

NOT LIKELY SENT: THE REMINGTON-HEARST "TELEGRAMS"

By W. Joseph Campbell



This article challenges as improbable one of American journalism's best-known anecdotes, the purported telegraphic exchange in 1897 between Frederic S. Remington and William Randolph Hearst in which Hearst supposedly vowed, "I'll furnish the war." The article discusses several reasons why it is exceedingly unlikely the exchange ever took place, including: The supposed reply is at odds with the editorial stance of Hearst's *New York Journal* in early 1897, and the account is not supported by the contemporaneous record of Remington's assignment to Cuba, from where he is said to have initiated the often-quoted exchange with Hearst.

"W.R. Hearst, *New York Journal*, N.Y.:

"Everything is quiet. There is no trouble here. There will be no war. I wish to return.

"Remington."

"Remington, Havana:

"Please remain. You furnish the pictures, and I'll furnish the war.

"W.R. Hearst."¹

The purported exchange of telegrams in January 1897 between Frederic S. Remington and William Randolph Hearst ranks undeniably as "one of the most famous stories in American journalism."² It has been called Hearst's "most quoted single utterance."³ It is often cited by both journalists⁴ and mass communication scholars.⁵ And it serves as compelling evidence about how the yellow press, led by Hearst's *New York Journal*, forced the United States into war with Spain in 1898.

The supposed exchange suggests not only reckless arrogance by Hearst but also speaks to the powerful potential effects of the news media. That, indeed, was the intent of James Creelman, the sole original source for the anecdote.⁶ In disclosing the supposed exchange in his book of reminiscences, *On the Great Highway*, Creelman maintained that the telegrams suggested the power and the foresight of yellow journalism. "Some time before the destruction of the battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Havana,"

W. Joseph Campbell, a former newspaper and wire service reporter, is an assistant professor at American University's School of Communication.

J&MC Quarterly
Vol. 77, No. 2
Summer 2000
405-422
©2000 AEJMC

Creelman wrote,⁷ “the *New York Journal* sent Frederic Remington, the distinguished artist, to Cuba. He was instructed to remain there until the war began; for ‘yellow journalism’ was alert and had an eye for the future.” Creelman then recounted—without attribution or supporting detail—the purported exchange of telegrams and added: “The proprietor of the *Journal* was as good as his word,” in bringing about the war with Spain.⁸

While some historians have expressed doubt that such an exchange ever took place,⁹ the literature reveals no concerted effort to assess the likely veracity of the account.¹⁰ This article, then, reviews the context and key evidence associated with the purported exchange and concludes that it is exceedingly unlikely such messages were ever sent. The reasons for doubting or disputing the exchange are many and go beyond Hearst’s somewhat belated denial,¹¹ go beyond the absence of documentation supporting Creelman’s account, and go beyond the fact that the telegrams Creelman described have never surfaced. These reasons—drawn from an extensive review of papers of Creelman, Hearst, Remington, and others—include:

- Creelman at the time of the exchange was in Europe, as the *Journal*’s “special commissioner,” or correspondent, on the Continent. As such, Creelman could only have learned about the supposed exchange secondhand.

- The contents of the purported telegrams bear little correlation to events in Cuba in early 1897. Specifically, the passages “there will be no war” and “I’ll furnish the war” are at odds with the fierce and devastating conflict in Cuba that had begun in February 1895 and had forced Spain to send 200,000 soldiers to the island.

- Hearst’s supposed reply to Remington runs counter to the *Journal*’s editorial positions in January 1897. The newspaper in editorials at that time expected the collapse of the Spanish war effort and resulting independence for Cuban insurgents. The *Journal* was neither anticipating nor campaigning for U.S. military intervention to end the conflict.

- It is improbable that such an exchange of telegrams would have been cleared by Spanish censors in Havana. So strict were the censors that dispatches from American correspondents reporting the war in Cuba often were taken by ship to Florida and transmitted from there.

- The pithy epigram of the purported reply to Remington seems uncharacteristic of Hearst’s telegrams. While not voluble or rambling in such messages, Hearst often offered specific suggestions and instructions in telegrams to his representatives assigned to important tasks and missions. It is thus likely that if Hearst had exchanged telegrams with Remington in January 1897, his messages would have contained explicit instructions and suggestions.

- The contemporaneous correspondence of Richard Harding Davis—the war correspondent with whom Remington traveled

on the assignment to Cuba—contains no reference to Remington's wanting to leave because "there will be no war." Rather, Davis in his letters gave several other reasons for Remington's departure, including the artist's reluctance to travel through Spanish lines to reach the Cuban insurgents. Davis also said in his correspondence that *he* asked Remington to leave because the presence of the artist impeded his reporting.

- Had there been such an exchange, Remington was clearly insubordinate and, as such, risked Hearst's displeasure. Despite Hearst's supposed instruction to stay, Remington left Cuba for New York in mid-January 1897. The *Journal* subsequently gave considerable prominence to Remington's sketches—arguably not the kind of response Hearst would have made or permitted in the face of outright insubordination.

The War in Cuba

Each of the foregoing reasons for disputing the purported Remington-Hearst exchange will be reviewed in some detail. But first, it is vital to consider the context in which the exchange supposedly took place. Briefly, Hearst in late 1896 hired Remington and Davis to travel to Cuba to spend time with the rebel forces,¹² whose insurrection by then had spread across much of the island.¹³ Spain had responded to the rebellion by sending to Cuba 200,000 soldiers. Their commander in 1896 and 1897 was Captain General Valeriano Weyler y Nicolau, who insisted that "war should be answered with war."¹⁴

Perhaps the most severe and controversial of Weyler's tactics was ordering much of Cuba's rural population into "reconcentration camps" in an attempt to deny the insurgents support from the countryside. Tens of thousands of Cuban non-combatants were thus crowded into the urban camps and many of them died from disease and malnutrition.¹⁵ Beyond the camps, the conflict produced horrors of its own.¹⁶ Reports of atrocities on both sides were not uncommon and not always exaggerated. By late 1896, the war had left "a stillness . . . over vast expenses of the Cuban countryside."¹⁷ A stalemate had thus taken hold by the time Remington and Davis set out for Cuba: The Spanish controlled the cities; the insurgents ruled the countryside.

