insisted in the letter that they were not JBS members, although a letter from retired Marine Corps Major General Robert Blake to Granville Knight suggests that they were at one time. “I understand Bill Drake and his wife have resigned from the John Birch Society,” Blake wrote. “Do you know why?” There is no record of a reply from Knight. Blake to Knight, October 29, 1961, folder 7, box 3, Knight Papers, Oregon.

¹⁰⁸ Drake and Shirley Pierce, “Santa Barbara’s Mislabeled Mansion,” *The Fact Reporting Network*, September 1960, in folder “Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions,” carton 1, TMS Papers,

Kelly's letter—and unflattering classification of Pierce and Drake as paranoiacs—did not dissuade Drake from reprinting the pamphlet's accusations two years later in her *Freedom Press*. In the three-part series, she additionally suggested that the Center was a hive of un-American activities where Soviet and American scientists met to discuss nuclear disarmament, where free enterprise and corporate profits were held in disdain, and where foreign diplomats found shelter to discuss their internationalist aims. Using the Center as an example, Drake merged her arguments with an older debate that was finding new resonance in the 1960s—how to limit the effectiveness and influence of tax-exempt foundations.¹⁰⁹ Like the congressional investigations and press commentators of the 1950s, these new critics like Drake saw the reports issued by foundations as being used far too often by authorities as an intellectual foundation for laws and executive actions. Without public debate, these foundation reports subverted the democratic process and represented a power grab by the intellectual elite over American society. They also saw shadowy influences from the foundation's boards of directors who could presumably direct private studies of particular projects, tamper with the results to meet certain preconceived ends, and then use their influences with members of Congress or the White House to parlay those faulty results into public policy. “What is the Fund for the Republic's real aim?” asked national critic Alice Widener. “Is it reflective of merely of Robert M. Hutchins' perennially puerile desire to be ‘different’ and thus attract attention? Or is it reflective of something more mature, subtle, and sinister?” She continued: “To save our free society, it is evident that patriots should try to find out the real height and

Berkeley; and Frank K. Kelly to Lillian Drake and Shirley Pierce, September 14, 1960, folder 15, box 2, Knight Papers, Oregon.

¹⁰⁹ Lillian Drake, “Fund for the Republic—A Study,” September 5, 1962; “Foundations Used to Cripple Competition,” September 5, 1962; “Fund for the Republic Objectives Are Questioned by Congress,” September 19, 1962; and “Influence of Tax Exempt Foundations,” October 3, 1962, all in *Freedom Press*.

depth of the Fund for the Republic's influence on policy planning in certain quarters within the Pentagon, State Department and the White House.”¹¹⁰

Yet as 1962 dawned, it appeared that finances would achieve what critics could not—shutter the Center. Controversy spilled over from the previous year. In December, the Center gave a small grant to two librarians in Iowa who produced a bibliography of right-wing literature. It was not a Center publication, but when it was published in late 1961, the weight of nearly a decades' criticism crashed down on the authors and on the Center. When the Center announced in June that its endowment would last only another two years unless it received an infusion of cash, critics chortled that had it not used its money to attack patriotic Americans as crackpots, then the Center might be able to continue to operate.¹¹¹ But nothing drew more negative press coverage—both from far right and mainstream publications—than comments Ferry made in which he suggested FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, whom he called the nation's “official spyswatter” was derelict because “he does not produce many flesh and blood spies and saboteurs year after year.” Ferry characterized as “sententious poppycock” Hoover's claims that communists in America “have the capacity to pervert our thinking and destroy . . . the foundation of our freedom.”¹¹² Condemnation came swiftly—from Richard M. Nixon,

¹¹⁰ Alice Widener, “Funded Thinking: A Bane in American Life,” *USA*, November 17, 1961, 4. See also Widener, “‘Badly Informed’ or Badly Informing: A Special Report on the Activities of the Fund for the Republic and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions,” *USA*, August 24-September 6, 1962; and Widener, “Pamphlet is Linked to Prayer Verdict,” *Cincinnati Enquirer*, September 6, 1962.

¹¹¹ “Hutchins' Fund Nears End of Cash,” *LAT*, June 10, 1962; Kelly, *Court of Reason*, 214-17; Jo Hindman, “Fund for the Republic Going Broke,” *American Mercury*, July 1960, 107-112; “Right-Wing Bibliography,” *Science* 135(February 23, 1962), 674; “Right Wingers Seem to be Almost Everywhere,” *Science* 134 (December 22, 1961): 2025-2027; Lyle C. Wilson, “Pamphlet on Right Wingers,” distributed by United Press International wire service, December 12, 1961; and Ralph M. Blagden, “Right Wing Extremists Play Unfathomable Role in US Politics,” *Sacramento Bee*, March 4, 1962.

¹¹² Ward, *Ferrytale*, 83-86; Kelly, *Court of Reason*, 219; W.H. Ferry, “J. Edgar Hoover Insults the American People,” *The Progressive*, September 1962, 42; “A Cop Becomes Cato,” *New Republic*, September 10, 1962, 14; Wallace Turner, “Fund Official Attacks FBI Chief on Red ‘Legends,’” *NYT*, August 7, 1962; and “RFK Has Spoken,” *New York Journal-American*, August 11, 1962; “The FBI's

Barry M. Goldwater, Robert F. Kennedy, and publications as large as the *New York Journal-American* and as small as the *Aurora (Illinois) Beacon-News*. Although the Center quickly insisted Ferry was speaking as a private citizen, the think tank's critics latched on to his statements as more evidence that Hutchins and the Center were up to no good. Widener said Ferry's remarks were a "rotten, sweeping smear fit only for sliding off a copperhead's tongue." Most critics renewed their calls for an investigation of the Center's tax-exempt status.¹¹³

Criticism was good for the Center's finances. Beset by financial problems, Hutchins and his fundraisers presented donors "with a fairly broad-stroke picture of how the Center is besieged by the forces of darkness," wrote Joan Didion in a 1967 *Saturday Evening Post* article. "[The] Center has had an invaluable, if unintentional ally in the Santa Barbara John Birch Society."¹¹⁴ The same could be said about many of the local JBS chapters' activities. Unintended consequences abounded; the society only succeeded in giving aid and comfort to its opponents. Its opposition to the National Council of Churches made the JBS seem as if it was against religious liberty. Its front on the campus of UCSB made it appear against academic freedom. Critics characterized its boycotts against UNICEF as anti-children, and flooded the organization with unprecedented donations. Finally, its constant hectoring of the Center—cast by critics as evidence the JBS feared free thought—only put the embattled institution on firm financial footing. In Santa Barbara and elsewhere, the JBS succeeded in explaining what it was against, but

Critics Criticize Hoover," *Aurora (Illinois) Beacon-News*, August 21, 1962; "Slap at FBI Chief Assailed by Nixon," *Charleston (West Virginia) Mail*, August 11, 1962; Barry Goldwater, "On Domestic Communism," *San Francisco Examiner*, August 28, 1962, all in folder "W.H. Ferry—Seattle Speech," box 9, CSDI/PU, UCSB.

¹¹³ Robert U. Brown, "W.H. Ferry and J.E. Hoover," *Editor & Publisher*, September 15, 1962, 68; and "Tax-Exempt Disservice," *Omaha (Nebraska) World-Herald*, August 9, 1962, in folder "W.H. Ferry—Seattle Speech," box 9, CSDI/PU, UCSB.

¹¹⁴ Joan Didion, "California Dreaming," *Saturday Evening Post*, October 27, 1967, 27.

failed to demonstrate what it was for. It only appeared to many that the society, rather than act in positive ways to further a legitimate political agenda, was content to be disruptive. In this way, it inspired fear rather than understanding and won—rightfully so—recognition for all the wrong reasons.

CHAPTER FOUR
“YOU CAN’T KILL A RAT WITH A FEATHERDUSTER”

Marion Day Storke rushed to answer the ringing phone. Her husband, Thomas, the 85-year-old publisher of the *Santa Barbara News-Press*, had a cold and was asleep in his upstairs bedroom, and she did not want to wake him. Paul Veblen, the newspaper’s executive editor, was on the line. “Please tell T.M. that he just won the Pulitzer Prize,” for the newspaper’s editorials against the John Birch Society, Veblen told her. “Oh, that’s very nice, isn’t it?” she replied and after exchanging a few more pleasantries, she placed the telephone back in its cradle and went about her afternoon. Marion Storke did not wake her husband for a half hour.¹

Thomas M. Storke was one of the last members of his newspaper’s staff to know of the Pulitzer honor, but the octogenarian needed his rest. Since the *News-Press* launched its campaign against the John Birch Society in January 1961, the publisher had emerged as a national spokesman against the political far right. The Pulitzer announcement in May 1962, merely cemented this reputation. Over the preceding eighteen months, national magazines, newspapers, and television programs had sought him out to describe the danger he believed groups such as the JBS posed to American politics. His newspaper’s editorials against the society had helped inspire a national debate about its philosophy and the effectiveness of its anticommunist aims. Magazines quoted him and carried his picture. His name appeared in wire stories printed in hundreds of newspapers nationwide. He sat beneath blistering klieg lights as a network profiled

¹ “News of Award Catches California Publisher Napping,” *Sacramento Bee*, May 8, 1962; and Paul Veblen to Frank Kelly, November 28, 1989, folder “John Birch Society,” box 1, Paul Veblen Collection, SBHC Mss 69, Department of Special Collections, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara [hereinafter cited as Veblen Collection, UCSB].

him for a television news report about his fight against the group in Santa Barbara. Initially reluctant to publish even a scant mention of the society in his newspaper's pages, Storke had become a symbol of resistance. It was a role he came to relish, and he rarely disappointed the reporters who sought his comments. He had a newsman's sense of what made good copy—after all, he had been a publisher for nearly six decades. He peppered his quotes with Western aphorisms and posed for pictures wearing his trademark Dakota Stetson, its wide brim shading his face and making the publisher appear to some as the incarnation of Smokey Bear.

Despite years of standing on the margins of history—as a confidante to legislators and governors, a delegate to historic nominating conventions, and a brief tenure as a United States senator—Storke had never been a truly national figure. His fight against the John Birch Society made him a spokesman against extremism and brought to him journalism's highest awards, but he knew his newspaper's small circulation—roughly 33,000 in 1961—limited his message.² Appearing in other publications and on television helped, but he needed to rally others in the media and in government to his cause as well. If Storke had become a public spokesman, he worked just as diligently behind the scenes to counter the JBS's growth and influence. He used sixty years of contacts within the media to cajole others to investigate the JBS. He distributed copies of Birch publications and founder Robert H.W. Welch's *The Politician*, the previously confidential "letter" in which he described a communist conspiracy that had infiltrated the highest reaches of American government and counted among its participants the president, the secretary of state, and the chief justice.

² The *News-Press*' daily circulation in 1961 was 31,466; its Sunday circulation was 32,654. See the 1962 edition of *Editor & Publisher International Year Book*, 44.

The John Birch Society became a national story in the spring of 1961 because Storke made it one. To understand how the John Birch Society has continued to be characterized today—as paranoiac, secretive, reactionary, and deluded—Storke’s earnest, clandestine dissemination of society publications and his role as a national spokesman against perceived political extremism must be examined. Storke’s newspaper was not the first to report on the society’s growth or its ideology, but those earlier reports had failed to spark a widespread reaction. Like all good dramas, the Birch story had an antagonist, Robert Welch. What these stories lacked was a unifying figure to disrupt the villain’s nefarious intentions. Storke fit the bill. By the time Storke recognized the organization’s presence in Santa Barbara and reacted to it, earlier media scrutiny of the young group in the summer of 1960 had all but disappeared. The national media’s renewed focus on the John Birch Society the following spring was in large measure because Storke provided an intriguing subject—an octogenarian Western editor and publisher who, rather than ride into the sunset or spend his golden years resting on the laurels of his legacy, saddled up for one last fight. In newspaper and magazine photographs, his Stetson even appeared white. The image was undeniably romantic, unquestionably cinematic, and exceedingly attractive.

Juxtaposed against the irascible, curmudgeonly Storke was Welch, whose earlier writings damned the society’s reputation and whose inability to finesse the media guaranteed it would never recover. Colorless, humorless, and combative, Welch played victim to Storke’s victor. His reactions to the media scrutiny was to decry rather than debate; he confined his responses to society publications and to speeches before friendly—at least he hoped they would be friendly—audiences. Welch also insinuated

that the communist conspiracy he believed lurked at every level of American life had infected the news media as well. Internally, the JBS hierarchy knew that the group would never escape *The Politician* as long as Welch remained at the society's helm. Some officers debated replacing Welch, while others wanted to cooperate more openly with the media. Ultimately, trying to dislodge Welch as leader of the society he founded would be, to paraphrase one of Welch's own statements, like trying to expel Khrushchev from the Kremlin (a feat that, incidentally, was later accomplished).³ If the JBS' national reputation suffered as a result of the media microscope, the society's leadership had no one but themselves to blame. Instead of inviting media inquiries, the refusals only gave credence to those who said the society had something to hide. The silence left a void for critics to fill. Storke stepped into the spotlight the JBS' self-immolation provided.

The characterizations of the JBS as paranoid, retrogressive, reactionary and ultimately dangerous that Storke described to eager reporters and broadcasters have in large measure endured. But Storke did not simply want to define the John Birch Society for a national audience. He wanted the group shamed and shunned. That much he did not do, and it is important to separate reputation from reality. While its reputation suffered—and indeed still bears the scars Storke and his media allies inflicted—the exposure actually benefitted the JBS. While the society closely guarded its membership totals, and it remains even today difficult to estimate or track its growth with any certainty, historians generally agree that by 1965, despite a half decade of intensely negative media scrutiny, the society had between 40,000 and 100,000 members nationwide. But the group's membership numbers only partially account for its overall influence. The JBS,

³ Commenting on the unlikely nature of the JBS' impeachment drive against Chief Justice Earl Warren, Welch wrote: "Dislodging Warren from Washington could be as difficult as kicking Khrushchev out of the Kremlin." *JBS Bulletin*, March 1, 1961, 7.

notes Lisa McGirr, “flourished in supportive ideological waters,” where members encouraged nonmembers to actively pursue anticommunist and conservative political action. The JBS’ influence, therefore, outdistanced its membership totals among ideological “fellow travelers.”⁴ Members and potential members largely ignored Welch’s pronouncements or embraced his explanation that what he wrote before the society’s founding was isolated in time and did not reflect the organization’s overall philosophy. JBS leaders chortled that the media’s attempts to “smear” the organization actually backfired; they reveled in the old maxim that there was no such thing as bad publicity. The media, Storke included, failed to understand that its focus on Welch’s ravings about communists in the White House, in the Supreme Court, in the nation’s schools and churches, was a distraction from a much larger and ultimately more significant story. The rank-and-file members of the JBS and their allies, working at the grassroots level to advance ideas of law and order, smaller government, fewer taxes, and a limited global presence, played a significant role in the growth of the conservative movement nationwide. Storke and his media allies contributed to the society’s resonance. They certainly did not dismantle it.

Storke’s stand against the JBS brought him national fame and journalism’s highest honors, but he was not the first newsman to write about the group or its founder’s early writings. Storke owed his emergence as a national figure to Jack Mabley, although it is unlikely the two newsmen ever met. A columnist for the *Chicago Daily News*,

⁴ Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 76-77; Jonathan M. Schoenwald, *A Time for Choosing: The Rise of Modern American Conservatism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 64; Matthew Dallek, *The Right Moment: Ronald Reagan’s First Victory and the Decisive Turning Point in American Politics* (New York: Free Press, 2000), 104; and Schoenwald, “We are an Action Group: The John Birch Society and the Conservative Movement in the 1960s,” in David Farber and Jeff Roche, ed., *The Conservative Sixties* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), 28.

Mabley was the first reporter to republish portions of *The Politician*, and his column set the standard other publications, including Storke's *News-Press*, followed. By quoting extensively from Welch's manuscript, Mabley and those newspapers with which he shared *The Politician* tied the society to the theories Welch had developed before the society's founding. In the critical early years of its existence, the John Birch Society never developed an adequate rebuttal to the revelations of Welch's more outlandish claims; as a result, the media focused on the organization's leadership but ignored the political advocacy rank-and-file members engineered in their respective communities. Once Storke's newspaper received a copy, *The Politician*—and the John Birch Society's infamy—spread nationally, and the dissemination of the previously confidential tract led to Storke's ascension as a national figure.

In the summer of 1960, a reporter at the rival, staunchly conservative *Chicago Tribune* gave Mabley a copy of Welch's *The Politician* after his own newspaper's editors rejected the story. "I don't know why," Mabley recounted. "Maybe they didn't believe it." Mabley published two successive columns in July that excerpted sections from *The Politician* that haunted the organization for decades. Mabley quoted Welch's letter and allowed the JBS founder to self-destruct. It was standard tactic other publications would follow. "The book," Mabley wrote in the first column, "accuses President Eisenhower of treason. It flatly calls him a communist, and for 302 pages attempts to document the charge." Mabley then quoted the manuscript's most damning passage: "[My] firm belief that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy."⁵

⁵ Jack Mabley, "Bares Secrets of 'Red-Haters:' They Think Ike is a Communist," July 25, 1960; and Mabley, "Strange Threat to Democracy," July 26, 1960, both in *Chicago Daily News*; Patrick T. Reardon and Ed Baumann, "Jack Mabley, 1915-2006: Chicago columnist was a journalistic pioneer," *Chicago*

It was the first time the passage had appeared in print for a mass audience, but if anyone was to blame for the bad publicity that resulted, it was Welch, whose megalomania would not allow him to keep his opinions private. By 1960, he had distributed more than 500 individually numbered copies of *The Politician* via registered mail.⁶ Each copy was “on loan,” he explained, “carefully sealed inside and labeled for [the recipient’s] reading only, and with a covering letter stating the nature of the document—as an expression of this writer’s opinions.” For the past year, he wrote in August 1960, he had sent out five to fifteen copies a month—yet somehow he believed he could control the book’s distribution. Its shocking contents rendered that impossible. Either people believed his evidence against Eisenhower and wanted to share it with others, or they could not believe anyone would make such allegations against the president, but wanted to share it nevertheless. Either way, the reaction was the same and what Welch described as “a long letter to a friend” became a widely read, and ultimately self-destructive, tract.⁷

Try as he might, Welch could never adequately convince anyone that *The Politician* was not a John Birch Society document. He claimed, unsuccessfully, that the only connection between the manuscript and the John Birch Society was that “it was written by your Founder.”⁸ *The Politician* had grown from a thirty-page letter Welch composed in 1954 to more than 300 pages.⁹ With each new draft, Welch expanded the distribution; only thirty people received carbon copies of the first draft, sixty the second,

Tribune, January 8, 2006; and Jack Mabley, *Halas, Hef, the Beatles, and Me* (Chicago: Contemporary Books, 1987), vii, 6, 16-17.

⁶ Claire Conner, *Wrapped in the Flag: A Personal History of America’s Radical Right* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2013), 52-56.

⁷ *JBS Bulletin*, August 1, 1960, 5-7.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁹ Mabley, “Strange Threat to Democracy,” *Chicago Daily News*, July 26, 1960.

and so on. A letter accompanying a newly expanded, typewritten and bound draft in 1958 told the reader that they were “carefully selected—for reasons which will become obvious,” and Welch asked them to return the draft after reading. “I hope you will consider the contents as strictly confidential, and will use precaution to keep the manuscript safeguarded while it is in your possession. But I shall not ask for it back in a hurry, because if anything happens to me I should like to have a goodly number of copies safely out in other hands.”¹⁰ It was this desire for dissemination—coupled with cloak-and-dagger secrecy that at times bordered on comedy—that guaranteed the confidentially Welch sought would be short-lived. By December 1958, the FBI obtained a copy that was forwarded to its Boston office from a “member of the United States Army.” It then distributed copies of several chapters and summarized the contents for the bureau’s administration.¹¹ Director J. Edgar Hoover forwarded a summary to an Eisenhower assistant and the attorney general.¹² At the same time, Welch continued to distribute copies. A typical letter that accompanied the manuscript made allusions to “a movement underway of which you undoubtedly have heard nothing—because we are concentrating entirely on building strength and understanding rather than creating noise.” The mysteriousness worried one recipient. “I have received your confidential document, have not broken the seal and have put it in the vault. . . . I decided I’d better put it in the vault and see if you still wanted me to open it. If not, I will return it to you with no hard

¹⁰ Robert Welch, “Dear Reader,” preface to *The Politician*, in Boston Field Office, John Birch Society, FBI file no. 100-32899-1A, Ernie Lazar Freedom of Information Act Collection, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Boston-1A [hereafter cited as Lazar FOIA Collection].

¹¹ Memorandum to J. Edgar Hoover from Boston Special Agent in Charge, February 4, 1959; and A.H. Belmont to F.J. Baumgardner, March 6, 1959, both in “Robert H.W. Welch Jr.,” FBI file no. 62-HQ-104401, Lazar FOIA Collection, https://archive.org/details/foia_Welch_Robert_H.W.-1.

¹² Hoover forwarded the excerpts on March 6, 1959, and refers to them in a September 11, 1959, letter to Eisenhower assistant Gordon Gray. See “Robert H.W. Welch Jr.,” FBI file no. 62-HQ-104401, Lazar FOIA Collection.

feelings whatsoever.” Welch replied that he should open it and also encouraged him to pass it along to a friend.¹³

With Welch distributing copies and with others making unauthorized duplicates, it should not have surprised the JBS founder that one eventually made its way to the press. But Welch maintained that *The Politician* did not form the organization’s philosophy; the group’s founding document was his *Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, a copy of the statement he read during the organization’s inaugural meeting in December 1958. By contrast, he said, *The Politician* was his personal opinion, written before the formation of the JBS, and he did not attempt to impose that opinion on members. Indeed, most members of the society had never read *The Politician* or even heard of it until Mabley’s columns appeared.¹⁴ The secrecy surrounding *The Politician* galled Mabley, and as he studied the society’s writings, he realized that dismissing the JBS as mere crackpots would be difficult because the group had the financial backing of wealthy and reputable businessmen, including three former presidents of the National Association of Manufacturers and a former Illinois congressman.¹⁵ “It was a secret society until my first story,” Mabley wrote a doctoral student thirteen years after the columns appeared. “The presence of three NAM ex-presidents on the board made the society something more than a bunch of kooks. . . . My unique weapon was physical possession of the original copy of the book. . . . I had ‘The Politician’ and a great deal more material which became very difficult to acquire after my stories.”¹⁶

¹³ Welch to [redacted], June 29, 1959, and July 16, 1959; [redacted] to Welch, July 7, 1959, all in Boston Field Office, FBI file no. 100-32899-1A, Lazar FOIA Collection.

¹⁴ JBS *Bulletin*, August 1, 1960, 8.

¹⁵ Mabley, “Strange Threat to Democracy,” *Chicago Daily News*, July 26, 1960.

¹⁶ Mabley to Craig A. Hosterman, January 10 and January 29, 1973, quoted in Hosterman, “An Analysis of Three Rhetorical Strategies Utilized by Robert Welch in Response to the Initial Wave of Criticism over the

Welch privately attempted to recall as many copies of *The Politician* as he could following Mabley's columns, and the founders' refusal to answer the allegations in public was a pattern that would continue to bedevil the JBS for years to come. But public reaction largely was muted. Timed to appear while Republican delegates were gathering in Chicago to nominate Vice President Richard M. Nixon for president in July 1960, the columns fell flat "because people found it difficult to believe," Mabley recalled, and most of the people who contacted him for information were "editors and reporters from other cities." Within days, the *Milwaukee Journal* published a story also drawing directly from Welch's unpublished manifesto, and the *Racine (Wisconsin) Journal-Times* quoted from Mabley's columns in editorializing against the JBS. "There would be little danger in this sort of tripe if it were merely the spouting of another extremist screwball," the newspaper opined, noting Welch's wealthy backers. "Those who have joined the John Birch Society or lend it support and counsel had better look to what they are doing. . . . It is a cause for crackpots, but those allegedly more responsible persons who support it will be tarred with the same brush."¹⁷ Such condemnation became typical in the coming year as the manuscript spread and the society's leadership entrenched itself behind allegations of a communist-led media conspiracy intent on destroying the organization's mission.

Mabley admitted sharing the Birch materials he had collected with the Milwaukee newspaper, and his collusion with other publications proves that Welch's allegations of a media conspiracy against the JBS indeed had some merit. But Welch never conceded his

John Birch Society during 1960-1961 (Ph.D. diss., Kent State University, 1975), 66; and Mabley, *Halas, Hef, the Beatles, and Me*, 17.

¹⁷ Mabley to Hosterman, January 10 and January 29, 1973, quoted in Hosterman, "An Analysis of Three Rhetorical Strategies," 67; Alex P. Dobiner, "Group Branding Ike as Red Has 10 Chapters in Wisconsin," *Milwaukee Journal*, July 31, 1960, in folder 172, box 16, Jack Mabley Papers, Roger and Julie Baskes Department of Special Collections, Newberry Library, Chicago; and "Amazing Case of Extremism," *Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times*, July 30, 1960.

own disastrous role in the media uproar. The negative publicity that consumed the last five months of 1960 had largely been the result of his inability and his outright refusal to adequately address the controversy. Welch gave one interview with the *Boston Herald* in August 1960, but his answers to the reporter's questions about *The Politician* were hollow because the newspaper printed his denials followed by contradictory quotations from the manuscript. Welch subsequently gave few interviews, but traveled the country and spoke to JBS meetings in controlled settings with a limited attendance. He confined his responses to these meetings and to the pages of the society's bulletin, which had a circulation limited to members. By September 1960, the JBS membership had reached 5,300 members in 324 chapters across the country. It was difficult, if not impossible, to counter daily media portrayals of the organization that potentially reached a million Americans, and there was a debate within the organization if Welch's public relations skills were hurting more than helping. Among those who believed the JBS should cooperate with media requests was Granville F. Knight, a Santa Barbara physician and member of the society's national council.¹⁸

Knight was no stranger to the press. An ear, nose, and throat specialist, he waged simultaneous campaigns against fluoride in drinking water, against the use of pesticides, and the use of certain feeds given to livestock; each, he claimed in articles in national journals and magazines, and in newspaper articles carried in the Santa Barbara newspaper and elsewhere, were unnatural affronts to personal liberty and therefore potentially communistic. Knight's anticommunism and strong views found kinship among the

¹⁸ Mabley to Hosterman, January 29, 1973, quoted in Hosterman, "An Analysis of Three Rhetorical Strategies," 76; Stanley Eames, "Extreme Rights Take Aim at Lefts," August 28, 1960; Eames, "Schools Target of Reds' Enemy," August 29, 1960; and Eames, "Anti-Red Group Weakest in N.E.," August 30, 1960, all in *Boston Herald*.

members of the young John Birch Society.¹⁹ While not among the group of twelve businessmen at the JBS' inaugural meeting in Indianapolis in 1958, Knight joined the new organization shortly thereafter and embraced the JBS initiative to dissuade Eisenhower from inviting Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to the United States.²⁰ The letters, coupled with Knight's insistent missives printed in national publications that subversives were manipulating medical science to further their socialistic aims, established Knight as the city's most prominent anticommunist. As the imbroglio between the JBS and the *News-Press* intensified, he also became the most visible target on which the paper trained its sights.

Unlike Welch, Knight wanted to cooperate with the media, and he met with *News-Press* executive editor Paul Veblen in late 1960. Given Welch's aversion to press coverage, Knight visited the newspaper without Welch's blessing, and the doctor let Welch know he had done so only afterward. Knight's unilateral decision to cooperate with the newspaper reflected the society's lack of any media plan. Rather than invite satisfactory coverage, however, Knight's meeting with Veblen ignited a national firestorm. Veblen knew Knight well; the doctor had treated the editor's daughter, and his missives against communists were regularly featured in the newspaper's letters column.

¹⁹ On Knight's anti-fluoride stance, see "Dr. Knight Hit on Fluoridation Stand," *SBNP*, July 11, 1956; on pesticides, see Granville F. Knight, "What are Pesticides Doing to Human Beings," *Modern Nutrition Magazine* (reprint No. 86, April, September and December 1952), 1-11; and Knight, "DDT: Miracle or Boomerang?" *Science Digest* 20 (December 1954): 23-26; on livestock feed, see "Hormones and Cancer," *New York Times* [NYT], January 29, 1956; on mental health, see Knight, "The Engineering of Consent," *American Mercury*, August 1961, 15, 17, and Knight's foreword to Ellen McClay's *Bats in the Belfry: The Case against Mental Health* (Los Angeles: Rosewood Publishing, 1964), xi-xvii.

²⁰ See replies from Wilton B. Persons, assistant to President Eisenhower, August 13, 1959; Representative Charles M. Teague, August 13, 1959, both in folder 5 "Correspondence: 1959, August;" and Senator Claire Engle, September 3, 1959, folder 6 "Correspondence: 1959, September," all in box 2, Granville Knight Papers, Collection 82, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene [hereafter cited as Knight Papers, Oregon]. Knight wrote the following year to Strom Thurmond and urged the South Carolina senator to again lead, as he had unsuccessfully in 1948, a third-party ticket for president in 1960. Thurmond declined. Thurmond to Knight, August 20, 1960, folder 14 "Correspondence: 1960, August," box 2, Knight Papers, Oregon.

Knight gave the editor a six-inch stack of Birch literature, including the *Blue Book*. Accompanying the package was a three-page statement in which he explained the JBS' goal of "awakening our people to the clever strategy and tactics" communists used in their plans for world domination. He defended the society's decision to keep its membership rolls private, its invitation-only membership policy, and labeled "ridiculous" insinuations that the society's structure was monolithic. But he insisted the society expected "criticism, slander and character assassination in an attempt to destroy its usefulness." Knight said the attacks were merely an indication that the JBS was effective. Veblen read the material, and commented later that he believed Knight, by ostensibly cooperating with the newspaper, was looking to counter past negative press reports by winning the *News-Press*' approval. He did not get it.²¹

A few days later, Veblen had a telephone conversation with an editor at the *Milwaukee Journal* with whom he had once worked at a Minneapolis newspaper. Offhandedly, he mentioned the material Knight had delivered, and his friend responded that he had thirty-two pages of a confidential manuscript called *The Politician* locked in a safe that his newspaper had received from Mabley. Veblen said his friend sent a copy, although others remembered differently how the *News-Press* obtained the manuscript.²²

²¹ Welch to Knight, January 17, 1961, folder 17 "Correspondence: 1961, January," box 2; and "Statement Given to the News-Press," December 23, 1960, folder 8, "Speeches and Writings," box 8, both in Knight Papers, Oregon; Veblen to Frank Kelly, November 28, 1989, folder "John Birch Society," box 1, Veblen Collection, UCSB; and Hans Engh, "Tom Storke at 90," *Los Angeles Times West Magazine*, November 20, 1966, 18.

²² The Milwaukee editor told Veblen he had received the copy from a retired FBI agent, but Jack Mabley recalled that the *Milwaukee Journal* called him after his columns appeared and requested the manuscript. Mabley also said he sent the Santa Barbara newspaper a copy, but Thomas Storke told Earl Warren that he received a copy of *The Politician* from United States Senator Milton Young. It is possible both Storke and Veblen received copies independently of each other; given how many copies of the manuscript were floating around by 1961, it is not unlikely. Veblen to Frank Kelly, November 28, 1989, folder "John Birch Society," box 1, Veblen Collection, UCSB; Mabley to Craig Hosterman, January 29, 1973, quoted in Hosterman, "An Analysis of Three Rhetorical Strategies," 76; and Thomas M. Storke [TMS] to Earl Warren [EW], December 6, 1963, folder "Chief Justice Personal S, 1963-1964," box 112, Earl Warren

Nevertheless, *The Politician* assumed a starring role in the newspaper's series on the JBS in Santa Barbara and in Storke's behind-the-scenes dissemination of Birch materials. Reporter Hans Engh used the manuscript and the materials Knight had delivered to explore the organization's presence in the city. He initially had Knight's cooperation, and the doctor invited Engh to attend a meeting. Engh left the gathering agreeing with some of the society's aims, but watching well-dressed men and women sitting around a living room, listening to recorded messages from Welch disturbed him. Welch's views were simply too extreme, and when Engh made it clear to Knight he had excerpts from *The Politician* and would feature them in his stories, cooperation between the *News-Press* and the local JBS ceased. Knight had learned a lesson; even when cooperating with the media, Welch's early writings would always haunt the group.²³

Knight tried to counter the negative reports he was certain were coming by scheduling a meeting with Storke. Veblen, sure that the newspaper would feel a backlash if it published the stories, sent Engh's copy to Storke. The publisher read them and asked Veblen the following day, "Why should we print this stuff? We wouldn't print an exposé of the Democratic or Republican party?" To another staff member, the publisher commented, "I've seen these crackpot outfits come and go—the less written about them the better. Maybe they'll die on the vine."²⁴

It was not the first time in the past few years staff members noticed the old man's hesitancy to delve into controversy. Storke had never shied away from a fight in his earlier days, but now in his mid-eighties, he appeared to have lost his zeal. Staff members

Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. [hereafter cited as Warren Papers, LC].

²³ Author's interview with Hans Engh, June 10, 2012, Sacramento, Calif.

²⁴ Veblen to Frank Kelly, November 28, 1989, Veblen Collection, UCSB; and Engh, "Tom Storke at 90," 18.

noticed his mind wandered in editorial meetings; he did not instantly recognize old friends as he once had. He was disengaged and they all knew why. In 1959, Storke's son and heir apparent, Charles, resigned as the newspaper's associate publisher. Charles had worked alongside his father since his graduation from Cornell in 1932 and the elder Storke planned to turn over the newspaper's leadership to his son while grooming his grandsons for what he hoped would be a newspaper dynasty in the city. By 1959, however, the old man seemed disinclined to retire, and Charles, approaching 50 years old, bristled in his self-described role as "little boss."²⁵ He quit and joined an advertising agency in Mexico City. Storke immediately blamed Charles' wife for the break.²⁶ His departure "was most distressing and left our little family badly broken," Storke wrote a friend in early 1960. "There never had been the slightest conflict between father-and-son in the newspaper management. . . . He gave up a future and heritage that few men have had." Yet the old man could not hide his disappointment. He wept as he ordered his son's name removed from the newspaper's masthead. Staffers had never before seen Storke cry.²⁷

Storke surveyed the future and worried that his newspaper would pass out of his family's hands after his death. His grandsons were not interested in journalism, and he

²⁵ Walker Tompkins, "Man of the Century—Santa Barbara's Most Powerful Citizen: Thomas More Storke," *Santa Barbara Magazine*, February-March 1983, 48-49; "Chas. Storke Moving to Mexico City," *SBNP*, December 2, 1959; "T.M. Storke Speaks Personally," *California Publisher*, February 1960, 41; Thomas M. Storke, *California Editor*, with a foreword by Earl Warren (Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1958), 476-77; and TMS to Alice Maynard, undated, folder "Alice Maynard," box 7, Thomas More Storke Collection, SBHC Mss 37, Department of Special Collections, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara [hereafter cited as T.M. Storke Collection, UCSB]; Charles A. Storke II, statement at testimonial for TMS, April 30, 1964, Miramar Hotel, Santa Barbara, folder "Civic Dinner for T.M. Storke," carton 1, Thomas More Storke Papers, BANC MSS 73/72 c, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley [hereafter cited as TMS Papers, Berkeley].

²⁶ Author's interview with Charles A. Storke III, June 25, 2012, San Francisco; and Carol E. Storke, e-mail to author, August 3, 2013.

²⁷ TMS to Raymond Moley, February 2, 1960, folder "Raymond Moley," box 21, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and Tompkins, "Man of the Century," 68-69.

deemed neither of his daughters competent to assume control. His second son, Thomas Jr., suffering from schizophrenia and the effects of a botched lobotomy, was institutionalized. Storke briefly hoped Charles—faced with threats of disinheritance—would return to Santa Barbara after a cooling down period, but tempers continued to flare. Accusatory letters passed between father and son. In one particularly bitter exchange, Charles accused his father of caring more about his public image than his family. “You, my dear father, have suffered the sad misfortune of being so strong, so dominant in your community, in your business and in your family that you have never listened to criticism if any one [sic] had the courage to offer it, nor to take it for what value it might have had if it reached you. If you will stop being T.M. Storke—a public figure—and start being my father we have a basis to talk.” Friends attempted to reconcile the two, but neither seemed inclined to budge. “Sometimes, we pick the wrong daughter-in-law,” Storke sighed.²⁸

Storke rearranged his staff after Charles’ departure, and he elevated managing editor Paul Veblen to executive editor. Veblen immediately filled the role Charles Storke once had—he cooled the elder Storke’s natural inclination to overreact.²⁹ But when Granville Knight brought the JBS story to the *News-Press*’ attention in late 1960, Veblen persuaded the publisher to gird up for a fight the older man was reluctant to make. Over the course of the next few years, Veblen wrote copy under Storke’s byline, authored the bulk of the editorial for which Storke would win the Pulitzer Prize, and pushed the

²⁸ TMS to Robert S. Allen [RSA], September 26, 1961, folder “Robert S. Allen,” box 1, TMS Papers, Berkeley; Charles A. Storke II to TMS, October 16, 1961, folder “Storke Estate Goleta,” box 9, T.M. Storke Collection, USCB; and TMS to Walter P. Jones, January 4, 1960, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960-1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC.

²⁹ “T.M. Storke Announces Promotions and Addition to Santa Barbara Staff,” *California Publisher*, February 1960, 41; Engh interview; and author’s interview with Barney Brantingham, June 1, 2012, Santa Barbara, Calif.

initially reluctant publisher into the national spotlight. Veblen knew Storke's image—gruff, yet loveable, elderly yet fiery—would be irresistible to other media outlets. Veblen stage managed Storke's rise to national prominence, and Storke gladly let the younger man pull the strings while he enjoyed the limelight.

Worried about the repercussions the newspaper might invite if it published the pieces, Veblen and Storke consulted Harry Ashmore, the former editor of the *Arkansas Gazette* whose anti-segregation editorials at the height of the 1957 Little Rock school crisis had earned him a Pulitzer Prize. Ashmore, then affiliated with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, told Storke that the newspaper was obligated to publish the stories. Storke was still unsure but his meeting with Knight in late January changed the publisher's mind. To prepare for the meeting, Storke had read the material Knight had brought to the newspaper the previous month, and Welch's inclusion of Storke's longtime friend Earl Warren in his list of communist conspirators enraged him. When Knight and Storke faced off on January 20, it was not a convivial coffee klatch. "Whenever a friend is criticized, it is only natural to become angry and to rush to his defense and to widely denounce any and all who may seem to be taking part in such criticism," Knight wrote to Storke a day after their meeting. "I trust that you will not be completely swayed by your emotional reaction and go off half cocked [sic] before you have had a chance to study and consider the facts." Knight enclosed "documentation" of the Warren Court's complicity in the communist conspiracy for Storke to read; it included speeches by United States Senator James O. Eastland and Rosalie Gordon's *Nine Men against America*, neither of which were likely to smooth the publisher's hackles. He closed his letter with a warning. "I expect you in all fairness to read or have

these read to you and to digest the contents before you attempt to blast Robert Welch and the John Birch Society . . . something you might sincerely regret later on.” In a letter to a fellow JBS council member, Knight recounted Storke “nearly had apoplexy . . . when talking to me about the impeachment move. . . . He was so upset that he called Bob Welch an SOB.” Storke’s description of the tense meeting differed. “I have just one good blow from the fist left,” he wrote Warren. “And I was ready to land this on the jaw of this local doctor, a man half my age, but who was too cowardly to resent it when I called him a lying SOB.”³⁰

Any doubts Storke had about publishing the stories disappeared after his meeting with Knight. Two days later, on Sunday, January 22, 1961, the *News-Press* published the first of Engh’s two-part series on the Birch Society. Neither story appeared on the front page, perhaps reflecting Storke’s lingering unwillingness to give the JBS too much prominence in his newspaper. The stories highlighted the organization’s secrecy and quoted at length from Welch’s manifesto, *The Politician*, the *Blue Book*, and the society’s monthly *Bulletin*. The JBS had several local chapters comprised of “hundreds” of members who met monthly in private homes where they listened to tape recordings, watched films, and discussed books—all of which either featured Welch or were sanctioned by him. Members were urged to join local parent-teacher organizations and, with conservative allies, seize control of them as a means to protect students from “liberals.” Welch also encouraged members to start reading rooms where the public could

³⁰ Engh interview; Eric Pace, “Harry S. Ashmore, 81, Whose Editorials Supported Integration in Arkansas, Dies,” *NYT*, January 22, 1998; Knight to TMS, January 21, 1961, folder 17 “Correspondence: 1961, January,” box 2, Knight Papers, Oregon; Knight to A.G. Heinsohn Jr., January 23, 1961, folder “Granville Knight,” box 2, A.G. Heinsohn Papers, Collection 127, Special Collection and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene; and TMS to EW, February 27, 1961, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960-1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC.

peruse and purchase sanctioned JBS literature. All of this seemed relatively innocuous, but for those unaware of Welch and the society, the most startling revelation came from *The Politician*, the allegation that Eisenhower was “a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.” Eisenhower’s actions, Engh quoted Welch as writing, were akin to “treason.” When questioned by Engh, Knight declined to confirm that Welch had made such charges against Eisenhower. When Engh persisted, reminding the doctor he had read portions of Welch’s manuscript, Knight replied: “I won’t say whether it does [call Eisenhower a Communist] or not. It is unfortunate if it does.”³¹ The doctor emphasized that *The Politician* was Welch’s opinion, but was not a sanctioned JBS publication. Few rank-and-file members had ever read it.

Nevertheless, *The Politician* continued to have a starring role in the *News-Press* series. The JBS could not—and never would—escape its conclusions. The newspaper’s second report contained similarly basic information about the society’s structure and beliefs, and quoted at length from *The Politician* and JBS publications. Engh again emphasized the group’s semi-secret status and its unwillingness to divulge membership rolls. More important, he exposed a rift between members and their leader. Engh suggested that Welch’s opinions were unpalatable even to his followers, but that JBS members were willing to ignore *The Politician* and focus instead on the group’s laudable anticommunist and conservative political aims. Four local members who spoke to Engh refused to agree with Welch’s characterization of Eisenhower as a communist.³²

Engh’s stories were sober appraisals of the JBS; they were factual, drew extensively from the JBS’ own publications and offered the society’s members a chance

³¹ Hans Engh, “John Birch Society: What Is It, Why?” *Santa Barbara News-Press* [SBNP], January 22, 1961.

³² Engh, “Birch Society Members Discuss Anti-Red Aims,” *SBNP*, January 23, 1961.

to speak for themselves. Engh's temperate approach differed sharply from the reaction the stories inspired—and the sharp editorial denunciation from Storke and Veblen that followed in the next month. Granville Knight even thanked Engh, although he and other JBS leaders later denounced the stories as part of a media “smear” campaign against the organization. If the stories proved anything, it was that the JBS had yet to formulate an adequate reply to dealing with revelations about Welch's *The Politician*; its allegations perplexed rank-and-file members who asserted they had never read the document because it was not a society publication. An advertisement the JBS purchased in the *News-Press* after Engh's stories appeared merely confirmed the schism but did little to salve the wounds Welch's own words had caused to the society's reputation. “Just because Mr. Robert Welch . . . is supposed to have said that former Presidents Truman and Roosevelt were tools of International Communism does not mean that members of the John Birch Society necessarily feel that way.”³³ The media—with Storke's help—made no such distinction.

Engh's stories did not inspire the sort of reaction Storke had hoped, and he waited anxiously for other media outlets to take notice of his newspaper's reports or to publish ones of their own. His angst deepened as the activities he and others in Santa Barbara ascribed to the JBS—late-night telephone calls, occasional acts of vandalism, threats to ministers, school leaders, and the newspaper's staff—continued. However, it remained supposition that the JBS directed these activities or that members participated in them. No one ever proved these happenings were the doings of the John Birch Society and no one faced formal charges as a result of them. But Storke *knew* who was responsible, and he wondered to staff members why the stories had not quelled these events, and he

³³ Engh interview; and “As Long As You Asked,” *SBNP*, January 24, 1961.

further wondered why other media outlets had not reported on the JBS in their respective communities. There were glimmers that help was forthcoming. In early February, a Pasadena newspaper published two consecutive columns that described the JBS in much the same terms the *News-Press* had prescribed, but Storke wanted more prestigious news organizations to affirm the depictions his newspaper had offered.³⁴ Storke's anxiety that his newspaper should never have reported on the group in the first place continued to grow, and he feared that if any repercussions would come, the *News-Press* would bear them alone. Then, a little less than a month after the first stories appeared, Veblen recalled, Storke's attitude brightened and "with his exquisite sense of timing," the publisher called for an editorial follow-up to Engh's stories.³⁵ What Veblen did not know is that Storke had learned that the support and validation he so desperately desired was on its way—and an editorial in the *News-Press* would serve to remind readers and other media outlets that the John Birch story had appeared first in his newspaper. Everyone else was merely following Storke's lead.

Veblen authored the bulk of the editorial that the *News-Press* published on its front page on February 26. It dared local "members of the society to come into the open and admit membership. . . . The *News-Press* challenges them to tell their fellow citizens exactly what they are up to and specifically what program they have in mind for Santa Barbara." The editorial concluded: "Come up from the underground," then urged the JBS to sue the newspaper. "The *News-Press* would welcome a suit as a means of shedding more light on the John Birch Society." Despite Veblen's admonitions and ultimatums,

³⁴ Bill Sumner, "Introducing the John Birch Group," February 10, 1961; and Sumner, "Ike a Red, John Birch Leader Says," February 13, 1961, both in *Pasadena Independent Star-News*.

³⁵ Paul Veblen to Frank Kelly, November 28, 1989, folder "John Birch Society," box 1, Veblen Collection, UCSB.

what drew the most attention was a prologue Storke authored himself. Dripping with Western imagery and more than a bit of chauvinism, it captured the media's attention and resulted in widespread characterizations of the old publisher as a mythic, gun slinging hero plucked from an Owen Wister story or from a Gary Cooper movie. Readers could almost picture tumbleweed blowing across the page. Storke wrote:

The editor and the publisher of the News-Press is in his 85th year. His entire life has been spent in this community. His memory takes him back many years and his reading even further. He lived when conditions were rugged. When West was West and men were men. He lived during periods when if a man or a group of men openly by word of mouth, or the printed word, called our president, our vice president, our secretary of state, the president's brother, members of the Supreme Court, and others at the head of our government, traitors, they were made to answer. Such slanders often called for a visit from a courageous and irate group which brought with them a barrel of tar and a few feathers. And such instances were particularly likely to occur if the slanderer came from New England. He lived when men were considered cowards when they hid behind women's skirts and clothed their identity through anonymity.³⁶

Staffers later dubbed the editorial's opening "High Noon in Santa Barbara," and when national magazines and newspapers reprinted the newspaper's denunciation of the JBS, they often summarized Veblen's challenges, but reprinted Storke's prologue in full.³⁷

Storke had declared himself leader of a vigilante posse intent on either tarring Welch and the JBS or running the group out of town. The week after the editorial appeared, Otis Chandler and the *Los Angeles Times* joined Storke's war against the JBS, finally providing the older publisher with the validation and support he had craved for the preceding month. Chandler, publisher of the *Los Angeles Times* for less than a year, told Storke that the *Times* would soon publish its own JBS exposé. Only then did the *News-*

³⁶ "The News-Press Stand on the John Birch Society," *SBNP*, February 26, 1961.

³⁷ Engh, "Tom Storke at 90," 18.

Press editorially denounced the group.³⁸ If Storke needed the *Times* to validate his newspaper's reports against the JBS, Chandler needed the JBS story to visibly sever his newspaper's eighty-year history of rabid conservatism. When he became publisher in April 1960, the thirty-two-year-old Chandler inherited three generations of sin and scandal that had made his family rich but that had cost the newspaper prestige.³⁹ The *Los Angeles Times* had long been an ancillary to the family's real estate holdings; it had furthered their financial ends while the publication had devolved into what a London newspaper described as "a shoddy sheet of extreme right wing viewpoint."⁴⁰ Chandler determined early in his tenure that the *Times* would shed the reputation as a Republican Party trumpet it had held since his great-grandfather Harrison Gray Otis had purchased it in 1882. If the *Times* in 1960 continued to be a Republican paper, it was because Otis had been a Republican; if it was antiunion, anti-government, anti-Democrat, it was because those were the precepts Otis had prescribed. Otis, wrote David Halberstam in his magisterial *The Powers That Be*, was "a zealot, an angry choleric man," who "wedded his paper to his prejudices. . . . The newspaper was a strident extension of his prejudices and passions and ignorance."⁴¹ Little had changed in eighty years.

