This article examines the relationship between the Wyoming Stock Growers Association and the press at the end of the Old West Long Drive Era (1867-1890). It considers not only the influence of Wyoming cattlemen on the press, but in particular the influence of the press on the frontier cattle business during the period when “Old West” was moving from frontier reality to American legend. Many historians agree that the dominant Old West myth of “cattle barons” versus “nesters” emanated from a particular episode in Wyoming, the “Johnson County War.” The story grew to become one of America’s most enduring legends, based on stylized ideals and assumptions that often had little to do with the reality of the frontier cattle business itself. The author relies on mostly primary sources in an attempt to show that this legend was actually created by journalists of the era, who were writing for more immediate audiences and more political goals.

Introduction: Historiography of frontier press and cattlemen

The enormous importance of the cattle industry in gilded age America reached a zenith in the 1880s cattle capital of Cheyenne, Wyoming. Money and influence from the East and overseas flowed into this western frontier town tied to civilization by a pair of Union Pacific tracks. It led to Cheyenne’s unlikely nickname, “little Wall Street.” In Cheyenne this was Sixteenth Street, where stood the headquarters of the Cheyenne Club, housing offices of the Wyoming Stock...
This article explores how the anarchist magazine Mother Earth published by Emma Goldman framed women’s issues during its twelve-year run. The magazine’s major contributions to female emancipation lay in the realm of sexuality: its recognition of the economic imperative in female sexuality, a critique of marriage, a cry against sexual double standards, a protest against oppressive moral codes, a challenge to patriarchy, the celebration of sexuality, and the demand for birth control. Paradoxically, on other key women’s issues such as suffrage or employment, the magazine pursued an anti-feminist agenda. The biggest paradox was that Goldman’s idealization of motherhood and essentialist claims about female biology, compounded by the anarchists’ antipathy toward the government and corporate world, made the magazine a vehicle for perpetuating restrictive gender stereotypes and stymied Mother Earth from supporting female forays into the public sphere.

Emma Goldman’s magazine Mother Earth was one of the most influential periodicals of the early radical press during the prewar decade that bubbled with new social visions before World War I burst them.¹ This article will explore how Mother Earth framed women’s issues during its twelve-year run from 1906 through 1917, when the federal government banned the anarchist magazine, then imprisoned and deported its pacifist publisher.

The subject is important because an analysis of Mother Earth’s articles about women’s issues illuminates the evolution of twentieth-century American women. Since no truly radical periodical de
This article examines the writings of Katherine Mayo (1867-1940), an influential writer and journalist on international issues in the 1920s and '30s, and locates them within the genre of “colonial discourse.” The authors begin with a chronological overview of her writing on Dutch Guiana, the United States and Europe and then scrutinize in greater detail her work on the Philippines and India. It is suggested that using culturally and racially essentialist tropes, Mayo painted a culturally and politically regressive picture of colonial “others” while simultaneously reifying the Anglo-Saxon “self.” In doing so, she functioned not as the objective reporter she claimed to be but as an active supporter of continued United States and British colonial rule in different parts of the world and an opponent of the immigration of Asians, namely Indians and Filipinos, to the United States.

When the writer and journalist, Katherine Mayo, died on October 9, 1940, her obituary in the New York Times noted, “time changes perspectives and chills enthusiasms; and a generation has grown up that has hardly heard [of her].” However, time was to prove this summary dismissal premature. A 1958 study revealed that her most controversial book Mother India, famously referred to as the “drain inspector’s report” by Mahatma Gandhi, was second only to the works of Rudyard Kipling as the most popular source of information on India in the United States. There is also anecdotal information about its use by Peace Corps volunteers as an introduction to India up until the 1970s. Just as novelist Pearl S. Buck influenced the early images of China, Mayo was instrumental in shaping the American view of India. Contem
Historians have learned much in the past decade about Doris E. Fleischman and her partnership in marriage and in public relations with Edward L. Bernays, and they have tended to agree that despite Bernays’s high profile, Fleischman was indispensable to the success of the Bernays firm. This study expands on that research by examining Fleischman’s work in the context of public relations ideas and principles. Relying on primary sources that included four speeches that had not been discussed heretofore, it was found that although there was duplication between her and Bernays’s work, there were also evident shifts in Fleischman’s thinking about public relations, including a sense that she was as much of a public relations pioneer as Bernays was, without, perhaps, his drive for self-promotion.

As Doris Fleischman Bernays sat outside her Cambridge house in the “utopian” weather of what would be her last spring, she thought about David Brinkley, Eddie, Social Security, gender discrepancies in public relations salaries, pain, pain relief, and the American hostages in Iran.¹

That her thoughts would return to Eddie (Edward L. Bernays) reflected a partnership that had begun more than half a century earlier, first in 1919, when Fleischman went to work for Bernays, and then in 1922, when she married him and became his partner in the firm Edward L. Bernays, Counsel.
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On the morning of December 11, 1941, Germany and Italy declared war on the United States. The United States Congress immediately reciprocated. Later that afternoon, President Roosevelt asked his press secretary, Stephen Early, to initiate actions assuring government control over one of America’s existing commercial radio networks. Using material from the Roosevelt Library, the NBC Collection at the Wisconsin Historical Society, and the Office of War Information papers, this article analyzes Roosevelt’s request in the context of domestic radio propaganda planning at the start of the Second World War. It presents the first detailed account of the manner by which network executives successfully derailed the attempt to establish a domestic government radio network. Ultimately, the Roosevelt administration elected not to operate a domestic network for propaganda purposes because the commercial networks effectively performed that function. And the chief vehicle for conveying government-sanctioned (and censored) war-related information over the airwaves turned out not to be government propagandists, but rather the first generation of broadcast journalists.

“Propaganda” is a controversial term. In the context of American politics it retains conspiratorial and anti-democratic connotations. In particular, the domestic dissemination of U.S. government propaganda remains remarkably controversial.¹ Unmediated, govern
This article examines the American Broadcasting Company’s dissatisfaction with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) during 1965 and 1966, as voiced in a series of critical speeches by the president of the network’s news division, Elmer W. Lower. Such public criticism was highly unusual at a time when NASA and the television networks shared a symbiotic relationship and American space exploration was widely celebrated. ABC’s unhappiness stemmed in part from what its news division president deemed as limited access to information as well as the absence of television cameras in the Gemini space vehicles. NASA cited technical reasons for keeping television cameras out of the Gemini capsules. However, this article also cites astronaut resistance as a contributing factor to the absence of onboard television cameras. A difficult personal relationship between ABC’s space correspondent and the space agency’s director of public affairs may have further motivated ABC’s criticism of NASA.

Among other things, the 1960s are remembered in communication literature both for the coming of age of television news and for the emergence of a more adversarial journalism. In such an environment, television’s coverage of America’s space program stood out, to some observers, as adulatory. CBS News anchorman Walter Cronkite was criticized as an “unabashed NASA booster.” Although he later rejected the criticism, Cronkite admitted in his memoirs that
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