The plans were for Remington and Davis to travel from Key West to Cuba aboard Hearst's yacht, the *Vamoose*, and make their way surreptitiously to the camp of one of the insurgency's commanding generals, Máximo Gómez. "We will stay a month with him[,] the yacht calling for copy and sketches once a week and finally for us in a month," Davis wrote in a letter to his mother.¹⁸ Reaching Cuba proved frustratingly difficult, however. Inclement weather, the yacht's suspect seaworthiness, and the crew's reluctance to attempt a landing in Cuba all conspired to keep Remington and Davis in Key West for three weeks.

Davis fumed about the delay. "The *Vamoose* is the fastest thing afloat and the slowest thing to get started I ever saw," he wrote in a letter to his family on Christmas Day 1896. "In fact, the engineer wanted to spend Christmas on shore so he is delaying the game for that."¹⁹ Waiting, Davis wrote 2 January 1897, "is all we do and that's my life at Key West. I get up and half dress and take a plunge in the bay and then dress fully and have a greasy

breakfast and then light a huge Key West cigar . . . and sit on the hotel porch . . . Nothing happens after that except getting one's boots polished."²⁰ Short-circuiting the assignment and returning to New York was considered, but rejected. Remington was inclined but, Davis wrote, "gave up the idea of returning as soon as he found I would not do so."²¹

Finally, they booked passage on a passenger steamer to Havana, arriving 9 January 1897.²² The next day they met Weyler, the Spanish military leader in Cuba, who granted "permission to travel over the island."²³ By 15 January 1897, Remington had parted with Davis and was on his way back to New York. On 24 January, the *Journal* began publishing his sketches and brief descriptions about the Cuban rebellion. Davis's reports trickled in later.

**Creelman, the
Anecdote's
Sole Source,
was in Europe
in Early 1897**

The first account of the purported telegraphic exchange appeared more than four years later in Creelman's *On the Great Highway*, published in 1901. Creelman does not in that account, nor in the version he wrote for *Pearson's* magazine in 1906,²⁴ describe how or when he learned about the supposed Remington-Hearst exchange. In any case, it had to have been second-hand because Creelman was in Europe in early 1897, as the *Journal's* "special commissioner" on the Continent.²⁵ He reported in the winter of 1897 from Madrid on Spain's struggling and increasingly costly effort to prosecute the war in Cuba. Creelman also reported from Paris and Rome.

Creelman's dispatches often contained little or no attribution and few named sources—not unlike those of many of his contemporaries and not unlike his account of the purported exchange of telegrams.²⁶ Creelman's reports, moreover, were characterized by an extravagant, breathless quality. Extraordinary conspiracies figured in his dispatches to the *Journal* in early 1897. In one, he described a "hidden deal" between the outgoing administration of President Grover Cleveland and Spanish authorities to help thwart the Cuban insurgency. "It has taken me many days to trace out the astounding dealings of President Cleveland and his Administration with the Spanish monarchy, but I am now in a position to give the American public some light on the subject," Creelman asserted in a dispatch published in the *Journal* on New Year's Day 1897.²⁷ At the heart of this supposed conspiracy was Cleveland's refusal "to recognize the Independence of the Cuban Government or the belligerency of its arms, and at the same time calm[ly] absolv[ing] Spain from all its responsibility for the protection of American property in the island," Creelman wrote.²⁸

Later that winter, he reported from Paris that he had uncovered plans by Spain and other European powers to array themselves against the United States. "Within an hour," he wrote in February 1897, "I have learned impressive details of the Spanish conspiracy to form a league of European governments against the United States."²⁹ Needless to say, such a "league" never took shape. Nor could it have, given the diverse interests among the European powers, their reluctance to "risk the wrath of the United States," and Spain's pursuit of a foreign policy that had generally ignored the rest of Europe.³⁰

Creelman's fondness for hyperbole, his reluctance or disinclination to cite sources, and his failure to explain how he learned about the purported Remington-Hearst exchange all serve to undercut the believability of his account about the telegrams.³¹

The content of the purported exchange—in particular, Hearst's supposed vow to "furnish the war"—bears little correlation to events in Cuba at the time or to coverage of those events by New York newspapers. It simply would have been incongruous for Hearst to have promised to "furnish" a war because he knew quite well that war had been waged in Cuba since early 1895. Indeed, the ongoing war was the very reason Hearst sent Remington and Davis to Cuba.

The war also commanded the attention of Congress in late 1896. As Remington and Davis prepared to go to Cuba, the U.S. Senate was considering a resolution encouraging the lame duck Cleveland Administration to "use its friendly offices with the government of Spain to bring to a close the war between Spain and Cuba."³²

Moreover, the *Journal* and its rival newspapers in New York City routinely described the Cuban insurgency as a "war," and they gave prominence to reports about the fighting, low intensity though it often was.³³ When Remington returned from Cuba, for example, the *Journal* reported that he had brought "from the scene of the war . . . a sketch book full of illustrations of characters, scenes and incidents, which are making the insurrection on the island so interesting to Americans."³⁴

The *New York Sun* in early 1897 referred often to an ongoing "war of extermination"³⁵ in Cuba. Like the *Journal*, the *Sun* assailed Weyler as a "Spanish savage" who "has made the island a place of slaughter. . . . The story of his deeds is such a one as mankind has not before heard for generations."³⁶ The *New York Tribune* invoked similarities between the Cuban insurrection and the American Revolution,³⁷ a not uncommon theme at the time. Even the *New York Herald*, a voice advocating diplomatic resolution to the Cuban insurrection, referred in January 1897 to the "destructive conflict in which neither side is able to vanquish the other by force."³⁸

Davis was under no illusions, either, about the situation in Cuba. "There is war here and no mistake," he wrote in a letter from Cuba in mid-January 1897, describing Weyler's reconcentration policy, "and all the people in the field have been ordered in to the fortified towns where they are starving and dying of disease."³⁹ Davis later compiled his dispatches from Cuba in a volume published late in 1897. The book was illustrated by Remington's sketches and was titled *Cuba In War Time*.⁴⁰

Editorials in Hearst's *Journal* in early 1897 expressed and reiterated the view that the Cuban rebels would ultimately defeat Spain in Cuba. At the time, the *Journal*'s editorials about Cuba were not bellicose; the newspaper was not campaigning for U.S. military intervention to end the conflict.⁴¹ Rather, the editorials reflected a view that Spain was unable to sustain much longer its war effort in Cuba. As such, Hearst's purported reply to Remington—"I'll furnish the war"—is inconsistent with the editorial stance of his newspaper.