Chandler knew that improving the paper's reputation would take money and a visible editorial break from its past that would be surprising enough to get readers talking about the changes afoot at the *Los Angeles Times*. His family's deep pockets provided the

³⁸ TMS to Earl EW, February 27, 1961, folder "Chief Justice Personal S, 1960-1962," box 112, Warren Papers, LC.

³⁹ "Changing Times," *Time*, April 25, 1960, 85; "Otis Chandler New Times Publisher," *Los Angeles Times* [LAT], April 12, 1960; and "Otis Chandler Is Named Publisher of L.A. Times," *Editor & Publisher*, April 16, 1960, 9.

⁴⁰ Dennis McDougal, *Privileged Son: Otis Chandler and the Rise and Fall of the L.A. Times Dynasty* (Cambridge, Mass.: Perseus Publishing, 2001), 219; and Frank Riley, "The Changing Direction of the 'Times,'" *Los Angeles*, June 1966, 29.

⁴¹ David Halberstam, *The Powers That Be* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), 95; and Ed Ainsworth, *History of the Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles: n.p., 1956), 7-8.

first; the John Birch Society guaranteed the second. The irony is that the views of the John Birch Society—a rejection of New Deal-era federal intervention, the income tax, frothing anticommunism—would once have found a comfortable home in the newspaper’s pages. But as the conservative politics of Southern California hardened and shifted right, Chandler decided his newspaper would move politically from the right to a balanced center. It began to report stories across the political spectrum. Conservative and liberal columnists received equal play on the editorial page. The *Times* might praise a politician in an editorial printed alongside a cartoon mocking him. “We are still a Republican newspaper and a conservative one,” Chandler told *Look* magazine in 1962, but we are determined to present both sides of the political spectrum and different shades of the spectrum.” In an interview four years later, as the newspaper continued to shed its hardline conservative past, Chandler added, “The old-line Republicans can’t comprehend what we are trying to do. They used to read only what they wanted to read. They look to the old days, and we won’t ever make them happy.”⁴²

Chandler’s ideological gambit paid off. The metamorphosis gave some people a reason to subscribe to the newspaper for the first time or buy advertising space within it. Yet the alienation many other readers felt was reflected among Chandler’s own relatives, some of whom sat on the board of the newspaper’s parent company, Times-Mirror. Chandler’s uncle Phillip, a company vice president, and his wife Alberta were members of the John Birch Society and had once hosted a party at which Robert Welch was the guest of honor. A year after Norman Chandler had anointed his son Otis publisher, Phillip Chandler remained sore that he had been passed over in favor of his younger, and less-

⁴² Max Vanzi, “Harry Chandler and Harrison Gray Otis,” *California Journal* 30 (November 1999): 24-25; “L.A.’s Mighty Chandlers,” *Look*, September 25, 1962, 112; and Riley, “The Changing Direction of the ‘Times,’” 29.

experienced, nephew. Phillip Chandler's anger only increased when he picked up his copy of the *Times* on March 5, 1961, and learned for the first time that the newspaper was publishing a series on the JBS.⁴³

Like Hans Eng's stories in the Santa Barbara paper, Gene Blake's series in the *Los Angeles Times* juxtaposed reactions from professed society members against excerpts from *The Politician*. But the stories were only one part of the visible break Chandler wanted. Like Storke, Chandler needed to denounce, not simply report, on the society. He did so editorially on March 12, 1961. In a signed, front-page editorial, Chandler agreed with the JBS' anti-communist aims, but suggested that the JBS' use of communist tactics—front organizations, whisper campaigns and smears—undercut the group's effectiveness and clouded its appeal. The editorial urged conservatives to question the group's leadership and its techniques before joining. "The *Times* believes implicitly in the conservative philosophy," Chandler wrote. "But the *Times* does not believe that the argument for conservatism can be won—and we do believe it can be won—by smearing as enemies and traitors those with whom we sometimes disagree." The editorial concluded: "Subversion, whether of the left or the right, is still subversion."⁴⁴ The editorial was the most pronounced break yet from the newspaper's past.

When Chandler took the helm of the *Los Angeles Times*, Eastern newspapers and television networks viewed Western journalism as rough-hewn, reactionary and unreliable. It was a hard image for the *Los Angeles Times*, which was once the quintessential example of this parochialism, to refute. Yet Chandler vowed to make the

⁴³ McDougal, *Privileged Son*, 230-31; Halberstam, *The Powers that Be*, 295-97; "A Changing Paper," *Columbia Journalism Review* (Fall 1961): 31-32; Phil Kerby, "Most Likely to Succeed," *The Nation*, January 15, 1968, 80; Riley, "The Changing Direction of the 'Times,' 31; and Mitchell Gordon, "The Chandlers of Los Angeles," *Nieman Reports* 19 (December 1965), 17.

⁴⁴ Otis Chandler, "A Peril to Conservatives," *LAT*, March 12, 1961.

newspaper's critics "eat their dirty words."⁴⁵ The John Birch Society story was one on which Western newspapers had taken the lead. Storke's *News-Press* and Chandler's *Los Angeles Times* were soon joined by newspapers in Ventura County and in Pasadena. The *Los Angeles Examiner* weighed in, and by late spring, the story spread north to San Jose and San Francisco.⁴⁶ By then, national publications had begun to take notice and to chase the story on which they had been scooped. *Time* magazine published its initial story the same week as the *Los Angeles Times* series. It offered a broad view of the society's growth nationally and emphasized that "the society accepts the hardboiled, dictatorial direction of one man [Welch] who sees democracy as a 'perennial fraud' and estimates that the U.S. is 40% to 60% Communist-controlled." The JBS, it concluded, was an "anonymous and unsettling presence felt in scores of U.S. communities."⁴⁷ The *Nation* published an article by *News-Press* reporter Hans Engh in early March as well, detailing how Santa Barbara's newspaper had exposed the JBS in the city and likened the organization to the antebellum "Know Nothing" political party, a "regressive force which, under one guise or another, seems to pop up whenever the country as a whole seems destined to move into a more progressive era." Engh's story was far more cerebral but no less factual than his earlier newspaper pieces; it, like other media reports, continued to hold Welch's views expressed in *The Politician* against the entire society and cut deeply into the group's national reputation as a whole.⁴⁸ Storke was pleased. Engh's report and others that had appeared in the first months of 1961 placed Santa

⁴⁵ Otis Chandler, quoted in *Inventing L.A.: The Chandlers and Their Times*, prod. and dir. Peter Jones and Mark Catalena, 117 min. PBS, 2009.

⁴⁶ *Pasadena Independent Star-News*, February 10, 13, 21, and March 12, 1961; *Ventura County Star-Free Press*, March 7, 1961; *San Francisco Chronicle*, March 28-30, 1961; *Los Angeles Examiner*, April 1, 1961; and *San Jose Mercury*, May 8-11, 1961.

⁴⁷ "The Americanists," *Time*, March 30, 1961, 21.

⁴⁸ Hans Engh, "John Birch Society," *The Nation*, March 11, 1961, 210.

Barbara and his newspaper at the vanguard of repelling the Birch menace. The intense media coverage, a *News-Press* editorial stated in late March, “has been brought about because deep concern has spread from Santa Barbara. . . . [Such] activities would be the cause for even greater concern if the operations of the John Birch Society and its sympathizers had not been brought into the open and made a matter of public discussion. The *News-Press* is proud that its articles and editorials have triggered this discussion.”⁴⁹

An unintended consequence of Storke’s campaign against the JBS was that Santa Barbara and Southern California as a whole became regular stops for anticommunist speakers throughout 1961. Some were members of the John Birch Society, while others were merely acolytes, but their appearances there left little doubt of the region had assumed as a battleground for spreading the anticommunist gospel. Robert Welch was the most prominent anticommunist to appear in Santa Barbara. Welch knew he was going into the lion’s den. Storke’s persistent criticisms of the John Birch Society were no longer confined to the pages of the *News-Press*. By April, the publisher’s proselytizing had won a national audience, and Storke was eager to have the JBS founder on his turf.⁵⁰ It was not Welch’s first visit to Santa Barbara. His April 1960 trip there to speak at one of the local JBS chapter’s first meetings had received no notice from the newspaper, but a five-page report from an informant had earned a spot in the society’s ever-growing FBI file.⁵¹ By April 1961, however, the days of anonymity for the JBS founder were over. “The smear campaigns against us increase in size, number, and viciousness,” he wrote in the

⁴⁹ “The John Birch Story Spreads,” *SBNP*, March 28, 1961.

⁵⁰ “Good Way to Clarify Birch Aims,” March 2, 1961; “Birch Society Head Due Here in April,” March 2, 1961; “UCSB Invites Birch Founder,” March 8, 1961; and “Birch Leader Plans Talk Here April 12,” March 20, 1961, all in *SBNP*.

⁵¹ “Santa Barbara Activities of the John Birch Society and Presentation Film by Robert Welch,” April 18, 1960, Los Angeles Field Office, FBI file no. 100-59001, Ernie Lazar FOIA Collection, John Birch Society, available at https://archive.org/details/foia_JBS-Los_Angeles-1.

March *Bulletin*. “[T]here is no limit to lies and fantasies involved.”⁵² Yet it was Welch who offered the biggest fantasy of them all. Ignoring seven months of publicity, Welch insisted that the negative portrayals began with a piece in the February 25, 1961, edition of *People’s World*, a Communist Party newspaper. Welch characterized the story as “the mother article,” that had inspired subsequent stories in the *Los Angeles Times* and *Time* magazine.⁵³ He ignored Mabley’s columns published in July 1960, the subsequent article in the *Milwaukee Journal* and the editorial in the *Racine Journal-Times*. These articles had caused him to claim in September 1960, that the society had “lived through one massive smear campaign” but emerged “stronger . . . than it was” prior to the attacks.⁵⁴ Now, he used the *People’s World* article to reset the clock on when the “smear” began in a misguided attempt to create a communist-inspired conspiracy where none existed. Included on the list of publications that had repeated the Communist Party line was Storke’s *News-Press*, although its initial articles appeared a full month before the *People’s World* article. The JBS was “pleased and proud” to place Storke on the list of its enemies that also included Otis Chandler.⁵⁵ In April, Welch decided to take his counterattack into his enemies’ territories and speak in Los Angeles and Santa Barbara.

Newspapers described Welch’s appearance at Los Angeles’ Shrine Auditorium on April 11 as “orderly” and “generally calm.” The media would apply none of those adjectives to the reception Welch received the following night in Santa Barbara. The city was the smallest municipality Welch visited on his April tour, but the unceasing criticism from the *News-Press* made it perhaps the most volatile. With so much of the back-and-

⁵² JBS *Bulletin*, March 1, 1961, 21-22.

⁵³ JBS *Bulletin*, April 1, 1961, 6-8; and “Enter (from stage right) the John Birch Society,” *People’s World*, February 25, 1961.

⁵⁴ JBS *Bulletin*, September 1, 1960, 1-2.

⁵⁵ JBS *Bulletin*, April 1, 1961, 22.

forth between the JBS and the *News-Press* occurring in print or behind-the-scenes, Welch's visit to Santa Barbara was the society's most public acknowledgement yet of the city's significance to its devolving national reputation. Yet Welch could not have picked a worse time to visit. The previous week, with the help of the *News-Press*, the student newspaper at the University of California's Santa Barbara campus had exposed a seemingly innocuous student organization called the Freedom Club as a John Birch Society front. Campus organizations demanded the JBS answer for its secret presence at UCSB, and students planned to protest outside the high school auditorium where Welch was scheduled to speak. About 200 undergraduates were seated inside the hall when Welch took the stage.⁵⁶

Fear of violence led sheriff's deputies, undercover policemen, and firemen to provide security. There were already indications that Welch's visit to Santa Barbara would be far less orderly than his speech in Los Angeles. In addition to the students' plans to protest, rumors of counterfeit tickets reached organizers.⁵⁷ Acknowledging its own role in stirring up the JBS controversy, the *News-Press* editorialized the day before Welch's arrival that, "He has every right to speak here. His adherents have every right to hear him" and urged calm.⁵⁸ Outside the hall, however, volunteers passed out reprints of the *News-Press* articles and editorial, while Birch supporters distributed rebuttals signed by Welch and Knight. Pickets carried signs that compared Welch to Hitler and Mussolini;

⁵⁶ "6000 Cheer Welch; 20 Pickets Here," *Los Angeles Examiner*, April 12, 1961; and "6,000 Hear Welch in Coast Address," *NYT*, April 12, 1961; "College Students Heckle Welch," *Los Angeles Mirror*, April 13, 1961; "Group Seeks to Avert Protest March Tonight," *SBNP*, April 12, 1961; "El Gaucho Forum," *El Gaucho* [UCSB student newspaper], April 7, 1961; and "College Head Lauds Student in Linking Birch Group 'Front'," *Los Angeles Examiner*, April 12, 1961. In addition to Los Angeles and Santa Barbara, Welch visited Phoenix, Dallas, Houston, Shreveport, and Tampa. Gene Blake, "Welch Says Kennedy Has Been Soft on Reds," *LAT*, April 14, 1961.

⁵⁷ Advertisement, *SBNP*, April 11, 1961.

⁵⁸ "Courtesy for Birch Leader," *SBNP*, April 11, 1961.

other protesters lined the route to the auditorium and shook their signs as Welch's car passed.⁵⁹

If the JBS founder hoped the demonstrations would be confined outside, he was disappointed, and the presence of film crews, photographers, and heckling students rattled him during most of his ninety-minute address. His praise of Joseph McCarthy and his condemnation of Earl Warren drew the most significant boos from the students; supporters tried to drown them out by clapping more loudly. As the night wore on, Welch grew more exasperated and repeatedly called on photographers to stop taking his picture. During a brief question-and-answer session that followed his formal remarks, a UCSB student named Charles Porter asked a series of pointed questions about the society's methods that further addled the JBS leader. When Porter tried to interrupt Welch, the businessman brusquely asked the younger man to sit down. Porter did not, and a policeman stepped between him and Welch. A photograph of the encounter appeared in *Newsweek*, *Time*, and the *New York Times*.⁶⁰

The situation only devolved. When CBS correspondent Grant Holcomb, who was in town filming material for a *CBS Reports* documentary on the organization's presence in Santa Barbara, approached Welch after the speech and asked him a question, Welch replied: "I am not going to talk to you." When Holcomb persisted, Welch snapped, "No comment. Now get out of here." Calling to people nearby, Welch asked "Who's that man? Get him out of here." But it was Welch who decided to leave first. Scurrying toward an exit with Holcomb and camera crew in pursuit, Welch continued to yell, "Get

⁵⁹ Bill Becker, "Coast Reaction Mixed on Welch," *NYT*, April 14, 1961.

⁶⁰ *Newsweek*, April 24, 1961, 43; *Time*, April 21, 1961, 20; and *NYT*, April 14, 1961; Hans Eng, "Welch Views Reds' Aims," and Steve Sullivan, "300 Are Left Out in Cold at Robert Welch Meeting," both in *SBNP*, April 13, 1961; and "College Students Heckle Welch," *Los Angeles Mirror*, April 13, 1961.

that man out! Get him out!” It was an appropriate end to a chaotic evening, and the image of Welch fleeing a camera crew proved an apt metaphor for the JBS founder’s inept dealings with the nation’s media.⁶¹

Welch’s unwillingness to work with the media—and his insistence that the media follow his rules when he did—meant trouble for the young organization, a fact many in the JBS recognized. If Welch alone spoke for the group, his hostility toward even the most basic question proved problematic for the organization; it certainly did not bedevil a press that was more than happy to report his obfuscations, his attempts to revise his own past statements and writings, and his penchant for blaming a broad, nonexistent conspiracy, rather than himself, for the media firestorm that now engulfed the JBS. His performance in Santa Barbara merely underscored rumblings within the organization’s national council that unless Welch ceded his position as the organization’s public face, the JBS would continue to suffer by its own hand. By the fall of 1961, as Welch’s missteps before the national press mounted and the JBS remained unable to shake *The Politician*, Knight wrote fellow national council member Fred C. Koch and bared his doubts that the organization could survive much more of Welch’s ineptness with the press. “Bob Welch must be replaced,” Knight bluntly concluded.⁶² Council members Ralph Davis and Paul Talbert agreed, and urged others in the JBS hierarchy to convince Welch that “some changes must be made. . . . The John Birch Society needs a new face.”⁶³

⁶¹ Gene Blake, “Welch, Student Swap Words at Santa Barbara,” *LAT*, April 13, 1961; “Birch Bark,” *Newsweek*, April 24, 1961, 43-44.

⁶² Knight to Fred C. Koch, September 5, 1961, folder 2 “John Birch Society,” box 1, T. Coleman Andrews Papers, Collection 119, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene [hereafter cited as Andrews Papers, Oregon].

⁶³ Paul Talbert to Clarence Manion, August 31, 1961, folder 4 “Correspondence: August 1961,” box 3, Knight Papers, Oregon.

Fellow council member T. Coleman Andrews refused to consider replacing Welch, an act he likened to a “policy of appeasement and surrender.” Replacing Welch, Andrews continued, “would be regarded by all fellow patriots as a retreat . . . and probably end in [the] failure of our undertaking.” Despite his steadfast defense of Welch, Andrews had himself been quietly working to counter the negative media portrayals of the society. Like most members of the national council, he fielded hundreds of letters from Americans seeking clarification of the society’s aims, and his responses were far more rational and succinct than Welch’s parrying with the national news media. Andrews, the former commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service in the Eisenhower administration and one-time candidate for president, defended the JBS much the same way Welch did, but his delivery was far more polished and, more important, he had not authored a book that hamstrung the organization in the media almost daily. Unlike Knight, however, Andrews refused to question Welch’s continued role as the society’s primary spokesman and his determination to answer every letter that crossed his desk, laudable though it was, could do little to counter the far greater reach of the national press. Andrews, like Knight and other members, struggled to convince the public that *The Politician* was only Welch’s opinion and did not reflect on the JBS as a whole. “I would be less than frank,” Andrews wrote one correspondent, “if I did not tell you that I do not agree with some of the extreme conclusions that have been expressed by Mr. Welch. At the same time, let me assure you that I do not know any American whom I regard as being more loyal and dedicated than Bob Welch, and who is as capable of doing an effective job against the Communists as he is.”⁶⁴

⁶⁴ T. Coleman Andrews to Knight, September 8, 1961, folder 2 John Birch Society,” box 1; and Andrews to Mrs. H.E. Cayse, April 21, 1961, binder “April-June 1961,” box 9, both in Andrews Papers, Oregon.

Despite their shared misgivings about the harm Welch's past statements were inflicting on the JBS, council members like Knight and Andrews differed on the remedy. While they could not agree that replacing Welch was a solid first step in salvaging the society's reputation, both men actively engaged in Welch's campaign to deflect attention away from his previous writings by essentially blaming the messengers. If the JBS was in trouble, they along with Welch concluded, it was the fault of the media, wherein lurked a communist element that demanded exposure. Welch used this tactic when he insisted the February 26 article in *People's World* precipitated and inspired other negative press portrayals. But resetting the clock and ignoring months of bad publicity was but one method of deflection. Casting aspersions on the reporters who dared to question the society was another, and Andrews and Knight joined Welch in smearing reporters and editors they claimed had besmirched the JBS. "It is not Bob Welch who is offside," Andrews wrote another correspondent, "rather it is Mr. [Jack] Mabley and his kind," the society's critics whom Andrews characterized as "half-baked Americans."⁶⁵

Knight disagreed with Andrews' description of critics as Americans. The Santa Barbara physician wondered whether they were Americans at all. In a deposition he gave to the California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities—a panel that would ultimately deem the JBS a worthwhile Americanist organization—Knight suggested several times that investigators look into the backgrounds of reporters who negatively portrayed the JBS in their respective publications. Mabley was included on his list, but he struck out particularly hard at the *News-Press*. He called Storke "a supposedly staunch free-enterprise man," and suggested that the newspaper's "vituperation—the

⁶⁵ Andrews to Francis C. Spence, February 7, 1961, binder "January-March 1961," box 9, Andrews Papers, Oregon.

venom—the hyperbole—the nastiness of the adjectives used are typical of the language employed every day by the Communist party to castigate its opponents.” A “major portion” of the nation’s media was under Communist control, he insisted. “I do not accuse all major publishers and editors of being Communists or Fabian Socialists. I do accuse them, however, of either wittingly or unwittingly following the Moscow Line. If these reporters and columnists—with a few shining exceptions—and others, are too stupid or too lazy to investigate before parroting the Moscow Line, then they are aiding in the downfall of our country. They are aiding the enemy whether or not they are conscious of their actions.”⁶⁶

In Knight’s pantheon of communist conspirators, the *News-Press* held special prominence. He told investigators that the entire editorial staff—from the publisher to editor Paul Veblen to reporters such as Hans Engh and James Schermerhorn, all of whom had suspicious sounding names and who all seemed to filter to the newspaper at roughly the same time—deserved the committee’s scrutiny. What Knight did not reveal was that he had himself undertaken an investigation of Paul Veblen, who shared a surname with Thorstein Veblen, the famed critic of capitalism whom Knight described as “a leftist writer on economics.” The last name Veblen “was not a common” one, Knight concluded, shared by three in every million Americans. Yet in Santa Barbara, there were six Veblens listed in the phone directory. “Where did Paul Veblen come from?” his memo asked ominously. Yet these suspicions did little to alleviate the overriding negative publicity the JBS faced throughout 1961. If Knight’s insistence of the disloyalty of the *News-Press* staff demonstrated anything, it was that the JBS founder was not the only

⁶⁶ Granville F. Knight, “Deposition for R.E. Combs, counsel, California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities,” undated, folder 1, box 8, Knight Papers, Oregon.

figure within the organization who favored conspiratorial thought over constructive press relations. Despite his desire to jettison Welch, Knight, like the society's founder, bore some fault for the group's devolving reputation.⁶⁷

Yet Welch, Knight and Andrews found comfort in the fact that the media portrayals might have injured the society's overall national reputation, but it had not stopped the society's growth. Membership grew steadily despite the media's intense focus. A Gallup Poll in April 1961, taken after nearly four months of largely negative media reports, indicated only nine percent of those polled had a favorable impression of the group. Despite this, by 1962, the society had grown to an estimated 60,000 members. While it never topped 100,000—and certainly never reached the one million members Welch desired—the society's growth clearly indicated that, despite the concentrated media scrutiny, the society's overall message of anticommunism, limited government, law and order, and isolationism appealed to Americans who felt the need to “do something” to salvage the national identity. The media was determined “to smear the organization,” Andrews wrote, “and they tried very hard to do just that; but all they have succeeded in doing had been to increase interest on the part of more people in becoming members of the organization.”⁶⁸

The JBS guarded its membership numbers so successfully that even a half century later, it remains difficult to estimate with any certainty what effect, if any, the media scrutiny had on its recruitment. As Andrews noted, however, membership numbers were but one gauge; fervor was another. While the media spotlight resulted in a few reported defections, members who remained seemingly drew inspiration from their besieged

⁶⁷ Undated memorandum, “Paul Veblen,” folder 5, box 10, Knight Papers, Oregon.

⁶⁸ Dallek, *The Right Moment*, 104-105; and Andrews to Walter R. Flack, March 28, 1961, binder “January-March 1961,” box 9, Andrews Papers, Oregon.

position. “We must fight as an army fights,” one member wrote. “Calculated risks must be taken. Some must die and some maimed. Some must go over the top and cut the barbed wire of lies. Some must crawl forward in the mud and filth of slander and vilification. This is all true, but fight we must because some men cannot bear to live a lie.” The combat rhetoric was typical. Another member explained: “It is now a battle to the death and it is not easy. The time has come for a showdown and good Americans are banding together to study, to learn, to be guided by wise men in the way of good government.”⁶⁹

Storke never realized—or at least never admitted—the media scrutiny he helped orchestrate had aided the JBS’ growth. Instead, he celebrated each misstep that continued to provide fodder for his newspaper and other media outlets nationwide. In a letter to Warren written the day after Welch’s disastrous performance in Santa Barbara, he gleefully recounted the role his newspaper had played in the embarrassing performance by “that crazy man from Belmont, Massachusetts.”⁷⁰ In the society’s May bulletin, Welch defended his performance in Santa Barbara and painted himself as persecuted by Holcomb and the *News-Press* during his visit. “I was in enemy territory and I knew it,” he wrote. “Back in February, the only paper in Santa Barbara, the *News-Press*, had even anticipated the Communist *People’s World* of San Francisco a few days with some of its charges against us; and this paper had been hammering away at us, in every possible manner, ever since.” He alleged that Holcomb of CBS and the *News-Press* were colluding “to destroy the John Birch Society. As past events have already shown, they

⁶⁹ Martin Verries to James J. Kilpatrick, February 6, 1961, folder 1, box 1; and Ida Padelford to Kilpatrick, March 2, 1961, folder 5, box 1, both in James J. Kilpatrick Papers, MSS 6626-a, Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

⁷⁰ TMS to EW, April 13, 1961, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC.

have no qualms about the methods used. And every members of the John Birch Society should keep this in mind in every contact he has . . . with any representative of CBS for any purpose.”⁷¹

Ironically, Storke shared Welch’s disenchantment with CBS. As April turned to May, both men awaited a CBS documentary that the network was never to broadcast. By then, a pattern had developed in both men’s dealing with the national press. If Welch found his press coverage unfair, Storke was equally as irritated, and Storke, like Welch, began to envision a conspiracy existed within the media. In Storke’s mind, however, the conspiracy protected, rather than exposed, the JBS and he grew increasingly embittered by what he considered kid gloves treatment other media outlets afforded the group. As such, few of the stories written about Santa Barbara that year pleased him. The exceptions were those that lauded him as the crusader. That was how he saw himself and how he wanted others to see him as well. “Apparently publications all over the country . . . are taking up the cudgels that you so valiantly and patriotically raised in that superb series of scathing articles,” columnist Robert S. Allen told him. “And obviously this counter-attack is none too soon, because this outfit was making headway. . . . But thanks to you, and now the other publishers following in your footsteps, maybe this damnable plot can be suppressed.” The United Press International opened its three-part series by lauding Storke and reprinting much of the newspaper’s editorial. Storke sent copies of the stories to correspondents and noted that the series went to the 1,325 subscribing newspapers and was read potentially by millions. Newspapers across the country, large and small, praised him. Ralph McGill, the Pulitzer Prize-winning editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, was joined by the *Oceanside (Calif.) Blade-Tribune* in noting Storke’s stand

⁷¹ JBS *Bulletin*, May 1, 1961, 7-11.

against the JBS. Storke dutifully trimmed out each new accolade and pasted them in a scrapbook.⁷²

More often than not, however, the press clippings irritated him. The June 1961, issue of *Holiday* magazine featured a long story, accompanied by glossy photographs of brown-robed monks walking solemnly in front of the Old Mission and wealthy Santa Barbarans relaxing poolside. The placid scenes were stark when printed next to an article by John D. Weaver that described “the mounting hysteria” that the John Birch Society’s presence in the city—and the newspaper’s exposure of it—had wrought.⁷³ The author depicted Storke as “too old and too tired,” and disengaged, caring more about his newly-arrived season passes to Santa Anita Racetrack than the John Birch Society. Weaver said that Storke “looked like an old lion that was drowsing in the sun, secure in its control of the jungle until a pack of mischievous jackals had crept up from behind and nipped it in a sensitive spot.”⁷⁴ Yet none of these descriptions angered Storke; he wrote a friend that the article “was quite complimentary to me but was quite unfair to Santa Barbara. I am sorry that he tied the John Birch Society into the story that otherwise would have pictured Santa Barbara as the great community that it really is.”⁷⁵ What he fixated on—and what others seemed to note as well in the scores of letters he received after the article was published—was a quote he claimed he never gave Weaver. “I am going to destroy these people,” Weaver quoted Storke. “I am going to run them out of Santa Barbara.” The

⁷² RSA to TMS, March 10, 1961, folder “Robert S. Allen,” box 1, TMS Papers, Berkeley; Barbara Bundschu, United Press International, “Nationwide Look at Birch Society,” March 29, 1961; “Views on Birch Group’s Methods,” March 30, 1961; and “Birch Views on Some National Figures,” March 31, 1961, all in *SBNP*; Ralph McGill, “Exposing a Danger,” *Atlanta Constitution*, April 3, 1961; and “A Laughing Matter,” *Oceanside (Calif.) Blade-Tribune*, April 9, 1961. See also scrapbook, vol. 17, carton 15, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁷³ John D. Weaver, “Santa Barbara: Dilemma in Paradise,” *Holiday*, June 1961, 84, 86.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 154, 157-58.

⁷⁵ TMS to Paul Leake, May 19, 1961, folder “Paul R. Leake,” box 18, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

alleged misquote forced Storke to publish an explanation disguised as a review of the article. It noted the story's "condescension" toward the city's "rustics," but praised its "completely admiring and respectful portrait" of Storke while noting that he did not threaten to exile members of the JBS from the city. "Those words were not spoken, or written, anywhere."⁷⁶

The explanation did little to quell the response, and criticism came at Storke from correspondents nationwide. One writer from Louisville, Kentucky, said that although he was "not a member of the Birch Society, and thus cannot be 'destroyed' by you, I felt compelled to write you that the whole wide world is also waiting for old 'T.M.' to destroy and run out of Santa Barbara the members and/or workers for, the Communist Party. May we assume that you will also pursue them with the same vim and vigor?" The magazine also published readers' responses, a number of which came from Santa Barbara. "[It] looks like Tom Storke got a hold on your man and had him follow the party line. People here don't think much of his paper and what he stands for." Another wrote, "God pity Mr. Storke for being so fully of hate." Another reader said the article "reminded me of hearts and flowers, candlelight and wine. It had all the features of an old-fashioned melodrama with the hero and the villain. It was nauseating." A member of a local American Legion post asked in its newsletter if "the people of Santa Barbara [are] going to allow a peevish old man to 'destroy them' . . ." Storke received an apology from the post commander.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Stanley M. Elliot, "Story of Birch Activity Here Gets the 'Holiday' Treatment," *SBNP*, May 14, 1961.

⁷⁷ M.L. Wellman to TMS, May 25, 1961, folder 2 "Correspondence: 1961, May," box 3, Knight Papers, Oregon; "Letters," *Holiday*, August 1961, 4, 6; Hebert V. Shepard, "Let's Wake Up," *The Sentinel of Post* 49, July 1961, 15-16, in scrapbook, volume 17, carton 15; and Charles H. Lynch to TMS, July 21, 1961, folder "JBS Request for Materials, K-L," carton 2, both in TMS Papers, Berkeley.

Oddly, however, Storke—known for correcting even the slightest error that appeared about him—never sought an apology or retraction from the magazine or its author. In fact, he later cooperated with Weaver for a series of articles he wrote on Warren and also sent him gifts.⁷⁸ Given his penchant for off-the-cuff remarks, it is likely Storke had vowed to exile JBS members from the city, but publicly, he maintained that the story “was certainly not pleasing to some of us who love Santa Barbara.” It was but one in a list of media disappointments that Storke experienced during his time on the national stage. His portrayal in *Time* magazine late in the year that described him as “the ruddy, irascible, benevolent tyrant who has played king of Santa Barbara for 61 years” was another.⁷⁹ Letters addressed to “Your Majesty” and the “85 year old SOB” arrived at his office. A year after the story appeared, Storke received a birthday card affixed with a royal title. He thanked the sender, but noted “I don’t know if I ever will live down the little squib that appeared in Time magazine in which I was referred to as ‘king.’ I am sure it was intended as a compliment but it was a gross overstatement, as you know.”⁸⁰

For Storke, the outrage was not in the stories that appeared about him—even with the purported misquotes, mischaracterizations and exaggerations. What particularly galled him were the stories that never appeared. Over the course of a year, he catalogued a substantial list of media disappointments. He sat for a long interview and photo session with *Life* magazine. Nothing appeared. *Newsweek* interviewed him three times with the

⁷⁸ John D. Weaver to Paul Veblen, January 18, 1965; Weaver to TMS, February 1, 1966; and John D. Weaver to TMS, February 7, 1966, all in folder “John D. Weaver,” box 37, TMS Papers, Berkeley. The articles formed the basis for Weaver’s biography of Earl Warren, *Warren: The Man, the Court, the Era* (Boston: Little Brown, 1967).

⁷⁹ TMS to Lawrence Spivak, May 15, 1961, folder “Lawrence Spivak,” box 31, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and “King Storke,” *Time*, November 17, 1961, 40.

⁸⁰ TMS to RSA, November 28, 1961, folder “Robert S. Allen,” box 1; Harry Storke to TMS, November 16, 1961, folder “Harry Storke,” box 33; and TMS to Herbert Walker, December 4, 1962, folder “W Miscellany Wa,” box 36, all in TMS Papers, Berkeley.

same outcome.⁸¹ But no media outlet disappointed him more than CBS. When network news producers approached him in April to take part in a proposed *CBS Reports* documentary on the JBS in Santa Barbara, Storke placed all the information the *News-Press* had gathered at their disposal. By then, the material included a secretly obtained tape of the UCSB Freedom Club, a JBS front. CBS reporters interviewed Storke, Veblen, members of the university community, church leaders, and other citizens to gauge the city's reaction to JBS activities there.⁸² A CBS film crew and reporter so irritated Welch during his appearance in Santa Barbara that he left the auditorium in a huff with the film crew in tow. The April 20 air date came and went.⁸³ CBS asked to interview Storke again in the network's New York studios. Sitting beneath the sweltering klieg lights dehydrated Storke and he developed a cold that left him bedridden for a week at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel. After he returned home, the network asked to interview with the publisher a third time.⁸⁴

CBS shot between 50,000 and 60,000 feet of footage at a cost of \$60,000. It never aired. "I do not understand," Storke vented to *Meet the Press* moderator Lawrence Spivak. "They came here of their own accord. No one pressured them when they were here. They made no secret of what they were doing and to let it drop at this time does not make sense. Some big business pressure has come into play." Later, *CBS Reports* producer Fred Friendly said that he scrapped the program because of the recording Storke had provided the network that secretly captured the Freedom Club meeting at UCSB.

⁸¹ TMS to RSA, September 26, 1961, folder "Robert S. Allen," box 1; and TMS to Ben H. Bagdikian, November 15, 1961, folder "JBS Requests for Materials, A-B," carton 15, both in TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁸² "CBS Reports' Film Nearing Completion," *SBNP*, April 16, 1961; and TMS to RSA, September 26, 1961, folder "Robert S. Allen," box 1, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁸³ TMS to RSA, April 13, 1961, folder "Robert S. Allen," box 1, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and TMS to EW, April 13, 1961, folder "Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962," box 112, Warren Papers, LC.

⁸⁴ TMS to RSA, September 26, 1961, folder "Robert S. Allen," box 1, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

Friendly emphasized that it was the newspaper, and not *CBS Reports*, that arranged for a recording device to be placed in the meeting room. “To use bugged tape at this stage of the program’s history, after all it has stood for, would have diminished the end by the means,” Friendly said. It was the first time the network had given any reason for the show’s shelving but Friendly’s “flimsy” reasoning incensed Storke and fueled his belief that the network and other media outlets feared the effects a potential boycott would have on their bottom lines. Why scrap the entire show when the network could have simply not used the bugged material, Storke asked. “Bob,” he fumed to Allen, “they are yellow. Someone pulled the string. . . . [Maybe] I am taking these matters too seriously. Maybe I belong to an era that is passed forever. . . . But when I see great institutions like CBS, *Life*, and *Newsweek* so weak . . . that they have to give aid and comfort to such character assassins as Welch and his group, I get discouraged.”⁸⁵

The publisher was unaware of the legal back-and-forth that had resulted from the wiretap. Storke also did not know that the JBS had a copy of the tape. Ironically, Storke’s miscalculation—having a recording device placed in the meeting room—gave the JBS an opening to threaten legal action, fast becoming its favorite weapon to counter criticism. A JBS attorney said CBS producers “were positively saccharine” after the network learned the group had the tape. Now with the upper hand, the JBS made several demands. It wanted the last twenty minutes of the documentary to feature Welch, alone, responding to the material presented in the first forty minutes. Second, they wanted Welch to see the first forty minutes beforehand so he could prepare a response. The organization also wanted its supporters and members to have the same number of interviews as any JBS

⁸⁵ Ibid.; and Robert Lewis Shayon, “Friendly Integrity,” *Saturday Review of Literature*, September 30, 1961, 30; TMS to Lawrence Spivak, May 15, 1961, folder “Lawrence Spivak,” TMS Papers, Berkeley.

critics.⁸⁶ Unwilling to meet these demands, CBS shelved it, but the following year the *CBS Reports* documentary “Thunder on the Right” featured footage of Welch’s sprint from the network’s reporter. The JBS founder declined to be interviewed for the program.⁸⁷

Despite these setbacks, which Storke equated to a personal snub, he continued to supply media contacts and government officials with Birch publications (and occasionally copies of the secret tape) in the hopes of spurring action against the group. Storke dispatched Veblen—with mimeographed copies of *The Politician*—to brief Governor Edmund G. “Pat” Brown and state Attorney General Stanley Mosk to “see if there is not something we can do to rid the state of this very obnoxious society.”⁸⁸ He sent Allen copied pages of *The Politician*, and Storke made sure Lawrence Spivak had a copy, too.⁸⁹ The publisher had been slow to embrace the potential for television as a disseminator of news, yet despite his disappointment with CBS, he still believed television could play a vital role in furthering his crusade against the JBS.⁹⁰

Programs like Spivak’s *Meet the Press* had established television as, one recent scholar wrote, “an arbiter of the national conversation and a laboratory of legitimacy,” and Storke was a devoted viewer.⁹¹ Cold War politics had shown the potential for television to expose corrupt motives in a way the printed word never could. The Army-

⁸⁶ Edward Magruder Jones to Paul Talbert, May 3, 1961; Talbert to unknown recipient, May 4, 1961; and Neil McCarthy to Talbert, May 4, 1961, all in folder 2 “Correspondence 1961: May,” box 3, Knight Papers, Oregon.

⁸⁷ Columbia Broadcasting System, “Thunder on the Right.” *CBS Reports*, prod. by Fred Friendly, 60 min., Films for the Humanities & Sciences, 1962, 2002, DVD.

⁸⁸ TMS to Edmund G. “Pat” Brown, March 3, 1961, box 3, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁸⁹ TMS to Lawrence Spivak, May 15, 1961, folder “Lawrence Spivak,” box 31, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁹⁰ Tompkins, “Man of the Century,” 51.

⁹¹ Solon Simmons, *The Eclipse of Equality: Arguing America on Meet the Press* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013), 245; and author’s interview with Thomas Storke Menzies, June 24, 2012, Glen Ellen, Calif.

McCarthy hearings and Edward R. Murrow's denunciation of Joseph McCarthy were prime examples of the young medium's power.⁹² Panelists on *Meet the Press* were noted for questioning politicians of all stripes with equal vigor and the show's gloves-off treatment of everyone reduced allegations of political bias.⁹³ *Meet the Press* was a place where controversial anticommunist organizations like the John Birch Society could expect questions as tough as those asked of Communist dictator Fidel Castro of Cuba. While Robert Welch had yet to be invited on *Meet the Press* when Storke travelled to New York in late April 1961 for a national publisher's convention, the publisher saw an opportunity to recruit Spivak. In his suitcase were excerpts from *The Politician*.⁹⁴ Spivak visited Storke during the convention, and the publisher gave the television newsman several pages of Welch's manuscript. Three weeks later, Spivak announced Welch would appear on his May 21 program.⁹⁵

By the time Welch appeared that Sunday on *Meet the Press*, his *Politician* had been so widely quoted in the media that regardless if Storke had given Spivak a copy or not, the most damning quotes would have been available to the panel. Storke knew this, but he thought the organization's finances were far more compelling than Welch's views on Eisenhower. Its funding sources might even be illegal—they were certainly suspicious, he wrote Spivak the week prior to Welch's appearance. Because the JBS was known to be against federal income tax, Storke suspected the group was not paying its fair share and probably deceiving its members. "He says in his 'Blue Book' that he will

⁹² On McCarthy's relationship with the media, see the standard account, Edwin R. Bayley, *Joe McCarthy and the Press* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981). See also Nancy C. Bernhard, *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda, 1947-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 162-68; and Ronald N. Jacobs and Eleanor Townsley, *The Space of Opinion: Media Intellectuals and the Public Sphere* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 38-40, 42-43.

⁹³ Sam Tanenhaus, *Whittaker Chambers: A Biography* (New York: Random House, 1997), 275-78.

⁹⁴ TMS to RSA, April 13, 1961, box 1, folder "Robert S. Allen," TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁹⁵ TMS to Spivak, May 15, 1961, folder "Lawrence Spivak," box 31, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

make no accounting to members of the society,” the publisher wrote. “However, here in Santa Barbara, he has been sent many huge checks from rich Santa Barbara widows, I am told. We think that it is a huge racket.”⁹⁶

The JBS founder certainly had the chance to refuse to appear on *Meet the Press*, but knowing the show’s reputation, he dared not risk the criticism that would follow. “Since the storm of publicity broke over us in February, I have consistently turned down invitations from national television and radio programs of every kind,” Welch wrote national council members prior to his *Meet the Press* appearance. “This is the first and only one I have accepted. . . . And I hope that it will be the last for quite a while. But there were a number of reasons why it seemed advisable for me to appear on at least one program at this time, and *Meet the Press* seemed to be the best one for our purposes.”⁹⁷ As his performance the following Sunday showed, Welch miscalculated. Ill at ease, Welch faced questions about *The Politician*, the effectiveness of the JBS, and, as Storke had hoped, the society’s finances. Quoting the *News-Press*’ February 26 editorial, which suggested the society would take in \$18 million a year from dues if it reached its goal of one million members, panelist Richard Wilson asked Welch how much money the society had earned the previous year. The founder declined to answer. He told the panel that even rank-and-file members were not privy to the society’s finances. It was a safety issue, Welch said. Members “come in knowing that because we are bound to have Communists within our membership . . . [you] cannot supply complete reports without giving away too much of your information.” Only the council and the society’s financial

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Robert Welch to national council members, May 16, 1961, folder 2 “John Birch Society,” box 1, Andrews Papers, Oregon.

auditors had those details, Welch concluded.⁹⁸ Storke later bragged that his was the only newspaper mentioned during Welch's *Meet the Press* appearance. Although Welch took the opportunity to indirectly accuse the *News-Press* of communist sympathies, the mention of his newspaper proved to Storke that he and the publication were leading a national anti-Birch crusade. A flurry of journalism's highest awards soon affirmed the publisher's status.

The Pulitzer Prize was the second of three national journalism awards Storke received that cemented his national reputation. Each brought renewed demands on the publisher both for his time and for information about the society. Letters from the public inundated the *News-Press*. Phone calls choked the switchboard. Some wanted information about the JBS; a few cancelled their subscriptions while a few more purchased subscriptions for the first time. Only one advertiser, Dr. Ross' Dog Food, the national sponsor of conservative commentator Dan Smoot's radio broadcast, pulled its advertising.⁹⁹ Reactions ranged from supportive missives to manifestos that insisted the newspaper's denunciation of the JBS aided communists. The newspaper's "un-American attack against the John Birch Society" was a "cover-up for JEWS with Soviet aims," wrote an accountant from Beverly Hills.¹⁰⁰ Other responses revealed a real fear among residents in Santa Barbara that the John Birch Society seemed to relieve. "Communism is a very real threat," wrote one. "Many people have done as I did in the past—dodged the issue, largely because they do not know what to do about it. On the other hand, the

⁹⁸ Robert Welch, appearance on *Meet the Press*, NBC, May 21, 1961, transcript in folder "Robert Welch," box 215, Lawrence E. Spivak Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

⁹⁹ TMS to Ben H. Bagdikian, November 15, 1961, folder "JBS Requests for Materials, A-B," carton 2, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and Heather Hendershot, *What's Fair on the Air? Cold War Right Wing Broadcasting and the Public Interest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 96.

¹⁰⁰ Arthur J. Hansel to TMS, March 22, 1962, folder "JBS Requests for Materials, H-J," carton 2, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

subconscious fear has been there. The John Birch Society has offered to these people a weapon with which they feel they may be able to defend themselves. There has been no constructive leadership through which we, the common people, can fight communism.” Storke replied that he shared the woman’s concern about communism, but believed the JBS’ methods and leadership were misguided and misleading others. Welch was, he wrote, “a fanatical demagogue and not unlike Hitler in his fanaticisms.”¹⁰¹

Storke attempted to answer each letter and enclosed in most a four-page reprint of Engh’s stories, he and Veblen’s editorial, and positive letters the newspaper had printed in reaction to the stories. By mid-March, the newspaper mailed some 10,000 copies of the material; two years later, Storke reported 25,000 had been distributed. With each new story that featured Storke, demands for information grew along with the publisher’s prestige.¹⁰² There was talk of a Pulitzer Prize for his newspaper in journalistic circles; it escalated in November after he received the Lauterbach Award from Harvard University’s Niemen Foundation. Quietly, Storke had been encouraging his friends to lobby the Pulitzer jury on his behalf. Ralph McGill, Harry Ashmore, Raymond Moley, Robert S. Allen, and Norman Chandler wrote letters of support, and Storke urged Lawrence Spivak to do the same.¹⁰³ The *Los Angeles Times* had also published a series and editorial on the JBS, but Chandler, then chairman of the *Times*’ parent company, pulled his newspaper’s entry in favor of Storke’s. “I told [the Pulitzer advisory board] that you were the first editor in the country to expose the John Birch movement and that

¹⁰¹ Mary-Jean Harder to TMS, April 2, 1961; and TMS to Harder, April 10, 1961, both in folder “JBS Requests for Materials, H-J,” carton 2, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹⁰² TMS to EW, March 15, 1961, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC; and TMS to Nick Williams, May 23, 1963, folder “Nick Williams,” box 38, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹⁰³ Harry Ashmore to John Hohenberg, March 2, 1961, in folder “Harry S. Ashmore,” box 2; RSA to TMS, April 17, 1961, and TMS to RSA, September 26, 1961 and October 17, 1961, all in folder “Robert S. Allen,” box 1; TMS to Lawrence Spivak, October 25, 1961 and November 17, 1961, folder “Lawrence Spivak,” box 31, all in TMS Papers, Berkeley.

the editorial under consideration was one of the most forthright and ‘gutty’ that had appeared in any newspaper in the country,” Chandler told Storke after the award for announced in May. The following month, Storke received the Elijah P. Lovejoy Fellowship from Colby College in Maine. Storke admitted he did not know who Lovejoy, an abolitionist editor murdered by a mob in Illinois in 1837, was, but the award was, he told Warren, “the third in the ‘triple crown’ that has come my way within a year.” The chief justice responded, “You have accomplished in journalism what Arnold Palmer failed by one or two strokes to do in the world of golf.”¹⁰⁴

But it almost did not happen. The newspaper initially entered its stories and editorial in the Pulitzer’s public service category, but the judges wanted to award the public service prize to another newspaper. The committee’s chairman unilaterally decided to put the *News-Press* material in the editorial commentary category, and Storke—who was listed as the author of the editorial—won. The awards for Storke largely obscured Veblen’s role in the newspaper’s JBS coverage, but the editor accepted his secondary role quietly. He later concluded “that what really made it happen was the dramatic impression of an 85-year-old warrior fighting for the domestic tranquility and good political health of the community his family had called home for . . . generations.”¹⁰⁵

Editorial writers nationwide lauded Storke’s growing list of honors and mail flooded the publisher’s office. “Most are, I am pleased to say, friendly,” he wrote Allen. “A very small part of one percent are ugly. A few days ago, a person from Dayton. Ohio,

¹⁰⁴ Norman Chandler to TMS, May 15, 1962, folder “Norman Chandler,” box 7, TMS Papers, Berkeley; TMS to EW, June 18, 1962, and EW to TMS, June 28, 1962, both in folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC.

¹⁰⁵ Paul Veblen to Frank Kelly, November 28, 1989, folder “John Birch Society,” box 1, Veblen Collection, UCSB.

wrote: ‘I am not a John Bircher, but you are fast making me one. I congratulate you on getting the Lauterbach Award from Red Harvard, Red Nieman Foundation, Red *New York Times*. I particularly congratulate you because I read you are 84 [sic] so you will not be here much longer.’¹⁰⁶ But Storke had no intention of leaving the public eye, either voluntarily or otherwise. In mid-1962, Storke decided to publish a second book, *I Write for Freedom*, and capitalize on his notoriety. It was a condensed version of his earlier memoirs with a new introduction and conclusion that recited his newspaper’s fight against the JBS. United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, whom Storke had twice supported for president, wrote the foreword and called the publisher, “a courageous spokesman of what is good and true and just.”¹⁰⁷ Not everyone agreed.

In late August 1962, Storke received a letter from columnist Westbrook Pegler. Earlier that month, Pegler’s increasingly bitter denunciations of the United States military, the White House, communists, Jews, Eleanor Roosevelt, the Pulitzer Prizes, and his bosses at the Hearst Corporation had resulted in his termination. The JBS had come to Pegler’s defense after his firing and it would eventually—although very briefly—add him to its speaker’s bureau and give him a column in its monthly *American Opinion* magazine.¹⁰⁸ Pegler, who himself had won a Pulitzer Prize for exposing labor

¹⁰⁶ “Brave Man’s Victory,” *Fremont (Calif.) News-Messenger*, December 28, 1961; “Prize Winner at 85,” *Ventura County Star-Free Press*, May 16, 1962; Irving Dillard, “Three Cheers for Editor Storke,” *Chicago Sunday American*, May 13, 1962; “Pulitzer Prize Well-Deserved by Editor Who Exposed the John Birch Society,” *Sioux Falls (South Dakota) Argus-Leader*, May 16, 1962, all in JBS Scrapbook, carton 15, TMS Papers, Berkeley. See also “A Courageous Editor,” *NYT*, November 2, 1962; Kimmis Hendrick, “Absorbing Orchids,” *Christian Science Monitor*, November 22, 1961; and TMS to RSA, November 28, 1961, folder “Robert S. Allen,” box 1, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹⁰⁷ Adlai E. Stevenson, “Foreword,” in Thomas M. Storke, *I Write for Freedom* (Fresno, Calif.: McNally and Loftin, 1962), v.

¹⁰⁸ Pegler published nine stories in *American Opinion* between February and November 1963. They included a tasteless obituary for Eleanor Roosevelt, a lamentation that would-be assassin Giuseppe Zangara had not killed Franklin D. Roosevelt during a February 1933, attempt on the president-elect’s life, and a “satire” on the joy of bigotry. Pegler and *American Opinion* parted company in early 1964 after Welch refused to print an article in which “Peg” said he wished Earl Warren would “break both his legs” and

racketeering in Hollywood in 1941, questioned whether Storke believed he deserved the trifecta of journalism awards he had received over the previous year.¹⁰⁹ “Will you tell me yourself whether you believe your conduct in this called for bravery and justified an ‘award’ implying heroism on your part?” Pegler continued: “Have you ever been assaulted by any member or agent of the Birch Society or threatened with violence in a way to put you in fear of injury or death?” In his reply, Storke expressed amazement “that you have taken over stewardship of the Birch Society. This places you in congenial company.” In response, Pegler called Storke an “old goat,” and “just a New Dealer prattling Democracy with dust on your knees. No self-respecting American could degrade himself to accept a bottlecap from that Harvard cell but you are so hard up for honors that you would grovel for a fly-button from FDR.”¹¹⁰

The exchange with Pegler—indeed any confrontation in which the publisher felt he got the upper hand on a foolish opponent—delighted Storke. He sent copies of the letters to friends and considered having them published in *Editor & Publisher* or the *Saturday Review of Literature*.¹¹¹ “I do not know why the skunk picked on me,” Storke

suggested the chief justice would use his commission’s report on President Kennedy’s assassination to blame right-wing groups such as the John Birch Society. Welch killed the article. “The Warren crowd was and is just looking for all possible ways to justify, reinforce, and make more convincing to the public that we are ‘hatemongers’ thereby causing all of the trouble and turmoil which our country is heir to at the present time,” Welch explained to Pegler, who promptly refused to write anything more for *American Opinion*. “I had enough of that with Hearst,” Pegler said. “I don’t have to take it anymore.” Robert Welch to Westbrook Pegler, February 17, 1964, folder “Communism, Opponents of—John Birch Society, 1960-1966,” box 20, Westbrook Pegler Papers, Hebert Hoover Presidential Library, West Branch, Iowa. See also *American Opinion*, February-November 1963, especially “Eleanor Roosevelt” (February 1963), “Zangara Missed!” (June 1963), and “Pegler on Bigotry” (November 1963); Oliver Pilat, *Pegler: Angry Man of the Press* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), 279-80; “Back on the Growl,” *Time*, December 28, 1962, 51; and “Pegler Again Man without a Publisher,” *Kansas City Star*, March 9, 1964.

¹⁰⁹ David Witwer, “Westbrook Pegler and the Anti-union Movement,” *Journal of American History* 92 (September 2005): 527.

¹¹⁰ Pegler to TMS, August 24, 1962, and August 30, 1962; TMS to Pegler, August 28, 1962, all in “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC; “Pegleriana,” *Columbia Journalism Review* 8 (Summer 1969): 75-76; and Hendershot, *What’s Fair on the Air*, 96.

¹¹¹ Alan J. Gould to TMS, September 4, 1962; TMS to Gould, September 5, 1962; and Gould to TMS, September 7, 1962, all in folder “Alan J. Gould,” box 11, TMS Papers, Berkeley. The *Columbia*

wrote a San Francisco publisher. “I do not know the man. I kicked his column out of my newspapers 20 years ago.”¹¹² Another publisher cautioned him against any further exchanges with Pegler, but Storke had already declared victory over “Peg,” just as he had with the JBS.¹¹³

Actually, Storke had already announced his triumph over the John Birch Society in the pages of the *New York Times Magazine*. In December 1961, after the Lauterbach presentation, the magazine asked Storke for a first-person account of his tussle with the John Birch Society. The article, written by Veblen and another editor, Ronald Scofield, compared the JBS to past social movements of the twentieth century, which given Storke’s age and sixty-year career in publishing, he could ostensibly recount that he had witnessed.¹¹⁴ “To me, Birchism—or Welchism—is a recurrence of a bad dream. My life spans eighty-five years of American history, and history has a way of repeating itself. Time and again I have seen people who should know better caught up in an emotional wave following a leader as absurd as Robert Welch.” Welch, like Joseph McCarthy, “fed on the paranoid fears of his followers.” As in most of his public statements he gave when receiving awards, responding to letters, or being interviewed, Storke insisted his newspaper had banished the JBS from Santa Barbara. Since the newspaper’s expose and editorial, “nothing more has been heard. . . . Exposure was all that was needed.” He continued: “The overwhelming majority of Santa Barbarans—the rational moderates—take their outpourings for what they are, the unbalanced exhortations of a tiny, fanatical,

Journalism Review published the exchange in 1969, after Pegler’s death. “Pegleriana,” *Columbia Journalism Review*, 75-76

¹¹² TMS to Charles L. Gould, August 28, 1962, folder “Charles Gould,” box 11, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹¹³ William R. Matthews to TMS, August 30, 1962, folder “William R. Matthews,” box 21, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹¹⁴ Veblen to Kelly, November 28, 1989, folder “John Birch Society,” box 1, Veblen Collection, UCSB.

highly vocal minority.” It closed, predictably, with a plea for other newspapers to do as the *News-Press* had. “[A] newspaper will not be listened to or win respect if it pussyfoots in stating its editorial beliefs,” the article concluded. “I have learned that you can’t kill a rat with a featherduster.”¹¹⁵

Long forgotten was Storke’s initial reluctance to confront the JBS, and as awards piled up and his national notoriety grew, the publisher embraced the spotlight and did not want to relinquish it. For the remainder of his life, as long as he was physically able to do so, Storke continued to capitalize on his role as a crusader against perceived political extremism. Mostly, that meant urging other newspapers to use Santa Barbara as a model to combat the JBS in their respective communities. He expressed disappointment that the *Los Angeles Times* had not followed up more ambitiously in its reporting on the JBS; by not doing so, he maintained the newspaper had allowed extreme conservatives to solidify power in Orange County and other suburban areas. When Sacramento newspaper publisher Leonard V. Finder wrote Storke in 1964 to seek his advice on a JBS boycott that began after the newspaper published its own series on political extremists, Storke encouraged him to follow the example he set in Santa Barbara, but to also learn from the mistakes of the *Los Angeles Times*. “They followed me in several strong editorials condemning the Birch movement,” Storke wrote. “However, there was a barrage against the *Times* thrown by some advertisers and readers. That was the *Times*' great mistake, not coming back with both fists. Now, unfortunately, the *Times* has many of these miserable creatures in its hair and the area is lousy with them. Had the *Times* taken the same course I did, the Birchers would have retreated just as they have here in Santa Barbara.” He told

¹¹⁵ Thomas M. Storke, “How Some Birchers Were Birched,” *New York Times Magazine*, December 10, 1961, 100-102.

Finder that any boycott by the JBS would be offset by the notoriety his newspaper would gain. “You may have an occasional business loss—I did—but it was only for a short time. Soon, business and circulation showed tremendous gains, much of which I credited to my fight against the Birchers.” A fight against the JBS “will pay off big.”¹¹⁶

By then, Storke had parlayed his trifecta of journalism awards and national fame into a hefty price tag for his newspaper. In 1961, he estimated his newspaper and radio station’s worth at \$5 million (\$39.3 million in 2014). In 1963, after the JBS campaign and the resulting awards, the *News-Press* was worth more than \$9 million (\$69 million today). Without an heir—his son Charles remained in Mexico City although relations between the two were healing—Storke sold his properties in 1964 for \$8 million (\$60.6 million today) and retired as editor emeritus with a lifetime salary of \$1,000 a week. He soon regretted his decision. Storke, then nearing 88, maintained his usual six-day-a-week work schedule, but the politicians and civic leaders who once filled his outer office in the hopes of a moment of his time no longer dropped by. After sixty years of publishing, Storke “found himself reduced to the status of just another citizen,” a local historian later noted. “It was a cross the old man found hard to bear.” He was no longer a powerbroker, but a relic of an age when friendships between publishers and politicians had reaped reciprocal benefits for both. Politicians received editorial support, while newspaper owners increased their prestige through the largesse of influential friends.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ TMS to Nick Williams, May 9, 1961, folder “Nick Williams,” box 38; and TMS to Leonard V. Finder, April 2, 1964, folder “Sacramento Union,” box 31, both in TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹¹⁷ TMS to Ben H. Bagdikian, November 15, 1961, folder “JBS Request for Materials, A-B,” carton 2; and TMS to Norman Chandler, July 19, 1963, folder “Norman Chandler,” box 7, both in TMS Papers, Berkeley; Walker A. Tompkins, *Santa Barbara History Makers* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: McNally & Loftin, 1983), 413; “Home Made Deal,” *Woodland (Calif.) Daily Democrat*, March 20, 1964; “Publisher Choosy on Paper’s Buyer,” *NYT*, March 15, 1964; and “How to Retire in Santa Barbara,” *Time*, March 27, 1964, 44.

That time was over. Grassroots groups such as the John Birch Society and a whole host of organizations and individuals on both sides of the political spectrum now demanded inclusion in political decisions that had once been made by people such as Storke and their powerful allies. He had tried to banish the JBS from Santa Barbara; indeed, he believed his political connections had given him the authority to do so. But in retirement, as Storke lost his power, the JBS, at least temporarily, continued to grow in influence. He had failed in his ultimate mission, to eradicate the group as a force not only in Santa Barbara, but nationwide—and that was probably the heaviest burden of all.

CHAPTER FIVE
“POLITICIANS USE ME. I DON’T USE THEM”

Thomas M. Storke’s printing presses were not the ultimate source of his political power. His friendships were, and he wanted people to know it. The publisher filled his autobiography with examples of how his associations with powerful men brought incalculable benefits to Santa Barbara—and bolstered his own unquestioned role as the community’s dominant figure. Storke courted powerful people his entire life, and he seemed determined to discuss as many of them in his memoirs as possible. In fact, so many friendships saturated his autobiography that Storke felt compelled to offer a caveat. “I am moved to wonder if any reader has gained the impression that I valued friendships only for what I got out of them,” he wrote. “If so, then I must hasten to correct that impression.” Nevertheless, *California Editor* catalogued achievements that he claimed were possible only “because I had what amounted to intimate personal friendships with the ‘right people’ in government.” These relationships, he concluded, “made it possible for me to get a sympathetic ear for the alleviation of our difficulties.”¹ Without question, these friendships reaped rewards, but they also came with a price. In exchange for political favors for Santa Barbara, Storke mortgaged his newspaper’s editorial support and abandoned his claims of journalistic independence. His career in publishing contained scores of examples where public men received his backing to secure the access to power Storke so craved. Over Storke’s sixty-year career, none enjoyed his largesse more than William Gibbs McAdoo and Earl Warren.

¹ Thomas M. Storke, *California Editor*, with a foreword by Earl Warren (Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1958), 346, 365.

Storke made no secret that his friendship with Earl Warren motivated his campaign to expel the John Birch Society from Santa Barbara, so when someone hoisted an effigy that bore both his name and that of the chief justice from a tree near the *News-Press* building in January 1964, it was hard for the octogenarian to disguise his joy. It was the second time in less than a month that an effigy of Warren had appeared in downtown Santa Barbara, but the first time Storke's name had been included. Another incident a few months later would replicate the dummy found in January with both the publisher and the chief justice's names affixed. The three incidents resulted in strong editorial denunciations in Storke's newspaper, but the public condemnations masked Storke's private glee, a perverse pleasure that remained two years later when he recounted the incidents to a visiting reporter. "They hung me twice," Storke laughed. "They hung Earl three times."²

For Storke, friendship was a public matter that brought political rewards. When pictures of him and his political friends appeared in the newspapers—or when his name was scrawled on a dummy alongside the chief justice of the United States—it served to remind readers that Storke was an important man who enjoyed access to the highest levels of government. The alliances between Storke and politicians such as McAdoo and Warren helped the publisher amass an impressive record of achievement for his city. Between 1933 and 1938, during McAdoo's tenure in the United States Senate, Storke's relationship with the senator gained some \$22 million dollars in New Deal funding for

² Thomas M. Storke [TMS] to Earl Warren [EW], January 8, 1964, folder "Chief Justice Personal S, 1963 to 1964," box 112, Earl Warren Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. [hereinafter cited as Warren Papers, LC]; "Warren and Storke Attacked in Effigy," January 8, 1964; "Warren Effigy Hanging under Investigation," December 27, 1963, both in *Santa Barbara News-Press* [SBNP]; and Thomas M. Storke, quoted in John D. Weaver, *Warren: The Man, the Court, the Era* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), 285.

Santa Barbara, a disproportionate sum given the city's wealth and population. Storke's own brief tenure in the Senate as McAdoo's interim successor resulted in \$10 million more for the city and the state. Storke's friendship with Warren brought more rewards to the city and to Storke personally. Appointments to public commissions, the inclusion of Santa Barbara College into the University of California system, and myriad other benefits of Warren's largesse flowed into the city. These achievements were in addition to what Storke alone gained, which would not have been possible had not he already fostered relationships with other men in power. The Cachuma Reservoir, a \$44 million project to secure a ready source of drinking water for the community, was a decade-long project that required Storke to further lean on associates he had gained over a half century of newspaper publishing. It was no surprise then that when the John Birch Society started its Santa Barbara chapters in 1961 that Storke had convinced himself that his achievements for his community—the rewards of years of friendship with people in the right places—granted him the right to determine who would set up shop in the city and the power to exile those who did not win his favor. The John Birch Society topped that list.³

Several factors motivated Storke's determination to drive the JBS from the city. The first, and most obvious, was his friendship with Warren. The young anticommunist group earned the old publisher's ire the moment it targeted Warren for removal as chief justice. Yet the complex relationship between politics and the press that existed in California for much of the first half of the twentieth century also fueled Storke's fury. For nearly fifty of his sixty-year career as a newspaper publisher, Storke's influence was enhanced by the impotence of California's two-party system; across the state, newspaper

³ Michael R. Adamson, "The Makings of a Fine Prosperity: Thomas M. Storke, the *Santa Barbara News-Press*, and the Campaign to Approve the Cachuma Project," *Journal of Urban History* 30 (January 2004): 195; and Walker A. Tompkins, "Introducing 'Mr. Santa Barbara,'" in Storke, *California Editor*, 6.

publishers stepped into the vacuum created by progressive era reforms to the state's election laws and themselves became political bosses. As a result, Storke gained a life-long affinity for government action and men in power. Through both he had achieved immense things for his native city, and when the John Birch Society targeted government officials—including Storke's friend Earl Warren—he responded by targeting the John Birch Society.

Powerful people appealed to Storke his entire life. In 1963, as he neared his eighty-seventh birthday and the end of his publishing career, Storke faced a libel suit and told an associate he would call as character witnesses “President Kennedy, Earl Warren, Governor Brown, [state Attorney General] Stanley Mosk,” and both of California's United States senators. Three quarters of a century earlier, in 1889 when he was 13, Storke accompanied his father, a state legislator, to a session of the assembly in Sacramento. The boy walked around the chamber, autograph book in hand, and collected legislators' signatures.⁴ He did not need to leave Santa Barbara to associate with influential people, however. In the 1870s, the city had emerged as a vacation destination for eastern industrialists. Returning to his hometown after his 1898 graduation from Stanford University, Storke served as a tutor to the children of William Seward Webb, then president of the Wagner Palace Car railroad company and the son-in-law of Cornelius Vanderbilt. Storke accompanied the Webbs on their journey home to New York, the first time he left California. In Washington, D.C., Storke visited the White House, U.S. Capitol, and other points of political interest. “This was my first insight into

⁴ Storke, *California Editor*, 71; and autograph book, vol. 9, carton 14; and TMS to Richard Guggenhime, September 6, 1963, folder “Richard Guggenhime,” box 11, both in Thomas More Storke Papers, BANC MSS 73/72 c, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley [hereinafter cited as TMS Papers, Berkeley].

official Washington,” he recalled six decades later. “It made a profound impression upon me, rousing an interest in national politics which was to influence the latter half of my life to a tremendous degree.”⁵

When he returned to Santa Barbara, Storke purchased the *Independent*, which, in a three-newspaper market, consistently came in third. Securing a \$2,000 loan from a retired druggist, Storke bought the newspaper and, like many publishers at the time, declared his publication independent—not only in name, but from any political affiliation. The other Santa Barbara newspapers had entrenched partisan allegiances; the leading *Morning Press* was consistently Republican, while the *Daily News*, the market’s second-largest paper, leaned Democratic. Storke saw an opportunity in declaring his autonomy, which since the postbellum era had become a trend among newspapers in markets much larger than Santa Barbara.⁶ In California by 1879, 54 percent of newspapers had declared themselves independent of partisan influence, a sensible economic move considering the growing domination of the state’s political scene by Republicans.⁷ Rather than express fealty to one party only, publishers could make themselves more attractive to both by claiming independence and renouncing strict party ideology. The *News-Press*, Storke editorialized in 1956, chose impartiality because it allowed the newspaper to be “free to select and to choose; to criticize and to compare. By remaining independent of both parties,” he concluded, “we feel that we are in a position objectively to criticize or to praise either.” To hammer home his independence, he

⁵ Storke, *California Editor*, 80-84; and Walker A. Tompkins, “Man of the Century: Santa Barbara’s Most Powerful Citizen: Thomas More Storke,” *Santa Barbara Magazine*, February-March 1983, 47.

⁶ Walker A. Tompkins, “Santa Barbara Journalists, 1855-1973,” *Noticias* 19 (Winter 1973), 8-9.

⁷ Si Sheppard, *The Partisan Press: A History of Media Bias in the United States* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2008), 143; and Jeffery B. Rutenbeck, “Newspaper Trends in the 1870s: Proliferation, Popularization, and Political Independence,” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 72 (Summer 1995), 364-65.

pointed to his long associations with McAdoo and Warren, one a Democrat and the other a Republican, as proof of his newspaper's autonomy.⁸

McAdoo and Warren shared a largely nonpartisan, pragmatic view of politics, and their moderation appealed to Storke and to voters. Political cunning, not dogma, influenced McAdoo's early support of New Jersey Governor Woodrow Wilson's candidacy for the 1912 Democratic presidential nomination.⁹ McAdoo's political instincts told him that fractures within the Republican Party made a Democratic victory in 1912 all the more certain. McAdoo was "organized by a remarkable sense of what a governing majority of voters wants," columnist Walter Lippmann later noted, adding that McAdoo was "infinitely . . . sensitive to the stimulus of popular feeling."¹⁰ Biographer Douglas B. Craig similarly concluded: "McAdoo's politics were those of ambition rather than ideology; he sought political influence and office to achieve concrete policy rather than serve a cause."¹¹

Like McAdoo, Warren eschewed ideology, but his "tendency to play down party loyalty was not solely a matter of expediency," historian Richard B. Harvey noted. "Temperamentally ill-suited for heated partisanship and moderate by nature, he tried not to arouse personal antagonisms, even in dealing with political adversaries."¹² However, contemporary critics charged Warren's "nonpartisanship" masked a lack of political depth. Journalist Carey McWilliams characterized the governor during his first term as a

⁸ Mark W. Summers, *The Era of Good Stealings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 75-78, 162; and T.M. Storke, "Fifty-Five Years of Picking, Choosing," *SBNP*, October 17, 1956.

⁹ William Gibbs McAdoo, *Crowded Years: The Reminiscences of William G. McAdoo* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931), 110, 113-14

¹⁰ Walter Lippmann, "Two Leading Democratic Candidates," *The New Republic*, June 2, 1920, 10-11.

¹¹ Douglas B. Craig, *Progressives at War: William G. McAdoo and Newton D. Baker, 1863-1941* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013), 71.

¹² Richard B. Harvey, "Governor Earl Warren of California: A Study in 'Non-Partisan' Republican Politics," *California Historical Society Quarterly* 46 (March 1967): 40.

“mean-natured and vindictive” pawn of his advisers and the state’s powerful, conservative newspaper publishers. “Miss Shirley Temple, aided by the same advisers and with the same newspaper support, could make a fairly popular governor of California,” McWilliams concluded. Author John Gunther depicted Warren as “honest, likable, and clean; he will never set the world on fire or even make it smoke.” The governor, he continued, suffered from “little intellectual background, little genuine depth or coherent political philosophy; a man who has probably never bothered with abstract thought twice in his life; no more a statesman in the European sense than Typhoid Mary is Einstein.”¹³

McWilliams and Gunther’s portrayals of Warren as a mental lightweight were not new and similar charges dogged him during his Supreme Court tenure as well. Yet Warren remained wildly popular in California, and publishers who supported him basked in his reflective glow. For Storke, his support of McAdoo and then Warren allowed him to boast of political independence and enhance his influence. Publishers and editors who similarly declared independence found themselves attractive to both parties and well positioned to sway the decisions of voters, the actions of party leaders, and put forth their own community vision.¹⁴ Editors therefore achieved a new standing in their communities after declaring their impartiality—which played a major role in Storke’s decision to avoid becoming a party organ. As historian Mark W. Summers has shown, independent editors, while free from the confines of party, convinced themselves and their readership that “editors had the right, even the duty, to take office, involve themselves in caucuses, offer private political advice to senators and congressmen who made allegiance with them, and

¹³ Carey McWilliams, “Warren of California,” *The New Republic*, October 18, 1943, 517; and John Gunther, *Inside USA* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947), 18.

¹⁴ Ted Curtis Smythe, *The Gilded Age Press, 1865-1900* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2003), 204-205.

even deign to take patronage if it were offered with no explicit conditions attached.”

Summers concluded: “They were not simply interested in commenting on politics, but participating in it as full players.” In short, many editors, despite claims of independence from political bosses, themselves became political bosses in their respective communities.¹⁵

As self-serving as the editors’ political motivation for declaring independence might be, they used their publications and their political muscle to maintain order within their communities. Continuity and consistency were good for business and for a community’s growth, and editors and publishers were above all else businessmen. Free from partisan alliances, newspaper publishers nevertheless assumed an ideologically conservative demeanor, and, as Summers suggests, editors, “looked askance at organizations committed to notions that could not be expressed on a ledger. It had no place for Socialists, Populists, Prohibitionists, or cranks in general.”¹⁶ These seemingly radical forces hurt businesses. While strikes and wars elsewhere made good newspaper copy and increased circulation, any disharmony closer to home threatened publishers’ livelihoods. As David Paul Nord notes, “One reason that the newspapers so stridently favored law and order was because they themselves were relatively small, local business, members in good standing of the local business community, and vulnerable to business slumps. Their revenues depended on local business conditions, particularly the economic health of local retail merchants, their advertisers.” Local newspapers and their proprietors therefore had a practical interest in maintaining the status quo, or at least controlling

¹⁵ Mark W. Summers, *The Press Gang: Newspapers & Politics, 1865-1878* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 69-70.

¹⁶ Mark W. Summers, *Party Games: Getting, Keeping, and Using Power in Gilded Age Politics* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 84-85, 89; and Summers, *The Era of Good Stealings*, 85.

through the pages of their publications any major changes that might upend their communities' delicate social order. The laissez-faire attitude toward government economic intervention left a power vacuum that was filled by business interests. In many communities, editors and publishers were among the largest business owners and they readily stepped in to conduct the public's business and, in the process, turn a profit.¹⁷

Storke maintained this postbellum view of a newspaper editor's activist role for the remainder of his life; his determination that groups such as the John Birch Society would not upset the political status quo—and potentially his business—clearly indicated his adherence to this principle. Just as his conservative business philosophy belonged to an earlier era, so did his politics, and his father deserved credit for helping Storke develop both. In 1873, Charles Albert Storke borrowed \$4,500 from his father-in-law and moved to Los Angeles to start the *Los Angeles Herald*. C.A. Storke, like many Union veterans of the Civil War, was Republican, but sympathy for the South over the radical wing's harsh Reconstruction policy led him to join the Democratic Party in 1872. In the first issue of the *Herald*, Storke declared that the newspaper would advocate Democratic principles—immigration restrictions, government decentralization, opposition to the protective tariff and business monopolies, and states' rights. “While the Herald will treat slavery as a dead issue, it will earnestly advocate the right of every state—be it Northern or Southern, Massachusetts or South Carolina—to govern itself in accordance with the wishes of its people . . . and without national interference,” Storke wrote in the newspaper's prospectus, published on the front page of the *Herald's* first issue.¹⁸

¹⁷ David Paul Nord, *Communities of Journalism: A History of American Newspapers and Their Readers* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 135, 145-46; and Smythe, *The Gilded Age Press*, 213.

¹⁸ Storke, *California Editor*. 26, 127; “Prospectus of the Los Angeles Herald,” *Los Angeles Daily Herald*, October 2, 1873; James M. Aubery, *The Thirty-sixth Wisconsin Volunteer Regiment: An Authentic Record*

These precepts placed the elder Storke in the Democratic Party's conservative, or Bourbon, wing, and when he became of age, his son also would embrace these values because they complimented his belief that a newspaper could facilitate social order. Radical Republicans coined the term "Bourbon" during Reconstruction but the party continued to ascribe the label to Democrats who believed government aid to farmers and laborers was antithetical to the natural laws of economics; government regulation and taxation should be minimized. Bourbons believed government should act to protect society against aberrant forces. For nearly three decades, they opposed agrarian and labor movements, which they perceived as dangerous to the social order. Bourbonism, summarized one historian, "combined postwar sectional resentment with the ancient Democratic suspicion of industry and eastern cities. . . . The enemy, of course, was a caricatured Republican party and everything it was supposed to stand for." He concluded: "The Bourbons feared social change and tried to stop it."¹⁹

While Storke accepted his father's political philosophy, he did not apply them to his newspaper as explicitly as the elder Storke had. C.A. Storke sold the *Los Angeles Herald* less than six months after its founding. While the economic Panic of 1873 hurt the young publication's advertising lineage and competition among the city's two other newspapers thinned the city's advertising dollar, the younger Storke later said he believed his father's strident partisanship worsened an already bad situation.²⁰ Unlike his father,

of the Regiment from its Organization to its Muster Out (Milwaukee [?]: n.p., 1900), 373; J.M. Scanland, "The Newspapers of Los Angeles," *Los Angeles Times* [LAT], September 4, 1932; and TMS to Harry Stanko, January 13, 1964, box 30, folder "S Miscellany, Sp-Sta," TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹⁹ Roger L. Hart, *Redeemers, Bourbons and Populists: Tennessee, 1870-1896* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1975), 57-58; Allen Johnston Going, *Bourbon Democracy in Alabama, 1874-1890* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1951), v; and Horace Samuel Merrill, *Bourbon Leader: Grover Cleveland and the Democratic Party* (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1957), 44-45.

²⁰ *Los Angeles Herald*, February 28, 1874; "The Evolution of a Newspaper," November 21, 1897; and C.A. Storke, "The Founder's Statement," February 17, 1895, both in *Los Angeles Herald*.

Thomas Storke tended to be more cautious editorially and in business. Determined to avoid such mistakes, the younger Storke declared his newspaper independent, but whether it was borrowing startup capital from a friendly druggist or taking a \$100,000 loan for a new press from a local bank—both of which he did in those lean early years—Thomas Storke realized that having well-placed friends benefited even the most independent publisher.²¹

Slightly more than a decade after becoming a publisher, Storke engaged his first political patron, and for the next sixty years, he was rarely without one. Storke sold his *Independent* in 1910 and entered the oil business. Failing to make a financial success, Storke again became a newspaper publisher in 1913, first buying the *Santa Barbara Daily News* and then repurchasing the *Independent*. Reviving two ailing newspapers required cash, and Storke's sojourn into the oil fields of eastern California had sapped his savings. A court battle between himself and the man to whom he had sold the *Independent* further drained Storke's financial resources. At age 37, with three small children at home, Storke needed cash and a patron, and he leveraged the one thing he had to offer—editorial support—to get both.²²

Postmasterships were coveted patronage positions. In many smaller communities like Santa Barbara, postmasters were the only representatives of the federal government. As Storke himself recognized in his memoirs, many smaller newspapers existed only “to land postmaster jobs or other political plums” for their editors, whose economic and professional prospects rose and fell with those of their political patrons. In a role not unlike that of a newspaper publisher, postmasters were, in the words of one nineteenth

²¹ Storke, *California Editor*, 114, 126; and Carol E. Storke, e-mail to author, August 3, 2013.

²² Tompkins, “Santa Barbara Journalists,” 8-11.

century writer, “the wheel of destiny for the community . . . the oracle to announce the voice of the divinities at Washington—the herald of all news, foreign and domestic, and the medium of all the good and evil tidings.”²³ Even as communication improved and quickened in the latter half of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, postmasters retained a great deal of influence in their communities. It was natural therefore for many newspaper publishers to subsidize their incomes—and increase their prestige—by seeking these positions.

Luckily for the cash-strapped Storke, the Santa Barbara postmaster position became available in 1914 when the fortunes of national and state Democrats seemed to be improving. James D. Phelan was perhaps the state’s most powerful Democrat—a dubious distinction given the impotence of the state’s Democratic Party at the time. Phelan, the former mayor of San Francisco who had championed Woodrow Wilson’s Democratic campaign for president, was the likely Democratic nominee for United States senator in 1914.²⁴ In January of that year, eleven months before Election Day, Storke appealed to Phelan and offered his editorial support in the coming campaign in exchange for Phelan’s help in securing the postmaster’s job from the Wilson administration. In California at the time, the daily press was overwhelmingly Republican, and Storke masked his newspaper’s relatively small circulation and emphasized instead its political leanings. Despite earlier declarations of nonpartisanship, Storke characterized his newspaper as “consistently Democratic—the only Democratic daily in many miles. I have always loyally [supported] the party’s nominees. I have done so when picking was slim and

²³ Richard R. John, *Spreading the News: The American Postal System from Franklin to Morse* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), 115-16, 120.

²⁴ Robert E. Hennings, “California Democratic Politics in the Period of Republican Ascendancy,” *Pacific Historical Review* 31 (August 1962): 268-69. See also Hennings’ Phelan biography, *James D. Phelan and the Wilson Progressives of California* (New York: Garland, 1985).

when the future, politically, did not look bright. I now own the largest and most successful daily newspaper between Los Angeles and San Jose and it is and will remain Democratic.” He concluded, “I wish to assure you that this paper will do all in its power to advance your ambitions to be United States senator.” In a subsequent letter, Storke reminded Phelan that, “I have been very prominent in party work here since I became of age . . . and for most of the time during the past fourteen years have owned a daily newspaper and have consistently worked for our party candidates.” In a last-ditch appeal, he wrote to a Phelan aide and offered to organize a “Phelan Club” in Santa Barbara and “enlist our Republican friends in the movement, as well as the faithful.”²⁵ The Senate endorsed Storke’s nomination in May 1914, and the new postmaster, as he had pledged, offered his newspaper’s full-throated support for Phelan’s successful candidacy. In his memoirs, Storke said of his patron, “no Senator ever worked harder for his state.”²⁶

The approval of Storke as postmaster was a rare occurrence when a Democrat reaped such a plum political position. The Democratic Party in California was moribund for much of the twentieth century, making patrons for Democrats like Storke hard to find.²⁷ Between 1899 and 1958, the party held the governor’s mansion only once, and consistently fared poorly in most statewide elections. The half century of defeat peaked in 1930, when Democrats snared only one congressional seat, nine legislative seats and ten of the 143 offices up for election that year. Despite gains in registration during the Depression years and the election of Culbert Olson as the state’s first Democratic

²⁵ TMS to James D. Phelan, January 23, 1914; TMS to Phelan, March 27, 1914; and TMS to John S. Irby, May 9, 1914, all in folder “Incoming Letters-Storke, Thomas M.,” box 27, James D. Phelan Papers, BANC MSS C-B 800, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

²⁶ Storke, *California Editor*, 203, 248; and “Here’s One Job Can’t Be Sold,” June 15, 1913; and “Favor Station in Los Angeles,” May 20, 1914, both in *LAT*.

²⁷ Royce C. Delmatier, “The Republican Party’s California,” in Royce D. Delmatier, Clarence F. McIntosh, and Earl G. Waters, ed., *The Rumble of California Politics, 1848-1970* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970), 202; and Oswald Garrison Villard, “Come Laugh at California,” *The Nation*, May 15, 1935, 563.

governor of the century, the party's prospects remained dim; although Democratic registration outpaced Republican registration from 1934 onward, the party remained unable to muster popular support among voters or to overcome intraparty factionalism.²⁸ "No one can control the 'Democracy' of California because no one knows what it is," *Newsweek* editor Raymond Moley wrote in 1940. "Its habitat is indeterminate; its size, problematical, and its various purposes, unlimited in number and completely contradictory one to the other."²⁹

Storke observed the party's perpetual struggles, but by regularly declining to support Democratic candidates, he also contributed to them. Such cannibalism infected the party for much of its history, and the Democrats' twentieth-century struggles were rooted in nineteenth-century factionalism between the northern and southern halves of the state.³⁰ While Democrats fought among themselves, Republicans capitalized on coalitions with mining, banking, and railroad interests.³¹ By 1900, noted one study, "the Republican Party ran California and the Southern Pacific Railroad ran the Republican Party." While the Democrats worked to reform the relationship between government and the railroad interests, their efforts repeatedly fell short. The reform impulse among Democrats, as historians of the era have shown, predated the better-known Progressive measures associated with Republicans such as Hiram W. Johnson. California Democrats came within a few thousand votes in 1902 and again in 1906 of installing reform-mind

²⁸ David Farrelly and Gerald Fox, "Capricious California: A Democratic Dilemma," *Frontier*, November 1954, 5-7; Thomas B. Mechling, "Why Democrats Lose in California," *Frontier*, March 1956, 5-6; and Delmatier, "The Rebirth of the Democratic Party," in *The Rumble of California Politics*, 235-36.

²⁹ Raymond Moley, "Chaos in California," *Newsweek*, April 15, 1940, 72.

³⁰ George W. Bemis, "Sectionalism in State Politics," *Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 248 (November 1946): 232-35; and Carey McWilliams, *Southern California: An Island on the Land* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1946; reprint, Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1973), 15-20 [page citations are to the reprint edition].

³¹ R. Hal Williams, *The Democratic Party and California Politics, 1880-1896* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1973), 257-66.

gubernatorial candidates, but factionalism once again undermined Democratic electoral chances and left reform movements for another party to assume.³² Johnson's successful 1910 campaign for governor of California is generally regarded as the death knell for corporate interests' domination of the state, and the public more closely associated the Republican Party with reform efforts, although Johnson's Progressive reforms found support equally from the ranks of both parties.³³

The sweeping reforms the state legislature passed during Johnson's tenure as governor defined California's elections for the next four decades. Both Democrats and Republicans supported home-rule legislation that restricted legislative interference into local government; an enlarged civil service system; child labor provisions; strengthened oversight of public utilities, including railroads; workmen's compensation; and environmental conservation. More important were the reforms California introduced in the area of elections. Johnson and his allies believed that corruption was the natural outgrowth of partisanship, and they introduced measures that essentially neutered traditional party organizations. In 1911, lawmakers passed "direct democracy" legislation that instituted the initiative, referendum and recall. Two additional policies further eroded party organizations. Legislation forbade party identification on ballots for state, county and municipal offices (with the exception of governor and the legislature). Cross-filing was instituted in 1913; it allowed candidates to run in a primary election of more than one party. Each of these measures substantially weakened California's party organizations but

³² John R. Owens, Edmond Constantini, and Louis F. Weschler, *California Politics and Parties* (London: MacMillan, 1970), 33-35; and Curtis S. Grassman, "Prologue to California Reform: The Democratic Impulse," *Pacific Historical Review* 42 (November 1973): 530-36.

³³ The classic works on Hiram Johnson and the Progressive Movement remain the best. See George E. Mowry's *The California Progressives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951); and Spencer C. Olin, Jr.'s *California Prodigal Sons: Hiram Johnson and the Progressives, 1911-1917* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968). See also Richard Coke Lower, *A Bloc of One: The Political Career of Hiram W. Johnson* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993).

Democrats seemed to fare worse than their Republican counterparts. Already weakened at the time these measures were instituted, the party—which technically ceased to exist when these laws took effect—could not find its footing. Republicans, however, with strong party leadership and continued identification as the party of reform, found no such troubles.³⁴ Historian Robert E. Hennings called the twelve-year period between 1920 and 1932 “the high tide of Republican dominance in California.”³⁵ Regional factionalism among Democrats and a solidly Republican press, coupled with the general prosperity of the decade, only solidified the party’s power.

A major factor in the Republican domination of California politics was the unflinching conservatism of the state’s newspaper publishers. In both Northern and Southern California, newspapers worked to unify the party ideologically. *The Los Angeles Times*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and the *Oakland Tribune*, acting in concert as a “triumvirate” or “axis,” towed a staunchly conservative editorial line that obliterated geographic boundaries. In the absence of traditional party organizations, newspaper publishers deepened their involvement in politics, directing rather than merely observing the political scene. The *Times-Chronicle-Tribune* axis made political candidates, broke careers and often spoke with one editorial voice, a phenomenon that worked to unify the northern and southern spheres of the Republican Party in a way Democrats could not

³⁴ The measures Johnson instituted in California starting in 1911 have received intense study, and this very brief synopsis of these reforms drew on many sources. Among these were William Deverell and Tom Sitton, ed., *California Progressivism Revisited* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), especially Deverell, “The Varieties of the Progressive Experience,” 1-14, and Jackson K. Putnam, “The Progressive Legacy in California: Fifty Years of Politics, 1917-1967,” 247-68; Dean E. McHenry, “Cross Filing of Political Candidates in California,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 248 (November 1946), 226-31; Robert J. Pitchell, “The Electoral System and Voting Behavior: The Case of California’s Cross-Filing,” *Western Political Quarterly* 12 (June 1959): 459-84; James C. Findley, “Cross-Filing and the Progressive Movement in California Politics,” *Western Political Quarterly* (September 1959): 699-711; Michael C. Rogin, “Progressivism and the California Electorate,” *Journal of American History* 55 (September 1968): 297-314; and Joshua Spivak, “California’s Recall: Adoption of the ‘Grand Bounce’ for Elected Officials,” *California History* 82 (2004): 20-37.

³⁵ Hennings, “California Democratic Politics in the Period of Republican Ascendancy,” 267.

do.³⁶ The state's largest publisher, William Randolph Hearst, was a Democrat, but his relationship with the party was schizophrenic. He also spent much of his time engaged in politics at the national level and in New York State, and his interest in California affairs was, at least until he moved back to his home state in 1924, fleeting.³⁷ Democratic publishers such as Thomas Storke, although scarce, nevertheless might have replicated a similar collusion with each other, but did not. Even if they had, an absence of viable candidates remained a major handicap to any hope of success for California Democrats.

If California's Democratic Party was unable to nurture bright political futures from within its own ranks, then importing talent was its next option. In March 1922, with the arrival of former Treasury secretary William Gibbs McAdoo in Southern California, the fortunes of the region's Democrats changed. McAdoo, a native of Georgia who had lived much of his adult life in New York City and Washington, D.C., was the first Democrat of any national renown to make the area his home base, and the aspirations of Democrats who had waited in painful seclusion for their fortunes to change finally seemed to come to fruition. In McAdoo, they saw a leader who could help wrest power from its traditional base in Northern California. More significant, McAdoo's national fame as a wartime member of President Woodrow Wilson's cabinet, as director-general of the nation's railroads, and as a presidential son-in-law kept his name in the headlines as a candidate for the White House. Southern California stood poised to move from political isolation to the center of the nation's political future.³⁸

³⁶ David Halberstam, *The Powers That Be* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1979), 120; and Gladwin Hill, *Dancing Bear: An Inside Look at California Politics* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1968), 70.

³⁷ Ben Procter, *William Randolph Hearst: The Later Years, 1911-1951* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 15-20, 119-20.

³⁸ Hennings, "California Democratic Politics in the Period of Republican Ascendancy," 269-71.

McAdoo only needed a patron and it was a role Storke was more than happy to fill. The publisher abandoned his natural antipathy for outsiders who moved to California for political and personal gain to welcome McAdoo, and he was soon introducing the new Californian to Democrats throughout the state. “Because I was born here and had been a continuous resident of California since 1876,” Storke recalled in his memoirs, “I knew every corner of the State and a thousand of its citizens.” McAdoo, by contrast, “was almost a complete stranger.” But Storke made a political calculation too. Ever cultivating powerful friends, Storke saw in McAdoo someone who could help his own fortunes and those of Santa Barbara as well. His former political patron, James Phelan, whose influence had help Storke win the postmaster’s position in Santa Barbara in 1914, had been defeated for re-election in 1920.³⁹ Republicans regained control of the White House, and political patronage to Democrats would return to the trickle experienced for much of Storke’s adult life.

A recent biography of McAdoo portrayed Storke as the former treasury secretary’s “first Californian suitor” when the former secretary arrived in California in 1922.⁴⁰ But Storke and McAdoo’s relationship began four years earlier, when McAdoo visited Santa Barbara in the summer of 1918. Storke openly courted McAdoo’s friendship and wrote later that he believed his correspondence with McAdoo convinced him to make Southern California his home.⁴¹ But there were other, more pressing, political reasons for the move. In 1920, McAdoo finished second to Governor James M.

³⁹ Ibid, 268; and Storke, *California Editor*, 348.

⁴⁰ Craig, *Progressives at War*, 246. Other sources on McAdoo’s life and career include John J. Broesamle, *William Gibbs McAdoo: A Passion for Change, 1863-1917* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1973); Philip M. Chase, “William Gibbs McAdoo: The Last Progressive, 1863-1941” (Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 2008); Otis L. Graham, *An Encore for Reform: The Old Progressives and the New Deal* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 112-13; and Fred Greenbaum, *Men against Myths: The Progressive Response* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2000), 131-52.

⁴¹ Storke, *California Editor*, 239-40.

Cox of Ohio at the party's nominating convention. Cox lost to Warren G. Harding, and McAdoo was seen as a serious contender for the Democratic nomination in 1924. After leaving the cabinet in November 1918, McAdoo had built a law practice in New York, but the experience of the 1920 convention convinced him that the party's future strength lay in a Southern and Western coalition.⁴² Running for president from New York was hardly a way to demonstrate kinship with these two regions. Additionally, New York's Tammany Hall let its feelings toward McAdoo be known when it launched a "Stop McAdoo" campaign prior to the 1920 convention.⁴³ McAdoo had spent his entire adult life along the east coast, and he needed to create an image as a Westerner. McAdoo transparently told the *Los Angeles Times* that "the call of the wild" drew him to California "to feel a broncho between my knees again and go exploring the mountains."⁴⁴ Moving to California—while plainly a political calculation—gave him a new base of operations. He would only need a guide to ease the transition, a role Storke readily filled.

McAdoo understood fully the symbiotic relationship between patron and beneficiary common in politics. He linked his own political fortunes to those of Woodrow Wilson and he became one of the New Jersey governor's most ardent supporters for the 1912 Democratic presidential nomination. Questions about McAdoo's intentions began before he stepped off the train at Los Angeles' Union Station in March 1922. Would his political fortunes remain wedded to California's or would he seek a higher office by coalescing Western and Southern wings of the party? His early activities in the state suggested the latter, although he continued to deny any presidential

⁴² Douglas B. Craig, *After Wilson: The Struggle for the Democratic Party, 1920-1934* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 46-50.

⁴³ William Nisbet Chambers, *The Democrats, 1789-1964: A Short History of a Popular Party* (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1964), 75.

⁴⁴ "McAdoo to Practice Law Here," *LAT*, March 2, 1922.

aspirations for the remainder of 1922.⁴⁵ “There is nothing further from my mind than a return to public life,” he told reporters in September, eight months after his arrival. “My change of residence to California was intended to remove me from and not to inject me into public life.” But there was an air of inauthenticity in McAdoo’s comments, which he delivered from a log raft during a ten-day junket down the Snake River in Idaho; seated in the raft with him was Storke.⁴⁶ The rafting trip was the latest in a series of events McAdoo planned during that first year in the West to make him appear authentically Western and to appeal to voters there and in the South. In March, two weeks after arriving in California, he joined the Southern California Horse Show Association. In June, newspapers carried a photo of him astride a horse during a cattle roundup at the ranch of oil magnate Edward L. Doheny, soon to be revealed at the center of the Teapot Dome oil scandal. The caption noted that “he took an active part” in the roundup, “keeping his saddle like a veteran, according to the other cowboys in the rodeo.”⁴⁷

While McAdoo’s skills on horseback won him approval among cowboys, the state’s press remained skeptical of his intentions. For the remainder of the year, each denial was met with cynical press commentary in the northern and southern halves of the state who alleged that McAdoo’s relocation was nothing more than blatant carpetbaggery and political opportunism.⁴⁸ The chorus of press speculation and criticism accentuated how valuable Storke—and his newspaper—were to McAdoo’s future. In a state like California, where the press was overwhelmingly Republican, an alliance with a

⁴⁵ “City Welcomes New Residents,” *LAT*, March 8, 1922;

⁴⁶ “Likes West Better than White House,” *San Diego Evening Tribune*, September 9, 1922.

⁴⁷ “Horse Show Gets W.G. M’Adoo,” *Riverside (Calif.) Daily Press*, March 16, 1922; and “McAdoo as a Cowpuncher,” *San Diego Union*, June 18, 1922.