Moreover, the *Journal*'s editorial position vis-à-vis Cuba in January 1897 was clearly based on, and influenced by, Creelman's reporting from Madrid. Notably, on 4 January 1897, the *Journal* assessed "the state of Spain" in an editorial and declared that the "news furnished by the *Journal*'s special commissioner to Madrid demonstrates that Spain is hardly able to prolong much longer the struggle with its lost colony, to say nothing of undertaking to give battle to a nation vastly its superior." The editorial added: "Not even

the rigidity of Weyler's censorship at Havana has prevented the news of his complete failure from reaching the mother country."⁴²

At the end of January, a *Journal* editorial said the rebels needed only to persevere to prevail: "They must now know that it is but a little more battle and struggle to win, even without the help of the great Republic where dearth of action matched verbal exuberance of sympathy. . . . Whatever disposition Spain may now display, it will be belated wisdom. She has practically already lost her magnificent colony. . . . Cuba Libre will speedily cease to be a mirage if the Cubans continue loyal to their own honor and duty, and that but a little longer."⁴³

Censors Would Have Been Unlikely to Clear the Telegrams

It is improbable that Spanish censors in Havana—the bane of American correspondents reporting about the insurgency—would have cleared the Remington-Hearst exchange.⁴⁴ A *Journal* correspondent sent to Cuba in 1896 later described how his counterparts were "broken-hearted" to find "how ruthlessly [their] stories had been slaughtered" by the censors in Havana.⁴⁵ The U.S. consul-general in Havana, Fitzhugh Lee, wrote in February 1897 that the "Spanish censor permits nothing to go out except formally to Spain and whenever you see a dispatch in newspapers dated Habana it is shaped to pass the censor."⁴⁶ Indeed, censorship in Cuba was "so strict that even routine dispatches had to be smuggled out of the country by boat and filed from Florida."⁴⁷ Correspondents also sent reports from Cuba through the consul-general's diplomatic pouch.⁴⁸

The prospect of severe censorship was precisely why Remington and Davis planned to enter Cuba illicitly, to be infiltrated by Hearst's *Vamoose*;⁴⁹ as Davis noted in letters to his mother and his family, the plan was that the yacht would retrieve Davis's reports from Cuba and take them to Key West, thus avoiding the censors in Havana.

Even if the censors had cleared the purported Remington-Hearst exchange,⁵⁰ the Spanish captain general in Cuba—regularly assailed in the *Journal* and other New York newspapers as "the butcher" Weyler⁵¹—surely would have seized on the telegrams as evidence of flagrant meddling. A vow from a leading American newspaper publisher to "furnish the war" certainly would not have been a message that Weyler would have ignored—especially in light of the hospitality he had extended Remington and Davis in Havana. The general, in fact, could have been expected to exploit Hearst's message for its obvious propaganda value to the beleaguered Spanish war effort.

Intercepting and publicizing the telegrams undoubtedly would have helped Weyler justify his policy of expelling or jailing American reporters who communicated with, or spent time among, the insurgent forces.⁵² Indeed, as early as the first months of the Cuban revolt in 1895, a Cuban-born American correspondent for the *New York World* was jailed briefly on charges of aiding the rebels.⁵³ A *Journal* reporter, Charles Michelson, was arrested in western Cuba and jailed ten days in 1896.⁵⁴ A few weeks after Remington and Davis arrived in Cuba, Sylvester Scovel of the *World*, who had spent time in January with the insurgents, was arrested on charges that included traveling without a military pass and communicating with the enemy.⁵⁵ Scovel was released after about a month in jail—and after the *World* campaigned vigorously for his freedom.⁵⁶

So the risks facing American correspondents covering the war in Cuba were well-known. Hearst, by planning to use the *Vamoose* to take Remington and Davis to Cuba, had seized upon a way of skirting Weyler's restrictions

on newsgathering. His sending a sensitive and combative message into the teeth of rigorous Spanish censorship would therefore have been inconsistent, reckless, and quite likely dangerous for his correspondents.

The pithy epigram of the purported reply to Remington seems uncharacteristic of Hearst's telegrams of the time. While not necessarily expansive or wordy in such messages, Hearst often included suggestions and instructions in telegrams to those whom he had assigned important tasks or missions. For example, Hearst's numerous telegrams to Creelman in Europe during the weeks before the Spanish-American War in 1898 were replete with instructions about coverage from the Continent. Those messages make it quite clear that Hearst was an engaged editor, closely managing one of his valued correspondents.

In the immediate aftermath of the destruction of the U.S. warship *Maine* in Havana harbor in February 1898, Hearst instructed Creelman, then in London, to "hold" an interview story that Creelman had evidently planned for the upcoming Sunday because "all interest now centered in *Maine*." Hearst also informed Creelman that the rival *World* and *Herald* were "printing good foreign interviews."⁵⁷ In a separate message, Hearst urged Creelman to prod the *Journal*'s correspondents in Europe, informing him, for example, that "Madrid seems [to be] doing nothing. *Herald* has fine cable on attitude of Weyler. *Maine* is great thing. Arouse everybody."⁵⁸ Hearst's deepening displeasure with reporting from Madrid prompted another cable to Creelman: "Stir up Madrid. *World* has cabled man there to get from Spanish government statement whether mines in Havana harbor. Should have something offset this."⁵⁹ Finally, Hearst instructed Creelman to "proceed [to] Madrid immediately. Get big interviews on situation. Describe war feeling, etc."⁶⁰

Few of Hearst's papers and letters from the late nineteenth century have been made public, including those for the months before, during, and after the Spanish-American War. Nevertheless, the available record suggests his clear propensity to send, via the telegraph, explicit and detailed instructions to his far-flung representatives. Had Hearst communicated with Remington by telegraph in January 1897, it is quite likely his messages to the artist would have contained explicit instructions and suggestions. A pithy response of the sort he supposedly made to Remington—"You furnish the pictures, and I'll furnish the war"—would have been out of character.