⁴⁸ “Mr. McAdoo Coming,” *San Jose Mercury-News*, March 7, 1922; and “Questioning McAdoo,” *San Diego Evening Tribune*, March 31, 1922. See also “M’Adoo Flays Partisanship,” March 15, 1922; and “Pen Points,” April 22, 1922, both in *LAT*; and TMS to Lee Ettelson, April 1, 1964, folder “Alan Cranston,” box 8, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

Democratic publisher worked to counter editorial jabs. For the remainder of their association, Storke and his newspapers would serve as a public relations arm for McAdoo's campaigns and his political whims. During McAdoo's unsuccessful Senate re-election campaign in 1938, Storke candidly—and a bit defensively—revealed the arrangement to George Creel, a former candidate for governor of California and himself a veteran of the Wilson administration. “Whatever I did politically, I did with the sole purpose of advancing Mac’s political interests,” the publisher wrote. “And I never did anything without being first asked to do it.” He concluded sharply: “Politicians use me. I don’t use them.”⁴⁹

Storke was simply posturing. His twenty-four year relationship with McAdoo had reaped reciprocal rewards for both men. McAdoo needed a ready ally in the press and an adviser to guide him through the contentious world of California politics. Storke craved an entrée to power, and the publisher believed McAdoo’s political pragmatism would appeal to California voters. Yet, it would be callous to suggest that there was no genuine affection between Storke and McAdoo. While politics and business were certainly at the heart of their association, they respected each other immensely and enjoyed each other’s company. They travelled extensively together in McAdoo’s private plane, “the Blue Streak.” They discussed their families; once, McAdoo broke down in tears as he recounted son William Jr.’s alcoholism.⁵⁰ He counseled Storke never to name a son after himself.⁵¹ Storke admired McAdoo’s business ethics but found his friend’s morality

⁴⁹ TMS to George Creel, March 31, 1938, box 8, folder “George Creel,” TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁵⁰ Storke, *California Editor*, 341; and Robert E. Hennings, “Summaries of interviews with California Democratic politicians, 1959-1960,” BANC MSS 2007/19, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

⁵¹ McAdoo’s warning was prescient. Born in 1922, Thomas More Storke Jr. suffered from schizophrenia and, in 1942, his father authorized a prefrontal lobotomy that left Thomas Jr. institutionalized until his death in 1994. Death certificate for Thomas More Storke Jr., March 1, 1994, folder, “Thomas M. Storke

wanting. He admitted to an interviewer that McAdoo was a womanizer who spent too much time with “his zipper down.” McAdoo admired Storke’s ability to build relationships, a skill he thought suited the publisher for electoral office. More than once, he urged his friend to replace him in the Senate. When McAdoo did resign, Storke took his place for a brief six-week term.⁵²

Storke’s short Senate tenure came at the end of a twenty-year association during which the two men’s business and political fortunes were linked inextricably. When McAdoo vacationed in Santa Barbara in 1919, shortly after leaving Wilson’s cabinet, the *Los Angeles Times*—unable to photograph the secluded former secretary of the treasury—featured a cartoon of Postmaster Storke delivering mail to McAdoo.⁵³ But the association between the two men was more than caricature. That same year, Storke and McAdoo invested in real estate in Santa Barbara with screen icons Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks. McAdoo held a twenty-percent share in United Artists and his Los Angeles law firm represented the production company founded by Fairbanks, Pickford, Charles Chaplin and director D.W. Griffith.⁵⁴ But politics remained at the core of their association, and as the years progressed, the two men deepened their symbiotic relationship, with Storke and his newspaper serving as ready mouthpiece for McAdoo. In return, Storke mortgaged his newspaper’s sacrosanct independence in exchange for ready access to the nation’s most-prominent Democratic family. For example, during

Jr.,” box 10, Charles A. Storke II Collection, SBHC Mss. 38, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara; and Carol Storke, e-mail to author, August 3, 2013.

⁵² William G. McAdoo to TMS, Feb. 1, 1938, folder, “William Gibbs McAdoo, 1923-1938,” box 20, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁵³ “McAdoo, Sphinx in Solitude,” *LAT*, Feb. 9, 1919. Coverage of McAdoo’s presence in Santa Barbara appeared in Storke’s *Daily News* throughout February, March and April 1919.

⁵⁴ The Las Alturas Land Company planned to develop luxury estates around Santa Barbara, but disagreements between Fairbanks and McAdoo led to the project’s abandonment in 1921. Storke and McAdoo continued to invest in real estate together for the next two decades. *California Editor*, 240-42; and Craig, *Progressives at War*, 240, 256.

McAdoo's bid for Senate in 1932, Storke's managing editor doubled as McAdoo's press agent.⁵⁵ During those early years of their friendship, McAdoo's presidential aspirations were never far from either man's mind, and McAdoo's plans continued to infatuate the state's press, as well.⁵⁶ While McAdoo continued to deny a desire to be his party's nominee, he simultaneously worked to erase controversies surrounding his tenure in Wilson's cabinet. When critics pointed out that government control of the nation's railroads had resulted in a \$200 million deficit, Storke released—undoubtedly with McAdoo's permission—a letter from McAdoo (who had served as director-general of the railroads) that countered the deficit had kept European nations from starvation and had contributed ultimately to the Allied victory in the war. The Associated Press, of which Storke's *Daily News* was a member, carried McAdoo's explanation to newspapers around the country. In October 1919, Storke told the *Los Angeles Times* that party leaders he spoke to regarded McAdoo as “the most formidable candidate,” but added that the party would rally to Wilson should the ailing president seek a third term.⁵⁷

Wilson's refusal to renounce a third term—despite suffering from the effects of a debilitating stroke, he vainly believed the convention might nominate him again—stymied McAdoo's 1920 presidential hopes, but he remained one of the top Democratic contenders for the 1924 nomination. However, McAdoo's ties to oil speculator Edward

⁵⁵ Examples of letters between McAdoo and George Lynn, Storke's managing editor, can be found in box 368, William Gibbs McAdoo Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. See also “Stubbs Death to Bring Poll,” *LAT*, March 2, 1937.

⁵⁶ “Coast Wonders about McAdoo,” *Riverside (Calif.) Daily Press*, March 24, 1922; “Familiar Bait,” *Oakland Tribune*, April 2, 1922; “McAdoo May Be Democratic Candidate for Presidency,” *San Diego Union*, April 16, 1922; “McAdoo Entertaining Presidential Hopes?” *LAT*, April 16, 1922; and “Looking to 1924,” *Riverside (Calif.) Daily Press*, November 15, 1922.

⁵⁷ “Railroad Deficit Caused by Efforts to Win the War,” *Saginaw (Mich.) News Courier*, June 6, 1919; “McAdoo for President: Santa Barbara Postmaster Says He will be Nominated,” *LAT*, Oct. 28, 1919; Wesley M. Bagby, “William Gibbs McAdoo and the 1920 Democratic Presidential Nomination,” *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications* 31 (1959): 43-58; Bagby, “Woodrow Wilson, a Third Term, and the Solemn Referendum,” *American Historical Review* 60 (April 1955): 567-575; and A. Scott Berg, *Wilson* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 2013), 688-91, 721-22.

L. Doheny, implicated in the Teapot Dome Scandal, and his refusal to publically renounce the rejuvenated Ku Klux Klan hobbled him.⁵⁸ Even as McAdoo's aspirations crashed at the New York convention, Storke continued to defend his friend. In a dispatch to his *Daily News* from the convention, where he was also a committed McAdoo delegate from California, Storke downplayed the Klan issue as "a midnight-hour stab" at McAdoo, who remained "the only candidate with a truly national following, and the bushwhacking maneuvers of his foes have accomplished no more up to date than the embarrassment of the Democratic party." He concluded, wrongly, that the "supporters of McAdoo have proved their strength in figures. Other candidates have demonstrated it only in noise."⁵⁹

An intraparty fracture between delegates from the industrial northeast and those representing the rural South and West compounded McAdoo's troubles and deadlocked the convention. Delegates chose compromise candidate John W. Davis. Despite McAdoo's loss, the 1924 presidential contest and the Democratic convention eight years later further united Storke and McAdoo. By 1932, with the Republican prosperity of the previous decade continuing to crumble under the weight of the Great Depression, prospects for a national Democratic victory seemed greater than at any time since 1912, thus making the nominating process all the more crucial and historic. McAdoo, Storke, and the other members of the California delegation went to Chicago in July as delegates pledged to House Speaker John Nance Garner's candidacy, but by shifting their support

⁵⁸ William Parker, "California Splits on Klan," *San Diego Evening Tribune*, June 26, 1924; Craig, *Progressives at War*, 240-41; and David Burner, *The Politics of Provincialism: The Democratic Party in Transition, 1918-1932* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), 102-25. On McAdoo's ties to Doheny and the implications for McAdoo's presidential hopes, see David H. Stratton, "Splattered with Oil: William G. McAdoo and the 1924 Democratic Presidential Nomination," *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* 44 (June 1963): 62-75. On the Klan controversy's effect on his candidacy, see James C. Prude, "William Gibbs McAdoo and the Democratic National Convention of 1924," *Journal of Southern History* 38 (November 1972): 621-28; and Lee N. Allen, "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924," *Journal of Southern History* 29 (May 1963): 211-28.

⁵⁹ T.M. Storke, "McAdoo Faces Dramatic Fight against Field," *Santa Barbara Daily News*, July 27, 1924.

to Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York, McAdoo—and Storke—could later assert they had been midwives of history. Regardless of the veracity of that claim, the 1932 Democratic National Convention established McAdoo as California’s premier Democrat, and Storke would be his aide-de-camp and greatest beneficiary.⁶⁰

Roosevelt entered the Chicago convention with the most pledged delegates, but after three ballots, he had failed to reach the two-thirds majority required for nomination. The two other top contenders were former New York Governor Alfred E. Smith and Garner. The bulk of Garner’s support—90 votes—came from the California and Texas delegations. William Randolph Hearst was Garner’s principal backer. Garner, who had represented Texas in the House since 1903, had been speaker a little more than two months when, on January 3, 1932, Hearst’s newspapers ran a front-page editorial signed by the publisher that promoted Garner’s candidacy. The publishing magnate also had made similar comments days before in a nationwide radio broadcast and had serialized a campaign biography in his news columns. Garner told Texas newspaperman Bascom N. Timmons that he preferred to remain speaker, and Timmons characterized Garner’s interest in the White House as “tepid.” Texans, however, rallied to their favorite son and if no other state backed him, Texans would remain true to their beloved “Cactus Jack.”⁶¹

But Hearst understood that the support of one state alone, even one that had 46 delegates, was not enough. He turned to McAdoo and, promising to back McAdoo’s United States Senate candidacy from California, asked him to lead Garner’s campaign in

⁶⁰ Delmatier, “The Rebirth of the Democratic Party,” 239.

⁶¹ Norman D. Brown, “Garnering Votes for ‘Cactus Jack’: John Nance Garner, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the 1932 Democratic Nomination for President,” *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 104 (October 2000): 152; W.A. Swanberg, *Citizen Hearst* (New York: Scribner, 1961), 435-38; David Nasaw, *The Chief: The Life of William Randolph Hearst* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000), 452-56; and Bascom N. Timmons, *Garner of Texas: A Personal History* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), 154, 160.

the state. Although he initially viewed Garner's candidacy with indifference, McAdoo could not refuse. Hearst's backing was essential in a statewide race; more important, McAdoo craved the national political spotlight again. He had not been a major player in national politics since 1924, and his law practice had taken a significant financial hit during the Depression. In need of a government salary once again and to satisfy his own political vanity, McAdoo did Hearst's bidding. In a vigorous campaign, McAdoo used his personal airplane to fly up and down California in support of Garner. He emphasized the speaker's Western roots and characterized Garner as an opponent of eastern business interests.⁶² Not surprisingly, Storke's *Santa Barbara Daily News* echoed the same theme. "Garner is of the west, for the west, and undoubtedly will be the choice of the west," the newspaper opined. McAdoo's barnstorming worked as much to re-introduce him to the California electorate than to summon support for Garner in the primary, and such phrases drew parallels with how McAdoo wanted voters to view him, too.⁶³

It worked. In the primary election in May, California Democrats pledged 44 delegates to Garner. The victory shocked Roosevelt's forces in California, which had failed to gauge Garner's support and had assured the New York governor that it would not be necessary to mount much of a primary campaign in the state. But the lack of newspaper support in California—where Hearst's five newspapers had a combined circulation of 815,000—hurt Roosevelt significantly. McAdoo emerged more triumphant than Garner did, however. He had demonstrated for the first time his vote-getting ability in a statewide race, and equally as important, he had shown that his political skills

⁶² Russell M. Posner, "California's Role in the Nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt," *California Historical Society Quarterly* 39 (June 1960): 125-26.

⁶³ *Santa Barbara Daily News*, April 2, 1932, quoted in Delmatier, "The Rebirth of the Democratic Party," 239-40.

remained sharp after an eight-year hiatus from active campaigning. He assumed control of the state party apparatus, won Hearst's backing for his Senate campaign, and would lead a pivotal delegation to the Democratic National Convention.⁶⁴

With a combined bloc of ninety delegates from Texas and California in his column, Garner was a significant force at the Chicago convention. As the fourth ballot loomed, Roosevelt's forces faced almost certain defeat, unless they could convince one of Garner's pledged states to switch. Roosevelt's lieutenants informed Garner's men that the vice presidency was his if he released his delegates. Garner's camp, led by Representative Sam Rayburn, made no commitments. California's delegation received similar overtures and the switch from Garner to Roosevelt came down to patronage. McAdoo elicited from Roosevelt's team a promise that he would control federal patronage in the state if Roosevelt was elected. But even with that guarantee, McAdoo made no commitments.⁶⁵

Storke and Hamilton H. Cotton, another California delegate, separately won a similar concession from Roosevelt's campaign manager James A. Farley. In 1934, two years after the convention, McAdoo asked Storke to write a memorandum detailing he and Cotton's meeting with Farley. Storke recalled that Farley pounded his fists on his chair and with tears in his eyes said, "Boys, Roosevelt is lost unless you come to us. I am short eighty-seven votes and cannot get them unless California comes in on the next ballot." Storke told Farley that he believed eventually the delegation would shift to Roosevelt, but Farley insisted that unless Roosevelt reached the two-third majority on the upcoming fourth ballot, Newton Baker, who had served as Wilson's secretary of war,

⁶⁴ Craig, *Progressives at War*, 314-15; and Storke, *California Editor*, 300-301.

⁶⁵ Lionel V. Patenaude, "The Garner Switch to Roosevelt: The 1932 Democratic Convention," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 79 (October 1975): 196-99.

would be the compromise nominee. Farley then rattled off a list of jobs that were McAdoo's for the taking, if he agreed to shift his delegation to Roosevelt. Storke and Cotton told him that McAdoo wanted nothing—but then asked for a guarantee that all federal patronage in the state would flow through McAdoo if Roosevelt became president. Farley agreed.⁶⁶

Storke and Cotton relayed Farley's overtures to McAdoo. McAdoo then convened a caucus of his delegates, who, unable to decide whether to abandon Garner in favor of Roosevelt, appointed a four-member steering committee with McAdoo at its helm to decide the delegation's direction. In the meantime, Garner had released Texas' delegates to Roosevelt, but the timing mattered little. When the fourth roll call began, McAdoo asked the convention chairman if he could approach the podium and explain California's vote. McAdoo then announced dramatically that California was shifting its support to Roosevelt, which resulted in a groundswell of support for the New York governor. Whether Texas had decided to tip the scales before California did not matter—McAdoo had gotten to the microphone first and as a result, appeared as kingmaker. This public moment defined McAdoo's role in Roosevelt's nomination, although later, some would claim private machinations and pure luck deserved the credit.⁶⁷ In his private journal, Farley noted that McAdoo "was given more credit that he was entitled to in Chicago . . . what he did was not due to any personal effort."⁶⁸ Others claimed that McAdoo benefited from the alphabet. "I firmly believe," a supporter wrote Baker, "that had California come

⁶⁶ Hamilton H. Cotton to William G. McAdoo [WGM], September 26, 1938; TMS to WGM, May 12, 1934, both in folder "William Gibbs McAdoo," box 20, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and Storke, *California Editor*, 312-20.

⁶⁷ Edward J. Flynn, *You're the Boss* (New York: Viking Press, 1947), 103; and Elliot A. Rosen, *Hoover, Roosevelt, and the Brains Trust: From Depression to New Deal* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), 265.

⁶⁸ James Farley, Private File, reel 1, 1918-April 1935, James A. Farley Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

further down the alphabetical line you would have been the nominee.”⁶⁹ Even at the time, participants were aware that the confusion of the convention would forever obscure the machinations that led to the governor’s nomination. An aide told Roosevelt: “Of the 56,000 Democrats alleged to have been in Chicago, undoubtedly 62,000 of them arranged the McAdoo shift.”⁷⁰

Storke staked his own claim and dedicated five chapters of his memoirs to explaining his role in convincing McAdoo to switch the delegation’s votes from Garner to Roosevelt on the fourth ballot. “Many times, McAdoo confided to me that our meeting with Farley led him . . . to make one of the most important decisions of his own political life; and he also felt it marked a turning point in American political history. In later years, he often told me, and on numerous occasions he told others in my hearing, that Ham’s and my meeting with Farley made the difference between our next president being Roosevelt or Baker.”⁷¹ Raymond Moley, a member of Roosevelt’s original Brain Trust, had drawn similar conclusions in his own memoirs. “I am convinced that the two persons who deserve more credit for the negotiations than anyone else were Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and Tom Storke, of Santa Barbara, Calif.,” Moley insisted.⁷² In a letter written a quarter century after the convention, Moley told Storke only “from what I heard at the time . . . [you were] influential in overcoming the McAdoo opposition to Roosevelt and of bringing his powerful influence into line with the choice of the majority of the convention,” Roosevelt.⁷³ Thirty-eight years after the convention, Farley wrote Storke,

⁶⁹ Craig, *Progressives at War*, 320.

⁷⁰ Chase, “The Last Progressive,” 338; and Daniel Scroop, *Mr. Democrat: Jim Farley, the New Deal, and the Making of Modern American Politics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), 64.

⁷¹ Storke, *California Editor*, 315.

⁷² Raymond Moley, *After Seven Years* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939), 31. Given Moley’s eventual break with Roosevelt, one wonders if he was crediting Storke or blaming him.

⁷³ Raymond Moley to TMS, August 9, 1957, folder “Raymond Moley,” box 21, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

who was then nearing his ninety-fourth (and last) birthday, that “There are few men who played a more important part than you did and I know that President Roosevelt always appreciated your generous efforts on his behalf.”⁷⁴

Storke stopped short in his autobiography of taking credit for Roosevelt’s signature legislative program, but noted that Baker and Garner’s conservatism made it unlikely either “was capable of fathering a ‘New Deal.’” He added: “How often, in the more than 25 years since that fateful night, have I pondered on how different the course of world history might have been had California failed to swing its weight to Roosevelt on the fourth ballot!”⁷⁵ For Storke, the New Deal—and Santa Barbara’s ready access to the newly elected United States Senator McAdoo—was pivotal. The program meant millions of dollars in relief that Storke played a hand in bringing home and on which the publisher based his power for a generation to come.

With Roosevelt’s nomination to his credit and FDR’s election in November almost a certainty, McAdoo returned to California as the unquestioned leader of the state’s party for the first time since his move there in 1922, and he was poised to return to national office for the first time since his resignation from the cabinet in 1918. Supported by the Hearst papers and benefiting from his identification with Roosevelt, McAdoo won the Senate race, his first elective office.⁷⁶ Santa Barbara—and Storke—reaped the benefits. McAdoo, who as a result of his convention deal with Farley controlled much of

⁷⁴ James A. Farley to TMS, August 10, 1970, in folder “James Farley,” box 10, TMS Papers, Berkeley. Farley does not mention Storke or his purported role in Roosevelt’s nomination in either of his memoirs. James A. Farley, *Behind the Ballots: A Personal History of a Politician* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1938); and *Jim Farley’s Story: The Roosevelt Years* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948).

⁷⁵ Storke, *California Editor*, 331. Historian Elliot Rosen similarly concluded: “If the electorate had chosen Baker in 1932, the course of our nation’s history would have been radically different. There would have been no New Deal.” Rosen, “Baker on the Fifth Ballot? The Democratic Alternative: 1932,” *Ohio History* 75 (1966): 227.

⁷⁶ “Democratic Patronage Dispute Widens Breach between Southland Factions,” *Riverside (Calif.) Daily Press*, Aug. 25, 1933; and “Bourbon Fight Taken to Chief,” *LAT*, Aug. 26, 1933.

the federal patronage in California, funneled \$22 million (equivalent to \$375.12 million in 2014) in Works Progress Administration and Public Works Administration projects to Santa Barbara County. It was an astounding amount, given the county's relatively small population and that the Depression had affected other California counties far worse. For the remainder of the decade, the New Deal's largesse was visible throughout the county. Federal funds rebuilt the Sheffield Reservoir, damaged in the 1925 earthquake, in addition to constructing a new water source for the county at El Cielito. Storke pushed for the construction of a new \$500,000 post office, then negotiated for the federal government to sell the old post office building to the city for a new art museum. The PWA built the Santa Barbara Bowl, an outdoor amphitheater. The list of New Deal projects grew to include a new armory, improvements at Santa Barbara College, improved sewage system, tennis courts, a swimming pool, and a beach bathhouse. When McAdoo attempted to draw the line at \$14,000 in federal government funds being used for "non-essential" bleachers at a baseball diamond, Storke reminded him that California paid the highest amount of taxes in the country and that Santa Barbara paid the fourth highest amount of taxes of any city in the country. "I'd like to see at least small portion of that tax money come home to roost," Storke recalled telling McAdoo. The city received the money. Storke, whose political ambitions routinely conflicted with his fiscal conservatism, explained: "It may seem paradoxical for me to say that I personally questioned deficit spending on such a vast scale, but I reasoned this way: the fund, having been appropriated, would be spent somewhere—so why not go after Santa Barbara's share?"⁷⁷

⁷⁷ Storke, *California Editor*, 346-48; "King Storke," *Time*, November 17, 1961, 40, 42; Kevin Starr, *Material Dreams: Southern California through the 1920s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990),

The New Deal sustained Santa Barbara during the Depression, but it also solidified Storke's reputation as the city's unquestioned patriarch. Newspapers statewide, knowing of his influence on McAdoo and seeing the benefits the relationship had brought to Santa Barbara, began to refer to him as "deputy Senator" and at least one newspaper mentioned his name as a potential Senate candidate in his own right.⁷⁸ In 1936, an unemployed young man wrote to his mother and asked her to get his father to see Storke. "Ask Dad to ask Tommy if he won't write a letter to Senator McAdoo endorsing me for a job," the young man insisted. "If Daddy does this right and Tom writes a good letter to McAdoo—the job is in the bag. McAdoo will do anything that Storke says. If Storke wants to, he can make McAdoo give me a good job."⁷⁹

How Storke got the letter and what the outcome of the young man's scheme is not known, but Storke's relationship with and influence on McAdoo could not be denied. In 1936, three years into his six-year term, the press reported rumors that McAdoo would accept an ambassadorship and leave the Senate; Governor Frank Merriam then would appoint Storke as interim senator. Both Storke and Merriam denied the stories, although McAdoo was increasingly restless with the rigidity of life as a junior senator. He told friends that his inclination was that of an executive, not a legislator. In addition, financial insecurity plagued him. As re-election neared, McAdoo suggested Storke run in his stead, but the publisher demurred. McAdoo staged a half-hearted re-election campaign in 1938. Storke, returning from a lackluster McAdoo speech in nearby Ventura County, told his

295-96; Walker A. Tompkins, *Santa Barbara History Makers* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: McNally & Loftin, 1983), 410-11; and Ronald L. Nye, "The Challenge to Philanthropy: Unemployment Relief in Santa Barbara, 1930-1932," *California Historical Quarterly* 56 (Winter 1977/1978): 314.

⁷⁸ Storke, *California Editor*, 389; "Storke is Suggested," *Riverside (Calif.) Daily Press*, Dec. 7, 1932; and "In-Between Senators," *Time*, December 19, 1938, 10-11.

⁷⁹ Alfred [no last name] to his mother [no name given], May 27, 1936, box 1, folder "A Miscellany, Ab-Am," TMS Papers, Berkeley.

wife that the senator would surely lose, and McAdoo's defeat in the August Democratic primary was therefore no surprise.⁸⁰ His opponent, Sheridan Downey, defeated the Republican challenger Philip Bancroft in the November general election that also featured a contest between Merriam and Democratic state Senator Culbert L. Olson. Freed from his allegiance to McAdoo, Storke joined other conservative Democrats in supporting the unsuccessful candidacies of Republicans Merriam and Bancroft.⁸¹

After Olson and Downey's elections in November, McAdoo announced he was resigning from the Senate to become chairman of the board of the American President Lines, a steamship company. The lame duck Merriam appointed Storke to fill the remainder of McAdoo's term.⁸² In a letter to columnist Robert S. Allen, Storke later said, "I never took my appointment as Senator too seriously. . . . The governor called me to carry on McAdoo's work . . . and to give me a ride on the gravy train."⁸³ Press reaction to the governor's appointment noted that with the Senate not in session, Storke would have little to do. "Probably he will have no opportunity to wear his interim toga," the *Los Angeles Times* opined, "but it is something to have one hanging in the closet." *Times* columnist Ed Ainsworth noted that Storke, despite the six-week span of his term, had left the state for Washington. "I understand he had to fly to get back there before his term

⁸⁰ "New M'Adoo Post Hinted," Jan. 23, 1936; "McAdoo Story Disbelieved by Merriam," Jan. 24, 1936, both in *LAT*; Don Short, "Jenny Race for Congress Hinted," *San Diego Evening Tribune*, Jan. 29, 1936; Craig, *Progressives at War*, 359; Chase, "McAdoo: The Last Progressive," 365-66; TMS to McAdoo, February 10 & February 11, 1938; and McAdoo to TMS, January 24, February 1, February 4, February 19, 1938, all in folder "William Gibbs McAdoo, 1923-1938," box 20, TMS Papers, Berkeley; and Hennings, "Summaries of interviews with California Democratic politicians, 1959-1960," Berkeley.

⁸¹ "Philip Bancroft: The Candid Candidate for U.S. Senator," *Bakersfield Californian*, November 4, 1938; "Democrats Put in Quandary," September 2, 1938; and "Democrats Aid Merriam," November 1, 1938, both in *LAT*.

⁸² "T.M. Storke Named McAdoo Successor," *SBNP*, November 10, 1938; "Storke Given M'Adoo's Post," *Los Angeles Examiner*, November 10, 1938; "Storke Made Senator as McAdoo Quits," *LAT*, November 10, 1938; and "In-Between Senators," *Time*, December 19, 1938, 10-11.

⁸³ TMS to Robert S. Allen, Jan. 19, 1959, folder "Robert S. Allen," box 1, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

expires,” Ainsworth joked.⁸⁴ Not everyone was laughing. Senator-elect Downey protested Storke’s appointment and argued that no patronage should be distributed at the behest of the interim senator without consulting him first. Storke, perhaps to needle Downey or to demonstrate that he could work the corridors of power without McAdoo’s aid, flew to Washington soon after his appointment. He told *Time* magazine that his presence in Washington was “just a honey-moon” and the publication described him as dining and dancing, but not taking the appointment “too seriously.”⁸⁵

But there was serious work to be done, and in less than a month, Storke accrued an enviable record that demonstrated an ability to navigate the New Deal bureaucracy and get results. Arriving in Washington a week after his appointment, Storke met first with Roosevelt and then arranged to meet with Harold Ickes, Roosevelt’s secretary of the interior who was in charge of distributing PWA funds.⁸⁶ Notoriously tight-fisted, Ickes told Storke “that no federal funds are left for California.” Storke protested and resurrected the formula he had once described to McAdoo—California’s share of federal funds should be proportional to the amount of taxes the state paid. The logic did not impress Ickes. “Mr. Secretary,” Storke said he told Ickes before he left the meeting empty-handed, “I don’t mind saying I am disappointed. Before I was appointed Senator, I used to get a lot of help from Washington. Now that I am here as Senator, I have to go back home in two weeks empty-handed.” Ickes then dispatched Storke to talk to his assistant, H.A. Gray. Storke presented his case again, but Gray made no promises. The following

⁸⁴ “Senator Storke,” November 10, 1938; and Ed Ainsworth, “Along El Camino Real,” November 15, 1938, both in *LAT*. See also “Senator Storke,” *San Diego Union*, November 11, 1938; “Random Notes,” *Bakersfield Californian*, November 11, 1938; and “Neighbors Praise Senatorial Appointment,” *SBNP*, November 13, 1938.

⁸⁵ “In-Between Senators,” *Time*, December 19, 1938, 10-11.

⁸⁶ David M. Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 178; “Storke Opens Senate Office,” *SBNP*, November 19, 1938; and “McAdoo Introduces Storke to Roosevelt,” *LAT*, November 18, 1938.

morning, however, he found on his desk an authorization for more than \$10 million in PWA projects for California, including \$450,000 in improvements at Santa Barbara State College (later the University of California at Santa Barbara). Storke did not know what changed Ickes' mind.⁸⁷

Combined with the funds granted to Santa Barbara largely because of his friendship with McAdoo, the \$10 million WPA allocation resulted in nearly \$32 million (equivalent to \$528.7 million in 2014) in federal funds Storke brought to California, and he later likened the New Deal to "Santa Claus."⁸⁸ Reflecting on Storke's tenure in the Senate, columnist Drew Pearson wrote he "accomplished more for California in eight weeks than most professional politicians accomplish in eight years."⁸⁹ He had navigated the at-times perilous New Deal bureaucracy with aplomb and brought home a substantial haul for his constituents. More important, Storke had demonstrated an ability to operate outside of McAdoo's shadow at a time when McAdoo's ability to make things happen was waning. Although he remained active in the state party and in patronage decisions after his defeat in 1938, McAdoo consciously limited his political life in order to rebuild his dwindling fortune in the private sector. He died three years after leaving the Senate. Storke's *News-Press* memorialized him as the city's benefactor. "[His] assistance has played an important part in practically every community development involving federal cooperation," the newspaper opined, concluding: "Like all of William Gibbs McAdoo's friendships that for Santa Barbara was never forgotten and always fulfilled."⁹⁰ That he

⁸⁷ California allocated \$550,000 for Santa Barbara State College improvements, bringing the total to \$1 million. Storke, *California Editor*, 401-409; "Million Promised for State College by Merriam, WPA," *SBNP*, December 6, 1938; and "College Work Fund Assured," *LAT*, December 6, 1938.

⁸⁸ Storke, *California Editor*, 402-404.

⁸⁹ Drew Pearson, quoted in Storke, *California Editor*, 6.

⁹⁰ "The Measure of a Man Who Was Santa Barbara's Friend," *SBNP*, February 3, 1941.

had been Storke's benefactor too was left unsaid, but Storke's connections with McAdoo, and the financial windfall that resulted for the city, was at the heart of Storke's power.

With the exception of McAdoo, no other politician enjoyed Storke's loyalty more than did Earl Warren, a fact he demonstrated consistently from Warren's tenure as California attorney general through his ardent defense of the chief justice against the John Birch Society's attacks. Although he was a lifelong Democrat, Storke consistently supported the Republican Warren's state and national candidacies, once for California attorney general, three times for governor, and whenever Warren's ambitions led him to seek national office. In return, Storke—and Santa Barbara—received unfettered access to the highest reaches of state government during much of Warren's three terms as California's chief executive.⁹¹ Typical of the praise Storke's newspaper heaped on Warren were two front page editorials that appeared after Warren was appointed to the Supreme Court. "There is not going to be any black robe long enough and deep enough to cover from discerning people the fact that the Earl Warren under that robe is a friend of Santa Barbara and of all that Santa Barbara and its people most consistently believe in and seek," the newspaper effused in the second day's editorial.⁹²

The relationship between Warren and Storke—and through him, Santa Barbara—did not begin as firmly or as fast as Storke would later recall, however. Early in Warren's gubernatorial tenure, despite Storke's uninterrupted editorial blessings, the Santa Barbara publisher privately fumed that Warren seemed indifferent to his overtures. With an

⁹¹ See "The News-Press Ballot for Best Interests of Santa Barbara and State," November 6, 1938; "What Counts in a Last-Minute Talk," November 2, 1942; "No Monday Morning Quarter-Backing," November 6, 1948; "News-Press's Recommendations," June 1, 1952; "Warren Deserves Your Vote," June 2, 1952; "The Results of Tuesday's Primaries," June 5, 1952; and "The News-Press Support of Stevenson in the Light of a Closing Campaign," October 29, 1952, all in *SBNP*.

⁹² "World Significance of New Chief Justice," September 30, 1953; and "Secondly, But Importantly Santa Barbara's Appraisal of the New Chief Justice," October 1, 1953, both in *SBNP*.

impressive record of achievement for his city, Storke might have eschewed the long patron-publisher relationship that had been at the heart of his ability to get things done. But the publisher's compulsion to court powerful men remained as strong in the 1940s as it had been three decades earlier. After Warren's first election in 1942, Storke regularly recommended friends to a variety of appointed state positions. As Warren's national political aspirations grew, Storke attempted flattery, praising the governor's declination of the Republican vice presidential candidacy in 1944. "I feel that the GOP will drop [Republican presidential nominee Thomas E.] Dewey like a hot potato" in 1948. Dewey, he concluded, "will go into the discard, where he belongs." Yet none of this seemed to affect Warren or inspire the relationship Storke desired.⁹³

In autumn 1945, Warren dispatched his administrative secretary on a tour of state newspapers in anticipation of the following year's re-election campaign. Merrell Small arrived at the *News-Press* one morning and sent his calling card into the publisher's office. Storke summoned him immediately.⁹⁴ Small had barely seated himself in front of the publisher's desk when Storke rose from his chair, walked over to a file cabinet and pulled out a series of bulging folders and rattled off the names of national and international figures with whom he had corresponded. Then he looked sternly at Small. "There isn't a goddamned thing in here from Earl Warren. Not a rap of paper and I've supported him. What's the matter with that fellow?"⁹⁵

⁹³ TMS to EW, October 2, 1944, March 6, 1946, and November 29, 1946, all in box 37, folder "Earl Warren," TMS Papers, Berkeley.

⁹⁴ Merrell Farnham Small, "The Office of the Governor under Earl Warren," interview by Amelia R. Fry and Gabrielle S. Morris, February 24, 1970, Earl Warren Oral History Project, Regional Oral History Office, University of California at Berkeley [hereinafter cited as Small interview, EWOHP].

⁹⁵ Small later told interviewers Amelia Fry and Gabriella Morris he regretted telling them about his encounter with Storke. "Really, I should have told you to turn that thing off," he said, referring to the tape recorder. "I would never want Warren to know that there was any record of this because he wouldn't want

Returning to Sacramento, Small told Warren, “You’ve got a dilly down in Santa Barbara.” As Small recounted his encounter with Storke, Warren—himself sensitive to personal slights—grew embarrassed, but the following year, he was the honored guest in Storke’s private box at the city’s annual Fiesta.⁹⁶ Their correspondence grew more familiar, and Storke once again enjoyed the access to power he so desired. Unlike with McAdoo, however, there was little Storke could give the governor that he did not already have. While McAdoo benefited from Storke’s editorial support—something hard to come by given the conservative demeanor of most of the state’s larger newspaper publishers—Warren enjoyed close friendships with most of the state’s major publishers, including the marginally Democratic Hearst papers. *Oakland Tribune* publisher Joseph R. Knowland backed Warren’s first political campaign for Alameda County district attorney and remained among his most ardent supporters for the remainder of his political career.⁹⁷ Knowland’s support endeared Warren to the remaining members of the Republican press axis and he enjoyed the endorsements of the *Los Angeles Times* and the *San Francisco Chronicle* as well as the friendships of their publishers and editors. One commentator said *Los Angeles Times* political editor Kyle Palmer was “as intimate with Warren as any newspaperman ever got to be.”⁹⁸

the public to know that this was how he became such a close friend of Storke. And Storke wouldn’t like it either.” Small interview, EWOHP.

⁹⁶ Small interview, EWOHP; and EW to TMS, August 26, 1946, box 37, folder “Earl Warren,” TMS Papers, Berkeley

⁹⁷ Warren repaid Knowland’s support by appointing his son, William R. Knowland, to the United States Senate in 1945, following the death of Hiram Johnson. Ed Cray, *Chief Justice: A Biography of Earl Warren* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), 44-46, 69-74, 167; and Gayle B. Montgomery and James W. Johnson, *One Step from the WhiteHouse: The Rise and Fall of Senator William F. Knowland* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 50-53, 59.

⁹⁸ G. Edward White, *Earl Warren: A Public Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 94; and Walter P. Jones, “An Editor’s Long Friendship with Earl Warren,” interviews by June C. Hogan and Amelia R. Fry, September 16, 1969, and August 25, 1970, EWOHP.

For a decade, Warren was an absolute political force, so the support of Storke or other Democrats, while nice to have, was not essential to his success. Yet Warren's friendship benefitted Storke and his legacy in Santa Barbara in numerous ways. In 1944, the state legislature and the governor, at Storke's behest, incorporated Santa Barbara College into the University of California System. Warren later said if "any man could be a father of a university, certainly Tom Storke is the father of the University of California at Santa Barbara." Storke maintained a parental interest in UCSB for the remainder of his life. As a University of California regent in the late 1950s, he approached Clark Kerr, poked the newly installed UC president in the chest, and twice told him, "Don't forget about Santa Barbara," and the city benefitted economically and culturally as a result of the university's growth in prestige and enrollment. "It would be difficult even to conceive of the community that Santa Barbara and its environs would become . . . without UC Santa Barbara," a university historian wrote. Storke "wanted to build an exciting Santa Barbara, a city possessed of a significant role in state and nation. [He] correctly sensed that for such distinguished future, a potentially distinguished university was essential."⁹⁹

Other projects followed. With Warren's blessing, Santa Barbara secured state agricultural funding for fairground facilities; once completed, the complex was christened the Earl Warren Showgrounds. More significant, Storke enlisted Warren's help in 1949 while Warren was still governor in lobbying federal officials for the Cachuma water reservoir.¹⁰⁰ Arid California had long dealt with a dearth of water and communities quite

⁹⁹ Cray, *Chief Justice*, 168; Earl Warren, Storke eulogy, October 16, 1971, folder "Remarks, Memorial Service for Thomas M. Storke," box 832, Warren Papers, LC; Clark Kerr, *Academic Triumphs*, vol. 1, *The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the University of California, 1949-1967* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 309-310; and Robert L. Kelley, *Transformations: UC Santa Barbara, 1909-1979* (Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa Barbara, 1981), 4-5.

¹⁰⁰ TMS to EW, September 21, 1949, November 30, 1949, and February 21, 1950; James H. Oakley to TMS, December 3, 1949, all in box 37, folder "Earl Warren," TMS Papers, Berkeley.

literally lived or died based on their accessibility to this precious natural resource. Between 1912 and 1937, Santa Barbara sponsored more than six water reclamation projects, but each proved only a temporary fix for a perennial problem that only worsened as the city's population grew. Below average rainfall further parched the region following the Second World War. In California, access to water was as much a political feat as an engineering one, and for more than a decade, Storke pumped associates at all levels of government to support the Cachuma project. Senators Carl Hayden of Arizona, Sheridan Downey of California, and Representatives Michael Kirwan of Ohio and Harry Sheppard of California were among those who heard Storke's plea and supported the project.¹⁰¹ A massive undertaking, it required the completion of a reservoir in the Santa Ynez Valley and the construction of a six-mile tunnel bored through the Santa Ynez Mountains that surrounded the city. While fiscally conservative, Storke believed government functioned primarily as a police force and engineer; it should work to stifle unrest and to build infrastructure like dams, roads, and other public works that sustained the economy and allowed communities to thrive. In California, the ability to bring water to people was currency, and a publisher, senator or mayor who did so could claim a hand in forging prosperity, not only then but for all time. Completed in 1957, the reservoir continues to provide Santa Barbara with drinking water. Storke called the decade-long wrangling between federal and state officials and local residents "my life's hardest fight." but it is also his greatest legacy.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ Storke, *California Editor*, 461-62. Hayden and Storke were classmates at Stanford University. "I couldn't turn down Tom Storke," Hayden recalled in an interview in 1966. "We can't get along without water." See "Hayden Visits T.M. Storke To Reminisce About Politics," *SBNP*, December 14, 1966.

¹⁰² Storke, *California Editor*, 451-67; Adamson, "The Makings of a Fine Prosperity," 194-95, 204-207; and "Thirsty Days End for Santa Barbara," *Business Week*, April 12, 1952, 138-40. On the perennial water woes of the West and California, see Donald Wooster, *Rivers of Empire: Water, Aridity, and the Growth of the American West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); Marc Reisner, *Cadillac Desert: The*

Warren's help in Storke's pet projects, such as the development of UCSB and Cachuma, guaranteed Storke would continue to support Warren editorially, whether the governor needed the support or not. Following the end of the Second World War, Warren's star within the national Republican Party continued to rise and as he had with McAdoo, Storke threw the (admittedly limited) editorial weight of his newspaper behind the governor's presidential ambitions. In 1947, a full year before the convention, the newspaper announced its support for Warren's bid for the Republican presidential nomination. When he lost the nomination to Dewey, and became instead the Republican nominee for vice president, the *News-Press* also supported that ticket, marking the second time in forty-eight years the newspaper supported a Republican presidential ticket. (The first time was Herbert Hoover's 1928 candidacy. Hoover had attended Stanford University with Storke). Storke wrote Warren following the convention, "we were a wee bit disappointed that the West didn't come first and the Hudson River area second." The Dewey-Warren ticket's surprise loss to incumbent President Harry Truman led the publisher to lament that the convention had failed to place its best candidate at the top of the ticket. "Dewey was the last man that the people or the great mass of Republicans wanted to lead the ticket," he concluded. "I believe political historians will agree that the political crime of the century, the most stupid and asinine, was committed at Philadelphia in June, 1948."¹⁰³

American West and Its Disappearing Water (New York: Viking, 1986); Norris Hundley, *The Great Thirst: Californians and Water, 1770s-1990s*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); and John Walton, *Western Times and Water Wars: State, Culture and Rebellion in California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

¹⁰³ "Governor Warren Becomes Candidate for President," November 14, 1947; "This Paper, for the Second Time in 48 Years, Supports and Republican for President," October 22, 1948; "Dewey and Warren," June 26, 1948; "Governor Warren Shows a Confidence in Us That We Should Return in Generous Measure," October 26, 1948; "Vote for the West," October 28, 1948, all in *SBNP*; TMS to EW, June 29, 1948, and

In the same letter, Storke pledged his support for Warren's presumed 1952 presidential race, and Storke gleefully approached the possibility of his friend finally being at the top of the Republican ticket. Warren's campaign asked the publisher to critique campaign materials. When Warren easily won the California Republican primary in June, the *News-Press* admitted editorially that it "has expressed its approval and support of Gov. Warren so many times that it does not have to repeat them." But when Warren failed to defeat General Dwight D. Eisenhower's bid for the nomination, the *News-Press* pulled its support for the Republican ticket and backed instead the failed candidacy of Illinois Governor Adlai E. Stevenson.¹⁰⁴

Although the days of political patronage were over once Warren ascended to the Supreme Court, Storke's legacy and his hold on Santa Barbara were secure. Plus, he had plenty of other friends in high places, but none as high as Warren. The chief justice became Storke's favorite name to drop. After the Senate confirmed Warren's appointment, Storke requested a photo of the chief justice in his judicial robes. Warren inscribed it to his "longtime friend," Storke proudly published the picture, inscription and all, on the front page of his March 1, 1954, edition. As the decade progressed, the *News-Press* carried stories about the pair traveling across Europe and the chief justice's yearly visits to California that invariably included a stopover in Santa Barbara as Storke's guest. In 1955, a little over two years into his tenure as chief justice, Storke reverted to a role he had played during his friendship with McAdoo—that of press agent. When rumors began to circulate that ill health would force Eisenhower to retire, Warren's name was

TMS to EW, November 11, 1948, both in box 37, folder "Earl Warren," TMS Papers, Berkeley; TMS to James A. Farley, March 3, 1948, box 10, folder "James Farley," TMS Papers, Berkeley.

¹⁰⁴ TMS to Verne Scoggins, January 10, 1952, box 37, folder "Earl Warren," TMS Papers, Berkeley; and "The News-Press Support of Stevenson in Light of a Closing Campaign," *SBNP*, October 29, 1952.

mentioned as a potential Republican candidate. A news story, distributed over the International News Service wire, denied Warren would make another bid for the White House. Storke added that he made the statement “on [Warren’s] authority.”¹⁰⁵

With a continent between them, Warren and Storke settled into a comfortable routine. Storke wrote Warren, and Warren occasionally called Storke, but the days of patronage were over, replaced instead by a relaxed, quiet friendship. In July and August 1956, they travelled to Europe together and began calling their occasional imbibing “court sessions.” Warren read an early draft of Storke’s memoirs and offered editorial critiques; he also wrote the book’s foreword. Storke sent Warren walnuts—a Santa Barbara staple—for Christmas, and his letters were breezy commentaries on California political life, filled with flattery and comparisons between Warren and the current crop of state politicians, who in Storke’s estimation would never compare to his friend.¹⁰⁶

There was much to discuss. The 1950s witnessed major changes in California politics. Warren’s three elections as governor and his ability to win nominations of both parties jostled the state’s comatose Democratic Party. For nearly four decades, the Republican domination of California government, supported by a friendly press that unified northern and southern regions of the state, a strong party organization that produced attractive candidates, and superior financial reserves, had neutered a factionalized Democratic Party despite its superior registration numbers. Democratic impotence and cross-filing of candidates resulted in Republican domination of the

¹⁰⁵ TMS to EW, March 1, 1954, folder “Chief Justice Personal, Sl-Sz, October 1953-1955,” box 111, Warren Papers, LC; T.M. Storke, “News-Press Publisher Tells of ‘Delightful’ Visit to Switzerland,” *SBNP*, August 6, 1956; and “Warren Won’t Run, Publisher Asserts,” *San Diego Union*, November 5, 1955.

¹⁰⁶ See, for example, TMS to EW, October 28, 1961, and November 4, 1961, both in folder “Chief Justice-Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112; and EW to TMS, March 24, 1958, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1958-1959,” box 112, both in Warren Papers, LC.

Democratic Party's primaries. No one exemplified this better than Warren, who in his 1946 re-election bid rode a wave of postwar Republican popularity and captured the nominations of both parties. At the beginning of Warren's third term, grassroots organizations like the California League of Women Voters and the Committee to Abolish Crossfiling in California used the state's initiative process to place before voters a constitutional amendment to end cross-filing. Legislators offered an alternative plan that would place party affiliation next to a candidate's name whether he had crossfiled or not. Voters approved the legislative plan in 1952 and it went into practice in 1954, a year after Warren became chief justice. The legislative compromise had much the same effect as abolishment. The inclusion of affiliations on the ballot cut down on voter confusion and restored parties' importance. In 1959, Democrats took advantage of a legislative majority and the previous year's election of Edmund G. "Pat" Brown as governor to abolish cross-filing. Cross-filing was over, but its legacy resonated into the next decade and beyond.¹⁰⁷

With a Democratic governor returned to Sacramento, Storke believed his command of Santa Barbara's destiny would continue, but his relationship with Brown was fractious at best. Much of the publisher's disillusionment with the new governor came down to patronage, and he lamented that Brown was not following the largely non-ideological example set by Warren. "Pat, I think you have had some poor advisors," Storke wrote the governor a year into his term. "Apparently they have advised a California administration 'of Democrats, by Democrats, and for Democrats, only.' That is not what . . . Hiram and Earl did. . . . If I have seemed critical, I may have felt that you

¹⁰⁷ Mary Ellen Leary, "The Two-Party System Comes to California," *Reporter*, February 7, 1957, 33-36; Francis Carney, *The Rise of the Democratic Clubs in California* (New York: Henry Holt, 1958), 5-6; and Alan Cranston, "Democratic Politics," in Eugene P. Dvorin and Arthur Misner, ed., *California Politics and Policies* (Reading: Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1966), 33.

were hurting yourself by alienating some wonderful and powerful Republicans who truly wanted to be your friends.”¹⁰⁸

Brown was unresponsive to Storke’s advice and his recommendations, and his inability to command deference as he once had incensed the old publisher. “This is not personal, but is in line with my continuous endeavors on behalf of . . . my community,” Storke fumed at Brown after a perceived slight. “And let me remind you in closing that I have never asked you, directly or indirectly, for anything for myself. You owe me nothing and I owe you nothing.” In response, the governor insinuated that Storke was oblivious to new political realities. “You have always spoken frankly, and I have liked you for it,” Brown wrote. “Sometimes, however, I feel that you do not put yourself in my position in reaching some of the conclusions that you have.”¹⁰⁹

By 1960, an era of California politics was over—whether Storke realized it or not. With the end of cross-filing, political parties in California regained their strength and the Democratic Party revived. For newspaper publishers, who had filled the void left in the absence of party machinery, the period in which they had acted—both behind closed doors and in the editorial pages of their newspapers—to manipulate their communities’ fortunes and win reciprocal political favors was also at an end. Storke’s newspaper, like the newspaper industry in general, no longer held the political sway it once had. Although the state’s press remained largely conservative, news coverage was more balanced.

Television and radio were supplanting the role newspapers formerly had held alone, and

¹⁰⁸ TMS to Clark Kerr, August 25, 1959, folder “Clark Kerr,” box 16; and TMS to Brown, Feb. 8, 1960, folder “Edmund G. “Pat” Brown,” box 3, both in TMS Papers, Berkeley. See also Brown to John J. Hollister, May 19, 1960; and John J. Hollister to Brown, May 25, 1960, both in folder “Santa Barbara County,” carton 503, Edmund G. Brown Papers, BANC MSS 68/90c, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

¹⁰⁹ TMS to Brown, April 7, 1960; and Brown to TMS, April 15, 1960; both in folder “Edmund G. “Pat” Brown,” box 3, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

the changed media landscape pushed newspapers to be less partisan in their coverage. An axis between newspapers in the northern and southern halves of the state that spoke with a unified, conservative editorial voice no longer existed. Political parties and their individual members were more important than publishers' relationships with their favored politicians for the first time in a half century.¹¹⁰

While Democrats found their footing in the new political environment, Republicans entered a period of ignominy. Warren's 1953 resignation to become chief justice left a vacuum in the state party hierarchy, and unwittingly strengthened groups and factions which, over the course of the next decade, would target the chief justice for removal. The Warren Era in California politics had ended—but the era of Earl Warren as a national target of conservative contempt had only just begun.

Copyright © James Savage 2014

¹¹⁰ David R. Davies, *The Postwar Decline of American Newspapers, 1945-1965* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2006), 129-36; and "What's Wrong with the Press?" *Newsweek*, November 29, 1965, 55-59.

CHAPTER SIX
“THE SOCIETY NEEDED A SYMBOL—IT CHOSE ME”

Ronald Reagan never thanked Earl Warren for electing him governor of California—but he should have. In 1953, when Warren became chief justice of the United States, the state Republican Party that he had dominated for more than a decade as governor factionalized as party members scrambled to assume control. The leadership vacuum caused by Warren’s absence weakened the party, allowed long-suffering Democrats to capitalize on the end of the cross-filing system that had denied them power for nearly a half century, and strengthened far-right elements that were emerging as a new grassroots strength in California and nationwide as well.¹

There was another, more significant, reason Reagan should have been grateful to Warren. A former actor and television pitchman who had never before sought public office, Reagan had emerged largely unscathed from the wreckage of Barry Goldwater’s landslide shellacking in the 1964 presidential race and his star within the Republican ranks was rising. When he announced his bid for California governor in 1966, Reagan was the new, conservative face of a party that was positioning itself as an alternative to the turmoil liberalism had wrought over the preceding decade. Reagan did not have to dig for anarchy, and neither did voters. It was on their television screens nightly. In the two years preceding the governor’s race, Californians had witnessed riots in the predominately African-American neighborhoods of Watts in Los Angeles, and Hunter’s

¹ Ethan Rarick, *California Rising: The Life and Times of Pat Brown* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 95-96; Gayle B. Montgomery and James W. Johnson, *One Step from the White House: The Rise and Fall of Senator William F. Knowland* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 242-44, 255-56; James Worthen, *The Young Nixon and His Rivals: Four California Republicans Eye the White House, 1946-1958* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2010), 139-67; and Jim Wood, “California Republicans; Are the Birchers Taking Over?” *The Reporter*, May 7, 1964, 24-26.

Point in San Francisco. Campus unrest and growing anti-war sentiment at the state's largest universities had pitted students against national guardsmen and administrators. Between 1965 and 1966, the murder rate in California increased by 14.4 percent. Robberies and rapes rose as well, 9 percent and 5 percent, respectively. In ascribing blame, Reagan and conservatives across the country pointed a collective finger at the nation's highest court and at the chief justice in particular. In Warren, they found a symbol on which to pin responsibility for a permissive society that had devolved into lawlessness and disorder.²

Reagan's campaign penetrated conservative resentment that had stewed in California and across the country since Warren became chief justice. Reagan astutely avoided denouncing the rank-and-file membership of Americanist organizations such as the John Birch Society, a misstep that had cost Richard M. Nixon crucial conservative votes during his unsuccessful gubernatorial bid four years earlier. In a deft statement, Reagan said he sought support from voters "by persuading them to accept my philosophy, not by my accepting theirs."³ Like Goldwater had two years earlier, Reagan criticized founder Robert H.W. Welch but retained the support of members by not attacking them directly. By appealing to voters' anxiety over the issue of crime and chaos, however, Reagan took a page from the JBS' playbook. The organization had promoted a campaign to impeach Warren for nearly five years. Reagan broadened it, tying lawlessness to liberalism and liberalism to his opponent, incumbent Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown,

² Matthew Dallek, *The Right Moment: Ronald Reagan's First Victory and the Decisive Turning Point in American Politics* (New York: Free Press, 2000), 185-90; and Kurt Schuparra, *Triumph of the Right: The Rise of the California Conservative Movement, 1945-1966* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1998), 63-64, 116-17. See also James Q. Wilson, "A Guide to Reagan Country: The Political Culture of Southern California," *Commentary* 43 (May 1967): 37-45; and Horace Sutton, "Ronald Reagan: Lancelot Out of the West," *Saturday Review of Literature*, September 23, 1967, 22-24.

³ Ronald Reagan, quoted in Dallek, *The Right Moment*, 124-25.

who—as a happy coincidence—saw himself as Warren’s ideological heir. On election night, Reagan won with 57.7 percent of the vote and carried all but three of California’s fifty-eight counties.⁴ The resounding victory sent a clear message nationwide that a new voice was on the scene and provided hope for conservatives who, only two years before, had believed their ideology would never recover from Barry Goldwater’s loss. Reagan had demonstrated the political potency of the John Birch Society’s message of “law and order” to white, middle-class voters who feared the country was coming unhinged, partly thanks to Earl Warren.

Throughout the 1950s and until Warren’s retirement in 1969, the court’s decisions fueled a nationwide cottage industry of criticism that reflected many conservative Americans’ growing anxiety. The John Birch Society organized those previously diffuse efforts into one national campaign that demonstrated the depth of public dissatisfaction about the high court. During an extraordinary sixteen-year period, the Warren Court ruled the constitution protected African-Americans’ right to an equal education (in *Brown v. Board of Education* and *Cooper v. Aaron*), a communist’s right to practice his ideology (in *Watkins v. United States*, among others) and a criminal defendant’s right to due process (in *Gideon v. Wainwright*, *Mapp v. Ohio* and *Miranda v. Arizona*). It held that school prayer infringed on students’ religious freedom (*Engle v. Vitale* and *Abington School District v. Schempp*), that the Constitution included a right to privacy (*Griswold v. Connecticut*), and laws barring interracial marriage were illegal (*Loving v. Virginia*). The court insisted that pornography enjoyed the protection of the First Amendment (*Roth v. United States* and *Jacobellis v. Ohio*) and ordered the reapportionment of legislative

⁴ Eugene C. Lee and Bruce E. Keith. *California Votes, 1960-1972* (Berkeley: University of California Institute of Government Studies, 1974), A32.

districts so that population alone would determine representation, significantly enhancing the political power of rural districts (*Baker v. Carr*).⁵

Warren did not forge these decisions alone, yet he personified the worst fears of conservatives who had decried the growth of federal government power since the New Deal. All of these cases challenged key tenets of a conservative ideology that had yet to define itself fully. Conservatives criticized the court's actions as being antithetical to states' rights, anticommunism, religious freedom, and free enterprise. Warren's court had acted as a legislative body and, through judicial fiat, infringed on state autonomy. The court comforted minorities, criminals, pornographers, atheists and an assorted cast of reprobates, degenerates and perverts, who collectively harmed the country's moral fabric. By the late 1960s, a period of intense social upheaval, many conservative voters had come to view the court's decisions as harbingers of disorder.

Warren believed conservative dissatisfaction with the court stemmed from its rulings that ended public school segregation and that severely restricted trusts and the ability of gas service companies to unilaterally raise rates.⁶ The latter was wildly unpopular in oil-rich states such as Texas (one of the JBS' major strongholds), Warren noted, but business cases lacked the emotional panache that accusations of subversion carried. It took little imagination to attribute all the court's actions during Warren's

⁵ *Brown v. Board of Education*, 337 U.S. 483 (1954); *Brown v. Board of Education II*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955); *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958); *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178 (1957); *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963); *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961); *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966); *Engle v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 461 (1962); *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963); *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 419 (1965); *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967); *Roth v. United States*, 354 U.S. 476 (1957); *Jacobellis v. Ohio*, 378 U.S. 184 (1964); and *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

⁶ *Klor's Inc. v. Broadway-Hale Stores Inc.*, 359 U.S. 207 (1959); *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1958); and *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division*, 358 U.S. 103 (1958). On *Klor* and subsequent antitrust cases, see Thomas E. Kauper, "The 'Warren Court' and the Antitrust Laws: Of Economics, Populism, and Cynicism," in Richard H. Sayler, Barry B. Boyer, and Robert E. Gooding Jr., ed., *The Warren Court: A Critical Analysis* (New York: Chelsea House, 1969), 134-51. On its gas rulings, see Richard A. Epstein, "The Takings Jurisprudence of the Warren Court: A Constitutional Siesta," *Tulsa Law Journal* 31 (Summer 1996): 644-76.

tenure to the justices' devotion to communism, and that is exactly what many Americans, including members of the John Birch Society, did. Since Warren joined the court, it had worked consciously to aid communists and their allies within the Civil Rights Movement, one member wrote in early 1961. "Surely," he insisted, "Justice Warren is not operating so consistently in the interests of the left out of sheer coincidence."⁷ Argued another: "Since Warren's appointment as Chief Justice, the Supreme Court has done more to destroy Constitutional government in America than all of the openly communistic programs since [Khrushchev] vowed that he would destroy us."⁸

As the John Birch Society's impeachment drive and its predecessors showed, dissatisfaction with the Supreme Court was a potentially potent political issue—if conservative politicians, Republicans and Democrats alike, could only tap into the existing anxiety. Historian George Nash argued that the Supreme Court's decisions on segregation, school prayer, privacy rights, internal security and a host of other issues galvanized the political right during the 1950s and 1960s. During the 1930s, the court had been a reliably conservative body that used the prerogative of judicial review to counter the excesses of the New Deal. The court's changing composition deprived conservatives of their judicial champions, and the court came to exemplify all they believed was going wrong with the country. Nash concluded that the court exerted "a significant influence on the postwar conservative intellectual movement. It is probably no exaggeration to say that as much as any other liberals, Earl Warren, Hugo Black, William O. Douglas, and their colleagues helped to revitalize American conservatism." The Warren Court, he

⁷ George Eaton to James J. Kilpatrick [JJK], February 2, 1961, folder 1, box 1, James J. Kilpatrick Papers, MSS 6626-a, Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville [hereinafter cited as Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia].

⁸ Mr. and Mrs. Dick Kelly to George Sokolsky [GS], February 7, 1961, folder 1, box 1, Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia.

concluded, “helped polarize Left and Right. And polarization is the first step toward self-definition.”⁹ The JBS campaign to impeach Earl Warren helped strengthen this polarization. It was a vital element in organizing grassroots conservative resentment against the court because it mobilized previously diffuse efforts into an instantly recognizable national campaign. Although unsuccessful, the drive to remove Earl Warren demonstrated the political viability of targeting the Supreme Court.

Conservative politicians learned by the end of the 1960s to use the Supreme Court to win votes. The John Birch Society had used it in a similar fashion—to build its membership rolls. When the nascent group began its impeachment drive against Warren in 1961, Welch aimed to penetrate the anxiety and urgency that already existed among many Americans about the court’s actions. Conservative authors, legislators, journalists, and other organizations had already laid the groundwork for what would become the JBS’ first and most-recognizable public relations campaign. The Cinema Education Guild produced one well-distributed pamphlet—a copy of which made its way into the Supreme Court building—featured Warren’s picture beneath block type that screamed: “WANTED! FOR IMPEACHMENT!”¹⁰ Welch built on such previous efforts.

In announcing the JBS’ impeachment campaign in early 1961, Welch contended that the court was “a nest of socialists and worse. . . . We believe that the impeachment of Earl Warren would dramatize and crystallize the whole basic question of whether the

⁹ George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America since 1945* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), 214; and Patrick Allitt, *The Conservatives: Ideas and Personalities throughout American History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 181-82.

¹⁰ An example of the pamphlet can be found in folder “Special Correspondence, Earl Warren, 1964-70 and undated,” box 62, Hugo Lafayette Black Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. [hereafter cited as Black Papers, LC]. The Cinema Education Guild initially published books that purported to expose communists within the motion picture industry. Its founder was Myron C. Fagan. See California Legislature, *Twelfth Report of the Senate Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities* (1963), 197-201.

United States . . . becomes gradually transformed into a province of the worldwide Soviet system.” Welch instructed members to form local Impeach Earl Warren committees, to inundate newspapers and congressional representatives with letters, and “to avoid giving [the impeachment campaign] any of the aspects of an emotional binge sheer noise-making is no part of our goal.”¹¹ Welch’s rhetoric was not all that different from the scattered groups who had preceded him in focusing their wrath on the high court; the difference was that when Welch asked his members to voice their opposition to the court and to Warren in particular, they listened, and the intensity of their responses forced the public and politicians alike to take notice of the determined young group.

Impeachment was a rarely used Constitutional weapon by 1961, legal scholar David E. Kyvig suggested, so uncommon that most Americans had little knowledge how it worked or how infrequently it had been successful in the past. The United States House of Representatives, the body Constitutionally charged with beginning impeachment proceedings, had only done so thirteen times since 1788; four federal judges had been removed by the Senate, and four officials resigned after the effort began against them rather than be impeached. The House impeached only one sitting Supreme Court justice, but more than a hundred and fifty years had passed since Samuel Chase avoided conviction in 1805.¹² President Andrew Johnson’s failed 1868 impeachment trial resulted in skepticism about the procedure’s effectiveness for removing high-profile officeholders such as a president or a Supreme Court justice. The JBS brought impeachment back into

¹¹ JBS *Bulletin*, January 1, 1961, 10-12, 19-20.

¹² David E. Kyvig, *The Age of Impeachment: American Constitutional Culture since 1960* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008), 36-37; Charles F. Hobson, “The Marshall Court (1801-1835): Law, Politics, and the Emergence of the Federal Judiciary,” in Christopher Tomlins, ed., *The United States Supreme Court: The Pursuit of Justice* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2005), 53-54. See also “A Trial to Remember: Samuel Chase,” *New York Daily News*, September 3, 1957.

the national spotlight after a long absence, Kyvig concluded.¹³ Nevertheless, so quixotic did the JBS' campaign to impeach Warren seem to some that they suggested lynching the chief justice was a more operative method for his removal.¹⁴

Even Welch admitted his organization's signature campaign would likely fail. Dislodging Warren from Washington," Welch conceded, "could be as difficult as kicking Khrushchev out of the Kremlin," but as a recruitment tool, the campaign's effectiveness was without question. Prior to the Warren impeachment drive, the JBS had operated in relative anonymity. "Bear in mind that no one was concerned with the John Birch Society until we initiated this project," a society coordinator wrote in late 1961. Warren himself characterized the campaign as "a public relations stunt. It was carried on . . . as a means of collecting funds for their organization." Its first major public relations campaign, the Committee Against Summit Entanglements, aimed to discourage Eisenhower from attending conferences with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. Newspaper advertisements appeared across the country paid for by the Committee Against Summit Entanglements, the first of many JBS "fronts" that urged Birch ends without attaching the Birch name.¹⁵

¹³ Kyvig, *Age of Impeachment*, 37.

¹⁴ Several right-wing speakers and commentators suggested hanging Warren, but Welch and the JBS never sanctioned such rhetoric. Among those who believed lynching an appropriate solution were columnist Fulton Lewis Jr., right-wing spokesman J. Evetts Haley (who later authored the polemic *A Texan Looks at Lyndon*), and retired Marine Corps Colonel Mitchell Paige. See "Attack on Warren Boomerangs on Anti-Reds' School on Coast," *New York Times* [NYT], December 17, 1961; Ed Cray, *Chief Justice: A Biography of Earl Warren* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), 391; and Bill Minutaglio and Steven L. Davis, *Dallas 1963* (New York: Twelve, 2013), 100-101. An editor's note in the September 9, 1961, issue of the *National Review* dismissed talk of impeaching Warren, but added that "maybe he should be hanged." The magazine in late December said the comment was a joke and described those who believed otherwise as "opaque." "In This Issue," September 9, 1961, 143; and "Notes and Asides," December 30, 1961, 442-43, both in *National Review*.

¹⁵ JBS *Bulletin*, March 1, 1961, 7; unnamed JBS chapter leader, quoted in Samuel Lawrence Brenner, "Shouting at the Rain: The Voices and Ideas of Right-Wing Anti-communist Americanists in the Era of Modern American Conservatism, 1950-1974" (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 2009), 199; Earl Warren, *The Memoirs of Chief Justice Earl Warren* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977), 303; and "Please,

The Warren “front” ended the society’s previous obscurity. Billboards began to dot highways and city streets entreating passers-by to “Save Our Republic—Impeach Earl Warren.” Visitors at the Indianapolis 500 were greeted by a similar message, as were motorists throughout the country, particularly in the South and in the West where the JBS was making the most inroads.¹⁶ The slogan appeared on bumper stickers, on buttons, and on banners trailed behind airplanes. In late February, members of Congress complained about the flood of letters they were receiving soliciting support for Warren’s removal.¹⁷ “We have a drastic situation creeping upon us right here inside our own borders,” one constituent wrote to Florida Senator George Smathers. “There are members of our Supreme Court that are working hand in hand with [communists]. . . . God help our country.”¹⁸ A woman in California wrote her congressman and suggested justices Douglas, Black, William Brennan, and Chief Justice Warren were ““communist sleepers”” who were “dedicated communists who do not carry a card, but live respectable lives so that they can infiltrate high places in the government in order to do great injury.”¹⁹

The justices themselves could not escape the ever-growing discontent with their performance; while Warren was the explicit target, the whole court found itself in the conservative crosshairs. During one of his regular trips through the Western United

President Eisenhower, Don’t!” August 30, 1959; “Americans Exhorted to Greet Khrushchev with ‘Civil Silence,’” August 24, 1959; and Peter Kihss, “Anti-Red Groups Here Press Protests against Khrushchev,” September 11, 1959, all in *NYT*.

¹⁶ Newton, *Justice for All*, 386; “Birchers Trail Anti Warren Banner in Sky,” *Sacramento Bee*, September 17, 1961; and “Brown Assails Bumper Strip Attack on Warren,” *Los Angeles Times [LAT]*, August 31, 1962.

¹⁷ John D. Morris, “Birch Unit Pushes Drive on Warren,” *NYT*, April 1, 1961; and Congress, House, Clare E. Hoffman, “Impeachment of Our Chief Justice: An Answer,” 87th Cong., 1st sess., *Congressional Record* 107, pt. 2 (February 21, 1961): 2500.

¹⁸ P.W. Allen to George Smathers, March 11, 1961, folder “Communist Scare, 1961-1962,” box 24, Black Papers, LC.

¹⁹ Leona McCartney to Glenard Lipscomb, April 23, 1961, folder “Communist Scare, 1961-1962,” box 24, Black Papers, LC.

States, Douglas happened upon an “Impeach Earl Warren” billboard outside Odessa, Texas. It was, he recalled later, “one of my most depressing moments.”²⁰ Brennan, who maintained a lower public profile than Warren and Douglas, observed picketers outside a legal conference in California but was able to slip by them unnoticed. The justices also shared the voluminous anti-court literature among themselves. “Thanks for letting me see this trash,” Justice Potter Stewart told Brennan. “It’s extraordinary.”²¹ Like the Congressional mailroom, the Supreme Court’s post office was overrun with correspondence from JBS members or those who disclaimed membership but offered support nevertheless. “You are living on borrowed time,” one correspondent informed Black, “but it is never too late to change. . . . I trust we can save our country from the communists in spite of you and your fellow travelers.”²² A letter-writer from San Marino, California, told Warren that he had attended a meeting—likely of a JBS chapter—where more than fifty citizens discussed the frightening “progress of Communism in the world in general and in our country in particular.” Warren’s name was mentioned, “and someone suggested that the country would be better off if you were removed from office.” The attendees offered “generous” applause at the suggestion. “It is not my purpose to embarrass you or to heckle you,” he concluded, “however, I do want to be among those who tell you that we hope your future actions on behalf of your country and

²⁰ William O. Douglas, “Justice Douglas Salutes His Old ‘Super Chief,’” *LAT*, August 6, 1974, in folder “Earl Warren,” box 669, William O. Douglas Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Douglas would himself later be the target of an unsuccessful impeachment attempt led by Republican Congressman Gerald R. Ford of Michigan. Allan C. Brownfeld’s polemic *Dossier on Douglas* (Washington, D.C. New Majority Book Club, 1970) details the conservative case against Douglas. See also Kyvig, *Age of Impeachment*, 87-112; William O. Douglas, *The Autobiography of William O. Douglas: The Court Years, 1939-1975* (New York: Random House, 1980), 355-377; and Bruce Allen Murphy, *Wild Bill: The Legend and Life of William O. Douglas* (New York: Random House, 2003), 430-35.

²¹ Seth Stern and Stephen Wermiel, *Justice Brennan: Legal Champion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2010), 230-31.

²² Mrs. V.G. Hultquist Jr. to Hugo L. Black [HLB], March 7, 1961, folder “Communist Scare, 1961-1962,” box 24, Black Papers, LC.

mine will leave no question but that you are there to protect and strengthen it.”²³ Other letters questioned why the Supreme Court seemed to counter Congressional action, particularly the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to limit communism’s influence and suggested that the court advise Congress on how to phrase anticommunist legislation so it could pass Constitutional muster. “Almost every day, I read in the paper of our officials in government warning our citizens to snap out of our apathy toward communism before it is too late,” one writer insisted. “Then, lo and behold, I read a little further, and see where our Supreme Court just released some more communists on their so-called Constitutional rights.” He concluded: “I think I can speak for most of the citizens of the United States when I say: ‘WE HAVE SNAPPED OUT OF OUR APATHY . . . ARE WE ALLOWED TO EXPECT THE SAME FROM OUR LEADERS?’”²⁴

As a rule, the justices did not respond to letters questioning their actions, but members of Congress—who answered more directly to voters—had no such luxury. Some members wrote Warren to ask how to respond to the growing number of inquiries about the court’s actions and the demands for his removal. The chief justice characteristically declined to offer advice. Rather than answer individual letters, congressmen began to include statements of support or agreement in constituent newsletters. Representative Jim Corman of California’s Twenty-Second District termed the mail his office received as “violent.” He went on to characterize Warren as “an honest and sincere jurist. . . I find his decisions sound and exceedingly fair.” Defending Warren

²³ Claude A. Quillin to Earl Warren [EW], December 12, 1960, folder “Correspondence, General, 1960,” box 361, Earl Warren Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. [hereafter cited as Warren Papers, LC].

²⁴ Mildred B. Tortoriello to HLB, March 6, 1961; and N.J. Carden to HLB, February 14, 1961, both in folder “Communist Scare, 1961-1962,” box 24, Black Papers, LC.

came at a cost, however. Representative Edith Green of Oregon's Third District defended Warren "only to be told that I must be a communist sympathizer too." Warren thanked Green, and shrugged off "criticism of the Court [as] a price one must pay for being a member of it." He admitted frustration that "members of the judiciary must submit to criticism in silence. In these circumstances," Warren concluded, "I have comforted myself with the theory of Mark Twain that a few fleas are good for any dog."²⁵

Warren maintained a bemused public front about the impeachment crusade and also said the criticism exemplified "that we have freedom of speech in our country." He told one correspondent that the "Impeach Earl Warren" billboards made him nostalgic for his political campaigns.²⁶ The chief justice joked with a Southern law clerk that—should Warren fire the younger man—the clerk could go back home and run for governor of his state as the nominee of both parties.²⁷ When Black received a Christmas card bearing the greeting, "Let's Impeach Earl Warren," he shared it with the chief justice. "If this is the worst they ever say about me, I will consider myself fortunate," Warren replied.²⁸ The chief justice's wife initially did not share his amusement, and one incident made both Warrens believe that perhaps the campaign against him was no laughing matter.²⁹ On October 29, 1963, five days after right-wing protesters in Dallas spit on United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson and an oil executive's wife hit him with a placard, Earl and

²⁵ EW to H. Allen Smith, March 14, 1961; Jim Corman, "Washington Newsletter," February 1961, 4; Edith Green to EW, April 22, 1961; and EW to Green, April 26, 1961, all in folder "Correspondence, General, 1960," box 361, Warren Papers, LC.

²⁶ EW to Joseph Carl Thomson, June 16, 1965, folder "Correspondence, General, 1965," box 362; and EW to Ralph Brown, March 18, 1963, folder "Correspondence, General, 1963," box 361, both in Warren Papers, LC.

²⁷ Bernard Schwartz, *Super Chief: Earl Warren and His Supreme Court* (New York: New York University Press, 1983), 281.

²⁸ EW to HLB, January 29, 1962, folder "Correspondence, Hugo L. Black," box 347, Warren Papers, LC.

²⁹ Drew Pearson, "The Chief Justice," unpublished profile of Earl Warren, folder "Drew Pearson, 1968," box 6, Warren Papers, LC.

Nina Warren were met by about seventy-five picketers outside a bar association dinner honoring Warren in New York City. The protesters threw pamphlets and jeered at the couple as they entered the hall; a few ripped placards from their wooden poles and hurled them at the Warrens.³⁰

Warren smiled at the crowd as he made his way to his waiting limousine, but the demonstration confirmed the private view the chief justice had held for a few years that there were deeper, more sinister forces behind the JBS campaign against him.³¹ Warren's posthumous *Memoirs*—written when retirement had lifted the silence he had maintained during his tenure—revealed a deep bitterness over the drive to remove him. He said the JBS blamed him for “the ills of the nation, as Hitler blamed the Jews in Germany. . . . The Society needed a symbol—it chose me.”³² Yet Warren could not help but wonder how conservatives who believed so diligently in the Constitution did not believe that all Americans—whether communist or African-American—deserved equal protection. In 1964, he hung a *New Yorker* cartoon that parodied James McNeil Whistler's “Arrangement in Grey and Black No. 1,” better known as “Whistler's Mother,” in his chambers. The elderly woman held in her hands an embroidery hoop on which she had stitched “Impeach Earl Warren.” Some saw the cartoon as a joke, but it was not. The cartoon, concluded a biographer, reminded the chief justice not of the threat of removal that loomed if he did not temper his decisions and those of the court, but of the responsibility he had to people who now saw the court as a catalyst for social justice.³³

³⁰ Minutaglio and Davis, *Dallas 1963*, 243-50; Schwartz, *Super Chief*, 281-82; and “Warren: Tolerant toward Pickets,” *U.S. News & World Report*, November 11, 1963, 24.

³¹ EW to Thomas M. Storke [TMS], March 6, 1961, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC.

³² Warren, *Memoirs*, 304.

³³ Pearson, “The Chief Justice”; Kyvig, *Age of Impeachment*, 58; Schwartz, *Super Chief*, 282; and Cray, *Chief Justice*, 292.

For many conservatives, including those who joined the John Birch Society largely because of its impeachment drive, Warren was a proxy. The president who appointed him, Dwight D. Eisenhower, had retired and could no longer be held responsible for putting Warren or his chief lieutenant, Brennan, on the court. But Eisenhower and his predecessor Franklin D. Roosevelt held ignominious places in Birch teachings. Eisenhower's "modern Republicanism" that maintained and in some instances furthered the reach of the New Deal, and his liberal foreign aid packages and free trade initiatives found little support in the more conservative wing of the Republican Party.³⁴ Roosevelt, who had expanded the reach of government in unprecedented and innumerable ways to combat the effects of the Great Depression, was dead, so Americans could no longer force him to explain his Supreme Court picks—notably Black and Douglas, whom many believed continued to push a New Deal agenda by judicial fiat. While Warren remained the symbol of these judicial excesses, the whole court might shape up because of the drive to oust the chief justice. "Even though we may . . . fail, at least some real awakening should come to those who read of and hear at last of the [court's] past actions," one JBS member wrote in early 1961. "But more importantly, I should hope that it could serve as an effective way to jar Warren and his associates. . . . A 'grass-roots' hard, word-of-mouth campaign could work . . . miracles."³⁵

But criticism of Warren and his court was not confined to the grassroots. While some criticized Eisenhower for appointing Warren, the president was critical of himself for the same reason. Warren's appointment as chief justice in October 1953 was not, as some critics would later suggest, political payback for the California governor shifting his

³⁴ Steven Wagner, *Eisenhower Republicanism: Pursuing the Middle Way* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006), 4-5.

³⁵ Martha C. Deviol to JJK, February 6, 1961, folder 1, box 1, JJK Papers, UVA.

state's delegation to Eisenhower at the 1952 Republican National Convention.

Eisenhower and Warren had similarly moderate views on politics that engendered criticism from the same conservative factions. Both “were practical and largely nonideological,” Warren biographer Jim Newton noted. “Ike championed the middle way; Warren eschewed partisanship.” Political sensibilities bound the two men together, but Eisenhower genuinely liked Warren personally. As Warren entered the final year of his third term as governor in 1953, he indicated a desire to retire, and Eisenhower wanted to find a place for him in his administration—perhaps solicitor general, secretary of the interior, or a spot on the Supreme Court should one become available.³⁶

The Supreme Court appealed to Warren, and Eisenhower told him the next vacancy on the court would be his, but the president had not reckoned that the first opening of his administration would be the center chair. Eisenhower initially waffled. Warren had been a county prosecutor and California's attorney general, but he had no previous judicial experience, a résumé deficiency he shared with six of his fifteen predecessors, including John Jay, John Marshall and Roger B. Taney.³⁷ After the September 1953, death of Chief Justice Frederick M. Vinson, Warren pushed the president to fulfill his promise. “The first vacancy,” Warren told Attorney General Herbert Brownell, “means the first vacancy.” Brownell repeated his conversation with Warren to Eisenhower and told the president, “We're stuck with him, I guess.”³⁸

³⁶ G. Edward White, *Earl Warren: A Public Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 138); Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Mandate for Change: The White House Years* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963), 228; Cray, *Chief Justice*, 24; and Jim Newton, *Eisenhower: The White House Years* (New York: Doubleday, 2011), 113. See also Newton, *Justice for All*, 5-7.

³⁷ Two others, Charles Evans Hughes and Harlan Fiske Stone, joined the Supreme Court as associate justices with no previous judicial experience, but were later elevated to chief. Arthur J. Sabin, *In Calmer Times: The Supreme Court and Red Monday* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 109.

³⁸ Newton, *A Justice for All*, 9.

The new chief justice's more progressive tendencies—those same characteristics that led President Harry S. Truman to quip that Warren was a Democrat “and didn't know it”—worried the president in the early months of Warren's tenure.³⁹ Warren joined a Supreme Court bitterly divided on the issue of civil rights. Unanimity on school desegregation and a host of other topics had eluded Vinson, whose tenure as chief justice saw a rise in factionalism among the justices and a decline in the public's perception of the court.⁴⁰ Warren's proven record of finding compromise through affability, while solid attributes in a chief justice, perplexed Eisenhower. The court might force the country in a direction in which it was not ready to go on civil rights, and the court's unanimous *Brown v. Board of Education* decision striking down school segregation in May 1954, confirmed the president's worst fears.⁴¹ Relations between the chief justice and Eisenhower cooled after *Brown*, and as the liberal direction of the court took shape, their association devolved into pleasantries and little else. Eisenhower was said to remark years later that the “biggest damn fool mistake” he made was appointing Warren to the court.⁴²

The *Brown* decision overturned a half century of Jim Crow segregation in public education and laid the groundwork for other decisions over the coming decade that would further loosen segregation's grip on areas such as public housing and transportation. A year after *Brown*, a second unanimous decision ordered governments in states where segregation persisted to integrate “with all deliberate speed.” While Eisenhower endorsed an almost-painfully slow civil rights agenda and Southern Democrats in Congress

³⁹ Oral history interview with Chief Justice Earl Warren, May 11, 1972, interview by Jerry N. Hess. Transcript at www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/warren.html.

⁴⁰ On Vinson and his tenure as chief justice, see James E. St. Clair, and Linda C. Gugin, *Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson of Kentucky: A Political Biography* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002); and Richard Kluger, *Simple Justice* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976), 584-91.

⁴¹ *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

⁴² Newton, *A Justice for All*, 328; and Jennifer A. Delton, *Rethinking the 1950s: How Anticommunism and the Cold War Made America Liberal* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 114.

remained recalcitrant, the court pushed forward as criticism rose that Warren and his colleagues were acting as legislators rather than jurists. Others saw the court's actions as governed by more shadowy forces and linked its desegregation rulings to communist influence on the justices; indeed, the entire Civil Rights Movement was a communist ploy to destroy American democracy through integration. Critics pointed to the justices' use of social sciences in justifying the *Brown* decision; that those works had been produced by purported socialists or unquestioned leftists only demonstrated the depth of the conspiracy of which the Supreme Court was a vital and willing participant. That the Communist Party had recruited few African Americans after the Second World War and had made few inroads into the growing Civil Rights Movement mattered little to these conspirative souls who had no doubt that the Supreme Court was capitulating to communists.⁴³

Several decisions in the 1957 term deepened the reddish pall critics saw over the Supreme Court's white marble temple and made them wistful for the days before Warren ascended to the bench. Earlier in the decade, in *Dennis v. United States*, the Vinson Court had, in the name of national security, legitimized the anticommunist crusades of the Justice Department and the FBI.⁴⁴ The Smith Act criminalized plotting to overthrow the United States government, which prosecutors said was the ultimate goal of membership in the Communist Party. With the sanction of the Supreme Court, the government

⁴³ *Brown v. Board of Education II*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955). On the *Brown* decisions, see Kluger, *Simple Justice*; Peter Irons, *Jim Crow's Children: The Broken Promise of the Brown Decision* (New York: Viking, 2002); James T. Patterson, *Brown v. Board of Education: A Civil Rights Milestone and Its Troubled Legacy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Michael J. Klarman, *From Jim Crow to Civil Rights: The Supreme Court and the Struggle for Racial Equality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), especially chapter 7; Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle, Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), 54-55; and Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 107-114.

⁴⁴ *Dennis v. United States*, 341 U.S. 494 (1951).

prosecuted more than 200 party members, and for all intents and purposes, the *Dennis* ruling outlawed the Communist Party in the United States.⁴⁵

As the decade progressed, the rulings of a reconstituted court with Warren now at the helm as Vinson's successor gave government agencies and anticommunists a reason to cry havoc. In addition to Warren's appointment, John Marshall Harlan II replaced Harold Burton, a Truman appointee, on the court, and two conservative, Roosevelt-appointed justices, Sherman Minton and Stanley Reed, were replaced by Eisenhower appointees Brennan and Charles Whittaker, respectively. All of the departed justices had voted with the majority in *Dennis*; the two dissenters, Black and Douglas, remained on the court and still believed the First Amendment guaranteed the freedom of associate even with communists.⁴⁶ More had changed than just the court's composition, however. Although initially inclined to uphold the government in cases questioning its anti-subversive activities, by his second term as chief justice, Warren began to fear that the government posed a greater threat to the nation's citizens than communism did. As California's governor, he had pushed for employees of the state's university system to sign an oath declaring their loyalty to the United States, yet he never considered those who declined subversives. The distinction between actual communists and those who valued academic freedom remained with Warren. Loyalty to one did not mean disloyalty to the nation as a whole, nor did he think patriotism trumped all other values. Indeed, he believed patriotism a convenient excuse for many in power to curtail individual freedoms in the name of national security. Warren's record on civil liberties would forever be

⁴⁵ The Smith Act is the colloquial name for the Alien Registration Act of 1940, 76th Cong., 3rd session, ch. 439, 54 Stat. 670, 18 U.S.C. § 2385. On the effects of the Smith Act, see Michal R. Belknap, *Cold War Political Justice: The Smith Act, the Communist Party and American Civil Liberties* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1977), 189-93, 280-81.

⁴⁶ Sabin, *In Calmer Times*, 108.

blighted by his actions as California's attorney general, when, in the early days of the Second World War, he ordered the relocation and internment of Japanese-Americans. While he later said he regretted the action, he added "I consoled myself with the thought that [removal] was occasioned by my obligation to keep the security of the state." As chief justice, however, he emphasized that in the absence of declared war, government had a far less compelling interest to restrict expressions of ideology and free thought. As he watched the actions of Senator Joseph McCarthy and those of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he began to see his role as extending constitutional rights to those who would otherwise have no refuge from persecution.⁴⁷ Writing in *Fortune* magazine in 1955, Warren decried hysteria, whether aimed at a particular race or a political philosophy. The Constitution, "exists for the individual as well as for the nation. . . . In the present struggle between our world and communism, the temptation to initiate totalitarian security methods is a subtle temptation that must be resisted day to day, for it will be with us as long as totalitarianism."⁴⁸

Changes in the court's membership allowed Warren lobby his colleagues to put these sentiments into action. Between the 1955 and 1957 terms, it became obvious to critics that changes were afoot in the court's direction as it chipped away at anticommunist prosecutions on the state and federal levels. The court issued fifteen rulings in a fifteen-month period that protected the criminal rights of alleged communists and restricted methods used by federal investigators to uncover communist subversion.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Warren, *Memoirs*, 149; White, *Earl Warren*, 126-28; Sabin, *In Calmer Times*, 124; and Christine L. Compston, *Earl Warren: Justice for All* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 55-56.

⁴⁸ Earl Warren, "Law and the Future," *Fortune*, November 1955, 107-108.

⁴⁹ The cases included *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*; *Pennsylvania v. Nelson*; *Cole v. Young*; *Slochower v. Board of Education of New York*; *United States v. Witkovich*; *Schwere v. Board of Examiners of New Mexico*; *Konigsberg v. State Bar of California*; *Jencks v. United States*; *Raley, Stern, and Brown v. Ohio*; *Flaxner v. United States*; *Sacher v. United States*; *Watkins v. United States*;

Jencks v. United States required that the Federal Bureau of Investigation open its files when evidence in them might be used to defend suspected communists.⁵⁰ Eisenhower, Attorney General Brownell and FBI director J. Edgar Hoover denounced the court's actions; other court critics cited the opinion of the sole dissenter, Justice Tom C. Clark, who said the ruling gave communists "a Roman Holiday for rummaging through confidential information as well as vital national secrets."⁵¹ But for those like Hoover who fixated on and often exaggerated the communist threat, the worst was yet to come. In four separate rulings issued Monday, June 17, 1957, the court severely limited federal and state investigatory power into communist organizations, and, as one historian noted, "put a legal nail in the coffin of McCarthyism."⁵²

For critics, the four decisions handed down the day that Hoover labelled "Red Monday" deepened the court's complicity in the communist conspiracy. *Yates v. United States* overturned the Smith Act convictions of fourteen Communist Party leaders and extended First Amendment protections to radical speech. *Watkins v. United States* limited HUAC's ability to require witnesses who professed links to the Communist Party to name associates. *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* protected the right of professors to discuss communism with their students, and *Service v. Dulles* protected federal employees from dismissal without definitive proof of disloyalty.⁵³ Collectively, the cases made government-led ideological persecutions more difficult, but they did little to quell anticommunist hysteria. If anything, by delegitimizing official anticommunist efforts, the

Sweezy v. New Hampshire; *Service v. Dulles*; and *Yates v. United States*. See Richard L. Stout, "The Dynamic New Role of the Supreme Court," *Christian Science Monitor*, September 26, 1957.

⁵⁰ *Jencks v. United States*, 353 U.S. 657 (1957).

⁵¹ Tom C. Clark, dissent in *Jencks v. United States*, 681-82.

⁵² Scott Martelle, *The Fear Within: Spies, Commies, and American Democracy on Trial* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2011), 251.

⁵³ *Yates v. United States*, 354 U.S. 298 (1957); *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178 (1957); *Sweezy v. New Hampshire*, 354 U.S. 234 (1957); and *Service v. Dulles*, 354 U.S. 363 (1957).

decisions spawned grassroots activities against the court that hysterically placed the justices at the center of a global communist plot. What would result from such fear, in the heated Cold War climate, was anyone's guess. A Montana newspaper warned: "It is such conditions as these, where the courts make so many rules that justice is unable to function because of the maze in which it is caught, that leads to vigilante organizations and lynching parties because the public must protect itself from the criminal element."⁵⁴ Within days of the "Red Monday" decisions, the nation's newspapers featured letters demanding the court's impeachment, and the *New York Daily News* printed a story recalling failed impeachment proceedings against Justice Samuel Chase in 1805. "So, Chase got away with his misconduct. But the fact remains that Congress finally called him on it, and his impeachment made him a sadder, wiser and more cautious man." The newspaper concluded: "It seems unnecessary to point out the moral of all this to present-day Americans." Indeed, the justices themselves could not escape public threats of recrimination. "What is wrong with our so-called Supreme Court?" a resident of Tyler, Texas, asked Black in a telegram. "Answer is we need a new Supreme Court."⁵⁵

Something—anything—had to be done. While members of Congress began to openly discuss impeachment proceedings against the court, others suggested ways to curb the justices' power. Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi, whose animus toward Warren began with the *Brown* decision and never abated, proposed a constitutional amendment that would require the Senate to reconfirm justices every four years rather than allowing them to serve for life without assessments of their performances. Eastland

⁵⁴ "Will the Vigilantes Return?" *Livingston (Montana) Enterprise*, November 30, 1957, in Supreme Court, FBI file no. 62-27585, part 16, available at <http://vault.fbi.gov/supreme-court>.

⁵⁵ "Views on High Bench," *Washington Star*, July 1, 1957; "A Trial to Remember: Samuel Chase," *New York Daily News*, September 3, 1957; and W.B. Gray to HLB, June 19, 1957, folder "October term 1957—*Yates v. U.S.*," box 334, Black Papers, LC.

later suggested—in an argument repeated continuously by anti-court advocates—that six Supreme Court justices had voted more than half of the time in support of communist defendants. What formula he used to determine that was not clear, but it mattered little to those who ascribed wholeheartedly to the notion that the court was dangerous.⁵⁶ Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina pushed for the wholesale impeachment of the court, and several House members also proposed scrapping the entire bench and starting anew.⁵⁷ “Who is exerting influence on members of the Supreme Court?” asked Representative George Andrews of Alabama. “How many left-wing and red-bossed legal experts have been planted on the staff of the Court? How many of the men who actually write the opinions of the judges have communist leanings of hold membership in the party?”⁵⁸ The FBI began looking into the background of Supreme Court law clerks, while one letter writer suggested the bureau investigate whether communists had slipped the justices tranquilizers.⁵⁹

Criticism came from within the legal community as well. Clarence Manion, dean of the Notre Dame law school and future founding member of the John Birch Society, said in a nationwide radio broadcast that the court’s “strictest construction of

⁵⁶ “High Court Scored in Senate and House,” *NYT*, June 25, 1957; and Congress, Senate, James O. Eastland, “Supreme Court Decisions in Passport Cases,” 85th Cong., 2nd sess., *Congressional Record* 104, pt. 10 (July 10, 1958): 13335-13344. The six justices were Black (100 percent); Douglas (95 percent); Warren (92 percent); Brennan (90 percent); Felix Frankfurter (77 percent); and John M. Harlan (58 percent).

⁵⁷ Kyvig, *Age of Impeachment*, 33-34.

⁵⁸ “Cong. Andrews Threatens Impeachment Proceedings against Supreme Court,” *Union Springs (Ala.) Herald*, July 4, 1957, in Supreme Court, FBI file no. 62-27585, part 13, available at <http://vault.fbi.gov/supreme-court>.

⁵⁹ Memorandum from R.R. Roach to A.H. Belmont, October 16, 1957, “United States Supreme Court Law Clerks;” and [redacted] to J. Edgar Hoover, September 25, 1957, “Tranquilizers—A Valuable Weapon in Chemical Warfare,” both in Supreme Court, FBI file no. 62-27585, part 3, available at <http://vault.fbi.gov/supreme-court>. On suspicions of law clerks’ influences on justices, see Todd C. Peppers, *Courtiers of the Marble Palace: The Rise and Influence of the Supreme Court Law Clerk* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), 2-6.

constitutional safeguards is reserved for communists and communist sympathizers.”⁶⁰

The president of the National Association of Attorneys General said the court’s decisions “set the United States back twenty-five years in its attempt to make certain that those loyal to a foreign power cannot create another Trojan horse here.”⁶¹ When the head of the American Bar Association’s anticommunism committee suggested that Congress “gird our country in defense of communist infiltration and aggression” and introduce legislation that would counteract the Supreme Court’s rulings, Warren quietly resigned from the ABA.⁶² Even a former member of the court decried its actions. Retired Justice Stanley Reed, who left the bench in early 1957, reminded a California law conference audience that Congress could—and should—countermand the court’s actions legislatively if its decisions were “wrong.”⁶³

The criticism of the court continued into the next year, and 1958 marked the beginning of an intensified period of reproach that would culminate with the start of the John Birch Society’s impeachment drive against Warren three years later. In early 1958, Eastland, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and Senator William E. Jenner of Indiana held a series of public hearings in which members of patriotic groups—but no constitutional scholars—testified about the implications of the court’s “pro-communist” rulings. The previous year, Jenner had introduced a bill that would limit the court’s jurisdiction in cases dealing with national security. The measure and a similar one he later sponsored failed, but Jenner discovered there was little political fallout for standing

⁶⁰ “Red Dangers Seen in High Court Rulings,” *Chicago Tribune*, August 12, 1957.

⁶¹ Louis C. Wyman, “What Two Critics Say about Court’s Rulings on Reds,” *U.S. News & World Report*, August 9, 1957, 114.

⁶² Herbert R. O’Connor, “Supreme Court Rulings Criticized by Bar Association Committee,” *U.S. News & World Report*, August 14, 1957, 139; and Schwartz, *Super Chief*, 283-85

⁶³ Stanley F. Reed, “Supreme Court Decisions Are Not Always the Last Word,” *U.S. News & World Report*, October 11, 1957, 118.

firm against communists and their allies on the Supreme Court. He received a letter from a South Carolina woman praising his efforts to curb the court's power. "It is the enemy within," she wrote. "It is a far greater menace to this Republic, our traditional liberties and our national security than our moral enemy, Communist Russia, whose interests it serves so faithfully. . . . It is the United States Subversive Court—not the United States Supreme Court."⁶⁴ Regardless of congressional failure to do more than grandstand and fume about the court's actions, each new utterance from detractors added to a growing literature that fueled grassroots critics' demands for either removing the justices or stripping them of their power.

The first five years of Warren's tenure as chief justice provided the court's critics with plenty of ammunition, and grassroots detractors looked to official—and more than a few unofficial—sources to provide fodder for their outrage. Copies of the *Congressional Record*, from which some members of Congress pulled their own anti-court statements and distributed to constituents in pamphlet form, made the rounds among the disparate patriotic groups that saw the court as an impediment to capitalism, limited government, and national security. Regardless of the group, which by 1958 came to include organizations with names such as the Defenders of the American Constitution, the Christian Nationalist Crusade, the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, and the Women's Patriotic Conference, newsletters, pamphlets, clippings from conservative commentators' columns, and statements by myriad critics were a unifying and edifying factor. If impeachment was a far-fetched goal, educating the public about the court's role in the American system of government

⁶⁴ Cray, *Chief Justice*, 349-50; William E. Jenner, "Court Has Challenged the Authority of Congress," *U.S. News & World Report*, August 9, 1957, 115; and Edith Dickey Moses to Jenner, June 13, 1957, folder "October term 1957—*Yates v. U.S.*," box 334, Black Papers, LC.

and sharing information, whether faulty or biased or just plain wrong, was a far greater result of the growing conservative dissatisfaction with the Supreme Court's actions. As more terms passed, and as the court ruled on cases limiting school prayer, enforcing integration, relaxing restrictions on pornography, implementing reapportionment, and insisting that the Constitution guaranteed a right to privacy, this literature grew alongside conservatives' ire.⁶⁵

By the time the John Birch Society launched its impeachment drive in 1961, Welch pointed his members to eight years of documentation he said would illustrate the court's subversion. The JBS placed many of these publications in its public reading rooms and recommended them on the society's approved reading list. Welch considered the most essential entry on his list to be the Constitution, which he demanded members "read and reread." Doing so "will enable you to make a monkey out of anyone spouting either part of the current Liberal line that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is, or that a Supreme Court decision is necessarily the law of the land." Also included on the society's list were a ten-part series that appeared in *Human Events*, articles from the *National Review*, a six-part editorial series from the *Indianapolis Star*, publications of the American Legion and transcripts from Clarence Manion's weekly "Manion Forum Network" radio broadcasts.⁶⁶ Broadcasts by Manion, who was among the JBS' founding members, were particularly important to disseminating JBS ideals and countering what Welch perceived as a media conspiracy against the organization. So, too were radio reports by retired FBI agent Dan Smoot, who, although not a JBS member, aligned his

⁶⁵ "Group Seeks to Impeach High Court," *Washington Post*, February 9, 1959; Cray, *Chief Justice*, 350; and Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, Committee on the Judiciary, "Limitation of Appellate Jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court," part 2, 85th Cong., 2nd sess., (1958), 151-55, 229, 301, 531.