The best contemporaneous record of Remington's assignment in Cuba is the correspondence of Davis, who wrote extensively about the mission in letters to his mother, Rebecca Harding Davis, and his family. Davis's letters show that he had little regard for the rotund, slow-moving Remington, whom he called "a large blundering bear."⁶¹ But the letters contain no reference to Remington's having wanted to leave Cuba because the artist believed "there will be no war." Rather, Davis in his correspondence offers no fewer than three other explanations for Remington's departure after the artist had been in Cuba just a week. They were:

- Remington left because he had adequate material for illustrating Davis's articles. Davis wrote 15 January 1897 in a letter to his mother: "Remington has all the material he needs for

**Hearst
Typically
Filled His
Telegrams
with
Instructions**

**Remington
Left Because
He Had
Enough
Material—
or Was
Asked,
or Was
Frightened**

sketches and for illustrating my stories so he is going home. I will go on further as I have not yet seen much that is interesting."⁶²

- Remington left at Davis's request. "I asked him to go as it left me freer," Davis wrote elsewhere in the 15 January letter. In a separate letter that day, Davis told his mother: "I am as relieved at getting old Remington to go as though I had won \$5000. He was a splendid fellow but a perfect kid and had to be humored and petted all the time."⁶³

- Remington left because he was frightened by the prospect of crossing Spanish lines to spend time with the Cuban insurgents. "Remington got scared and backed out much to my relief and I went on and tried to cross the lines," but without success, Davis wrote later in January 1897.⁶⁴

Davis's correspondence also indicates that Remington's departure came soon after they visited Jaruco, where they encountered unpleasant conditions. "There we slept off the barnyard," Davis wrote, "and cows and chickens walked all over the floor and fleas all over us."⁶⁵ The hardships of that outing may have contributed to Remington's decision to cut short his stay. In all, the assignment was an exacting one for the artist. A friend, writing years later, said of Remington's time in Cuba in 1897: "The heat was terrible, the transportation bad, and his physical condition poor. He suffered."⁶⁶

Whatever prompted Remington's departure—and it appears that he was neither reluctant nor disinclined to leave—none of Davis's letters suggest that the artist wanted to return to the United States on the pretense of having found "no war" in Cuba. Indeed, Davis wrote that Remington had become "very bitter over what he saw" during the assignment and intended "to stir up Washington" upon his return.⁶⁷ Davis also described the artist as "very excitable and a firebrand"⁶⁸—hardly an apt or fitting description for someone who supposedly had found "everything is quiet" in Cuba. Remington certainly seemed the firebrand in writing to the *World* about a month after returning from Havana. In the letter, Remington denounced the Spanish administration in Havana as "the woman-killing outfit down there in Cuba."⁶⁹

Exchange Meant that Hearst Tolerated Remington's Insubordi- nation

If there had been such an exchange, then Remington clearly was insubordinate: He defied Hearst's supposed order to "remain" and instead returned to New York. Even so, Remington's work received prominent display, which suggests that if the telegrams were exchanged, Hearst ignored or overlooked undeniable insubordination by a wayward artist. Perhaps Hearst believed he had little choice but to use what illustrations Remington provided. But the variety of Remington's drawings, the prominence they received, and Hearst's recollections of the Remington-Davis assignment many years later all suggest that Hearst was scarcely displeased with the artist or his work.

Remington's illustrations certainly were prominently displayed in the *Journal*. His sketches of a bedraggled Spanish scouting party, and of pro-Spanish guerrillas escorting captured rebel sympathizers, dominated the newspaper's first news pages Sunday, 24 January 1897.⁷⁰ A headline that introduced the sketches referred to Remington as "the gifted artist" who had been assigned to Cuba "especially for the *Journal*."⁷¹ A few days later, the

Journal devoted its entire second page to a sketch by Remington that depicted Cuban troops firing at small Spanish fortifications that dotted the landscape. The illustration appeared beneath a headline that read: "Frederic Remington Sketches A Familiar Incident of the Cuban War."⁷²

In recollections written years later, Hearst commented favorably about the artist's work for the *Journal*. Hearst noted that he had sent Davis and Remington to Cuba "'to describe and depict the atrocities which the cruel Spaniards were inflicting upon the courageous Cubans, struggling for their liberties. These correspondents did their work admirably and aroused much indignation among Americans against 'Butcher' Weyler, the bloodthirsty Spanish general, but no urge to war.'"⁷³

Remington, though, was none too pleased with the reproduction quality of his illustrations from Cuba. "Davis will write and I will draw," he wrote after returning home in January 1897, "but can't do much in a *Yellow Kid* journal—printing too bad."⁷⁴ Nevertheless, he appears to have remained on favorable terms with Hearst. For example, Remington assured his publisher in 1898 that Hearst would not object to the use in a forthcoming book of several illustrations that the artist had drawn for the *Journal*.⁷⁵

The preponderance of evidence is that the telegraphic exchange described by Creelman—and repeated many times by journalists and media historians—never took place. Even so, there may have been an opportunity for Remington to have communicated with Hearst by telegram, without Davis's knowledge.

Davis's correspondence indicates that he and Remington parted ways 15 January in Matanzas, east of Havana. The artist was escorted to Havana by an interpreter named Otto.⁷⁶ Remington probably spent at least a day there before obtaining the required exit visa from Spanish authorities,⁷⁷ time enough to send Hearst a message announcing he was on his way home—and perhaps justifying his return with the excuse, "Everything is quiet. . . . There will be no war." Remington, under this scenario, may have then boarded the steamer from Havana without receiving or waiting for Hearst's reply. Davis, in Matanzas, would not have immediately known about the telegram.

But such a scenario is implausible, as it fails to explain why Spanish authorities declined to exploit the purported reply by Hearst. The scenario also fails to explain why and how Creelman, across the Atlantic, learned of such an exchange. If his sources were Spanish authorities in Madrid, why then would they have shared the evidence of a Hearstian *faux pas* exclusively with Creelman, an apologist for Hearst? Why would they not have publicized such a prize? Why would they not have shared it with one of the many bitter newspaper rivals to Hearst and his *Journal*?

The far more plausible and persuasive explanation is that the purported exchange of telegrams never took place. The more plausible and persuasive explanation is that Remington, rather than finding "everything is quiet," grew impatient with a frustrating and physically demanding assignment that had been slow to unfold, and with a fellow correspondent, Davis, who could barely tolerate the artist's presence.

Despite the preponderance of evidence, a few matters remain unresolved, including that of Remington's silence about the purported exchange. He appears to have said nothing about it, after Creelman's book appeared in 1901 and after the matter became the subject of a brief controversy in 1907.