⁶⁶ *JBS Bulletin*, supplement for February 1961, 2-5.

anticommunist and anti-Supreme Court pronouncements closely with the group's principles. Welch placed a two-part series Smoot published in his newsletter among the titles he recommended members read. Copies of Smoot's report made their way into the chambers of several Supreme Court justices as did copies of anticommunist New Orleans publisher Kent Courtney's pamphlet "Tax Fax for Americans" that listed the justices' purported pro-communist voting records.⁶⁷

In 1958, Rosalie M. Gordon published *Nine Men against America*. The book codified the right's complaints against the Warren Court and served as the basis for the grassroots criticism that would come later, including from the JBS. Gordon was conservative author John T. Flynn's secretary for three decades before starting her own career as a commentator. Flynn's writings on socialism's global threat and the erosion of the federal-state relationship in the United States found an audience among conservatives, and the JBS placed his books on its recommended reading list.⁶⁸ Gordon's earlier writings critical of the United Nations, the state of American education, and American-Soviet peace conferences similarly resonated with the political right.⁶⁹ Her *Nine Men against America* catalogued conservative arguments about the overreaching role the

⁶⁷ On Clarence Manion and Dan Smoot, see Heather Hendershot, *What's Fair on the Air? Cold War Right Wing Broadcasting and the Public Interest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 35, 58, 65-101, 154; *The Dan Smoot Report*, January 30 and February 6, 1961, both in folder "Communist Scare, 1961-62," box 24, Black Papers, LC. Also included in the Black Papers are two copies of Courtney's "Tax-Fax for Americans," which excerpted in pamphlet form articles from his anticommunist, segregationist *Independent American* newspaper. Despite being phrased in question form, the titles—"On Whose Side is the Supreme Court?" and "Impeach Earl Warren?"—leave little doubt of Courtney's views of the Supreme Court.

⁶⁸ John E. Moser, *Right Turn: John T. Flynn and the Transformation of American Liberalism* (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 9, 14, 195-96, 200; and Nash, *Conservative Intellectual Movement*, 14, 18, 20.

⁶⁹ Rosalie Gordon, "NEA's Phony Box Score on the United Nations," *American Mercury*, October 1955, 117-20; Gordon, *What's Happened to Our Schools?* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: America's Future, 1956); and Gordon, *How the Reds Won: The Lesson behind American-Soviet Parleys* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: America's Future, Inc, 1959). See also Jack Nelson and Gene Roberts Jr., *The Censors and the Schools* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1963), 10.

Supreme Court had assumed in American life, and she too found a place in the JBS' library of recommended sources.

Readers who had studied the individual attacks on the Supreme Court over the preceding five years found little new in *Nine Men against America*. The importance of Gordon's book was that it catalogued for the first time in one volume the Warren Court's impeachable sins. It charged Eisenhower's Supreme Court appointees—particularly Warren and Brennan—with “solicitude for communists and criminals” and insisted the court's desegregation and internal security decisions were in lockstep with communism's ultimate goal to collectivize American society. The desegregation rulings gave “the socialist revolutionaries in America . . . what they want—the opening wedge for complete control of education by the central government.” The 1957 “Red Monday” decisions had, under the guise of civil liberties, emboldened communists and endangered the nation. “Hardly a week went by during the spring 1957 session . . . that a new crack was not hammered into the wall we had raised against the communist conspiracy,” Gordon lamented. “Through these cracks, the communist termites are now happily swarming.”⁷⁰

Gordon ended her indictment with a call to action. She repeated the many failed proposals made by members of Congress and commentators to limit justices' terms; to evaluate their performances before reconfirmation; to require members of the court to have a decade of judicial experience; and to strip the president of the power to appoint all federal judges, including Supreme Court members. To protect the Constitution, Gordon ironically encouraged citizens to advocate radical alterations to the document. Yet “the overwhelming urgency” of the communist threat required action. “You can sit back in

⁷⁰ Rosalie M. Gordon, *Nine Men against America* (New York: The Devin-Adair Co., 1958), 89, 125, 132, 143-44.

complacent despair and say: ‘Oh, what’s the use. Congress pays no attention to what we want,’” she chided. “If you do, you have no one to blame but yourself if the Supreme Court continues to ride roughshod over your liberties.” She concluded: “But if you and enough other Americans demand that Congress rescue from the nine usurpers on the bench the tattered charter of freedom, repair it, and restore it to the people, you will be amazed at how quickly the demand will bring action.”⁷¹

Nine Men against America was the blueprint for the John Birch Society’s drive against Warren, although the book stopped short an explicit demand for the court’s removal. “The impeachment process . . . is a long, difficult, and cumbersome one,” Gordon explained. “Yet it is well for us to remember that it is there.”⁷² For much of the conservative community, the difficulty in impeachment precluded its use. Even senators like Thurmond and Eastland, who regularly beat the drum for punishing the court for its desegregation and national security decisions, admitted removal was unlikely. Yet for members of the John Birch Society, improbability only fueled their determination; the struggle would make victory all the more sweet. Naysayers realized their resolve early in the JBS’ impeachment drive. When conservative syndicated columnist George Sokolsky doubted—correctly as it turned out—that a grassroots movement to impeach Warren could succeed, Welch instructed his growing membership to inundate the writer with appeals for him to reconsider. “No matter what can be said about Earl Warren,” Sokolsky wrote, “it cannot be said that he has been corrupt . . . or that he has been subversive. . . . Therefore, to talk of impeachment is nonsense.”⁷³ Welch dismissed the columnist’s lecture as a “complete and blatant distortion” of the impeachment movement and

⁷¹ Ibid., 147-49, 157-59.

⁷² Ibid., 148.

⁷³ George E. Sokolsky, “Jumping Jupiter!” *Washington Post*, January 14, 1961.

countered that the movement could “snowball to the point where it showed the real sentiments of a majority of the American people in an unmistakable fashion.”⁷⁴

Sokolsky’s contempt for the impeachment drive puzzled Welch. Friends called the columnist “the high priest of anti-Communism,” and he became known in the 1950s for his ardent defense of Senator Joseph McCarthy.⁷⁵ After the Supreme Court’s “Red Monday” decisions in 1957, Sokolsky said in a radio broadcast that the rulings “can only lead to anarchy” because “they imperil the United States.” Sokolsky considered the court “a political rather than a judicial organ of government.”⁷⁶ But Sokolsky’s column was an attack on the JBS’s impeachment crusade, not a reversal of his previous criticism of the court; Welch did not see it that way at all and told his membership to work to change the columnist’s mind. “We need George Sokolsky on our side in this particular fight,” Welch conceded. “And we think all it will take to win him as an active supporter will be to prove that we are not just a few excited people with an ‘angry fancy,’ making a futile gesture.”⁷⁷

Between his syndicated column and weekly radio commentary, Sokolsky’s views reached millions of Americans weekly. Facing a dearth of press support from much of the nation’s media, Welch and the JBS could not abide a conservative columnist’s dismissal of the organization’s signature campaign, particularly when it was designed to gain the group support and the spotlight. By 1961, James Jackson Kilpatrick, the segregationist editor of the *Richmond (Va.) News-Leader*, had built a regional following for his columns

⁷⁴ JBS *Bulletin*, supplement for February 1961, 7.

⁷⁵ “George Sokolsky, Columnist, Dies,” *NYT*, December 14, 1962; and “Man in the Middle,” *Time*, May 24, 1954, 44.

⁷⁶ George Sokolsky, “Civil Rights and the Supreme Court,” American Broadcasting Company, September 1, 1957, transcript in Supreme Court, FBI file no. 62-27585, part 15, available at <http://vault.fbi.gov/supreme-court>.

⁷⁷ JBS *Bulletin*, supplement for February 1961, 9-10.

and editorials resurrecting the doctrine of interposition to resist the Supreme Court's mandate to integrate Southern schools.⁷⁸ While his reach was smaller than Sokolsky's, Welch similarly considered his support vital to the JBS' impeachment drive. Kilpatrick was a logical recruit. He believed the Warren Court, in the *Brown* decision and numerous others, intended to restrict the power of state governments to regulate their educational systems or investigate the communist threat. The doctrine of interposition was an historical declaration of the power of states to nullify federal actions as they saw fit; suggested first by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison in their Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions, it had been John C. Calhoun's argument to disregard federal tariffs in South Carolina in the 1830s. Although the Civil War had altered forever the relationship between the states and the federal government, Kilpatrick believed interposition right and courts wrong.⁷⁹ "In a fit of wishful thinking," one historian wrote, Kilpatrick, "simply ignored the impact of the Civil War."⁸⁰ His outrage over the Supreme Court's rulings made him a voice against integration but appealed to the emerging conservative movement. Welch wanted his support.

Welch placed Kilpatrick's dissertation on the doctrine of interposition, *The Sovereign States*, on the JBS' recommended reading list. The book railed against the

⁷⁸ "Speaking from the South," *Newsweek*, January 2, 1961, 48-49.

⁷⁹ J. Harvie Wilkinson, *Harry Byrd and the Changing Face of Virginia Politics, 1945-1966* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1968), 140. On Kilpatrick's resurrection of interposition, see Nancy MacLean, *Freedom is Not Enough: The Opening of the American Workplace* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 45-46; Nash, *Conservative Intellectual Movement*, 201-202; Benjamin Muse, *Virginia's Massive Resistance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961), 20-21, 96-97; and Joseph J. Thorndike, "'The Sometimes Sordid Level of Race and Segregation': James J. Kilpatrick and the Virginia Campaign against *Brown*," in Matthew D. Lassiter and Andrew B. Lewis, ed., *The Moderates' Dilemma: Massive Resistance to School Desegregation in Virginia* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998), 51-71. On Kilpatrick, see Garrett Epps, "The Littlest Rebel: James J. Kilpatrick and the Second Civil War," *Constitutional Commentary* 10 (Winter 1993): 19-36; and David L. Chappell, "The Divided Mind of Southern Segregationists," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 82 (Spring 1998): 45-72.

⁸⁰ James E. Ryan, *Five Miles Away, A World Apart: One City, Two Schools, and the Story of Educational Opportunity in Modern America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 40.

court's "usurpations" and the "deification of the federal government and the steady stultification of the states." Government, he argued, "was less evil when it is closest to the people."⁸¹ Such conclusions might have come directly from the JBS' *Blue Book*, and the society's hierarchy praised Kilpatrick's interposition stance as "courageous" and "thrilling." Clarence Manion, a founding member of the society's national council, told his nationwide radio audience that the editor's views counterattacked the "federal invasion of the long standing constitutional prerogative" of state autonomy. Kilpatrick was not a member of the JBS, but his views and associations with many of the JBS leadership made him, if nothing else, a very close relative.⁸² Although praise from Birch leaders like Manion and Welch certainly widened his audience and his reputation as a leader of the emergent conservative movement, Kilpatrick, like Sokolsky, would not lend his support to the group's signature program.

Welch was determined to show through sheer volume his organization's resolve. At the same time he urged members to write Sokolsky for support, he told them to send similar letters to Kilpatrick.⁸³ Kilpatrick considered the society something of a punch line—he called them "idiots" and their Warren impeachment campaign "hairbrained"—until bags and bags of letters appeared for more than three months at his Richmond office. "By God," he exclaimed to William F. Buckley Jr., publisher of the *National Review* to which Kilpatrick was a contributor, "the first 20 or 30 I answered. . . . The next 100 we answered with a mimeographed reply. The next 400 we simply filed. I am not

⁸¹ James Jackson Kilpatrick, *The Sovereign States: Notes of a Citizen of Virginia* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1957), ix, 280-81, 304-305.

⁸² Manion, quoted in William P. Hustwit, *James J. Kilpatrick: Salesman for Segregation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 75-76, 242 (n. 46). See also Hustwit, "From Caste to Color Blindness: James J. Kilpatrick's Segregationist Semantics," *Journal of Southern History* 77 (August 2011): 639-66.

⁸³ JBS *Bulletin*, supplement for February 1961, 10.

even sure my Girl Friday is opening the damned things now. This has been the most incredibly disciplined pressure group ever to come my way, and we are frankly a little stunned by it.”⁸⁴ But Kilpatrick would not support the movement, even though his writings had helped inspire it.

Kilpatrick’s writings against the court had helped fuel conservative resentment of the justices’ rulings. Now, as he faced a grassroots push to remove Warren, the most he would do, he told one JBS member, was not denounce as futile the Warren impeachment drive as Sokolsky had. Kilpatrick admitted the effort, despite its impracticality, might serve some useful purpose. “I doubt if any editor in the country has been more critical of Warren than I have been these past six or seven years,” he told one correspondent. “He was a miserable choice for the court, and I wish very much that he would get off it. I don’t believe the society’s effort to impeach Warren will get anywhere, and it may succeed only in getting his back up—he is a stubborn man—so that he will not retire any time soon. But the venture obviously provides an escape valve for some deeply held feelings about the court.” To another, Kilpatrick wrote, “There may be a certain value in badgering this old fathead just for the sake of badgering him.”⁸⁵

While the letters Kilpatrick received burdened him and his office staff in 1961, they revealed anxiety and anger over the implications of the Warren Court’s actions, and an urgent desire to do something—anything—to counter them. The letters voiced the concerns of average in a way that no billboard or banner could; they also demonstrated people’s willingness to admit JBS membership, which contradicted claims by critics that

⁸⁴ JJK to William F. Buckley Jr., March 27, 1961, folder 1, box 6, James J. Kilpatrick Papers, MSS 6626-b, Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville.

⁸⁵ JJK to James Drummey Jr., February 3, 1961; and JJK to Mrs. H.B. Canfield, February 6, 1961, both in folder 1, box 1, Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia.

the organization operated in various levels of secrecy. Some offered patriotic justifications for advocating Warren's removal. "I intend to take the long march to Washington and unpack the Supreme Court by the method given to me by the Constitution," one letter writer stated. "I will march with other soldiers and cut the enemy supply lines by impeaching the Chief Justice. . . . I am going to leave Valley Forge behind and strike a blow at foreign mercenaries." In addition to militaristic fervor, the letters revealed a deep civic understanding and Constitutional knowledge, but also the conspiratorial thought that scholars have historically highlighted in their studies of the JBS. "We are losing, sir," wrote one. "Our Supreme Court is now in a state of paralysis heading for the ultimate Soviet Global Conquest." Others were more reasonable in their motivations and in estimating their chances of success. "The more I dig into this Warren mess, the more I feel we have a chance. Believe me, we are not naïve enough to think this is an easy task. Most of us know what is in store, but with the good Lord's help and Mr. Warren's record, we, at least, have a fighting chance."⁸⁶

Repeating the arguments posed by the anti-court literature circulated during much of the preceding decade, these grassroots critics displayed an enthusiasm for their improbable task that even a naysayer like Kilpatrick could not deny or ignore. "No cause is hopeless if it is right," one correspondent concluded. Wrote a couple from Houston: "If we don't succeed, we feel that when it's all over, he'll know he's been under siege, and perhaps conduct himself accordingly. . . . For our country, we've got to succeed." A veterinarian in South Carolina wrote to Kilpatrick and noted it was after 2 a.m. He had been awake since the previous morning. "I have the interest and the willingness to spend

⁸⁶ Martin Verries to JJK, February 6, 1961, folder 1, box 1; Virginia Wesley to GS, March 2, 1961, folder 5, box 1; and Ray Watkins to GS, February 8, 1961, folder 1, box 1, all in Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia.

late hours doing my John Birch homework,” he explained. “Our effort is growing daily—no hourly—and we will succeed!” He continued: “You will hear from many people who work harder than I and have less, but all are willing and able and want to see Earl Warren impeached—for the sake of the United States of America, not for the sake of our personal selves.”⁸⁷

To these letter writers, the campaign to impeach Warren was at once an act of patriotism, a response to a national emergency, an alarm to awaken fellow citizens, and a movement to correct a mistake in placing Warren on the bench in the first place. Martial imagery was common. “What the founders gave to us, we MUST defend,” insisted one. “The enemy within is more dangerous [than] the enemy without.” The Warren Court had placed the country, “almost within the cruel grasp of arch fiends,” wrote one woman who said she was writing all members of Congress to “to save America for God and children.” She concluded: “We do not have too much time as the hour is late. We do not have too much help as our beloved people have been brainwashed and misled and are helping the enemy unintentionally.” A Nashville attorney described impeachment as a revolution. “When the Executive and the Judicial branches of government become partners in a conspiracy to subjugate the only voice that the people have—the Legislative—then the people themselves are the only power left to restore the proper balance.” It was a characterization repeated by letter writers time and again. The country, wrote one, was engaged in “World War III,” while another concluded: “It is now a battle to the death.”⁸⁸

⁸⁷ Joseph Bourg to JJK, undated; Mr. and Mrs. H.K. Mead, February 6, 1961; and C.J. Maddox to JJK, February 3, 1961, all in folder 1, box 1, Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia.

⁸⁸ Harold R. Collins to JJK, February 2, 1961, folder 1, box 1; Mrs. Mildred Barton to JJK, undated, folder 2, box 1; William F. Burton, Jr., to GS, February 22, 1961, folder 2, box 1; William O. White to GS, March 13, 1961, folder 5, box 1; and Ida L. Padelford to JJK, March 2, 1961, folder 5, box 1, all in Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia.

Letter writers' arguments about Warren's fitness or constitutional doctrines often devolved into name calling, the sort of misplaced effort Kilpatrick had worried the JBS' impeachment campaign would inspire. One letter described the chief justice as a "prostitute." Another portrayed Warren as "the quarterback or field general for that infamous conspiracy which openly threatens our destruction. Sure, he may not be an actual communist, but he serves their cause and purpose better than a dedicated card carrier." He was "anti-American," concluded another, while one man described the chief justice "a treasonous and traitorous individual," for whom the best "method of removal would be HANGING!" Warren, concluded another writer, was among the "fools and incompetents who have [led] this country . . . from one Cold War disaster to another. To give such a fool the power Warren has is like placing an alcoholic in command of an aircraft carrier."⁸⁹ Kilpatrick thought such characterizations were counterproductive, a view he shared with some in the JBS hierarchy who worried by the end of 1961 that the impeachment campaign was a distraction. While the attention the campaign drew had infused the organization's ranks with new members, a backlash from the media and the public had damaged its reputation. "Since the drive to impeach Earl Warren has met with so much resistance, criticism and ridicule," wrote national council member Granville Knight in September, "shall we soft pedal this drive or stop it altogether?" Welch replied that had no intention of backing down. Neither did his detractors.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ H.J. Sbiski to GS, March 11, 1961, folder 5, box 1; Edgar S. Anderson to GS, March 10, 1961, folder 2, box 1; George Richardson to GS, February 18, 1961, folder 3, box 1; and Vera Tudor to GS, February 12, 1961, folder 3, box 1; and Thomas J. Mullen, Jr., to GS, March 15, 1961, folder 5, box 1, all in Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia.

⁹⁰ JJK, form letter to respond to JBS members, undated, folder 1, box 1, Kilpatrick Papers, Virginia; and Granville Knight to Fred C. Koch, September 5, 1961, folder 2 "John Birch Society," box 1, T. Coleman Andrews Papers, Collection 119, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene.

While letters overwhelmed Kilpatrick in Virginia, across the country in California, *Santa Barbara News-Press* publisher Thomas M. Storke seemingly gained strength, and grew more determined in his fight against the JBS, from the daily anti-Warren mail. Storke received one such note that urged him to “wake up before [it is] too late. Your friend, the Chief Justice, may be honestly misled—many brilliant men have been.” The unsigned letter warned Storke that “the communists have taken advantage of us—they are too smart for us—they planned way back to destroy us and our form of government and are succeeding all down the line.” Storke had grown increasingly irritable with such attacks on Warren, Eisenhower, and other government officials. The publisher’s power in Santa Barbara depended on his ability to win favors from leaders; he therefore likened attacks on them with attacks on his own prestige and legacy. “Out West,” he wrote one John Birch Society member in 1961, “we respect the office of the President of the United States. I can assure you, had Welch lived in the West when I was a young man and was so disrespectful of our President and our Supreme Court, I might have helped in applying a dose of tar and feathers.”⁹¹

Three years earlier, as groups nationally began to paint the Supreme Court under Warren’s leadership as subversive, the Santa Barbara publisher began receiving pamphlets calling for the chief justice’s removal. “I haven’t taken the trouble to read other than the first page,” he told Warren, “but may I ask you what, if anything, I can do to stop this kind of blackmail going through the mails?” Warren replied that he too had seen the pamphlet, which “like all other scurrilous literature, should be dignified in no

⁹¹ Undated note to TMS, folder “John Birch Society,” carton 2; and TMS to Mary Jean Harder, April 10, 1961, folder “JBS request for materials, H-J,” carton 2, both in Thomas More Storke Papers, BANC MSS 73/72 c, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley [hereafter cited as TMS Papers, Berkeley].

other way but by consignment to the wastebasket.” By the spring of 1961, however, Storke had “reached a boiling point.”⁹²

The previously disparate groups that had made attacking the Supreme Court into an industry were given a face and a national profile when the John Birch Society made Warren’s removal its primary goal. Storke considered Warren one of the two best governors in California history, and he and Warren had been friends for nearly two decades. These attacks on him and on officeholders amounted to sacrilege. “Earl,” he told Warren, “I am going to take them on.” Yet Storke’s defense of the chief justice in his newspaper assumed a strangely muted quality. Initially, it attacked the JBS editorially and reported on its activities locally and nationally, but the paper largely kept Warren’s name out of its coverage. Storke’s initial defense of his friend was simply to remove the chief justice from the equation; the old publisher seemed reticent to sully his friend’s name by printing it alongside that of the JBS. Warren, who declined to comment publically on the JBS, privately approved Storke’s anti-Birch crusade. “As far as I can see there isn’t much that can be done except to smoke them out a little as you are doing,” Warren wrote. “I am more than ever amazed how some people can in the name of freedom advocate totalitarian measures to accomplish their purposes.”⁹³

While Warren never engaged in any explicit public rebuttal of the John Birch Society’s allegations against him and the court, Storke assumed, as he had in the past, the role of mouthpiece for the cloistered chief justice. The publisher used his private

⁹² TMS to EW, September 3, 1958; and EW to TMS, September 22, 1958, both in folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1958-1959,” box 112; and TMS to EW, February 27, 1961, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960-1961,” box 112, both in Warren Papers, LC.

⁹³ Thomas M. Storke, *California Editor*, with a foreword by Earl Warren (Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1958), 183; and Warren, *Memoirs*, 305; and EW to TMS, March 6, 1961, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC.

correspondence with Warren as ammunition against the society, often without the chief justice's approval. Warren never scolded his friend for this breach, nor did he stop revealing his thoughts about the JBS. Storke took this as implicit approval. The JBS, Warren wrote Storke, "is launching this kind of an attack as a screen for other interests With these people, I am sure the real reason for the attack is not because of the communist menace but because of our segregation, anti-trust and natural gas cases. A direct attack on those would not be popular, but it is still possible to get an audience when anyone is called a communist."⁹⁴ Storke filed Warren's letter away, but the following month, a stopover by JBS founder Robert Welch gave the publisher reason to use Warren's thinking.

In April, Welch visited Santa Barbara as part of a national tour to counter negative press portrayals of the society. Storke's unrelenting attacks on the society drew Welch to Santa Barbara, the smallest city on his two-week trip. Speaking at a local high school, Welch was asked by an audience member why the JBS had targeted Warren for removal. "I don't like him," Welch answered curtly. The response drew boos from the audience and editorial criticism from the *News-Press*. Welch's reply also gave the newspaper an opening to reveal the chief justice's feelings about the JBS' campaign against him but to disguise them as its own. "The question arises," the newspaper asked, "whether Welch, in leading the attacks on the chief justice of the United States, is acting just out of the personal bitterness and malice he expressed of whether he is being used by other interests that cannot come out directly against Earl Warren." In sending a copy of

⁹⁴ Ibid. Warren is referring to the court's decision in *Klor's Inc. v. Broadway-Hale Stores Inc.*, 359 U.S. 207 (1959); *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1958); and *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division*, 358 U.S. 103 (1958).

the editorial to Warren, Storke noted, “You may recognize the thinking which is disclosed in this editorial.”⁹⁵

After Welch departed Santa Barbara, the newspaper again largely removed Warren’s name from its coverage of the society as Storke assumed a larger national role in fighting the organization’s growth and influence. But in August, the JBS gave Storke the opportunity to cement his ever-growing national reputation when it announced a contest for the best essay on “grounds for impeachment of Supreme Court Justice [sic] Earl Warren.” Welch, in a speech in Tulsa, Oklahoma, said the first prize was \$1,000 and the contest was opened to college undergraduates who were interested in exploring “acts of subversion.”⁹⁶ The same week, Storke announced an essay contest of his own on the issue of character assassination. “A serious public issue, with both legal and psychiatric implications, has been raised by organized attacks on the integrity and patriotism of distinguished American citizens,” Storke said in his newspaper’s announcement of the contest, which he opened to psychiatry and law students or practitioners in either field. Dutifully, Storke relayed word of the contest to Warren, who replied that he had encouraged his family to enter the JBS’s contest “because they know better than anyone else what my shortcomings are. I don’t know whether any of them have done it or not, but if they haven’t they might be losing some easy money.”⁹⁷

⁹⁵ “College Students Heckle Welch,” *Los Angeles Mirror*, April 13, 1961; Gene Blake, “Welch, Student Swap Words at Santa Barbara,” *LAT*, April 13, 1961; and Hans Engh, “Welch Views Reds’ Aims” and “What’s behind Attack on Warren?” both in *Santa Barbara News-Press* [*SBNP*], April 13, 1961; and TMS to EW, April 13 1961, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC.

⁹⁶ “Birchers Sponsor Warren ‘Essays,’” *SBNP*, August 6, 1961; and John Wicklein, “Birch Society Will Offer \$2,300 for Impeach-Warren Essays,” *NYT*, August 5, 1961.

⁹⁷ “‘Character Assassination’ Is Essay Contest Subject,” *SBNP*, August 10, 1961; flyer, “Essay Contest,” in “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC; EW to TMS, October 28, 1961, “Chief Justice Personal S, 1960 to 1962,” box 112, Warren Papers, LC. Santa Barbara attorney Howard Richards won Storke’s contest, while University of California, Los Angeles, undergraduate Eddie Rose took first prize in the Birch contest. Rose’s essay, “Coincidence or Treason” appeared in the April 1962,

Yet Storke was not the only person to defend Warren, nor was his newspaper the only one to come to the chief justice's aid. Even before the JBS took up its anti-Warren drive, publications and people around the country had defended the Supreme Court against charges of subversion. In 1956, after Senators James O. Eastland and Joseph McCarthy alleged that the Warren Court's decisions aided communists, *Collier's* magazine warned critics that "the mud will wash off without leaving a stain" on the chief justice, but that would it would likely splatter them instead. Two years later, in the wake of the Red Monday decisions and persistent demands for congressional action to curb the court's powers, the American Jewish Congress noted, as Warren later did, a definite link between critics of the court's internal security decisions and its earlier desegregation rulings. The organization praised the court and noted that "during 1958, the only significant gains in the civil rights area were those made in the courts." It urged the court to remain firm despite growing official and grassroots criticism of its actions.⁹⁸ After the JBS announced its Warren campaign, the *New York Times* opined that if the chief justice had moved the country toward a democracy rather than a republic, as the JBS charged, then he "belongs in the society of James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Henry David Thoreau, Walt Whitman, John Locke, Alexis de Tocqueville, John Stuart Mill, Lord Bryce and others." *The Times* ended its editorial by asking "Can we impeach Lincoln?" In 1961, Solicitor General Archibald Cox told a meeting of the American Bar Association—which had been among the court's most persistent critics—that critics merely confirmed that the Warren Court was doing its job. "The stupid attacks upon

issue of *American Opinion*. See also "Student at U.C.L.A. Wins Birch Contest," *NYT*, February 6, 1962; "Character Assassination Essay Winners Named," *LAT*, February 28, 1962; and "The Unveiling," *Time*, February 16, 1962, 23.

⁹⁸ "A Slur on a Great American," *Collier's*, August 31, 1956, 78; and Commission on Law and Social Action, American Jewish Congress, "Annual Report 1958," 2.

Chief Justice Warren and his associates . . . are hardly as virulent as the shafts which were loosed against John Marshall.” However, Cox concluded, “[One] must mark the line between criticism of decisions and attacks upon the integrity of the justices To disregard this line, however fine it sometimes seems, and thereby to attack the rule of law, is a gross disservice to the nation.” The *Christian Science Monitor* similarly found the JBS’ reasoning for impeaching Warren faulty; the chief justice had not acted alone, a columnist wrote, but in concert with at least four other justices. “Are these men, and the three presidents who appointed them, and the senators who voted overwhelmingly for their confirmation, the members of the Congress and the bar who all urged their appointment, all communists or communist sympathizers and dupes?” he asked. “The prospect is unthinkable.”⁹⁹

Other defenders were equally as incredulous. United States Senator Thomas H. Kuchel (pronounced KEEK-uhl) of California was among those who could not fathom the attacks on the chief justice. As with Storke, friendship and loyalty played definite roles in Kuchel’s defense of Warren. In January 1953, after Richard M. Nixon resigned from the Senate to become Eisenhower’s vice president, Governor Warren appointed Kuchel, then California’s Republican comptroller, to fill the unexpired term. Kuchel venerated Warren and said his own socially progressive political philosophy rested on “the Earl Warren side of the street.”¹⁰⁰ Kuchel’s unapologetic compromises with

⁹⁹ “The Nature of Democracy,” *NYT*, April 14, 1961; Archibald Cox, “The Nature of Supreme Court Litigation,” August 9, 1961, folder “Correspondence, General, 1961,” box 361, Warren Papers, LC; and William H. Stringer, “Tactics of Epithet and Smear Shunned by Responsible Men,” *Christian Science Monitor*, reprinted in *SBNP*, September 3, 1961.

¹⁰⁰ Geoffrey Kabaservice, *Rule and Ruin: The Downfall of Moderation and the Destruction of the Republican Party from Eisenhower to the Tea Party* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 137; Todd Holmes, “Demise and Ascent: The Career of Thomas Kuchel and the Advent of the Reagan Right,” *Boom: A Journal of California* 1, no. 4 (Winter 2011): 21-25; Thomas H. Kuchel, interview by Michael L. Gillette, May 15, 1980, interview 1, Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library, Austin, Texas, transcript at

Democrats damned him as a “liberal,” a mantle he wore proudly but that made him a target for conservative groups such as the John Birch Society.

Ignoring Kuchel’s staunch anticommunism, the JBS cited the senator’s refusal to take seriously its claims of internal subversion as evidence he was a communist sympathizer. Kuchel certainly did not redeem himself in their eyes when he took to the Senate floor in March 1961 to condemn the society’s attacks on Eisenhower and on his mentor Warren. “Good God!” he exclaimed, “Should the American people and the American government let that kind of vile spleen be poured” upon the public?” Kuchel’s condemnation of the JBS and his defense of Warren found favor in California’s press, but the organization began to work against the senator’s re-election then still a year away. Storke advised Kuchel to “give them all the rope you can, but strengthen your support and loyalty to Earl.” Kuchel assured Storke he did not need to be reminded that he owed his political career to Warren’s largess. “I must say that I am proud of the enemies I have made. Had I not attacked the John Birch Society in the Senate, I would have felt unclean.”¹⁰¹

Kuchel continued to defend Warren by attacking the JBS; his speeches in the Senate and back home in California assumed a similar tactic to Storke’s *News-Press*. He simply left Warren out, erasing the possibility that the chief justice’s name would appear in the press alongside that of the organization that made his removal its paramount objective. Speaking on the floor of the Senate in May 1963, Kuchel labeled the JBS as

<http://bjlibrary.org>; and Nicol C. Rae, *The Decline and Fall of the Liberal Republicans: From 1952 to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press: 1989), 28.

¹⁰¹ Congress, Senate, Thomas H. Kuchel, “The John Birch Society,” 87th Cong., 1st sess., *Congressional Record* 107, pt. 4 (March 30, 1961): 5330-5331; “Storm over Birchers,” *Time*, April 7, 1961, 18-19; John D. Morris, “Inquiry Is Sought on Birch Society,” *NYT*, March 31, 1961. TMS to Kuchel, September 7, 1961, and Kuchel to TMS, September 18, 1961, both in folder “P-Kuchel, John Birch Society,” carton 142, Thomas H. Kuchel Papers, BANC MSS 69/70c, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley [hereafter cited as Kuchel Papers, Berkeley].

among “fright peddlers” who flooded Congressional offices with paranoiac, hysterical mail only to assume that representatives and senators who ignored their theories were disloyal. The speech was something of a valedictory for Kuchel, who the previous year had turned back far right efforts to unseat him, but it also served to place the moderate senator squarely in the sights of the same groups he now labelled as “downright un-American. For they are doing a devil’s work far better than communists themselves could do.” He concluded: “I shall always fight the big lie, the smear, witch hunts, anti-Catholicism, anti-Semitism, racism of any kind—which are not the hallmarks of conservatism, but are the trademarks of communism and fascism.”¹⁰²

As sweeping as Kuchel’s denunciation of the far right was, it was also simplistic. The anticommunist manifestos that filled his mail daily reflected the views of a fraction of conservatives. Far more labored at the grassroots level to counter not only feared communist subversion but also evidence of encroaching government power. A constituent from Santa Barbara warned Kuchel during his 1962 re-election bid that he seemed unaware of the changes such organizations were enacting at the grassroots level. As the John Birch Society and other groups gave conservative activists a voice and a means to enact political change, unresponsive politicians would be the first to feel their growing influence. “I suggest you spend your time boosting for Republican principles like private enterprise, fiscal responsibility, a balanced budget, a reduction in taxes, and justice for both business and labor,” the voter told Kuchel, concluding: “Millions of independent as well as Republican voters are uneasy and frightened by the rapid strides

¹⁰² Congress, Senate, Thomas H. Kuchel, “The Fright Peddlers,” 88th Cong., 1st sess., *Congressional Record* 109, pt. 6 (May 2, 1963): 7640; Anthony Lewis, “Kuchel Scores Birch Society as ‘Fright Peddlers,’” *NYT*, May 3, 1963; “‘Fright Peddlers’ Fed on Irresponsible Charges,” *America*, May 25, 1963, 734; “Like a Lone Tree,” *Time*, June 7, 1963, 24; and Kuchel, “‘A Plot!! To Overthrow America!!!’” *New York Times Magazine*, July 21, 1963, 6, 62.

this country is taking toward socialism.”¹⁰³ At the center of this fear, this voter and others pointedly counseled Kuchel, were the actions of the Supreme Court under his political patron, Earl Warren.

When Kuchel ran for re-election in 1962, conservative cries for “law and order” had yet to enter the political mainstream in a meaningful way. The same cannot be said of his final, unsuccessful campaign in 1968. During those critical six years, the United States seemed in perpetual turmoil—assassinations, urban violence, and antiwar protests were all underscored by a growing distrust in government’s ability to protect its citizens from enemies within and without. By 1968, more than 100 cities had experienced riots. College students revolted. The nation slipped further into a quagmire in Southeast Asia. A countercultural revolt promoted sex and drugs and dismissed authority. Permissiveness, conservative politicians railed, was the order of the day—and the law was backing up those who would further upset the nation’s moral compass.¹⁰⁴

The Warren Court remained a symbol of liberal laxity, and conservatives by 1968 examined Warren’s fifteen-year tenure as chief justice and discovered the root causes for the violence and immorality they saw daily on their television. The court’s decisions during the 1960s gave First Amendment protections to pornography, removed prayer from public schools, allowed interracial marriage, and expanded the rights of criminal defendants. Each new decision provided conservative politicians with ready fodder. More often than not, however, they failed to find a way to capitalize on a growing fear that the Supreme Court was endangering American families. In 1964, Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater characterized Supreme Court decisions as “jackassian.” In

¹⁰³ Hebert S. Woodward to Kuchel, February 27, 1962, folder “P-Kuchel, John Birch Society,” carton 142, Kuchel Papers, Berkeley.

¹⁰⁴ Melvin Small, ed. *A Companion to Richard M. Nixon* (London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 143.

several speeches during his 1968 campaign for president, Alabama Governor George C. Wallace blamed the court for urban rioting. “We don’t have riots in Alabama,” he shouted in one. “They start a riot down there, first one of ‘em to pick up a brick gets a bullet in the brain, that’s all.”¹⁰⁵ Wallace’s role as segregation’s poster child left little doubt in his listeners’ minds who “they” were.

As messengers, Goldwater and Wallace failed. Their rhetoric alienated voters; their personalities and past history as firebrands eroded the potency of the Supreme Court as a political issue. “These were things the American people *did* want to hear,” author Rick Perlstein concluded, “if only the messages were communicated more skillfully.” Ronald Reagan’s election as California governor in 1966 had demonstrated that fear of societal disorder resonated across party lines. Like Reagan, Richard M. Nixon would channel Goldwater and Wallace’s fury, but sound like “a statesman” when he did so, Perlstein wrote.¹⁰⁶ Nixon understood the value of the court as a symbol, and his campaign for “law and order” boiled down into a neat, succinct phrase the anxiety the Supreme Court had inspired among many Americans for more than a decade. They only had to turn on their televisions for a daily reminder of lawlessness, riots in American cities and the rise of crime across the nation. Who was to blame for this breakdown in civility, the erosion of American life? Richard Nixon claimed to know. “Let those who have the responsibility to enforce our laws and our judges who have the responsibility to interpret them be dedicated to the great principles of civil rights,” Nixon said in accepting the

¹⁰⁵ Barry Goldwater, quoted in Rick Perlstein, *Before the Storm: Barry Goldwater and the Unmaking of the American Consensus* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001), 425; and George C. Wallace, quoted in Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995), 367.

¹⁰⁶ Perlstein, *Before the Storm*, 426; and Rick Perlstein, *Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America* (New York: Scribner, 2008), 202.

Republican nomination for president in 1968. “But let them also recognize that the first civil right of every American is to be free from domestic violence, and that right must be guaranteed in this country.” Nixon’s “law and order” appeal made “it sound as if Black and Douglas and Bill Brennan and Earl Warren all were out on the streets themselves, egging on criminals,” one journalist later concluded, but to Americans who had over the past decade sought some remedy for the court’s excesses or some explanation for increased crime, Nixon placed the blame squarely on the court.¹⁰⁷

By 1968, when Nixon tapped into the anti-court sentiment the JBS had cultivated over the past eight years, the organization had abandoned its drive to impeach Earl Warren. In early 1967, Welch again targeted the Supreme Court as a symbol of a heavy handed government and internal subversion in the hopes of boosting public interest in the society. In announcing a renewed effort to impeach Warren, Welch said the political climate was more conducive as the nation had devolved into lawlessness. Like Nixon would the following year, and as Reagan had the previous in 1966, Welch placed the blame solely on Warren and the Supreme Court. By the end of 1967, Welch realized the rehabilitated campaign was not inspiring the kind of support he had hoped and he dropped it entirely. Nixon picked it up.¹⁰⁸

As Nixon was sworn in as the nation’s thirty-seventh president in January 1969, he ironically took his oath of office from the man he had criticized so vociferously to reach that moment, Chief Justice Earl Warren. Nixon’s triumph was equaled only by Warren’s bitterness. The new president’s campaign against the court compounded the

¹⁰⁷ Richard M. Nixon, quoted in Kevin J. McMahon, *Nixon’s Court: His Challenge to Judicial Liberalism and Its Political Consequences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 35; and Liva Baker, quoted in McMahon, *Nixon’s Court*, 35.

¹⁰⁸ “Birchers Chart Warren Attack,” *NYT*, January 12, 1967; “Drive to Impeach Warren Considered by Birch Society,” *LAT*, January 12, 1967; and “Welch Loses a Campaign,” *SBNP*, October 31, 1967.

chief justice's distaste for Nixon that dated back to their days in California politics. Two decades after the fact, Warren still blamed Nixon for working to deny him the 1952 Republican presidential nomination in order to get the vice presidential slot for himself. Even as he entered retirement, Warren spoke of Nixon "in terms that would ordinarily be reserved for someone who had proved to engage in serious violations of criminal law and ethical conduct," a friend of the chief justice recalled. Another more succinctly summarized Warren's feelings: "He had absolutely no use for Nixon."¹⁰⁹

Nixon—and the ever-growing conservative movement—certainly had a use for the chief justice. Warren's leadership of the Supreme Court was inspired by a belief that government could be an interventionist force in American life, that the courts could inspire change by responding to society's most pressing concerns. As a result, the Supreme Court became a target for some because it provided a refuge to others. The JBS had kept the court in its crosshairs for nearly a decade, had penetrated existing resentment, and found an issue that resonated with an ever-growing number of Americans. The JBS failed to remove Warren—the chief justice left the court on his own accord in June 1969—but its contempt for the Supreme Court, its persistent and coordinated efforts, futile as they might have been, demonstrated the viability of the court as a political issue. Its impeachment campaign against Warren was a critical bridge between grassroots disenchantment and eventual electoral success. This lost cause was the John Birch Society's greatest contribution to modern conservatism.

Copyright © James Savage 2014

¹⁰⁹ White, *Earl Warren*, 142; and Richard Rodda, quoted in Roger Morris, *Richard Milhous Nixon: The Rise of an American Politician* (New York: Henry Holt, 1990), 771.

CHAPTER SEVEN
“ITS UNROLLING PSYCHOSIS OF CONSPIRACY”

Targeting the Supreme Court carried political rewards, but defending it, as Thomas Kuchel discovered, inspired retribution. By 1968, Kuchel was California’s senior senator, the Senate Republican minority whip, an ally of the Johnson White House, and an enemy of the John Birch Society. His defense of Earl Warren and his characterizations of the JBS and extremist elements within his own party as “fright peddlers” drew cudgels for Kuchel. In 1964, he co-managed the Civil Rights Act to passage in the Senate and did the same for the Voting Rights Act in 1965. The John Birch Society rebuked each measure and decried the Civil Rights Movement as a front for communists.¹

Kuchel had turned back efforts among California’s far right to defeat him for re-election in 1962, but two years later, the JBS and other groups began to circulate a fake affidavit that suggested police had arrested a drunken Kuchel in 1949 after discovering the then-California comptroller performing oral sex on another man in a parked car. Kuchel sued and four men entered no-contest pleas to charges of conspiring to commit criminal libel. Although vindicated, the allegations returned in a whisper campaign when he sought re-election in 1968, and the smear demonstrated the depths of far-right embitterment with the senator’s moderate Republicanism. Kuchel had refused to endorse Barry Goldwater’s 1964 presidential race or Ronald Reagan’s gubernatorial bid in 1966. He maintained a cool relationship with the governor who had gained office by attacking the senator’s political mentor, Earl Warren. Kuchel could not endorse a man who refused to disavow support from JBS members. The 1968 Republican primary pitted Kuchel

¹ Todd Holmes, “Demise and Ascent: The Career of Thomas Kuchel and the Advent of the Reagan Right,” *Boom: A Journal of California* 1, no. 4 (Winter 2011): 21-25. See also “Thomas Kuchel: The Middleman,” *Saturday Review*, September 23, 1967, 26-27.

against Max Rafferty, the state superintendent of public instruction who even conservative stalwarts such as William Rusher decried as an example of Southern California's "fever swamp of rightist kookery." Overconfident in his ability to again rebuff a JBS-backed primary challenger, Kuchel staged a lackluster campaign and lost by 69,632 votes out of 2 million cast.² Kuchel retired, but remained a cautionary tale to moderates in both parties that on-going political re-alignment was widening the chasm between left and right. The middle ground became an increasingly perilous place to be.

The battle between Eastern establishment Republican moderates and Western conservatives that played out in Santa Barbara and elsewhere culminated in the conservative triumph of Ronald Reagan in 1980. Reagan had taken the pieces of Goldwater's splintered conservative vision and rejoined them to become California's governor. The turmoil of the 1960s provided "law and order" conservatives such as Reagan and moderates such as Richard M. Nixon plenty of opportunities to position themselves as an alternative to liberalism. Although both moderate and conservative Republicans capitalized on unrest—a rare moment of unity within the usually feuding family—turmoil defined the Nixon years as conservatives in the South and West chipped away at the political center. Nixon may have won in 1968 and again in 1972, but his decline in the morass of Watergate proved as much an opening for conservatives as it did for Democrats to regain the White House. Reagan's victory was the result of persistence and timing as much as ideology.³

² Geoffrey Kabaservice, *Rule and Ruin: The Downfall of Moderation and the Destruction of the Republican Party from Eisenhower to the Tea Party* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 137-39, 169-70, 237-39; "The Smear," *Time*, March 5, 1965, 23; and *JBS Bulletin*, September 1964, 13. A copy of the false affidavit can be found in folder 4, box 10, Granville Knight Papers, Collection 82, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene [hereafter cited as Knight Papers, Oregon].

³ On the 1968 election, see Rick Perlstein, *Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America* (New York: Scribner, 2008), 289-354. On Reagan's 1980 election see Jeffery D. Howison, *The*

By 1980, the John Birch Society, which had contributed to this eventual victory, at least in the early, critical years of the conservative movement, was a shadow of its former self. In the 1960s, the Republican Party had a hard time shaking the JBS, both out of self-interest and because of continued media characterizations of the group as extremists within the GOP ranks. Twice before the 1964 election, William F. Buckley Jr., publisher of the *National Review*, attempted to excommunicate the JBS from the conservative movement lest it hobble Goldwater's chances of gaining the Republican presidential nomination. Goldwater might be further damaged if the JBS—as a conservative group—offered its endorsement. As a prophylactic measure, Buckley, with Goldwater's prior knowledge and approval, published his first excoriation of the JBS in February 1962, and as other publications had for more than a year, insisted that Robert Welch's *Politician* remained a barrier for the JBS to win mainstream acceptance. “[By] the extravagance of his remarks, he repels rather than attracts a great following,” Buckley wrote, concluding: “Mr. Welch has revived in many men the spirit of patriotism, and the same spirit calls now for rejecting, out of love of truth and country, his false counsels.” In a second article, published in late 1963, Buckley again tried to distance Goldwater from any association with the JBS, which he claimed was “sandbagging conservative candidates.” Yet Buckley, as Goldwater and Reagan later would, stopped short of criticizing rank-and-file members while maintaining that “Mr. Welch is seized of an unreal vision.” He continued: “I have nothing against, in fact I have considerable

1980 Presidential Election: Ronald Reagan and the Shaping of the American Conservative Movement (New York: Routledge, 2014), 87-112; and Andrew E. Busch, *Reagan's Victory: The Presidential Election of 1980 and the Rise of the Right* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 163-90. For coverage of the years in between, see Bruce J. Schulman and Julian E. Zelizer, ed., *Rightward Bound: Making American Conservative in the 1970s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008); and Sean Wilentz, *The Age of Reagan: A History, 1974-2008* (New York: Harper, 2008).

admiration for . . . members of the John Birch Society . . . and I judge them as individuals, not as members.”⁴

Buckley’s relationship with the JBS exemplified the complex marriage between the organization and the wider conservative movement. Several members of the *National Review* staff and one of its primary financial backers were JBS members, and Buckley had written a defense of the society during the initial public outcry over *The Politician* during the spring of 1961. The JBS had a larger membership than *National Review*’s circulation; any criticism of the group might strike at the young magazine’s ever-fragile bottom line.⁵ Yet Buckley remained wary about the implications Welch and his followers might have for the conservative movement, which was just as fragile. Republicans could not hold the JBS too closely, lest they be tainted, but the party could not afford to disavow grassroots conservatives, some of whom had found political purpose within the organization. A Republican strategist told the *National Review*’s William Rusher that “fortunately or unfortunately, the Birchers are contributing a substantial portion of our workers and some of our leaders in many important areas and can be expected to be increasingly in evidence as the campaign progresses.” Goldwater refused to denounce members, telling Buckley and others in early 1962, as he was considering a White House bid, “Every other person in Phoenix is a member of the John Birch Society. I’m not talking about Commie-haunted apple pickers or cactus drunks. I’m talking about the

⁴ “The Question of Robert Welch,” February 13, 1962, 84, 88; William F. Buckley Jr., “Goldwater and the John Birch Society,” November 19, 1963, 430, both in *National Review*; Buckley, “Goldwater, the John Birch Society, and Me,” *Commentary* 125 (March 2008): 52-54. See also Buckley, *The Jeweler’s Eye* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1968), 23-26, 61, 83; William A. Rusher, *The Rise of the Right* (New York: William Morrow, 1984), 117-27, 189-90; and Kevin Mattson, *Rebels All! A Short History of the Conservative Mind in Postwar America* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2008), especially chapter 1.

⁵ Carl T. Bogus, *Buckley: William F. Buckley Jr. and the Rise of American Conservatism* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2011), 181-82; and Buckley, “The Uproar,” *National Review*, April 22, 1961, 241-43.

highest cast of men of affairs.” He could not dismiss the JBS. To do so would endanger his potential presidential campaign *and* his senatorial seat. “You can’t do that kind of thing in Arizona,” Goldwater concluded.⁶

Despite two condemnations in the pages of *National Review*, Welch remained a stone in the party’s shoe. In 1963, he published for the first time *The Politician*, which still contained much of the venom of the original. Several members of the JBS National Council, realizing the further damage wide dissemination of the previously confidential document would cause, resigned in protest. This did not help Goldwater’s presidential aspirations, and after his eventual loss, Buckley and the intellectual core of the Republican Party could no longer risk holding the Birch wolf by the ears—they had to let it go, even if it bit them. The society had actually grown as a result of Goldwater’s loss, especially in Texas and in California. By 1965, it had an estimated 80,000 members. It ran 350 American Opinion Bookstores across the country and its revenues were estimated at \$6 million (\$45 million in 2014). Welch was not going away. Despite calls by Goldwater and others that he be replaced as the society’s head, the JBS founder remained entrenched.⁷ Out of frustration and concern for the fortunes of conservative candidates such as Senator John Tower in Texas and Ronald Reagan in California, *National Review* hit the society harder than ever. In a twelve-page article, it denounced the JBS as simply dangerous.

It is no longer possible to consider the Society merely as moving towards legitimate objectives in a misguided way. However worthy the original motivations of those who have joined it and who apologize for it, it is time

⁶ Donald T. Critchlow, *The Conservative Ascendancy: How the GOP Right Made Political History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 59; and Barry Goldwater, quoted in Buckley, “Goldwater, the John Birch Society, and Me,” 53.

⁷ Bogus, *Buckley*, 194; and Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, *The Radical Right: Report on the John Birch Society and its Allies* (New York: Random House, 1967), 88-97.

for them to recognize that the John Birch Society is rapidly losing whatever it had in common with patriotism or conservatism—and to do so before their own minds become warped by the adherence to its unrolling psychosis of conspiracy.⁸

The withering indictment did not inspire all conservative politicians to denounce the society. Indeed, Reagan returned in 1966 to the tried-and-true method of punching at Welch but refusing to do the same to his members.

Welch retired as head of the JBS in 1983, but returned later the same year when his successor, Georgia Democratic Congressman Larry McDonald, died after a Soviet jet shot down a Korean Airlines plane with him and 268 other passengers aboard. True to form, the society's *American Opinion* magazine suggested that Soviets had lured the plane into their airspace using electronics and shot it down because "one of the world's most important anticommunist leaders" was on board. The magazine's December cover featured portraits of McDonald, John Birch and Robert Welch, a holy trinity of anticommunism.⁹

Welch died two years later at age 85. The JBS' membership had declined precipitously since its height in the mid-1960s, but it had remained controversial nevertheless. A 1965 investigation by a California Senate subcommittee declared that the growth of the society since the 1964 presidential race resulted in elements of "the lunatic fringe" joining its ranks. It also noted "a growing incidence of anti-Semitism," a charge Welch vehemently denied. In 1973, Chicago lawyer Elmer Gertz sued Welch for libel after Welch referred to him in an article as a "Leninist" and a "communist-fronter." The U.S. Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision issued the following year, ruled that Welch had

⁸ "The John Birch Society and the Conservative Movement," *National Review*, October 19, 1965, 914, 920.

⁹ "Georgia Democrat on Flight," September 1, 1983, and "Georgians Grieve and Vent Outrage," September 5, 1983, both in *NYT*; Scott Stanley Jr., "Dear Reader," *American Opinion*, October 1983. See also *American Opinion*, December 1983.

indeed libeled Gertz. Ironically, three of the four justices who ruled in Welch’s favor—William O. Douglas, William J. Brennan, and Byron White—were Warren Court veterans.¹⁰

The campaign to impeach Earl Warren, the JBS’ signature public program in its first decade, has remained spiritually active. Since Warren’s retirement, the court he led continues to be upheld as the yardstick of judicial activism, an idea that courts could be just as much a catalyst of social change as legislatures. The charge is bandied about regardless of political stripe. In 2012, when the Supreme Court upheld President Barack Obama’s signature legislation, the Affordable Care Act, conservative activists began a campaign—so far unsuccessful—to impeach Chief Justice John Roberts, a Republican. Two years earlier, when the court struck down campaign finance limits, a Democratic congressman started a similar effort to remove Roberts. Politicians often have embodied both qualities, praising the Warren Court and then parsing their words. In 2008, then-Senator Obama, the Democratic presidential nominee, told the *Detroit Free Press* that members of the Warren Court might serve as models for the kinds of nominees he would pick for the Supreme Court. Realizing the fallout his comments might inspire, Obama then backpedaled and said the Warren Court’s activist philosophy might not be “appropriate for today.”¹¹

¹⁰ California Legislature, *Thirteenth Report of the Senate Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities* (1965), “Robert Welch Dead at 85,” *New York Times* [NYT], January 8, 1985; and *Gertz v. Welch*, 418 U.S. 323 (1974). See also Robert Welch Memorial Issue, *American Opinion*. March 1985; and “Remembering Robert Welch,” *New American*, December 13, 1993, 4-10, 23-30.

¹¹ The Affordable Care Act decision was *National Federation of Independent Businesses, et al., v. Sebelius, et al.*, 567 U.S. ____ (2012). The campaign finance decision was *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010). See also “The Incumbent’s Bane: Citizens United and the 2010 Election,” *Wall Street Journal*, January 25, 2011; “John Roberts Saves ‘Obamacare,’ Enrages Tea Party Conservatives,” *LAT*, June 29, 2012; and Jeffrey Toobin, *The Oath: The Obama White House and the Supreme Court* (New York: Doubleday, 2012), 43-44.

Obama's hedge was rooted in nearly four decades of attacks on the Warren Court's legacy, which began even before Warren retired in 1969. The previous year, President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed his confidant, Associate Justice Abe Fortas, as Warren's successor. Southern Democrats—including Warren's perpetual critics Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi and Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina—used Fortas' confirmation hearings to pummel the Warren Court's record. The Senate filibustered Fortas' nomination after allegations arose he had continued to advise Johnson while serving on the Supreme Court, a major breach of ethics, and amid Republican demands that the new president, likely Richard M. Nixon, be allowed to appoint the chief justice instead of the lame duck Johnson. Even a man of Johnson's immense political savvy could not save Fortas, and the White House pulled his nomination. Allegations of financial impropriety eventually cost Fortas his seat; he left the court before Warren did. Warren remained chief justice long enough to swear in Nixon—a task he loathed—and greet Warren Burger, his successor in June 1969. Across the nation, the few remaining “Impeach Earl Warren” billboards were either dismantled or collapsed from neglect.¹²

But the Supreme Court remained a political football, in large measure because of the Warren Court's legacy of judicial activism. Its 1965 ruling in *Griswold v. Connecticut* read a right to privacy into the Constitution for the first time. In 1973, after Warren's retirement, Justice Harry Blackmun, a Nixon appointee, extended *Griswold's* privacy provisions to include a woman's right to have an abortion. *Roe v. Wade* became an axle around which the American conservative movement continues to turn, and guaranteed that confirmation hearings for Supreme Court justices would grow ever more contentious

¹² David Kyvig, *The Age of Impeachment: American Constitutional Culture since 1960* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008), 61-86; and Lucas A. Powe Jr., *The Warren Court and American Politics* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2000), 471-74, 484.

as the years progressed. Presidential candidates routinely denied “litmus tests” for judges, but the abortion issue has remained a central theme both in nominations and confirmations for more than four decades.¹³

Liberals who defended the Warren Court were just as vociferous as conservatives who criticized it. After Fortas’ failed appointment, Democrats retaliated by blocking two of Nixon’s nominees whose views were antithetical to the Warren Court. Clement Haynsworth and G. Harrold Carswell were nods to the support the South had given Nixon in the 1968 campaign. Haynsworth, whose nomination failed first, was from South Carolina and was Thurmond’s protégé. Carswell was a Floridian. As appeals court judges, both had issued rulings favorable to segregation and against the rights of criminal defendants, both tenets of the Warren Court’s activism. Nixon’s appointees, said Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, “remind me of the people who used to put up ‘impeach Earl Warren’ signs on the highways.” The president, who blamed the John Birch Society for his 1962 gubernatorial loss in California, was not amused. Despite his plans to the contrary, however, Nixon’s appointees to the court never dismantled the Warren legacy or chipped away at it in a significant way.¹⁴

Warren lived long enough to watch Watergate consume Nixon’s career. On July 9, 1974, his former colleagues Douglas and Brennan visited Warren’s hospital bedside. Earlier that day, the Supreme Court had heard emergency oral arguments in the case of *United States v. Nixon*, and they told their former chief that the justices likely would

¹³ *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965); and *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973). See also Frederick P. Lewis, *The Context of Judicial Activism: The Endurance of the Warren Court Legacy in a Conservative Age* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999), 125-32; and Thomas M. Keck, *The Most Activist Supreme Court in History: The Road to Modern Judicial Conservatism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 54-65, 97-102.

¹⁴ Kevin J. McMahon, *Nixon’s Court: His Challenge to Judicial Liberalism and Its Political Consequences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 7, 117-28.

compel the president to turn over incriminating recordings in which he discussed the 1972 Watergate burglary. Warren died that night. One month later, Nixon resigned.¹⁵

Three years earlier, Warren had eulogized his friend Thomas M. Storke as Santa Barbara's foremost citizen. His eulogy did not mention the John Birch Society or his own role in Storke's decision to confront the organization. Storke had bristled in retirement after he sold the *News-Press* in early 1964. Before the sale, Storke won a guarantee from the new Republican owners that the newspaper would endorse President Lyndon B. Johnson's re-election bid. Afterward, Storke relinquished control of the newspaper's editorial policy.¹⁶ When his views differed from the new publisher's opinions, the old man purchased advertising space to inform readers of *his* judgments; stories occasionally appeared that announced Storke's endorsement of various candidates or gave his views of the national political situation. Rather than indicate an intuitive grasp of the ever-evolving social climate of the late 1960s, however, these stories reflected Storke's vain—in every sense of the word—attempt to influence the community as he once had.¹⁷

As his influence waned, however, Storke's legend grew. Mariachi bands serenaded him on his birthdays, and school children delivered cards and letters. Invariably, stories appeared in the newspaper in which the retired publisher recounted how Santa Barbara had grown during his nine decades and how he had contributed to that

¹⁵ Jim Newton, *Justice for All: Earl Warren and the Nation He Made* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2006), 513-15; and *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683 (1974).

¹⁶ Thomas M. Storke [TMS] to Earl Warren [EW], March 5, 1964, folder "Chief Justice Personal S, 1963-1964," box 112; and Earl Warren, Storke eulogy, October 16, 1971, folder "Remarks, Memorial Service for Thomas M. Storke," box 832, both in Earl Warren Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. [hereafter cited as EW Papers, LC].

¹⁷ "This is Forgotten History," undated advertisement, in scrapbook 49, Gledhill Library, Santa Barbara Historical Museum, 153-54 [hereafter cited as SBHM]; "T.M. Storke Urges a NO Vote on Harbor Bonds May 2nd," May 2, 1967; "T.M. Storke Announces Plan to Support Yorty," May 31, 1966; "Busy and Prosperous Europe Impresses Editor on Visit," June 28, 1964; and "East, West GOP Contrasts Noted," October 21, 1964, all in *Santa Barbara News-Press* [SBNP].

growth.¹⁸ By the late 1960s, tour buses began to stop outside Storke's house on Santa Barbara Street and recount the story of the publisher's fight against the John Birch Society.¹⁹ But Storke was not content to let others mold his legend, and he used some of the award money he won as a result of the JBS editorial to commission two journalism buildings, one at his alma mater, Stanford, which was dedicated in 1964, and another five years later at the University of California's Santa Barbara campus. The UCSB building featured a 174-foot tower and carillon. Once completed, it was the tallest structure in Santa Barbara County and remains so.²⁰ Storke also commissioned a bust of himself to be placed in the UCSB student union. Students began a tradition of rubbing its nose for luck on exam days. Not all students felt as friendly, however. In the late 1960s, as anti-Vietnam War protests swept campuses nationwide, unknown UCSB students kidnapped Storke's bust, doused it with paint and tossed it in a slough. Incensed, the old man threatened to send his likeness to Stanford, but relented only when he was told there was no guarantee Stanford students would not do the same.²¹

The anti-establishment climate on the nation's campuses disturbed Storke, an establishment figure, even before his bust was vandalized. A former member of the University of California Board of Regents, he maintained a paternalistic interest in the

¹⁸ "Birthday Wishes for T.M. Storke," November 24, 1966; and "6,500 Children Send Birthday Wishes on T.M. Storke's 94th Birthday," November 23, 1970, both in *SBNP*.

¹⁹ Irving Dillard to TMS, April 13, 1968, folder "Irving Dillard," box 9, Thomas More Storke Papers, BANC MSS 73/72 c, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley [hereafter cited as TMS Papers, Berkeley].

²⁰ Scrapbook, "Dedication of Storke Student Publications Building," November 20, 1964; "Storke Student Publications Building Formally Dedicated," *Stanford Daily*, November 20, 1964; and Rich Zeigler, "A symbol of faith in student publications is a-building at Santa Barbara," *Collegiate Journalist* 5 (Winter 1968): 4, all in box 95, T.M. Storke Collection, SBHM.

²¹ Paul Veblen to Tom Fesperman, October 9, 1995, folder "Paul Veblen," box 10, Charles A. Storke II Collection, SBHC Mss 38, Department of Special Collections, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara [hereafter cited as CAS Collection, UCSB]; Barney Brantingham, "To Storke, students' activism was a bust," August 7, 2002, and Goleta Savings and Loan Association advertisement, June 11, 1967, both in *SBNP*; and TMS to Tom C. Clark, March 11, 1968, folder "Tom Clark," box 7, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

UC system, particularly UCSB. The 1964 Free Speech Movement at Berkeley inspired a barrage of complaints from Storke about the “unthinkable” influence of “beatniks.”²² He wrote a friend, “I can’t understand what has gotten into the young people of today.” To another, he characterized Free Speech Movement spokesman Mario Savio as “a little wop . . . whose family is only a few years away from Sicily, the birthplace of the Al Capones and the Costellos.” Who would have thought, he asked incredulously, that such a person “would have a great university, its President and the Board of Regents on their knees?”²³

Storke was equally critical of Republican gubernatorial candidate Ronald Reagan. Despite their shared feelings about the need to return order to the Berkeley campus, Storke considered Reagan “as shallow as a piece of Kleenex” and a tool of extremist elements within the state Republican Party. Despite misgivings about Governor Edmund G. “Pat” Brown—indeed, the former publisher had supported Brown’s failed primary challenger, Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty, a conservative Democrat—Storke allowed the governor’s 1966 re-election campaign to release a letter in which he described “the slippery hands of Robert Welch and his John Birch Society” as manipulating Reagan’s attacks on Berkeley. Following a public outcry, Storke claimed—as he had in the past whenever his comments stirred negative reaction—that press excerpts of his letter had misquoted him.²⁴

²² TMS to Dorothy B. Chandler, April 17, 1970, folder “Dorothy Chandler,” box 7; and TMS to Richard Guggenhime, December 3, 1964, folder “Richard Guggenhime,” box 11, both in TMS Papers, Berkeley.

²³ TMS to Charles Gould, February 23, 1965, folder “Charles Gould,” box 11, TMS Papers, Berkeley.

²⁴ “T.M. Storke Announces Plan to Support Yorty,” *SBNP*, May 31, 1966; TMS to Edmund G. “Pat” Brown, September 22, 1966, folder “Chief Justice Personal S, 1965-1966,” box 113, EW Papers, LC; “Storke Comments,” *Goleta (Calif.) Gazette-Citizen*, October 13, 1966; “Noted Publisher Sees Bircher Link in Reagan Raps at UC,” *Sacramento Bee*, October 2, 1966; TMS to Otis Chandler, September 21, 1966, folder “Otis Chandler,” box 7; TMS to Paul Draper, March 11, 1966, folder “Paul Draper,” box 9; TMS to Fred Womble, October 10, 1966, folder “W Miscellany, Wo-Wu,” box 36; and TMS to Thomas Griffin, October 10, 1966, folder “G Miscellany, Go-Gu,” box 10, all in TMS Papers, Berkeley.

Reagan called Storke after the letter appeared. “I never was so disappointed in a man as I was with him,” Storke told UC President Clark Kerr. “Hate ran out of his mouth and both ears. His ignorance of business, government, politics, the University and people would not qualify him to be the mayor in the smallest city in California. I have seen all I want of him and I hope we do not meet.” Yet two years after the election, Storke met with Reagan and attempted to engineer—as he had with Brown—a friend’s appointment to the Board of Regents. He praised Reagan’s stance on university matters and told others he was working with the governor to address the campus situation. When Reagan ignored his recommendations and declined an invitation to the dedication of Storke Tower at UCSB, however, the former publisher washed his hands of the new governor.²⁵

Storke continued to go to his office in downtown Santa Barbara until a few weeks before his death, but as he approached his final birthday, he told family members—including his son Charles, with whom he had reconciled in 1966—that his will to live was gone. He died October 12, 1971, six weeks shy of his 95th birthday. Newspapers across the country eulogized him. An editorial in the Holyoke, Massachusetts, paper concluded that Storke “broke the back of the John Birch Society.” Closer to home, the *Fresno Bee* recounted when “the John Birch Society was riding high in Santa Barbara County, intimidating many, Tom Storke turned the most powerful weapon of a

²⁵ TMS to Clark Kerr, September 7, 1966, folder “Clark Kerr,” box 16; TMS to Ronald Reagan, December 9, 1968; Reagan to TMS, August 15, 1970; Paul Beck to Vernon Cheadle, October 1, 1969, all in folder “Ronald Reagan,” box 27; and TMS to Rudolph A. Peterson, January 17, 1969, folder “Rudolph Peterson,” box 25, all in TMS Papers, Berkeley; Reagan to TMS, January 10, 1969, box 772, Correspondence Unit: X-Files; and TMS to Reagan, November 1, 1968, folder “Governor Personal-S, November,” box 1968/121, Correspondence Unit: 1968 Governor’s Personal, in Ronald Reagan Gubernatorial Papers, Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, Simi Valley, Calif.; “Famed Editor, 92, Still Fights,” *San Francisco Sunday Examiner & Chronicle*, November 24, 1968; and TMS to Charles A. Storke II, November 5, 1968, folder “Correspondence—Thomas M. Storke, 1962-1970,” box 9, CAS Collection, UCSB.

newspaper—exposure—against it. By the time he was through, he had discredited the Birchers.”²⁶

The truth, however, lacked elegiac quality. While he had played a major role in damaging the JBS’ national reputation, Storke never banished the organization from the city and it outlived his ownership of the *News-Press*. The downtown American Opinion Bookstore, the most visible symbol of the organization’s presence, closed sometime in the late 1960s, but otherwise, no one quite remembers when (or knows if) the JBS left Santa Barbara.²⁷

Many of the main characters in the confrontation that unfolded in Santa Barbara did leave, however, and most could not avoid controversy. David Alan Arnold, the UCSB freshman who enjoyed a moment of notoriety after exposing a JBS cell on campus, resigned from the university in 1962. A pacifist, he relinquished his draft card as a member of the California National Guard, and with the help of the American Civil Liberties Union, won a successful fight to reverse his dishonorable discharge. He later worked with an international organization that aimed to end wars before becoming a private detective. He then moved overseas and became a major in the Israeli police force. Arnold died in 1988 at age 45.²⁸

Chet Merriam, who precipitated Arnold’s infiltration of the UCSB Freedom Club, moved to Chico, California. He opened a branch of the American Opinion Bookstore, launched a bid for Congress and received the endorsement of former President Dwight D.

²⁶ “Thomas Storke: A Giant Among Men,” *Fresno (Calif.) Bee*, October 15, 1971; and “The loss of Tom Storke,” *Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram*, October 16, 1971, both in scrapbook, box 100, Thomas M. Storke Collection, SBHM. See also “Thomas More Storke Is Dead; Editor Attacked Birch Society,” *NYT*, October 13, 1971; “Publisher Thomas Storke Dies; Won Pulitzer Prize in 1962,” *Los Angeles Times [LAT]*, October 13, 1971; Walker A. Tompkins, “City Bids Farewell to T.M. Storke,” *SBNP*, October 17, 1971; and Carol E. Storke, e-mail to author, August 3, 2013.

²⁷ Michael Redmon, “John Birch Society,” *Santa Barbara Independent*, May 23, 2011.

²⁸ Michael Stephens, e-mails to author, September 17 and October 25, 2011.

Eisenhower—who JBS founder Robert Welch and Merriam once described as a communist agent. Merriam initially withdrew from the race, re-entered it two weeks later, and then faced accusations he bankrolled his campaign with contributions from gamblers. By then, the JBS had expelled him for unknown reasons, although Merriam’s erratic behavior was a liability at a time when the society was under renewed scrutiny about its involvement in Goldwater’s presidential campaign. Merriam earned thirty-five percent of the vote in a landslide loss and faded into obscurity. He was 58 when he died in 1992.²⁹

Dr. Granville F. Knight, the city’s most visible anticommunist and one-time member of the JBS National Council, moved his medical practice to Santa Monica, California, in 1963, and he continued to rail against fluoridation, food additives and communists for the rest of his life.³⁰ Before his departure, friends gave him a poem that lamented “St. Barbara’s loss is St. Monica’s gain.” It continued:

*And now that you’re free in the land of the truth
Just think what you are leaving behind you, forsooth!
That fair, but unfortunate Fantasyland
Where Hutchins and Storke hold the world in their hands
Where those ‘Intellectuals’ ponder the hours
Pursuing their work in the tall Ivory Towers
Of the Center, they find, with smug satisfaction
That fallacy’s fact and the truth is reaction!
They feel that they bring to the modern world much
By deep concentration of navels and such.
They study the actions of Man and his kind
With lofty, and leftist! Superior Mind.
When not ‘being seen’ at a socialite party
They’re writing the socialist line for the ‘arty!’
While old Mr. Storke—like a hawk on his perch
Collects his rewards for his blasts at John Birch!*

²⁹ Bill Botwright, “Merriam, Former Santa Barbaran, In Congress Race,” November 12, 1963; Botwright, “Merriam Congress Candidate—Again,” March 29, 1964; “Ex-Aide for Bich Society Here Accused of Gambling Backing,” May, 22, 1964; “Ike is Questioned on Backing Merriam,” October 28, 1964, all in *SBNP*; and “Meet the Merriams,” *Placerville (California) Mountain Democrat-Times*, October 29, 1964.

³⁰ Granville Knight to *LAT*, June 25, 1965; folder 6, box 4, Knight Papers, Oregon; “Official on Milk Board Doubts Its Competence,” March 26, 1969; and Knight, “Survey Shows Malnutrition,” September 26, 1971, both in *LAT*.

*Well, somehow we pray—may circumstance dent
The hard, polished sphere of their smug self-content!*³¹

Knight maintained a vigorous correspondence and continued to promote conservative causes. He supported Goldwater for president in 1964, criticized the Great Society as “socialism,” damned Medicare as “the camel’s nose in the tent, which will . . . make all citizens wards of the federal government,” and opposed gun control. In 1971, he wrote Nixon and voiced opposition to the president’s planned visit to China, just as he had opposed summit meetings between Nikita Khrushchev and Eisenhower in the early days of the John Birch Society.³² Knight never forgave Welch for squandering the JBS’ energy in its campaign to impeach Earl Warren instead of acting more positively toward other goals. He told a friend that Welch had “refused to entertain any new ideas, even though they might be constructive, and downgraded anyone who proposed such ideas.” A lack of pragmatism had undercut the JBS’ potential, Knight concluded. He died in 1982 at age 77.³³

Frank and Eleanor Ketcham continued to run Americans for Freedom. After the November 22, 1963, assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the *News-Press* published a photograph of the Ketcham family’s flag at full staff. In response, vandals placed a cardboard sign on the newspaper’s front doors that called it “a tool of ‘Democratic’ Socialist’s [sic]” and encouraged an economic boycott of the publication. The Ketchams purchased a quarter-page advertisement to thank people for the

³¹ Unknown author, “To the Knights,” May 18, 1963, folder 15, box 3, Knight Papers, Oregon.

³² Granville Knight to Barry Goldwater, May 7, 1964, folder 1, box 4; Knight to Charles M. Teague, June 28, 1968, folder 14, box 14; Knight to *Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook*, August 13, 1965, folder 8, box 4; Knight to Frank G. Bonelli, June 19, 1968, folder 14, box 4; Knight to Richard M. Nixon, September 8, 1971, folder 2, box 5, all in Knight Papers, Oregon.

³³ John J. Miller to Knight, July 22, 1971, folder 1, box 5, Knight Papers, Oregon; Knight to A.G. Heinsohn Jr., July 25, 1968; and Knight to Heinsohn, March 9, 1972, both in folder “Granville F. Knight,” box 2, both in A.G. Heinsohn Papers, Collection 127, Special Collection and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene.

“heartening deluge of understanding and sympathetic support. It is good to know,” the advertisement continued, “that most people are fair, just and good in dealing with their fellow men.”³⁴ But they lowered the flag.

The flag flap brought renewed attention to Americans for Freedom, but by 1964, the Ketchams, who were both in their seventies, could no longer keep pace with the demands of the organization. They told a reporter that in 1963 alone they had mailed out at their own expense some 1.5 million pieces of literature. They folded Americans for Freedom shortly after. Frank Ketcham died in 1972. Eleanor died two years later. Both were 79 when they died.³⁵

The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, which the Ketchams so vehemently opposed, outlived them, and it remained controversial. When United Nations delegates convened there in June 1963, the Center received threatening phone calls. Pickets greeted delegates at the airport and lined the street outside the Center when their cars arrived there. All denied affiliation with the John Birch Society. In August 1967, the Center sponsored a gathering of students in which some participants advocated overthrowing the government. Again, opponents used the conference to insist the Center lose its tax-exempt status. But internal schisms and perpetual funding problems curtailed the Center’s activities for the remainder of its existence. Robert M. Hutchins retired in 1969 as president, returned in 1975 and died two years later still at the helm of the Center he founded. It survived another decade, although it operated with a shadow of its former staff and with a fraction of its former vigor. Santa Barbarans, who had always viewed the Center with some puzzlement, no longer worried about controversial speakers or

³⁴ “Ketcham, After Reporter’s Query, Lowers His Flag to Half-Staff,” December 20, 1963; “Boycott Sign at News-Press, December 21, 1963; and “In Appreciation,” December 27, 1963, all in *SBNP*.

³⁵ Raymond C. Baker, “A Card-Carrying American,” *Lima (Ohio) News*, January 10, 1964.

pronouncements. “There’s kind of an invisible wall between the center and the community,” Hutchins’ successor Maurice Mitchell complained in 1979, when finances forced it to abandon its Montecito mansion and move to UCSB. “And the community speaks about the center in strange terms, as if everybody was kind of a wild-eyed nut, which is not true.” Plagued by community disinterest, the Center closed in 1987.³⁶

Lillian and William Drake, whose *Freedom Press* newspaper was among the Center’s most vocal critics, published their newspaper in Santa Barbara until 1964, when they relocated to Los Angeles. It ceased publication three years later.³⁷ It is not known what became of the Drakes.

After the completion of her series on communism, Ellen Haldeman ceased writing for the *Carpinteria Herald*. Fearful for the safety of her children, Haldeman curtailed her anticommunist appearances, but she never returned to her previous life as a full-time housewife and mother. She started several businesses and social clubs and later became a real estate agent. She and Harry left Santa Barbara in 1981 to be near their grandchildren in Orange County. He died in 1986. Ellen moved in the early 1990s to Nevada and died there in 1998 at age 72. But their mother’s political activities—and the turmoil they inspired—remain with her children. The Haldemans’ eldest daughter wrote to the author that her “patriotism and conservative tendencies were strengthened, as were those of every member of my family. We children were empowered by those experiences.” She describes herself today as “of the Tea Party persuasion.”³⁸

³⁶ Jerry Rankin, “Center might fold its intellectual tent and leave city,” *SBNP*, April 8, 1979; and “Center to Leave UCSB,” *SBNP*, December 2, 1987; Frank K. Kelly, *Court of Reason: Robert M. Hutchins and the Fund for the Republic* (New York: Free Press, 1981), 307-312; and Harry S. Ashmore, *Unseasonable Truths: The Life of Robert Maynard Hutchins* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1989), 536-37.

³⁷ *Freedom Press*, January 15, 1964, and December 27, 1967.

³⁸ Linda Haldeman Larsson, e-mail to author, April 4, 2014; and Maria L. La Ganga, “Many Betting on Vegas in Migration out of California,” *LAT*, September 13, 1993.

The rise of the Tea Party following Obama's 2009 inauguration brought immediate comparisons to the John Birch Society. Some were valid: both movements were forged in fear—the JBS of communism and the Tea Party of taxes, health care reform, and government bloat. Historian Ronald P. Formisano summarizes the Tea Party's principles as “limited government, debt reduction, no higher taxes, and no new spending. It reveres the Constitution, interpreting it as limiting the powers of the federal government, and argues that Congress has far exceeded its rightful boundaries.” Its members, like those of the JBS in an earlier generation, will not tolerate “politics-as-usual compromise, moderate Republican lawmakers, or negotiation with political adversaries.”³⁹ Commentator Glenn Beck, then a personality on Fox News, further invited comparison between the two when he recommended books that might have been plucked from the JBS' reading list nearly a half century previous. W. Cleon Skousen's *The Naked Communist* was a favorite of JBS members and supporters; Beck recommended it to Tea Partiers as well, which historian Sean Wilentz characterized as “alarming.”⁴⁰ (As an aside, the fact the Tea Party has an ally in a major news network certainly separates its experiences from that of the JBS).

The parallels continued. The father of two of the Tea Party's most prominent financial backers, the Koch Brothers, was an original member of the JBS' National Council. Both the JBS and the Tea Party were founded to warn the American people of their president's divided loyalties—Eisenhower to communism and Obama to socialism.

³⁹ Ronald P. Formisano, *The Tea Party: A Brief History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012), 1-2, 9, 13-17. See also Sam Tanenhaus, “The Crescendo of the Rally Cry,” *New York Times Magazine*, Jan. 24, 2010; and Frank Rich, “The Axis of the Obsessed and the Deranged,” *NYT*, February 28, 2010.

⁴⁰ Sean Wilentz, “Confounding Fathers,” *The New Yorker*, October 18, 2010, 39. See also Kevin Drum, “Recycled,” *Mother Jones*, September/October 2010), 50-53.

Both operated largely at the grassroots, although the Tea Party lacks the centralized directorate the JBS had and seems content to let politicians such as Senators Ted Cruz and Rand Paul assume leadership of their ranks. Both groups comprise a multitude of opinions of varying validity, but are often portrayed as a homogenous ideological sect. For instance, “Birthers” who believe Obama is a foreign-born interloper, sit alongside those who have accepted that he was born in Hawaii, just as rank-and-file members of the JBS did not all ideologically adhere to Welch’s depictions of Eisenhower as a communist agent. Unlike members of the JBS, Tea Partiers openly profess membership as a badge of patriotism instead of hiding it as a stigma of paranoia.⁴¹

Just as the John Birch Society contributed to rifts in the Republican Party and politicians disavowed Welch while embracing his followers, Republicans today face the Tea Party with similar ambiguity. A headline in the *New York Times* over an article written by one perplexed Republican asked simply “Where Have You Gone, Bill Buckley?” That the John Birch Society has enjoyed resurgence—and indeed a new respect—among conservatives since the advent of the Tea Party has alarmed many, regardless of political stripe. When the JBS co-sponsored the Conservative Political Action Caucus’ 2010 meeting, a must-attend event for presidential aspirants, progressive commentator Rachel Maddow used Thomas M. Storke’s *New York Times Magazine* article from 1961 to remind her viewers of Welch’s teachings, Buckley’s denouncement,

⁴¹ Theda Skocpol, and Vanessa Williamson, *The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 78, 126, 194; Jill Lepore, *The Whites of Their Eyes: The Tea Party’s Revolution and the Battle over American History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 98; Robert B. Horwitz, *America’s Right: Anti-Establishment Conservatism from Goldwater to the Tea Party* (Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 2013), 43-47, 175-76, 180-81; and Christopher S. Parker and Matt A. Barreto, *Change They Can’t Believe In: The Tea Party and Reactionary Politics in America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 255. See also “Movement of the Moment Looks to Long-Ago Texts,” October 2, 2010, and Frank Rich, “The Billionaires Bankrolling the Tea Party,” August 29, 2010, both in *NYT*.

and that the Tea Party and the JBS were ideological brethren.⁴² That conservatism's strength continues to rest in grassroots activism just as it did a half century ago is undeniable.

Postwar American conservatism developed in a thousand places. Rather than a movement defined within the halls of power, it solidified in churches, gymnasiums, and parlors throughout the country. But it did not take shape without contention, even in regions that had long embraced conservative values. As a grassroots force, operating in places such as Santa Barbara, the John Birch Society's ability to attract adherents to the conservative cause and organize them into political action underwrote the ideology's resonance. In the struggle to determine its ideological boundaries, conservatives were forced to determine who would help them in their mission and whether conspiratorial thought of communist subversion could exist alongside mainstream tenets such as limited government, statism, military superiority, and a defense of *status quo* values. The lingering stains of its critical early years—the lyrical lampoons, dismissive characterizations, and contemptuous cartoons—obscure the society's importance, even to the people who benefitted the most from its work. Members of the John Birch Society were not caricatures. While fear of unknown forces may have driven them to the organization, they used the camaraderie and sense of shared purpose they gained from the group to contribute to the most significant re-alignment in postwar American politics.

Whether future scholars say the same about the Tea Party remains to be seen, and they will have to determine whether the twenty-first century alliance between it and the

⁴² David Welch, "Where Have You Gone, Bill Buckley?" *NYT*, December 4, 2012; MSNBC, "John Birch Society," *Rachel Maddow Show*, December 18, 2009, available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-RJsEPMOHZQ>; Thomas M. Storke, "How Some Birchers Were Birched," *New York Times Magazine*, December 10, 1961, 100-102; and Jonathan Alter, *The Center Holds: Obama and His Enemies* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2013), 30, 35, 193.

John Birch Society is a confederacy of the fearful or a patriotic union that saved the republic. They might find in the Tea Party—as this study has of the John Birch Society—some contribution, whether good, bad or both, to conservatism in the United States. But in order to do that, they will have to continue to study the Tea Party’s spiritual godfather in the places it operated, sorted out the parameters of its ideology, and received brickbats for its founder’s paranoia. Describing the contentions that existed at the country’s earliest years, journalist Jon Meacham concluded that “Conspiracies are only laughable when they fail to materialize.”⁴³ Imbued with new energy from conservatives who once shunned it, the John Birch Society may yet have its moment to chortle.

Copyright © James Savage 2014

⁴³ Jon Meacham, *Thomas Jefferson: The Art of Power* (New York: Random House, 2012), xxvii.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Manuscript Collections:

Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley

Edmund G. Brown Papers, BANC MSS 68/90 c

Robert E. Hennings, Summaries of interviews with California

Democratic politicians, 1959-1960, BANC MSS 2007/19

Hiram Johnson Papers, BANC MSS C-B 581

Thomas H. Kuchel Papers, BANC MSS 69/70

James D. Phelan Papers, BANC MSS C-B 800

Charles Albert Storke Papers, BANC MSS 73/71 c

Thomas More Storke Papers, BANC MSS 73/72 c

California Judicial Center Library, San Francisco

Stanley Mosk Papers

California State Archives, Sacramento

California Un-American Activities Committees Records

Earl Warren Papers

Davidson Library, Department of Special Collections, University of California,
Santa Barbara

Harry S. Ashmore Collection, Mss 155

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions Collection, Mss 18

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions / Princeton University Files, Mss 253

Community Development and Conservation Collection, SBHC Mss 1

Frank K. Kelly Papers, Mss 279

Jean Storke Menzies Collection, SBHC Mss 34

Charles A. Storke II Collection, SBHC Mss 38

Thomas M. Storke Collection, SBHC Mss 37

Walker A. Tompkins Collection, SBHC Mss 19

UCSB, Office of the Chancellor, Chancellor's Records, UArch 17

UCSB, Office of Public Information Subject Files, UArch 12

Paul Veblen Collection, SBHC Mss 69

Gledhill Library, Santa Barbara Historical Museum, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Scrapbooks

Thomas M. Storke Collection

Herbert Hoover Presidential Library, West Branch, Iowa

Westbrook Pegler Papers

Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Washington, D.C.

Hugo Lafayette Black Papers
William O. Douglas Papers
James A. Farley Papers
William Gibbs McAdoo Papers
Lawrence E. Spivak Papers
Earl Warren Papers

National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Md.
Records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Record Group 65

Roger and Julie Baskes Department of Special Collections, Newberry Library, Chicago
Jack Mabley Papers

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, Simi Valley, Calif.
Gubernatorial Papers

Santa Barbara Public Library, Santa Barbara, Calif.
Vertical File, John Birch Society
Vertical File, Thomas More Storke
Vertical File, Vandenberg Air Force Base

Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville
James J. Kilpatrick Papers, MSS 6626-a, MSS 6626-b

University of Oregon Libraries, Special Collections and University Archives, Eugene
T. Coleman Andrews Papers, Collection 119
A.G. Heinsohn Jr., Collection 127
Granville F. Knight Papers, Collection 82

Government Documents:

California Legislature. Senate. *Twelfth Report of the Senate Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities*. Sacramento, 1963.

_____. *Thirteenth Report of the Senate Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities*. Sacramento, 1965.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *State and Small Areas, California. U.S. Census of Housing, 1960*, vol. 7. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

_____. *U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 1960. Census Tracts. Final Report PHC (1)-139*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

U.S. Congress. House. Clare E. Hoffman, "Impeachment of Our Chief Justice: An Answer." 87th Cong., 1st sess. *Congressional Record* 107, pt. 2 (February 21, 1961): 2500.

U.S. Congress. Senate. James O. Eastland, "Supreme Court Decisions in Passport Cases." 85th Cong., 2nd sess. *Congressional Record* 104, pt. 10 (July 10, 1958): 13335-13344.

_____. Thomas H. Kuchel, "The John Birch Society." 87th Cong., 1st sess., *Congressional Record* 107, pt. 4 (March 30, 1961): 5330-5331.

_____. Thomas H. Kuchel, "The Fright Peddlers." 88th Cong., 1st sess., *Congressional Record* 109, pt. 6 (May 2, 1963): 7636-7642.

U.S. Department of Commerce. *U.S. Census of Population, 1960: United States Summary*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

Federal Bureau of Investigation Files: *The Boston and Los Angeles field office files, and the Robert H.W. Welch file are part of the Ernie Lazar Freedom of Information Act Collection, and are available at http://archive.org/details/ernie1241_jbs. The Ketcham and Storke files were obtained through the author's Freedom of Information Act requests. The U.S. Supreme Court file is available at <http://vault.fbi.gov/supreme-court>.*

John Birch Society, Boston Field Office, file no. 100-32899.

John Birch Society, Los Angeles Field Office, file no. 100-59001.

Frank W. Ketcham, file no. 100-60903.

Thomas M. Storke, file no. 80-306.

U.S. Supreme Court, file no. 62-27585.

Robert H.W. Welch, file no. 62-HQ-1004401.

United States Supreme Court Decisions: *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963); *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962); *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954); *Brown v. Board of Education II*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955); *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010); *Cole v. Young*, 351 U.S. 536 (1956); *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, 351 U.S. 115 (1956); *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958); *Dennis v. United States*, 341 U.S. 494 (1951); *Engle v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 461 (1962); *Flaxner v. United States*, 358 U.S. 147 (1958); *Gertz v. Welch*, 418 U.S. 323 (1974); *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963); *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 419 (1965); *Jencks v. United States*, 353 U.S. 657 (1957); *Jacobellis v. Ohio*, 378 U.S. 184 (1964); *Klor's Inc. v. Broadway-Hale Stores Inc.*, 359 U.S. 207 (1959); *Konigsberg v. State Bar of California*, 366 U.S. 36 (1961); *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967); *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961); *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966); *National Federation of Independent Businesses, et al., v. Sebelius, et al.*, 567 U.S. ____ (2012); *Pennsylvania v. Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497 (1956); *Raley v. Ohio*, 360 U.S. 423 (1959); *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973); *Roth v. United States*, 354 U.S. 476 (1957); *Sacher v. United States*, 356 U.S. 576 (1958); *Service v. Dulles*, 354 U.S.

363 (1957); *Schware v. Board of Examiners of New Mexico*, 353 U.S. 232 (1957); *Slochower v. Board of Education of New York City*, 350 U.S. 551 (1956); *Sweezy v. New Hampshire*, 354 U.S. 234 (1957); *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division*, 358 U.S. 103 (1958); *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1958); *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683 (1974); *United States v. Witkovich*, 353 U.S.194 (1957); *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178 (1957); *Yates v. United States*, 354 U.S. 298 (1957).

Oral Histories: *Unless otherwise noted, oral histories are part of the Earl Warren Oral History Project, Regional Oral History Office, University of California at Berkeley. Transcripts are available at <http://www.calisphere.universityofcalifornia.edu>.*

Cavanaugh, Bartley. "Hunting and Fishing with Earl Warren: A Mutual Interest in Government, Politics, and Sports." Interview by Amelia R. Fry, May 4, 1972.

Heckendorf, Percy C. "Japanese-American Relocation Reviewed." Interview by Amelia R. Fry, May 22-23, 1972.

Jones, Walter P. "An Editor's Long Friendship with Earl Warren." Interviews by June C. Hogan and Amelia R. Fry, September 16, 1969, and August 25, 1970.

Kuchel, Thomas H. Interview by Michael L. Gillette, interview 1, May 15, 1980. Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library, Austin, Texas. Transcript at <http://lbjlibrary.org>.

Lynn, Wallace. "Hunting and Fishing with Earl Warren: Hunting and Baseball Companion." Interview by Amelia R. Fry, February 24, 1972.

MacGillivray, W. Don. Interview by Carlos Vásquez, August 8-10, 1989. State Government Oral History Program, California State Archives. Transcript at <http://www.sos.ca.gov/archives/oral-history/pdf/macgillivray.pdf>.

Roosevelt, James. "California Democrats in the Earl Warren Era: Campaigning for Governor against Earl Warren, 1950." Interview by Amelia R. Fry, August 7, 1972.

Small, Merrell Farnham. "The Office of the Governor under Earl Warren." Interview by Amelia R. Fry and Gabrielle S. Morris, February 24, 1970.

Warren, Earl. Interview by Jerry N. Hess, May 11, 1972. Harry Truman Presidential Library. Transcript at <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/warren.html>.

Author's Interviews & Correspondence:

Brantingham, Barney. Interview by author, June 1, 2012, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Engh, Hans. Interview by author, June 10, 2012, Sacramento, Calif.

Goodall, George, and Kristine Power. Interview by author, May 31, 2012, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Haldeman, Steven. E-mail to author, March 20, 2014.

Larsson, Linda Haldeman. E-mails to author, April 6, April 16 and April 29, 2014.

Menzies, Thomas Storke. Interview by author, June 24, 2012, Glen Ellen, Calif.

Stevens, Michael. E-mails to author, September 15, September 17, October 21, and October 25, 2011.

Storke, Carol E. E-mails to author, August 3 and August 23, 2013.

Storke, Charles A., III. Interview by author, June 25, 2012, San Francisco.

Magazines, Journals & Newsletters: *America, American Library Association Bulletin, American Mercury, American Opinion, The Atlantic, Business Week, Bulletin of the John Birch Society, California Publisher, Christian Century, Collier's, Columbia Journalism Review, Commentary, Commonweal, Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Dan Smoot Report, Editor & Publisher, Esquire, Fortnight, Fortune, Frontier, Holiday, Independent Woman, International Affairs, Kiplinger Magazine, Life, Look, Los Angeles, Los Angeles Times West Magazine, Modern Nutrition Magazine, Mother Jones, The Nation, Nation's Business, National Geographic, National Review, New American, New Republic, New York Times Magazine, The New Yorker, Newsweek, The Quill, The Reporter, Santa Barbara Magazine, Saturday Evening Post, Saturday Review, Science, Science Digest, Sunset, Time, U.S. News & World Report, USA.*

Newspapers: *Amarillo (Texas) Sunday News-Globe, Arizona (Phoenix) Republic, Atlanta Constitution, Bakersfield Californian; Boston Herald, Carpinteria (Calif.) Herald, Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Chicago Daily News, Chicago Tribune, Christian Science Monitor, Cincinnati Enquirer, El Gaucho [UCSB], Freedom Press, Goleta (Calif.) Gazette-Citizen, Indianapolis Star, Kansas City Star, Kansas City Times, Lima (Ohio) News, Lompoc (Calif.) Record, (London) Times Los Angeles Evening Herald Express, Los Angeles Examiner, Los Angeles Herald, Los Angeles Mirror, Los Angeles Times, Milwaukee Journal, Monterey Peninsula Herald, New York Daily News, New York Times, Oakland Tribune, Oceanside (Calif.) Blade-Tribune, Oregon (Salem) Statesman, Pasadena Independent Star-News, People's World, Placerville (Calif.) Mountain Democrat-Times, Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times, Riverside (Calif.) Daily Press, Sacramento Bee, San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner, Saginaw (Mich.) News Courier, San Diego Evening Tribune, San Diego Union, San Jose Mercury, San Jose Mercury-News, Santa Barbara Daily News, Santa Barbara Independent, Santa Barbara Morning Press, Santa Barbara News-Press, Santa Barbara Star, Stamford (Conn.) Advocate, Sunday (London) Times, Ventura County (Calif.) Star-Free Press,*

Wall Street Journal, Washington Star, Washington Post, Woodland (Calif.) Daily Democrat.

Other Primary Sources:

Ashmore, Harry S. *Unreasonable Truths: The Life of Robert Maynard Hutchins*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1989.

Aubery, James M. *The Thirty-Sixth Wisconsin Volunteer Regiment: An Authentic Record of the Regiment from its Organization to its Muster Out*. Milwaukee [?]: n.p., 1900.

Baedeker, Karl, ed., *The United States with an Excursion into Mexico*. 2nd ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Brownfeld, Allan C. *Dossier on Douglas*. Washington, D.C. New Majority Book Club, 1970.

Broyles, J. Allen. *The John Birch Society: Anatomy of a Protest*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Buckley, William F. *The Jeweler's Eye*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.

Commission on Law and Social Action, American Jewish Congress, "Annual Report 1958."

Cone, Mary. *Two Years in California*. Chicago: S.C. Griggs, 1876.

Daniels, E.J. *The Red Devil of Communism*. Orlando: Christ for the World Publishers, 1954.

Douglas, William O. *The Autobiography of William O. Douglas: The Court Years, 1939-1975*. New York: Random House, 1980.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *Mandate for Change: The White House Years*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963.

Epstein, Benjamin R., and Arnold Forster. *The Radical Right: Report on the John Birch Society and Its Allies*. New York: Random House, 1966.

Farley, James A. *Behind the Ballots: A Personal History of a Politician*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1938.

_____. *Jim Farley's Story: The Roosevelt Years*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948.

- Fisher, Lawrence E. "An Incomplete History of the First Presbyterian Church, Santa Barbara, California." n.p.: 1980.
- Flynn, Edward J. *You're the Boss*. New York: Viking Press, 1947.
- Forbes, Gordon. *Too Near the Sun*. New York: Dell, 1955.
- Forster, Arnold, and Benjamin R. Epstein. *Danger on the Right*. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Gordon, Rosalie. *How the Reds Won: The Lesson Behind American-Soviet Parleys*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: America's Future, Inc, 1959.
- _____. *Nine Men against America: The Supreme Court and Its Attack on American Liberties*. New York: Devin-Adair, 1958.
- _____. *What's Happened to Our Schools?* New Rochelle, N.Y.: America's Future, 1956.
- Grove, Gene. *Inside the John Birch Society*. Greenwich, Conn.: Gold Medal Books, 1961.
- Gunther, John. *Inside USA*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947.
- Hawley, Walter A. *The Early Days of Santa Barbara, California*. Santa Barbara: Schauer Printing Studio, 1920.
- Hough, Emerson. *The Web*. Chicago: Reilly & Lee, 1919.
- Janson, Donald, and Bernard Eismann. *The Far Right*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Kelly, Frank K. *Court of Reason: Robert Hutchins and the Fund for the Republic*. New York: Free Press, 1981.
- Kelly, Walt. *The Jack Acid Society Black Book*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962.
- Kerr, Clark. *Academic Triumphs*. Vol. 1, *The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the University of California, 1949-1967*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- _____. *Political Turmoil*. Vol. 2, *The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the University of California, 1949-1967*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Khrushchev, Nikita S., and Strobe Talbott. *Khrushchev Remembers: The Last Testament*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1974.