***Could the
Telegrams
Have Been
Sent,
Nonetheless?***

***Lingering
Questions***

So why did Remington not deny the exchange? Perhaps he wanted to avoid reminders of the assignment to Cuba, on which he said he "saw more hell . . . than I ever read about."⁷⁸ The immediate aftermath of the trip proved controversial and embarrassing, because of Remington's wildly inaccurate and imaginative sketch of Spanish authorities conducting a strip-search of a young Cuban woman aboard an American passenger vessel, the *Olivette*. The sketch accompanied Davis's report about the search and was published in the *Journal* in February 1897,⁷⁹ and quickly exposed as exaggerated.⁸⁰ Perhaps by keeping a silence, Remington sought to avoid revisiting awkward issues that surrounded the trip to Cuba.⁸¹

Davis, on the other, would not likely have kept silent had he known about an exchange of telegrams. After all, the trip to Cuba had left Davis embittered and disgusted with Hearst. He blamed Hearst for failing to follow through on plans to infiltrate him and Remington into Cuba. He blamed Hearst for thwarting his plans to join the Cuban insurgents by publishing an erroneous report in mid-January 1897 that said Davis and Remington had linked up with the rebels. Davis complained about those lapses in a letter to his mother, writing: "Twice [Hearst] has prevented me from doing what I set out to do."⁸² Davis also tried to distance himself from Hearst's journalism, telling his mother in another letter: "I am not writing for the *Journal*, the *Journal* is printing what I write."⁸³

More than four years later, Davis received from Creelman a copy of *On the Great Highway*. Davis promptly replied, thanking Creelman and praising the book as "entertaining" and "full of information."⁸⁴ But Davis did not comment or raise questions about the chapter in which Creelman related the Remington-Hearst exchange.

Why wasn't Hearst more insistent in denying the purported exchange of telegrams? Perhaps it was because Creelman's account was meant not to be damning but *flattering*, to illustrate the power and effectiveness of yellow journalism. Creelman was expansive in defense of the genre, writing in *On the Great Highway*:

How little they know of "yellow journalism" who denounce it! How swift they are to condemn its shrieking headlines, its exaggerated pictures, its coarse buffoonery, its intrusions upon private life, and its occasional inaccuracies! But how slow they are to see the steadfast guardianship of public Interests which it maintains! How blind to its unfearing warfare against rascality, its detection and prosecution of crime, its costly searchings for knowledge throughout the earth, its exposures of humbug, its endless funds for the quick relief of distress!⁸⁵

The purported Remington-Hearst exchange, moreover, appears not to have been particularly important or newsworthy at the time: It was cited only infrequently in reviews⁸⁶ of *On the Great Highway*. The anecdote about the telegrams does not appear in obituaries about Creelman, who died in 1915.⁸⁷ Indeed, the anecdote seems to have provoked almost no discussion or controversy until a correspondent for the *Times* of London mentioned it in a dispatch from New York in 1907. He wrote: "Is the Press of the United States going insane? . . . A letter from William Randolph Hearst is in existence and was printed in a magazine not long ago. It was to an artist he had sent to Cuba, and who reported no likelihood of war. 'You provide the pictures,' he wrote,

'I'll provide the war.'"⁸⁸

Hearst, indignant about the report, replied in a letter to the *Times*. He described as "frankly false" and "ingeniously idiotic" the claim

that there was a letter in existence from Mr. W. R. Hearst in which Mr. Hearst said to a correspondent in Cuba: 'You provide the pictures and I will provide the war,' and the intimation that Mr. Hearst was chiefly responsible for the Spanish war.

This kind of clotted nonsense could only be generally circulated and generally believed in England, where newspapers claiming to be conservative and reliable are the most utterly untrustworthy of any on earth. In apology for these newspapers it may be said that their untrustworthiness is not always to intention but more frequently to ignorance and prejudice.⁸⁹

It does not seem likely that Hearst tacitly permitted the legend of the telegrams to take hold and grow, as emblematic of his power and influence. Rather, the record suggests that Hearst rejected any credit for fomenting the Spanish-American War and pointedly blamed Spain instead. "Any informed and unprejudiced person knows that the one cause of the Spanish war was Spain, and that from the time of the blowing up of the Maine in Havana Harbour war was inevitable," he wrote in his letter to the *Times* of London in 1907.⁹⁰ In a column written in 1940, Hearst asserted that it was the *Maine's* destruction that "precipitated the conflict" with Spain.⁹¹

This article, in addressing and challenging an enduring anecdote of yellow journalism, maintains there is little if any evidence that Remington and Hearst exchanged the telegrams, as Creelman described. Because the evidence is so persuasive that the purported exchange did not take place, the anecdote deserves relegation to the closet of historical imprecision—at least until proven otherwise. Journalists and historians are clearly ill-served by repeating the anecdote, by presenting a fanciful story as factual.

They likewise are ill-served by presenting the anecdote as illustrative of some "greater truth" about Hearst's supposed warmongering—that he was intent on provoking war over Cuba between the United States and Spain. As this article has shown, however, Hearst's *Journal* at the time of his supposed exchange with Remington was anticipating the *collapse* of Spain's war effort in Cuba, and was not campaigning for U.S. armed intervention. In taking such an editorial stance, the *Journal* relied heavily on Creelman's reporting from Madrid about Spanish views and opinion. Rather than reflecting and confirming Hearst's intentions at that time, the purported telegram to Remington, if sent, would have been contradictory and incongruous.

By repeating the certainly colorful anecdote about the Remington-Hearst telegrams, journalists and historians risk falling victim to the distorting effects of "the aesthetic fallacy," a condition in which facts and details are used to construct "a beautiful story"—a story that distorts or supplants empirical truths.⁹² The Remington-Hearst anecdote is indeed "a beautiful story," a succinct and delicious tale, one rich in hubris and in swaggering recklessness. It is, however, a story altogether dubious and misleading. It

Conclusion: Why It Matters

suggests power that the press, including Hearst's *Journal*, did not possess, that of propelling the country into a war that it did not want.

NOTES

1. James Creelman, *On the Great Highway: The Wanderings and Adventures of a Special Correspondent* (Boston: Lothrop Publishing, 1901), 177-78.

2. Arthur Lubow, *The Reporter Who Would Be King: A Biography of Richard Harding Davis* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1992), 139-40.

3. John K. Winkler, *William Randolph Hearst: A New Appraisal* (New York: Hastings House, 1955), 95. Historians have given various versions to the purported Remington-Hearst exchange. One variation was: "You make the pictures, and I'll make the war," see Oliver Carlson and Ernest Sutherland Bates, *Hearst: Lord of San Simeon* (New York: Viking, 1936), 97; and Oliver Carlson, *Brisbane: A Candid Biography* (New York: Stackpole Sons, 1937), 120. The purported exchange sometimes has been presented as "you provide the pictures, I'll provide the war."

4. See, for example: Clifford Krauss, "Remember Yellow Journalism," *New York Times*, 15 February 1998, sec. 4, p. 3, col. 1; Michael Taylor, "The Reign of S.F.'s 'Monarch of the Dailies,'" *San Francisco Chronicle*, 7 August 1999, sec. A, p. 9; and "Forget the Maine!" *Economist* 346 (3 January 1998): 32. The anecdote also has appeared in several books by journalists. See, for example, David Halberstam, *The Powers That Be* (New York: Dell Publishing Co. Inc., 1980), 295; Allen Churchill, *Park Row* (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1958), 104; and Willis J. Abbot, *Watching the World Go By* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1933), 217.

5. See, among others, Michael Schudson, *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers* (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1978), 61-62; Ray Eldon Hiebert and Sheila Jean Gibbons, *Exploring Mass Media for a Changing World* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000), 151; and Philip Seib, *Headline Diplomacy: How News Coverage Affects Foreign Policy* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1997), 5.

6. Creelman's account is the earliest reference to the purported exchange that has been found. Leading journalism history texts that discuss the exchange cite Creelman's book as the original source. See, for example, Frank Luther Mott, *American Journalism: A History: 1690-1960*, 3d ed. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1962), 529. See also John D. Stevens, *Sensationalism and the New York Press* (New York: Columbia University Press: 1991), 96. Stevens wrote, "Creelman's memoir is the only evidence for the infamous anecdote about Hearst's cabling Remington that he would provide the war."

7. Creelman did not specifically say when the exchange occurred, but Remington's visit to Cuba before the *Maine's* destruction was in January 1897.

8. Creelman, *On the Great Highway*, 177.

9. See, for example, Carlson and Bates, *Hearst: Lord of San Simeon*, 97; Stevens, *Sensationalism and the New York Press*, 92; and Joyce Milton, *The Yellow Kids: Foreign Correspondents in the Heyday of Yellow Journalism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1989), xii.

10. Some historians have characterized the anecdote as "legend" but have repeated it nonetheless. See, for example, Jean Folkerts and Dwight L. Teeter Jr., *Voices of a Nation: A History of Mass Media in the United States*, 3d ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1998), 269-70. Mott prefaced his description of the

purported Remington-Hearst exchange, stating that it was "said to have taken place." Mott, *American Journalism: A History*, 529. Other writers have accepted the anecdote without reservation. See, for example, Joseph E. Wisan, *The Cuban Crisis as Reflected in the New York Press* (1895-1898) (New York: Octagon Books, 1965), 459; and Douglas Allen, *Frederic Remington and the Spanish-American War* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1971), 11. See also Philip S. Foner, who referred in a footnote to "the famous telegram Frederick[sic] Remington sent to William Randolph Hearst from Havana." Foner, *The Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of American Imperialism, 1895-1902*, vol. 1 (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972), 163. Hearst's biographers also have tended to accept the anecdote at face value. See, notably, Ferdinand Lundberg, *Imperial Hearst: A Social Biography* (New York: Modern Library, 1937), 68; and W. A. Swanberg, *Citizen Hearst* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), 107-108. Hearst's recent biographer attempted to qualify the account by stating that Hearst "allegedly replied" to Remington with the vow to "furnish the war." See Ben Procter, *William Randolph Hearst: The Early Years* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 103.

11. The purported exchange was mentioned in the *Times* of London in 1907, which prompted Hearst to reply, calling the report "frankly false and . . . ingeniously idiotic." See W.R. Hearst, "Mr. W.R. Hearst on Anglo-American Relations," *Times* (London), 2 November 1907, p. 5. Hearst later was quoted by his son as denying the purported exchange. See William Randolph Hearst Jr., *The Hearsts: Father and Son* (Niwar, CO: Roberts Rinehart, 1991), 38.

12. For other accounts of the Remington-Davis assignment, see Charles H. Brown, *The Correspondents' War: Journalists in the Spanish-American War* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967), 76-82; Lubow, *The Reporter Who Would Be King*, 137-42; and Milton, *The Yellow Kids*, 140-42.

13. See Louis A. Pérez Jr., *Cuba Between Empires, 1878-1902* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1983), 43-52; and Louis A. Pérez Jr., *Cuba Between Reform and Revolution*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 157.

14. Cited in Pérez, *Cuba Between Empires*, 54.

15. Pérez, *Cuba Between Empires*, 55-56.

16. A favored tactic of the insurgents was to set fire to sugar cane fields, in keeping with their decree for a moratorium on economic activity on the island. See Pérez, *Cuba Between Reform and Revolution*, 162-63.

17. Pérez, *Cuba Between Reform and Revolution*, 166

18. Richard Harding Davis, letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 19 December [1896], Richard Harding Davis Collection, Alderman Library of American Literature, University of Virginia (hereafter cited as Davis Collection). That the assignment was to last one month contradicts and undercuts Creelman's claim that Remington "was instructed to remain [in Cuba] until the war began." Creelman, *On the Great Highway*, 177.

19. Davis, letter to his family, 25 December 1896, Davis Collection.

20. Davis, letter to his family, 2 January 1897, Davis Collection.

21. Davis, letter to his family, 2 January 1897, Davis Collection.

22. See, Davis letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 9 January 1897, Davis Collection.

23. Davis letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 10 January 1897, Davis Collection.

24. James Creelman, "The Real Mr. Hearst," *Pearson's*, September 1906, 259.

25. Some historians have mistakenly placed Creelman with Remington

in Cuba at the time of the purported exchange. See Lundberg, *Imperial Hearst*, 68. Hiley H. Ward stated Creelman "could have been present when" Remington "had the exchange with Hearst." See Ward, *Mainstreams of American Media History: A Narrative and Intellectual History* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1997), 279.

26. Milton wrote: "Creelman specialized in interviewing the greatest men and women of the day. And since he considered himself the conscience of the fourth estate, he normally did as much talking as listening." Milton, *The Yellow Kids*, 93. Creelman was not reluctant to recall for readers his past interviewing coups, either. In a report from Rome in February 1897, he said of Pope Leo XIII: "The Pope's voice ringing vigorously over the heads of the kneeling multitude in the Sistine chapel this morning was the best answer to the declaration that the august 'Prisoner of the Vatican' is dying. I watched him for an hour this morning . . . and his eye was as bright and his tones as clear and sonorous as when I interviewed him in the Throne room seven years ago." Creelman, "Leo Strong in Body and Mind," *New York Journal*, 9 February 1897, p. 1.