- Khrushchev, Sergeĭ, and Shirley Benson. *Nikita Khrushchev and the Creation of a Superpower*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.
- Kilpatrick, James Jackson. *The Sovereign States: Notes of a Citizen of Virginia*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1957.
- Knight, Granville F. "Foreword," in Ellen McClay, *Bats in the Belfry: The Case against Mental Health*. Los Angeles: Rosewood Publishing, 1964, xi-xvii.
- Lee, Eugene C. *California Votes, 1928-1960*. Berkeley: University of California Institute of Government Studies, 1963.
- Lee, Eugene C., and Bruce E. Keith. *California Votes, 1960-1972*. Berkeley: University of California Institute of Government Studies, 1974.
- Lewis, Fulton, Jr. *The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic*. Washington, D.C.: Special Reports Inc., 1955.
- Lindley, Walter and J.P. Widney. *California of the South: Its Physical Geography, Climate, Resources, Routes of Travel, and Health-Resorts: Being a Complete Guide-Book to Southern California*. New York: D. Appleton, 1888.
- Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr. *The Storm Has Many Eyes: A Personal Narrative*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1973.
- Mabley, Jack. *Halas, Hef, the Beatles, and Me*. Chicago: Contemporary Books, 1987.
- MacDonald, A.J. *Kangaroo Court Versus the John Birch Society*. Los Angeles: A.J. MacDonald, 1963.
- MacDonald, Dwight. *The Ford Foundation: The Men and the Millions*. New York: Reynal, 1956.
- Mayo, Morrow. *Los Angeles*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1933.
- McAdoo, William Gibbs. *Crowded Years: The Reminiscences of William G. McAdoo*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.
- McWilliams, Carey. *California: The Great Exception*. New York: A.A. Wyn, 1949.
- _____. *The Education of Carey McWilliams*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.
- _____. *Factories in the Field: The Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1939.

- _____. *Southern California: An Island on the Land*. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1946. Reprint, Layton, Utah: Gibbs Smith, 1973.
- Moley, Raymond. *After Seven Years*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939.
- Nelson, Jack, and Gene Roberts Jr. *The Censors and the Schools*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1963.
- Newberry, Mike. *The Fascist Revival: The Inside Story of the John Birch Society*. New York: New Century Publishers, 1961.
- Overstreet, Harry and Bonaro. *The Strange Tactics of Extremism*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1964.
- Perkins, Joseph J. *Business Man's Estimate of Santa Barbara County, California*. Santa Barbara: Daily Press Steam Printing House, 1881.
- Richards, T. Addison. *Appleton's Companion Handbook of Travel*. New York: D. Appleton, 1866.
- Roberts, Edwards. *Santa Barbara and Around There*. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1886.
- Rusher, William A. *The Rise of the Right*. New York: William Morrow, 1984.
- Sands, Frank. *Santa Barbara at a Glance: A Compendium of Reliable Information for Citizens, Sojourners and Strangers Who May Come in Future*. Santa Barbara: n.p., 1895.
- Santa Barbara County Commission to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. *Santa Barbara, California*. Santa Barbara: C.L. Donohoe, 1904.
- Sherwin, Mark. *The Extremists*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963.
- Skousen, W. Cleon. *The Communist Attack on the John Birch Society*. Salt Lake City: Ensign Publishing Co., 1963.
- Spaulding, Edward S. *Adobe Days along the Channel*. Santa Barbara: Schauer Printing Studio, 1957.
- Staats, H. Philip, and Charles Henry Cheney. *Californian Architecture in Santa Barbara*. New York: Architectural Book Publishing Co., 1929.
- Stoddard, Charles A. *Beyond the Rockies: A Spring Journey in California*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.

Storke, Thomas M. *California Editor*. With a foreword by Earl Warren. Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1958.

_____. "A Glimpse of Santa Barbara in the 1890s." *Noticias* 12, no 4. (1966): 13-15.

_____. *I Write for Freedom*. With a foreword by Adlai E. Stevenson. Fresno, Calif.: McNally and Loftin, 1962.

_____. "Santa Barbara and the *News-Press*." Santa Barbara, Calif.: News-Press Publishing Co., n.d.

Storke, Yda Addis. *A Memorial and Biographical History of the Counties of Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo and Ventura, California*. Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1891.

Timmons, Bascom N. *Garner of Texas: A Personal History*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948.

Vahan, Richard. *The Truth about the John Birch Society*. New York: Macfadden-Bartell, 1962.

Waldor, Milton A. *The John Birch Society: Peddlers of Fear*. Newark, N.J.: Lynnross, 1966.

Warner, Charles Dudley. *Our Italy*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1891.

Warren, Earl. *The Memoirs of Chief Justice Earl Warren*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977.

Welch, Robert H.W. *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*. 8th ed. Boston: Western Island Publishers, 1961.

_____. *The Life of John Birch*. Chicago: Regnery, 1954.

_____. *The Politician*. Belmont, Mass.: Belmont Publishing Co., 1963.

Wood, E.N. *Guide to Santa Barbara, Town and County*. Santa Barbara: Wood & Sefton, 1872.

Wormser, René A. *Foundations, Their Power and Influence*. New York: Devin-Adair, 1958.

Video and Sound Recordings:

Brown, Michael. "The John Birch Society." The Chad Mitchell Trio. Kapp 457, 1962.

Columbia Broadcasting System. "Thunder on the Right." *CBS Reports*. Produced by Fred Friendly. 60 min. Films for the Humanities & Sciences, 1962, 2002. DVD.

Dylan, Bob. "Talkin' John Birch Paranoid Blues." *The Bootleg Series, Vols. 1-3*. Columbia Records, 1991.

MSNBC. "John Birch Society." *Rachel Maddow Show*. December 18, 2009. Available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-RJsEPMOHZQ>

Secondary Sources

Books

Ainsworth, Ed. *History of the Los Angeles Times*. Los Angeles: n.p., 1956.

Allitt, Patrick. *The Conservatives: Ideas and Personalities throughout American History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

_____. *Religion in America since 1946: A History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Alter, Jonathan. *The Center Holds: Obama and His Enemies*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2013.

Andree, Herb, Noel Young, and Wayne McCall. *Santa Barbara Architecture, from Spanish Colonial to Modern*. Santa Barbara: Capra Press, 1975.

Andrew, John A., III. *The Other Side of the Sixties: Young Americans for Freedom and the Rise of Conservative Politics*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1997.

Athearn, Robert G. *The Mythic West in Twentieth Century America*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1986).

Baur, John E. *The Health Seekers of Southern California, 1870-1900*. San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1959.

Bayley, Edwin R. *Joe McCarthy and the Press*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981.

Belknap, Michal R. *Cold War Political Justice: The Smith Act, the Communist Party, and American Civil Liberties*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1977.

Bell, Jonathan. *California Crucible: The Forging of Modern American Liberalism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

- Benowitz, June Melby. *Days of Discontent: American Women and Right-Wing Politics, 1933-1945*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2002.
- Berg, A. Scott. *Wilson*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 2013.
- Berlet, Chip, and Matthew N. Lyons. *Right-Wing Populism in America: Too Close for Comfort*. New York: Guilford Press, 2000.
- Bernhard, Nancy C. *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda, 1947-1960*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Black, Maggie. *Children First: The Story of UNICEF, Past and Present*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Blee, Kathleen M., and Sandra McGee Deutsch, ed. *Women of the Right: Comparisons and Interplay across Borders*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012.
- Bogle, Lori Lyn. *The Pentagon's Battle for the American Mind: The Early Cold War Years*. Bryan Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.
- Bogus, Carl T. *Buckley: William F. Buckley Jr. and the Rise of American Conservatism*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2011.
- Bowen, Michael. *The Roots of Modern Conservatism: Dewey, Taft, and the Battle for the Soul of the Republican Party*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011.
- Boyarsky, Bill. *Big Daddy: Jesse Unruh and the Art of Power Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- _____. *The Rise of Ronald Reagan*. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Braitman, Jacqueline R., and Gerald F. Uelman. *Justice Stanley Mosk: A Life at the Center of California Politics and Justice*. Jefferson, N.C: McFarland, 2013.
- Brennan, Mary C. *Turning Right in the Sixties: The Conservative Capture of the GOP*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- _____. *Wives, Mothers, and the Red Menace: Conservative Women and the Crusade against Communism*. Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 2008.
- Broesamle, John J. *William Gibbs McAdoo: A Passion for Change, 1863-1917*. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1973.
- Brown, Archie. *The Rise and Fall of Communism*. New York: HarperCollins, 2009.
- Broyles-Gonzalez, Yolanda, and Pilulaw Khus. *Earth Wisdom: A California Chumash Woman*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2011.

- Burke, Robert E. *Olson's New Deal for California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953.
- Burner, David. *The Politics of Provincialism: The Democratic Party in Transition, 1918-1932*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.
- Busch, Andrew E. *Reagan's Victory: The Presidential Election of 1980 and the Rise of the Right*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.
- Calhoun, Robert M. *Political Moderation in America's First Two Centuries*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Camarillo, Albert. *Chicanos in a Changing Society: From Mexican Pueblos to American Barrios in Santa Barbara and Southern California, 1848-1930*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Cannon, Lou. *Governor Reagan: His Rise to Power*. New York: Public Affairs, 2003.
- _____. *Ronnie and Jesse: A Political Odyssey*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1969.
- Capozzola, Christopher. *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Carlson, Peter. *K Blows Top: A Cold War Comic Interlude, Starring Nikita Khrushchev, America's Most Unlikely Tourist*. New York: Public Affairs, 2009.
- Carney, Francis *The Rise of the Democratic Clubs in California*. New York: Henry Holt, 1958.
- Carter, Dan T. *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.
- Caute, David. *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge under Truman and Eisenhower*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.
- Ceplair, Larry. *Anti-Communism in Twentieth-Century America: A Critical History*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Praeger, 2011.
- Chafe, William H. *The Unfinished Journey: America since World War II*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Chambers, William Nisbet. *The Democrats, 1789-1964: A Short History of a Popular Party*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1964.

- Cohen, Robert. *Freedom's Orator: Mario Savio and the Radical Legacy of the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Cohen, Robert and Reginald E. Zelnik, ed. *The Free Speech Movement: Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Compston, Christine L. *Earl Warren: Justice for All*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Conner, Claire. *Wrapped in the Flag: A Personal History of America's Radical Right*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2013.
- Cragg, Dan. *Guide to Military Installations*, 5th ed. Mechanicsburg, Pa.: Stackpole Books, 1997.
- Craig, Douglas B. *After Wilson: The Struggle for the Democratic Party, 1920-1934*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- _____. *Progressives at War: William G. McAdoo and Newton D. Baker, 1863-1941*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.
- Cray, Ed. *Chief Justice: A Biography of Earl Warren*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997.
- Critchlow, Donald T. *The Conservative Ascendancy: How the GOP Right Made Political History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- _____. *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- _____. *When Hollywood Was Right: How Movie Stars, Studio Moguls, and Big Business Remade American Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Culver, Lawrence. *The Frontier of Leisure: Southern California and the Making of Modern America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Dallek, Matthew. *The Right Moment: Ronald Reagan's First Victory and the Decisive Turning Point in American Politics*. New York: The Free Press, 2000.
- Daly, Christopher B. *Covering America: A Narrative History of a Nation's Journalism*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012.
- Davies, David R. *The Postwar Decline of American Newspapers, 1945-1965*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2006.

- Davis, David Brion, ed., *The Fear of Conspiracy: Images of Un-American Subversion from the Revolution to the Present*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1971.
- Delmatier, Royce D., Clarence F. McIntosh, and Earl G. Waters, ed. *The Rumble of California Politics, 1848-1970*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- Delton, Jennifer A. *Rethinking the 1950s: How Anticommunism and the Cold War Made America Liberal*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Deverell, William, and Tom Sitton, ed. *California Progressivism Revisited*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Deverell, William. *Railroad Crossing: Californians and the Railroad, 1850-1910*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- _____. *Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of Its Mexican Past*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Diamond, Sara. *Roads to Dominion: Right-Wing Movements and Political Power in the United States*. New York: Guilford Press, 1995.
- Dionne, E.J. *Our Divided Political Heart: The Battle for the American Idea in an Age of Discontent*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2012.
- Doenecke, Justus D. *Not to the Swift: The Old Isolationists in the Cold War Era*. Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 1979.
- Doherty, Thomas. *Cold War, Cool Medium: Television, McCarthyism, and American Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.
- Douglas, George H. *The Golden Age of the Newspaper*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- Dudziak, Mary L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Dumke, Glenn S. *The Boom of the Eighties in Southern California*. San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1944.
- Dvorin, Eugene, and Arthur J. Misner, ed. *California Politics and Policies: Original Essays*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1966.
- Dzuback, Mary Ann. *Robert M. Hutchins: Portrait of an Educator*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

- Etulain, Richard W., and Michael P. Malone. *The American West: A Modern History, 1900 to the Present*. 2nd ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007
- Farber, David, and Jeff Roche, ed. *The Conservative Sixties*. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.
- Farr, Finis. *Fair Enough: The Life of Westbrook Pegler*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1975.
- Farrelly, David, and Ivan Hinderaker. *The Politics of California: A Book of Readings*. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.
- Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration of Northern California. *The WPA Guide to California: The Federal Writers Project Guide to 1930s California*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Federal Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration. *A Guide to the Channel City and Its Environs*. New York: Hastings House, 1941.
- Feldman, Jay. *Manufacturing Hysteria: A History of Scapegoating, Surveillance, and Secrecy in Modern America*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2011.
- Fernlund, Kevin J. *The Cold War American West, 1945-1989*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998.
- Findlay, James F., Jr. *Church People in the Struggle: The National Council of Churches and the Black Freedom Movement, 1950-1970*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Foley, Elizabeth Price. *The Tea Party: Three Principles*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Formisano, Ronald P. *The Tea Party: A Brief History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.
- Fraser, Steve, and Gary Gerstle, ed. *The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order, 1930-1980*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Fried, Richard M. *The Russians are Coming! The Russians are Coming! Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold-War America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Friedberg, Aaron L. *In the Shadow of the Garrison State: America's Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Froese, Paul. *The Plot to Kill God: Findings from the Soviet Experiment in Secularization*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

- Frost, Jennifer. *Hedda Hopper's Hollywood: Celebrity Gossip and American Conservatism*. New York: New York University Press, 2011.
- Fuerst, Martin J. *Bibliography on the Origins and History of the John Birch Society*. 5th ed. Sacramento, Calif.: St. Didacus Co., 1965.
- Fursenko, A. A., and Timothy J. Naftali. *Khrushchev's Cold War: The Inside Story of an American Adversary*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2006.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Cold War: A New History*. New York: Penguin Books, 2005.
- _____. *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.
- Gareis, Sven Bernhard, and Johannes Varwick. *The United Nations: An Introduction*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
- Gebhard, Patricia. *George Washington Smith: Architect of the Spanish Colonial Revival*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 2005.
- George, Alice. *Awaiting Armageddon: How Americans Faced the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- George, John, and Laird Wilcox. *Nazis, Communists, Klansmen and Others on the Fringe*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1992.
- Gifford, Laura Jane, and Daniel K. Williams, ed., *The Right Side of the Sixties: Reexamining Conservatism's Decade of Transformation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2012.
- Gill, Jill K. *Embattled Ecumenism: The National Council of Churches, the Vietnam War, and the Trials of the Protestant Left*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2011.
- Going, Allen Johnston. *Bourbon Democracy in Alabama, 1874-1890*. University: University of Alabama Press, 1951.
- Goldberg, Robert Alan. *Barry Goldwater*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- _____. *Enemies Within: The Culture of Conspiracy in Modern America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Grassroots Resistance: Social Movements in Twentieth Century America*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1991.

- Gottlieb, Robert, and Irene Wolt. *Thinking Big: The Story of the Los Angeles Times, Its Publishers and Their Influence on Southern California*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1977.
- Graham, Otis L., Jr. *An Encore for Reform: The Old Progressives and the New Deal*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Greenbaum, Fred. *Men against Myths: The Progressive Response*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2000.
- Gregg, James E. *Newspaper Endorsements and Local Elections in California*. California Government Series, no. 12. Davis: University of California Institute of Government Affairs, 1966.
- Gregory, James N. *American Exodus: The Dust Bowl Migration and Okie Culture in California*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Griffin, G. Edward. *The Life and Words of Robert Welch, Founder of the John Birch Society*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: American Media, 1975.
- Halberstam, David. *The Powers That Be*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979.
- Hardisty, Jean. *Mobilizing Resentment: Conservative Resurgence from the John Birch Society to the Promise Keepers*. Forward by Wilma Mankiller. Boston: Beacon Press, 1999.
- Hart, Roger L. *Redeemers, Bourbons and Populists: Tennessee, 1870-1896*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1975.
- Harvey, Richard B. *Earl Warren: Governor of California*. New York: Exposition Press, 1969.
- Hawley, Willis D. *Nonpartisan Elections and the Case for Party Politics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.
- Hendershot, Heather. *What's Fair on the Air? Cold War Right Wing Broadcasting and the Public Interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- Hennings, Robert E. *James D. Phelan and the Wilson Progressives of California*. New York: Garland, 1985.
- Herring, George C. *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

- Herzog, Jonathan P. *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex: America's Religious Battle against Communism in the Early Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Hill, Gladwin. *Dancing Bear: An Inside Look at California Politics*. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing, 1968.
- Himmelstein, Jerome L. *To the Right: The Transformation of American Conservatism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Hodgson, Godfrey. *The World Turned Right Side Up: A History of the Conservative Ascendancy in America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996.
- Hofstadter, Richard. *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966. Reprint, New York: Vintage Books, 2008.
- Horwitz, Robert B. *America's Right: Anti-Establishment Conservatism from Goldwater to the Tea Party*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 2013.
- Howison, Jeffery D. *The 1980 Presidential Election: Ronald Reagan and the Shaping of the American Conservative Movement*. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Hundley, Norris. *The Great Thirst: Californians and Water, 1770s-1990s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Hustwit, William P. *James J. Kilpatrick: Salesman for Segregation*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.
- Hyman, Harold M. *To Try Men's Souls: Loyalty Tests in American History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Irons, Peter. *Jim Crow's Children: The Broken Promise of the Brown Decision*. New York: Viking, 2002.
- Isserman, Maurice, and Michael Kazin. *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Jacobs, Ronald N., and Eleanor Townsley. *The Space of Opinion: Media Intellectuals and the Public Sphere*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Jeansonne, Glen. *Women of the Far Right: The Mother's Movement and World War II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Jensen, Joan M. *The Price of Vigilance*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.

- John, Richard R. *Spreading the News: The American Postal System from Franklin to Morse*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Johnson, George. *Architects of Fear: Conspiracy Theories and Paranoia in American Politics*. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Thatcher, 1983.
- Kabaservice, Geoffrey. *Rule and Ruin: The Downfall of Moderation and the Destruction of the Republican Party from Eisenhower to the Tea Party*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Kaplan, Richard L. *Politics and the American Press: The Rise of Objectivity, 1865-1920*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Katcher, Leo. *Earl Warren: A Political Biography*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Keck, Thomas M. *The Most Activist Supreme Court in History: The Road to Modern Judicial Conservatism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Kelley, Robert L. *Transformations: UC Santa Barbara, 1909-1979*. Santa Barbara: University of California, Santa Barbara, 1981.
- Kennedy, David M. *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- _____. *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Key, V.O. *Politics, Parties, & Pressure Groups*. New York: Crowell, 1964.
- _____. *Public Opinion and American Democracy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Klarman, Michael J. *From Jim Crow to Civil Rights: The Supreme Court and the Struggle for Racial Equality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Klatch, Rebecca E. *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Klock, Paul R., ed. *Western Space and Missile Center: Vandenberg Air Force Base, California*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Air Force, 1990.
- Kluger, Richard. *Simple Justice*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976.
- Kropp, Phoebe S. *California Vieja: Culture and Memory in a Modern American Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

- Kyvig, David E. *The Age of Impeachment: American Constitutional Culture since 1960*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008.
- LaFeber, Walter. *America, Russia and the Cold War*. 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.
- Lamar, Howard Roberts. *The Far Southwest, 1846-1912: A Territorial History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Lambert, Frank. *Religion in American Politics: A Short History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Landberg, Leif C.W. *The Chumash Indians of Southern California*. Los Angeles: Southwest Museum, 1965.
- Laslett, John H.M. *Sunshine Was Never Enough: Los Angeles Workers, 1880-2010*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
- Lassiter, Matthew D., and Andrew B. Lewis, ed. *The Moderates' Dilemma: Massive Resistance to School Desegregation in Virginia*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998.
- Latham, Earl. *The Communist Controversy in Washington: From the New Deal to McCarthy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Laville, Helen. *Cold War Women: The International Activities of American Women's Organisations*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Lee, Eugene C. *The Politics of Nonpartisanship: A Study of California City Elections*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Leonard, Thomas C. *The Power of the Press: The Birth of American Political Reporting*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Lepore, Jill. *The Whites of Their Eyes: The Tea Party's Revolution and the Battle over American History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Lewis, Frederick P. *The Context of Judicial Activism: The Endurance of the Warren Court Legacy in a Conservative Age*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999.
- Limerick, Patricia Nelson. *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1987.
- Lipset, Seymour M., and Earl Raab. *The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790-1970*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

- Lochin, Roger W. *Fortress California, 1910-1961: From Warfare to Welfare*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Lower, Richard Coke. *A Bloc of One: The Political Career of Hiram W. Johnson*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Lowitt, Richard. *The New Deal and the West*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- _____, ed. *Politics in the Postwar American West*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.
- Luck, Edward C. *Mixed Messages: American Politics and International Organization, 1919-1999*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999.
- Lytle, Mark Hamilton. *America's Uncivil Wars: The Sixties Era from Elvis to the Fall of Richard Nixon*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- MacLean, Nancy. *Freedom is Not Enough: The Opening of the American Workplace*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Malone, Michael P., and Richard W. Etulain. *The American West: A Twentieth-Century History*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.
- Mannino, Edward F. *Shaping America: The Supreme Court and American Society*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2009.
- Martelle, Scott. *The Fear Within: Spies, Commies, and American Democracy on Trial*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2011.
- Matsumoto, Valerie J., and Blake Allmendinger. *Over the Edge: Remapping the American West*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Mattson, Kevin. *Rebels All! A Short History of the Conservative Mind in Postwar America*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2008.
- May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1998.
- Mayer, Milton. *Robert Maynard Hutchins: A Memoir*. Edited by John H. Hicks. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- McCarthy, Anna. *The Citizen Machine: Governing by Television in 1950s America*. New York: New Press, 2010.
- McDougal, Dennis. *Privileged Son: Otis Chandler and the Rise and Fall of the L.A. Times Dynasty*. Cambridge, Mass.: Perseus Publishing, 2001.

- McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- McKenzie, David. *A World Beyond Borders: An Introduction to the History of International Organizations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.
- McMahon, Kevin J. *Nixon's Court: His Challenge to Judicial Liberalism and Its Political Consequences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- McNeill, William Hardy. *Hutchins' University: A Memoir of the University of Chicago, 1929-1950*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Meacham, Jon. *Thomas Jefferson: The Art of Power*. New York: Random House, 2012.
- Meilinger, Philip S. *Hoyt S. Vandenberg: The Life of a General*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Merrill, Horace Samuel. *Bourbon Leader: Grover Cleveland and the Democratic Party*. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1957.
- Meyerowitz, Joanne J., ed. *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.
- Miller, Clyde A., II, ed. *A New Significance: Re-Envisioning the History of the American West*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Minutaglio, Bill, and Steven L. Davis. *Dallas 1963*. New York: Twelve, 2013.
- Mitchell, Greg. *The Campaign of the Century: Upton Sinclair's Race for Governor of California and the Birth of Media Politics*. New York: Random House, 1992.
- Montgomery, Gayle B., and James W. Johnson. *One Step from the White House: The Rise and Fall of Senator William F. Knowland*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Morgan, Ted. *Reds: McCarthyism in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: Random House, 2003.
- Morone, James A. *Hellfire Nation: The Politics of Sin in American History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Morris, Roger. *Richard Milhous Nixon: The Rise of an American Politician*. New York: Henry Holt, 1990.
- Moser, John E. *Right Turn: John T. Flynn and the Transformation of American Liberalism*. New York: New York University Press, 2005.
- Mowry, George E. *The California Progressives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951.

- Mullins, William H. *The Depression and the Urban West Coast, 1929-1933*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Murphy, Bruce Allen. *Wild Bill: The Legend and Life of William O. Douglas*. New York: Random House, 2003.
- Murphy, Paul L. *World War I and the Origin of Civil Liberties in the United States*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1979.
- Murray, Robert K. *Red Scare: A Study in National Hysteria, 1919-1920*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955.
- Muse, Benjamin. *Virginia's Massive Resistance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961.
- Nasaw, David. *The Chief: The Life of William Randolph Hearst*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.
- Nash, George H. *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America since 1945*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Nash, Gerald D. *Creating the West: Historical Interpretations, 1890-1990*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991.
- Nash, Gerald D., and Richard W. Etulain, ed. *The Twentieth-Century West: Historical Interpretations*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989.
- Neal, Steve. *Happy Days Are Here Again: The 1932 Democratic National Convention, the Emergence of FDR—and How America Was Changed Forever*. New York: William Morrow, 2004.
- Newton, Jim. *Eisenhower: The White House Years*. New York: Doubleday, 2011.
- _____. *Justice for All: Earl Warren and the Nation He Made*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2006.
- Nickerson, Michelle M. *Mothers of Conservatism: Women and the Postwar Right*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Nord, David Paul. *Communities of Journalism: A History of American Newspapers and Their Readers*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001.
- Olin, Spencer. *California's Prodigal Sons: Hiram Johnson and the Progressives, 1911-1917*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.
- Orsi, Richard J. *Sunset Limited: The Southern Pacific Railroad and the Development of the American West, 1850-1930*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

- Oshinsky, David M. *A Conspiracy So Immense: The World of Joe McCarthy*. New York: Free Press, 1983.
- Owens, John R., Edmond Costantini, and Louis F. Weschler. *California Politics and Parties*. New York: MacMillan, 1970.
- Parker, Christopher S., and Matt A. Barreto. *Change They Can't Believe In: The Tea Party and Reactionary Politics in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Patterson, James T. *Brown v. Board of Education: A Civil Rights Milestone and Its Troubled Legacy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Paul, Rand, and Jack Hunter. *The Tea Party Goes to Washington*. New York: Center Street, 2011.
- Perlstein, Rick. *Before the Storm: Barry Goldwater and the Unmaking of the American Consensus*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2001.
- _____. *Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America*. New York: Scribner, 2008.
- Peppers, Todd C. *Courtiers of the Marble Palace: The Rise and Influence of the Supreme Court Law Clerk*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Phillips, Herbert L. *Big Wayward Girl: An Informal Political History of California*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968.
- Phillips-Fein, Kim. *Invisible Hands: The Making of the Conservative Movement from the New Deal to Reagan*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2009.
- Pilat, Oliver. *Pegler: Angry Man of the Press*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.
- Pitt, Leonard. *The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1890*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
- Powaski, Ronald E. *Toward an Entangling Alliance: American Isolationism, Internationalism, and Europe*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Powe, Lucas A., Jr. *The Warren Court and American Politics*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000.

- Powers, Richard Gid. *Not without Honor: The History of American Anticommunism*. New York: Free Press, 1995.
- Procter, Ben. *William Randolph Hearst: The Early Years, 1863-1910*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- _____. *William Randolph Hearst: The Later Years, 1911-1951*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Pubols, Louise. *The Father of All: The de la Guerra Family, Power, and Patriarchy in Mexican California*. Berkeley: Published for the Huntington-USC Institute on California and the West by University of California Press and Huntington Library, 2009.
- Putnam, Jackson K. *Old-Age Politics in California: From Richardson to Reagan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- Rae, Nicol C. *The Decline and Fall of the Liberal Republicans: From 1952 to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press: 1989.
- Ramet, Sabrina Petra, *Religious Policy in the Soviet Union*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Rarick, Ethan. *California Rising: The Life and Times of Pat Brown*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Reeves, Thomas C., ed. *Foundations under Fire*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1970.
- _____. *Freedom and the Foundation: The Fund for the Republic in the Era of McCarthyism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.
- _____. *The Life and Times of Joe McCarthy: A Biography*. New York: Stein and Day, 1982.
- Regnery, Alfred S. *Upstream: The Ascendance of American Conservatism*. New York: Threshold Editions, 2008.
- Reisner, Marc. *Cadillac Desert: The American West and Its Disappearing Water*. New York: Viking, 1986.
- Rice, Richard B., William A. Burrough, and Richard J. Orsi, *The Elusive Eden: A New History of California*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996.
- Ritchie, Donald. *Reporting from Washington: The History of the Washington Press Corps*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Roberts, Brian. *American Alchemy: The California Gold Rush and Middle-Class Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Robins, Robert S., and Jerrold M. Post. *Political Paranoia: The Psychopolitics of Hatred*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Roche, Jeff. *The Political Culture of the New West*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008.
- Roche, John P. *The Quest for the Dream: The Development of Civil Rights and Human Relations in Modern America*. New York: Macmillan, 1963.
- Rogin, Michael Paul, and John L. Shover. *Political Change in California: Critical Elections and Social Movements*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing, 1970.
- Rohrbough, Malcolm J. *Days of Gold: The California Gold Rush and the American Nation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Rorabaugh, W.J. *Berkeley at War: The 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Rose, Lisle A. *The Cold War Comes to Main Street: America in 1950*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999.
- Rosen, Elliot A. *Hoover, Roosevelt, and the Brains Trust: From Depression to New Deal*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.
- Rosenfeld, Seth. *Subversives: The FBI's War on Student Radicals, and Reagan's Rise to Power*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2012.
- Ryan, James E. *Five Miles Away, A World Apart: One City, Two Schools, and the Story of Educational Opportunity in Modern America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Sabin, Arthur J. *In Calmer Times: The Supreme Court and Red Monday*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Sarashon, David. *The Party of Reform: Democrats in the Progressive Era*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1989.
- Sayler, Richard H., Barry B. Boyer, and Robert E. Gooding Jr., ed. *The Warren Court: A Critical Analysis*. New York: Chelsea House, 1969.
- Scheck, Raffael. *Mothers of the Nation: Right-Wing Women in Weimar Germany*. New York: Berg, 2004.

- Scheiber, Harry N. *The Wilson Administration and Civil Liberties, 1917-1921*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1960.
- Schneider, Gregory L. *The Conservative Century: From Reaction to Revolution*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009.
- Schoenberger, Robert A., ed. *The American Right Wing: Readings in Political Behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Schoenwald, Jonathan M. *A Time for Choosing: The Rise of American Conservatism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Schomp, Gerald. *Birchism Was My Business*. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
- Schrecker, Ellen. *Many are the Crimes: McCarthyism in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Schudson, Michael. *Discovering the News: The Social History of American Newspapers*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.
- Schulman, Bruce J. and Julian E. Zelizer, ed. *Rightward Bound: Making American Conservative in the 1970s*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Schuparra, Kurt. *Triumph of the Right: The Rise of the California Conservative Movement, 1945-1966*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1998.
- Schwartz, Bernard. *Super Chief: Earl Warren and His Supreme Court—A Judicial Biography*. New York: New York University Press, 1983.
- Schwartz, Jordan A. *The New Dealers: Power Politics in the Age of Roosevelt*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.
- Scroop, Daniel. *Mr. Democrat: Jim Farley, the New Deal, and the Making of Modern American Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006.
- Service, Robert. *Comrades! A History of World Communism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Sheppard, Si. *The Partisan Press: A History of Media Bias in the United States*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2008.
- Shermer, Elizabeth Tandy, ed. *Barry Goldwater and the Remaking of the American Political Landscape*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013.
- Silk, Mark. *Spiritual Politics: Religion and America Since World War II*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988.

- Simmons, Solon. *The Eclipse of Equality: Arguing America on Meet the Press*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- Simpson, Lee M.A. *Selling the City: Gender, Class, and the California Growth Machine, 1880-1940*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Sitton, Tom, and William Deverell, ed. *Metropolis in the Making: Los Angeles in the 1920s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Sitton, Tom. *John Randolph Haynes: California Progressive*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Skocpol, Theda, and Vanessa Williamson. *The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Small, Melvin, ed. *A Companion to Richard M. Nixon*. London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- Smith, Jason Scott. *Building New Deal Liberalism: The Political Economy of Public Works, 1933-1956*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Smythe, Ted Curtis. *The Gilded Age Press, 1865-1900*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2003.
- St. Clair, James E., and Linda C. Gugin. *Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson of Kentucky: A Political Biography*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002.
- Starr, Kevin. *Americans and the California Dream, 1850-1915*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- _____. *California: A History*. New York: Modern Library, 2005.
- _____. *The Dream Endures: California Enters the 1940s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- _____. *Endangered Dreams: The Great Depression in California*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- _____. *Golden Dreams: California in an Age of Abundance, 1950-1963*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- _____. *Inventing the Dream: California through the Progressive Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- _____. *Material Dreams: Southern California through the 1920s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

- Stern, Seth, and Stephen Wermiel. *Justice Brennan: Legal Champion*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2010.
- Stevens, Bryan W. *The John Birch Society in California Politics, 1966*. Valinda, Calif.: Publius Society, 1966.
- Stevens, Errol Wayne. *Radical L.A.: From Coxey's Army to the Watts Riots, 1894-1965*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009.
- Stevens, Jason W. *God-Fearing and Free: A Spiritual History of America's Cold War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Stimson, Grace H. *Rise of the Labor Movement in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.
- Storrs, Landon R.Y. *The Second Red Scare and the Unmaking of the New Deal Left*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Summers, Mark W. *The Era of Good Stealings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- _____. *Party Games: Getting, Keeping, and Using Power in Gilded Age Politics*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- _____. *The Press Gang: Newspapers and Politics, 1865-1878*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Swanberg, W.A. *Citizen Hearst*. New York: Scribner, 1961.
- Tanenhaus, Sam. *Whittaker Chambers: A Biography*. New York: Random House, 1997.
- Taubman, William. *Khrushchev: The Man and His Era*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2003.
- Tebbel, John William. *The Compact History of the American Newspaper*. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1969.
- Thomas, William H., Jr. *Unsafe for Democracy: World War I and the U.S. Justice Department's Covert Campaign to Suppress Dissent*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008.
- Tomlins, Christopher, ed. *The United States Supreme Court: The Pursuit of Justice*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2005.
- Tompkins, Walker A. *Santa Barbara History Makers*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: McNally & Loftin, 1983.

- _____. *The Yankee Barbareños: The Americanization of Santa Barbara County, 1796-1925*. Ventura, Calif.: Movini Press, 2003.
- Toobin, Jeffrey. *The Oath: The Obama White House and the Supreme Court*. New York: Doubleday, 2012.
- Tushnet, Mark, ed. *The Warren Court in Historical and Political Perspective*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993.
- Van Nuys, Frank. *Americanizing the West: Race, Immigrants, and Citizenship, 1890-1930*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002.
- Vinyard, Jo Ellen McNergney. *Right in Michigan's Grassroots: From the KKK to the Michigan Militia*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011.
- Wagner, Steven. *Eisenhower Republicanism: Pursuing the Middle Way*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006.
- Walton, John. *Western Times and Water Wars: State, Culture and Rebellion in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Wanner, Catherine, ed. *State Secularism and Lived Religion in the Soviet Union and Ukraine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Ward, James A. *Ferrytale: The Career of W.H. "Ping" Ferry*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Weaver, John D. *Warren: The Man, the Court, the Era*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.
- Weiss, Thomas G., et al. *UN Voices: The Struggle for Development and Social Justice*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- Westad, Odd Arne. *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- White, G. Edward. *Earl Warren: A Public Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- _____. *The Eastern Establishment and the Western Experience: The West of Frederic Remington, Theodore Roosevelt, and Owen Wister*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- White, Richard, and John M. Findlay, ed. *Power and Place in the North American West*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1999.

- Whitfield, Steven. *The Culture of the Cold War*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Wilentz, Sean. *The Age of Reagan: A History, 1974-2008*. New York: HarperCollins, 2008.
- Wilkinson, J. Harvie. *Harry Byrd and the Changing Face of Virginia Politics, 1945-1966*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1968.
- Williams, R. Hal. *The Democratic Party and California Politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1973.
- Wilson, James Q. *The Amateur Democrat: Club Politics in Three Cities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Woods, Jeff. *Black Struggle, Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004.
- Worster, Donald. *Rivers of Empire: Water, Aridity, and the Growth of the American West*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Worthen, James. *The Young Nixon and His Rivals: Four California Republicans Eye the White House, 1946-1958*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2010.
- Wrobel, David M., and Michael C. Steiner, ed. *Many Wests: Place, Culture and Regional Identity*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997.
- Yurchak, Alexei. *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Zernike, Kate. *Boiling Mad: Inside Tea Party America*. New York: Henry Holt, 2010.
- Zubok, Vladislav, and Constantine Pleshakov. *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War: From Stalin to Khrushchev*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Journal Articles:

- Adamson, Michael R. "The Makings of a Fine Prosperity: Thomas M. Storke, the *Santa Barbara News-Press*, and the Campaign to Approve the Cachuma Project." *Journal of Urban History* 30 (January 2004): 189-212.
- Allen, Lee N. "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924." *Journal of Southern History* 29 (May 1963): 211-28.
- Anderson, Totton J. "The 1958 Election in California." *Western Political Quarterly* 12 (March 1959): 276-300.

- Bagby, Wesley M. "William Gibbs McAdoo and the 1920 Democratic Presidential Nomination." *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications* 31 (1959): 43-58.
- _____. "Woodrow Wilson, a Third Term, and the Solemn Referendum." *American Historical Review* 60 (April 1955): 567-575.
- Barker, Roseanne M. "Small-Town Progressivism: Pearl Chase and Female Activism in Santa Barbara, California, 1911-1918." *Southern California Quarterly* 79 (Spring 1997): 47-100.
- Bell, Jonathan. "Social Democracy and the Rise of the Democratic Party in California, 1950-1964." *Historical Journal* 49, no. 2 (2006): 497-524.
- Bemis, George W. "Sectionalism in State Politics." *Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 248 (November 1946): 232-35.
- Bender, Averam B. "From Tanks to Missiles: Camp Cooke/Cooke Air Force Base (California), 1941-1958." *Arizona and the West* 9 (Autumn 1967): 219-42.
- Brinkley, Alan. "Conservatism as a Growing Field of Scholarship." *Journal of American History* 98 (December 2011): 748-51.
- _____. "The Problem of American Conservatism." *American Historical Review* 99 (April 1994): 409-429.
- Brown, Norman D. "Garnering Votes for 'Cactus Jack': John Nance Garner, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the 1932 Democratic Nomination for President," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 104 (October 2000): 149-88.
- Calhoun, Robert M. "On Political Moderation." *Journal of the Historical Society* 1 (June 2006): 275-95.
- Chappell, David L. "The Divided Mind of Southern Segregationists." *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 82 (Spring 1998): 45-72.
- Clayton, James L. "Defense Spending Key to California's Growth." *Western Political Quarterly* 15 (June 1962): 280-93.
- _____. "The Impact of the Cold War on the Economies of California and Utah." *Pacific Historical Review* 36 (November 1967): 449-73.
- Critchlow, Donald T. "Rethinking American Conservatism: Toward a New Narrative." *Journal of American History* 98 (December 2011): 752-55.

- Douglass, John Aubrey. "Earl Warren's New Deal: Economic Transition, Postwar Planning, and Higher Education in California." *Journal of Policy History* 12, no. 4 (2000): 473-512.
- Duram, James C., and Eleanor A. Duram. "The John Birch Society and the Constitution: A Study in Distortion." *Indiana Social Studies Quarterly* 23 (Spring 1970): 44-54.
- Epps, Garrett. "The Littlest Rebel: James J. Kilpatrick and the Second Civil War." *Constitutional Commentary* 10 (Winter 1993): 19-36.
- Epstein, Richard A. "The Takings Jurisprudence of the Warren Court: A Constitutional Siesta." *Tulsa Law Journal* 31 (Summer 1996): 644-76.
- Findley, James C. "Cross-Filing and the Progressive Movement in California Politics." *Western Political Quarterly* 12 (September 1959): 699-711.
- Gebhard, David. "The Spanish Colonial Revival in Southern California, 1895-1930." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 26 (May 1967): 131-47.
- Goebel, Thomas. "'A Case of Democratic Contagion': Direct Democracy in the American West, 1890-1920." *Pacific Historical Review* 66 (May 1997): 213-30.
- Gordon, Mitchell. "The Chandlers of Los Angeles." *Nieman Reports* 19 (December 1965): 15-19.
- Grassman, Curtis E. "Prologue to California Reform: The Democratic Impulse, 1886-1898." *Pacific Historical Review* 42 (November 1973): 518-36.
- Gregg, James E. "Newspaper Editorial Endorsements and California Elections, 1948-62." *Journalism Quarterly* 42 (Autumn 1965): 532-38.
- Harvey, Richard B. "Governor Earl Warren of California: A Study in 'Non-Partisan' Republican Politics." *California Historical Society Quarterly* 46 (March 1967): 33-51.
- Hennings, Robert E. "California Democratic Politics in the Period of Republican Ascendancy." *Pacific Historical Review* 31 (August 1962): 267-80.
- Hichborn, Franklin. "The Party, the Machine, and the Vote: The Story of Cross-filing in California Politics." *California Historical Society Quarterly* 38 (December 1959): 349-57.
- Holmes, Todd. "Demise and Ascent: The Career of Thomas Kuchel and the Advent of the Reagan Right." *Boom: A Journal of California* 1, no. 4 (Winter 2011): 21-25.

- Hustwit, William P. "From Caste to Color Blindness: James J. Kilpatrick's Segregationist Semantics." *Journal of Southern History* 77 (August 2011): 639-66.
- Isaacs, Terry. "Politics, Religion and the Blue Book: The John Birch Society in Eastern New Mexico and West Texas, 1960-1965." *New Mexico Historical Review* 71 (January 1996): 51-73.
- McGirr, Lisa. "A History of the Conservative Movement from the Bottom Up." *Journal of Policy History* 14, no. 3 (2002): 331-39.
- McHenry, Dean E. "Cross Filing of Political Candidates in California." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 248 (November 1946): 226-31.
- _____. "The Pattern of California Politics." *Political Research Quarterly* 1 (1948): 44-53.
- Nye, Ronald L. "The Challenge to Philanthropy: Unemployment Relief in Santa Barbara, 1930-1932." *California Historical Quarterly* 56 (Winter 1977-1978): 310-27.
- Oliver, Pamela, and Mark Furman. "Contradictions between National and Local Organizational Strength: The Case of the John Birch Society." *International Social Movement Research* 2 (1989): 157-61.
- Patenaude, Lionel V. "The Garner Switch to Roosevelt: The 1932 Democratic Convention." *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 79 (October 1975): 189-204.
- Phillips-Fein, Kim. "Conservatism: A State of the Field." *Journal of American History* 98 (December 2011): 723-43.
- Pitchell, Robert J. "The Electoral System and Voting Behavior: The Case of California's Cross-Filing." *Western Political Quarterly* 12 (June 1959): 459-484.
- Posner, Russell M. "California's Role in the Nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt." *California Historical Society Quarterly* 39 (June 1960): 121-39.
- Pritchard, Robert L. "California Un-American Activities Investigations: Subversion on the Right?" *California Historical Society Quarterly* 49 (December 1970): 309-327.
- Prude, James C. "William Gibbs McAdoo and the Democratic National Convention of 1924." *Journal of Southern History* 38 (November 1972): 621-28.
- Putnam, Jackson K. "The Pattern of Modern California Politics." *Pacific Historical Review* 61 (February 1992): 23-52.

- _____. "The Persistence of Progressivism in the 1920s: The Case of California." *Pacific Historical Review* 35 (November 1966): 395-411.
- Rawls, James J. "The California Mission as Symbol and Myth," *California History* 71 (Fall 1992): 342-61.
- Reeves, Thomas C. "The Foundation and Freedoms: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Fund for the Republic." *Pacific Historical Review* 34 (May 1965): 197-218.
- Rogin, Michael. "Progressivism and the California Electorate." *Journal of American History* 55 (September 1968): 297-314.
- Rosen, Elliot. "Baker on the Fifth Ballot? The Democratic Alternative: 1932." *Ohio History* 75 (1966): 226-46.
- Rusher, William A. "Toward a History of the Conservative Movement." *Journal of Policy History* 14, no. 3 (2002): 321-30.
- Rutenbeck, Jeffery B. "Newspaper Trends in the 1870s: Proliferation, Popularization, and Political Independence." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 72 (Summer 1995): 361-75.
- Sagarena, Roberto Lint. "Building California's Past: Mission Revival Architecture and Regional Identity." *Journal of Urban History* 28 (May 2002): 429-44.
- Shields, Currin V. "A Note on Party Organization: The Democrats of California." *Western Political Quarterly* 7 (December 1954): 673-83.
- Shover, John L. "The California Progressives and the 1924 Campaign." *California Historical Quarterly* 51 (Spring 1972): 59-74.
- Simmons, William S. "Indian Peoples of California." *California History* 76 (Summer/Fall 1997): 48-77.
- Spivak, Joshua. "California's Recall: Adoption of the 'Grand Bounce' for Elected Officials." *California History* 82, no. 2 (2004): 20-37.
- Stone, Barbara S. "The John Birch Society: A Profile." *Journal of Politics* 36 (February 1974): 184-97.
- Stratton, David H. "Splattered with Oil: William G. McAdoo and the 1924 Democratic Presidential Nomination." *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* 44 (June 1963): 62-75.
- Taggart, Harold F. "The Party Realignment of 1896 in California." *Pacific Historical Review* 8 (December 1939): 435-52.

- Tompkins, Walker A. "Santa Barbara Journalists, 1855-1973." *Noticias* 19 (Winter 1973): 1-19.
- Toy, Eckard V., Jr. "The Right Side of the 1960s: The Origins of the John Birch Society in the Pacific Northwest." *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 105 (Summer 2004): 260-83.
- Vanzi, Max. "Harry Chandler and Harrison Gray Otis." *California Journal* 30 (November 1999): 24-25.
- Wilson, James Q. "A Guide to Reagan Country: The Political Culture of Southern California." *Commentary* 43 (May 1967): 37-45.
- Witwer, David. "Westbrook Pegler and the Anti-union Movement." *Journal of American History* 92 (September 2005): 527-52.
- Dissertations and Theses:
- Berkowitz, Aaron M. "Mr. Khrushchev Goes to Washington: Domestic Opposition to Nikita Khrushchev's 1959 Visit to America." Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Chicago, 2010.
- Brenner, Samuel Lawrence, "Shouting at the Rain: The Voices and Ideas of Right-Wing Anti-communist Americanists in the Era of Modern American Conservatism, 1950-1974." Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 2009.
- Chase, Philip M. "William Gibbs McAdoo: The Last Progressive, 1863-1941." Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 2008.
- Hart, Randle Joseph. "The Truth in Time: Robert Welch, the John Birch Society and the American Conservative Movement, 1900-1972." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2007.
- Henderson, Lloyd Ray. "Earl Warren and California Politics." Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1965.
- Hosterman, Craig A. "An Analysis of Three Rhetorical Strategies Utilized by Robert Welch in Response to the Initial Wave of Criticism over the John Birch Society during 1960-1961." Ph.D. diss., Kent State University, 1975.
- Larson, Eric C. "The Issue of Birchism in the 1962 California Republican Gubernatorial Primary." Master's thesis, California State University, Fullerton, 1975.
- Stone, Barbara S. "The John Birch Society of California." Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1968.

Tocchet, Gary John. "September Thaw: Khrushchev's Visit to America, 1959." Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1995.

Tuttle, Frederick B., Jr. "The California Democrats, 1953-1966." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1975.

Wood, Jean. "Thomas Storke and the John Birch Society." Senior thesis, Immaculate Heart College, Santa Barbara, Calif., 1972.

Video Recording:

Inventing L.A.: The Chandlers and Their Times. Produced and directed by Peter Jones and Mark Catalena. 117 min. PBS, 2009. DVD.

VITA

James Savage is the author of *Jim Garrison's Bourbon Street Brawl: The Making of a First Amendment Milestone* (University of Louisiana at Lafayette Press, 2010). An award-winning former newspaper reporter and editor, he received his bachelor's and master's degrees in history from the University of Louisiana at Lafayette in 2004 and 2006, respectively. He is the recipient of the Louisiana Historical Association's Hugh F. Rankin Prize for Best Graduate-Level Research Paper (2007); the Conference of Southern Graduate Schools' Humanities and Fine Arts Thesis Award (2009); the University of Kentucky Department of History Charles P. Roland Fellowship (Spring 2012); the University of Kentucky Graduate School Dissertation Enhancement Award (Spring 2012); and the University of Kentucky Graduate School Dissertation Year Fellowship (2013-2014). He is a native of Bayou Current, Louisiana.