27. James Creelman, "Cleveland Strikes Cuba A Secret Blow," *New York Journal*, 1 January 1897, p. 1.

28. Creelman, "Cleveland Strikes Cuba A Secret Blow," p. 1.

29. James Creelman, "Will Europe Try to Coerce Us?" *New York Journal*, 21 February 1897, p. 1.

30. See David F. Trask, *The War With Spain in 1898* (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co. Inc., 1981), 474.

31. Hearst appears to have overlooked the flaws and hyperbole in Creelman's reporting and to have valued him for his eagerness as well as his ability to land interviews with important personalities. Willis J. Abbot quoted Hearst as saying: "The beauty about Creelman is the fact that whatever you give him to do instantly becomes in his mind the most important assignment ever given any writer. Of course, it's a form of egotism. He thinks that the very fact of the job being given to him means that it's a task of surpassing importance, else it would not have been given to so great a man as he." Abbot, *Watching the World Go By*, 208.

32. "The Cameron Cuban Resolution," *Public Opinion* 21 (26, 1896): 1.

33. Murat Halstead, a venerable newspaper editor who had traveled to Cuba for Hearst's *Journal* in 1896, wrote in 1897: "The Cubans are as thoroughly in a state of revolt against Spain as the Virginians were in the height of the war of the early sixties against our federal government." See Halstead, *The Story of Cuba: Her Struggles for Liberty, the Cause, Crisis and Destiny of the Pearl of the Antilles*, 5th ed. (Chicago: Henry Publishing Co., 1897), 457.

34. "Cuban War Illustrated by Frederic Remington," *New York Journal*, 24 January 1897, p. 1.

35. See "A War of Extermination," *New York Sun*, 8 January 1897, p. 1; "War of Extermination," *New York Sun*, 12 January 1897, p. 1; and "War of Extermination," *New York Sun*, 21 April 1897, p. 1.

36. "Two Reports from Western Cuba," *New York Sun*, 29 December 1896, p. 6.

37. "'No Surrender' in Cuba," *New York Tribune*, 17 January 1897, p. 6. Comparisons between the Cuban war and the American Revolution were often invoked in the New York press. The *Sun*, for example, described the Cuban insurgents as "not less determined than were the long-enduring Americans in the days of Washington." See "The Unequalling Patriots of Cuba," *New York Sun*, 6 May 1897, p. 6.

38. "The Cuban Problem To Be Solved by Statesmanship, Not Force of Arms," *New York Herald*, 27 January 1897, p. 8.

39. Davis, letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 15 January 1897, Davis Collection.

40. Richard Harding Davis, *Cuba In War Time* (New York: R. H. Russell, 1897). Davis describes Cuba as being "divided into two military camps, one situated within forts, and the other scattered over the fields and mountains outside of them" (13). A publisher's note says that Remington's illustrations were "here reproduced through the courtesy of Mr. W.R. Hearst."

41. One editorial published in January 1897 can perhaps be described as faintly bellicose. It stated in part: "Americans everywhere ... have long since reached the conclusion that it is our duty to intervene between the butchers and their victims, and have long regarded that duty as a privilege to be eagerly longed for and joyfully taken at the first opportunity." See "Evidence in Support of Sulzer," *New York Journal*, 10 January 1897. The following day, however, the *Journal* returned to the theme that Spain was unlikely to hold out in Cuba. It stated in an editorial discussing reports that Madrid was prepared to offer autonomy to the insurgents: "The fact that Spain is willing to grant so much is sufficient indication that she is no longer in condition to retain anything. The Cubans should hold out for complete independence and admitted sovereignty." See "Some Late Cuban News," *New York Journal*, 11 January 1897, p. 8. The insurgents consistently rejected Spanish offers of autonomy, insisting instead on outright political independence.

42. "The State of Spain," *New York Journal*, 4 January 1897, p. 6. Creelman had reported: "The most thoughtful men in Spain today say that Cuba is lost to the monarchy, and that [President] Cleveland and [Secretary of State Richard] Olney are simply prolonging a cruel and disastrous struggle. But for their pride they would be glad to see the end come at once. It is impossible to talk with representative Spaniards without realizing this fact." Creelman, "Cleveland Strikes Cuba A Secret Blow," *New York Journal*, 1 January 1897, p. 1.

43. "Belated Wisdom of Spain," *New York Journal*, 31 January 1897, p. 38.

44. John K. Winkler made this point in his biography of Hearst, *W.R. Hearst: An American Phenomenon* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1928), 144. Mott, however, rejected Winkler's view as "absurd," but neither elaborated on nor explained his dismissive characterization. See Mott, *American Journalism: A History*, fn 12, 529.

45. Murat Halstead, "Our Cuban Neighbors and Their Struggle for Liberty," *Review of Reviews* 13 (April 1896): 424. The rigors of Spanish censorship were cited from time to time by the trade journal *Fourth Estate*. The publication suggested in February 1897 that censorship in Havana was a fundamental reason for exaggerated reports about Cuba published in the U.S. press. See "The Press and War," *Fourth Estate*, 18 February 1897, 6, and "War and Prize Fighting," *Fourth Estate*, 15 April 1897, 6. For a discussion about erroneous and exaggerated reporting during the first two years of the Cuban insurrection, see George Bronson Rea, *Facts and Fakes about Cuba* (New York: G. Munro's Sons, 1897).

46. Fitzhugh Lee to Secretary of State Richard Olney, 10 February 1897; Library of Congress, Olney Papers.

47. Milton, *The Yellow Kids*, 83.

48. See "War on Correspondents," *Fourth Estate*, 20 May 1897, p. 2.

49. The intended use of the *Vamoose* was no secret. The *Fourth Estate* said in November 1896: "The *New York Journal* has planned a bold move to outwit

the Spanish censor. William R. Hearst has chartered the steam yacht *Vamoose*, the fastest craft afloat in American waters. The *Journal* will carry its own dispatches from Havana to Key West. It will take the *Vamoose* but three hours to make the trip." See "The Journal's Bold Move," *Fourth Estate*, 26 November 1896, p. 1.

50. Creelman himself knew that Spanish authorities in Cuba had little tolerance for correspondents who flouted the censors. He was expelled in 1896 after filing a report for the *New York World* about Spanish atrocities in Cuba—a report he made a point of sharing with Weyler. Creelman, *On the Great Highway*, 167-69. See also Milton, *Yellow Kids*, 97.

51. Creelman described Weyler as "the most sinister figure of the nineteenth century" and "the most monstrous personality of modern times." Creelman, *On the Great Highway*, 158, 169.

52. Brown, *Correspondents' War*, 8.

53. Brown, *Correspondents' War*, 8.

54. Charles Michelson, *The Ghost Talks* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1944), 86.

55. Brown, *Correspondents' War*, 85.

56. Brown, *Correspondents' War*, 86-87. See also, "The Imprisoned Newspaper Correspondent," *Fourth Estate*, 4 March 1897, p. 2; and "Potentiality of President and the Press," *Fourth Estate*, 18 March 1897, p. 7.

57. William Randolph Hearst, trans-Atlantic cablegram to James Creelman, 19 February 1898; Ohio State University library, Creelman Collection (hereafter cited as Creelman Collection).

58. Hearst, trans-Atlantic cablegram to Creelman, 19 February 1898, Creelman Collection.

59. Hearst, trans-Atlantic cablegram to Creelman, 23 February 1898, Creelman Collection.

60. Hearst, trans-Atlantic cablegram to Creelman, 24 February 1898, Creelman Collection.

61. Davis, letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 4 January 1897, Davis Collection.

62. Davis, letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 15 January 1897, Davis Collection.

63. Davis, letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 15 January 1897, Davis Collection. Davis also said in the letter: "I was very glad he went for he kept me back all the time and I can do twice as much in half the time. He always wanted to talk it over and that had to be done in the nearest or the most distant cafe, and it always took him fifteen minutes before he got his cocktails to suit him. He always did as I wanted [in] the end but I am not used to giving reasons or traveling in pairs."

64. Davis, undated letter to Gus [Thomas?] [20? January 1897], Davis Collection.

65. Davis, letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 15 January 1897, Davis Collection.

66. Augustus Thomas, "Recollections of Frederic Remington," *Century Magazine* 86 (July 1913): 357. A Remington scholar, Allen P. Splete, also said that the artist, because of his heft, probably found the assignment to Cuba demanding. Splete, interview with author, Washington, D.C., 8 June 1999.

67. Davis, undated letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, [January 1897], Davis Collection.

68. Davis, undated letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, [January 1897], Davis Collection.

69. Frederic Remington, "Frederic Remington Writes to the World about Scovel," *New York World*, 21 February 1897, p. 1. Remington's letter was written to support the release of Sylvester Scovel, the *World* correspondent then in jail in Cuba. Remington's reference to "the woman-killing outfit" reflected the theme, common in the U.S. press, that Spanish authorities routinely mistreated Cuban women.

70. "Cuban War Sketches Gathered in the Field by Frederic Remington," *New York Journal*, 24 January 1897, pp. 31-33.

71. "Cuban War Sketches," p. 31.

72. "Frederic Remington Sketches A Familiar Incident of the Cuban War," *New York Journal*, 29 January 1897, p. 2.

73. "The Spanish-American War," in Edmond D. Coblentz, ed., *William Randolph Hearst: A Portrait in His Own Words* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1952), 58.

74. Frederic Remington, letter to Poultney Bigelow, 28 January 1897, in Allen P. Splete and Marilyn D. Splete, *Frederic Remington — Selected Letters* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1988), 219.

75. Frederic Remington, letter to [?] Harper, [16 September 1898?], Alderman Library of American Literature, University of Virginia Alderman Library, Remington Collection. Remington, referring to Hearst, wrote, "There is no doubt that I can get his permission."

76. Davis, letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 16 January 1897, Davis Collection. He wrote: "I got a grand lot of letters today which Otto my interpreter brought back from Havana after having conducted Remington there in safety."

77. See Davis, *Cuba In War Time*, 123. He wrote: "In order to leave Havana, it is first necessary to give notice of your wish to do so by sending your passport to the Captain General, who looks up your record, and, after twenty-four hours, if he is willing to let you go, visés your passport and so signifies that your request is granted."

78. See, Remington, letter to Bigelow, 28 January 1897, in Splete and Splete, *Frederic Remington — Selected Letters*, 218.

79. Richard Harding Davis, "Does Our Flag Shield Women?" *New York Journal*, 12 February 1897, pp. 1-2. Remington's illustration depicting the strip-search appeared on p. 2.

80. See "Tale of a Fair Exile: Senorita Arango's Own Story of the Olivette 'Search Outrage,'" *New York World*, 15 February 1897, p. 1.

81. In their detailed biography of Remington, Peggy and Harold Samuels do not question whether Remington sent the telegram to Hearst. They repeat the anecdote. See Peggy and Harold Samuels, *Frederic Remington: A Biography* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982), 249. They also note, 248: "Remington had been paid for a month in Cuba, and the month was up."

82. Davis, letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 24 January 1897, Davis Collection.

83. Davis, letter to Rebecca Harding Davis, 20 January 1897, Davis Collection.

84. Davis, letter to James Creelman, 18 November [1901], Creelman Collection. The letter reads: "I have today received your volume of reminiscences and descriptions and I thank you for them most heartily. Already I have read most of them with great interest, and I find them most admirably selected, and entertaining, full of information, full of unconscious proofs of a life well spent in a profession that is its [sic] own reward. I am very glad you thought well of putting these experiences into a book. They will help to

stimulate and to encourage to a like energy and effort. I hope it will have the generous circulation it deserves. Thank you again for sending it [to] me"

85. Creelman, *On the Great Highway*, 177.

86. A review that did mention the purported exchange was "On the Great Highway," *The Independent*, 27 February 1902, 516-17.

87. Scores of newspaper obituaries are among Creelman's papers at Ohio State University. None of those reviewed refer to the purported Remington-Hearst exchange.

88. "The American Press," *Times* (London), 30 September 1907, p. 5. The magazine article mentioned may have been Creelman's profile about Hearst published in *Pearson's* in 1906.

89. Hearst, "Mr. W. R. Hearst on Anglo-American Relations," *Times*, p. 5.

90. Hearst, "Mr. W.R. Hearst on Anglo-American Relations," *Times*, p. 5.

91. "The Spanish-American War," in William Randolph Hearst, 58.

92. David Hackett Fischer, *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 87.