

The Battle for Linton: Radical Hoosier Women’s Engagement of the Indiana National Guard during a General Strike

Donald Edward Jones
Butler University

A dust covered yearbook recently found in a box under the bottom shelf of the new public library in Linton, Indiana, included the following “Class Prophecy” for the Senior Class of 1917: “As I lay thus, dreaming of the past, there suddenly appeared before me, a radiant figure clad in flowing white. Held in front of her was a shining shield, upon which was engraved the name ‘Future.’”¹ The young prophetess continued to describe yet another beautiful bejeweled creature wearing a crown emblazoned with the letters F-A-M-E. “Suddenly, a roar of cannon smote upon my ears . . . generals were shouting orders . . . smoke of artillery obscured the picture and a noise of quarreling arose. Linton appeared before my startled eyes . . . suddenly the people on lower Main were thrust aside and a procession of ladies came marching . . .”² Whether the author realized it or not, her remarkable prescience was fulfilled two years later during “The Battle for Linton.”

It was April 29, 1919, and Linton, Indiana, was in the midst of a general strike.³ United States district attorney, L. Ert Slack, was in communication with Washington and had dispatched agent Charles Tighe of the Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice special agent Earl Houck to Linton.⁴ Tighe missed his train, yet Houck traveled with Adjutant General Harry B. Smith and 130 members of the Indiana National Guard carrying a Proclamation of Martial Law issued by Governor James P. Goodrich.⁵ Strikers were arriving in Linton by the “thousands and the situation looked ominous.”⁶

The special agents were sent to investigate reports of violence against the New Home Telephone Company, then under receivership of the United States government. Five

hundred people had besieged the building on April 28 and demanded the dismissal of eight scab operators from Indianapolis who had replaced thirteen striking young women from Linton.⁷ The U. S. district attorney warned residents of Linton that anyone who “willfully interfered with the operation” of a telephone company under the auspices of the postmaster general and the federal government faced fines and/or imprisonment, and those who were in violation of the federal statute would “most certainly be prosecuted.”⁸ The adjutant general prepared a list of names for the governor to report to Washington.⁹

However, thousands of working class citizens from Linton dismissed the D.A.’s warnings, and through mass mobilization and community action, they effectively cut off all “telephonic communication.”¹⁰ They walked away from the mines, the stores, and all places of business bringing an immediate end to production and trade. By fomenting a successful general strike, Linton rank and file unionists were able to challenge capitalist prerogatives at the point of production through direct action and defy local law enforcement and the constituted authorities through community solidarity. In short, they were not listening to their bosses or the cops. The strikers’ militancy was manifest and occurred without the guidance or sanction of a union hierarchy and notably with the support of the town’s *petite bourgeoisie*.

Incredibly, historians have completely missed this remarkable event although an abundant amount of archival evidence exists. The strike received front-page coverage in the state’s largest dailies, the *Indianapolis Star* and the *Indianapolis News*, for three days, and of course, the local press covered the story—albeit in a different light—for weeks. Nationally, the story ran in the *Chicago Tribune*, *Hartford Courant*, *Atlanta Constitution*, *Christian Science Monitor*, and *Boston Daily Globe*. In fact, the Indiana State Archives, Herbert Hoover Presidential Library in West Branch, Iowa, and the United Mine Workers’ Archives housed at Penn State University have also yielded abundant evidence. It would be incorrect, therefore, to dismiss the story on the basis that there is not enough evidence to justify scholarly consideration. This story is important and deserves to be told because it signifies that community solidarity can

overcome the power of a state militia through radical direct action.

This study also reassesses early 20th-century labor history by focusing on the possibilities and implications brought forth by radical class action of the rank and file during the “Battle for Linton.” It was a battle for contested space, contested authority, and contested gender roles that culminated in a general strike of working class radicals who stood up to and defeated the state’s armed forces. General strikes in America are rare occurrences. Those initiated by a workforce made entirely of women are even more exceptional. And it is truly singular that the Linton episode concluded with the defeat and withdrawal of the state’s militia. Indeed the workers’ triumph gives insight into its contested meaning and history. More importantly, it also questions the dominant narrative concerning gender roles of radical women workers and their supposed lack of direct action.

“In April 1919, five companies of militia were sent to Linton in Greene County to halt rioting and demonstrations resulting from a strike of operators of the Home Telephone Company in that coal-mining community.”¹¹ The preceding sentence is not merely the sum of the historiography, but its entirety as found in Clifton J. Phillips’ work *Indiana in Transition*, Volume IV, of the definitive Indiana History series. Yet even that one-sentence description fails to accurately reflect the archival evidence, as we will soon see, for the Indiana National Guard did not “halt” the rioting or the demonstrations, but rather was the cause of renewed community indignation. Phillips also failed to realize that Linton was in the throes of a militant general strike that directly confronted the power of the ruling class.

Phillips was not, of course, the only historian to overlook the events in Linton, for Benjamin D. Rhodes’ biography of Governor James P. Goodrich, who hastily sent the troops to quell the disturbance, ignores the event as does Dane Starbuck’s treatment of Indiana’s Republican governor in “James P. Goodrich: The Consummate Politician.”¹² A similar phenomenon can even be found among Indiana military historians. William J. Watt’s *Indiana’s Citizen Soldiers: The Militia and National Guard in Indiana History* praises, on the one hand, several successful military interventions in labor disputes, yet, on

the other hand, he inexplicably decried the fact that some historians maintain that “militia units found justification for their existence by functioning as a strikebreaking force.”¹³ The blatant omission of the Linton affair in light of the extant evidence in Watt’s work is, nonetheless, quite conspicuous.

Although Indiana’s local and military historians may have neglected the Linton general strike in particular, labor historians have extensively written on the other salient issues brought up in this study, including the role of women in the labor movement, the relationship of workers to both civil and military authorities, the general strike, and other radical rank-and-file labor disruptions. For instance, Teresa Amott and Julie Matthaui have detailed how the interconnectedness of race, class, and gender through history has helped to perpetuate a “complex hierarchy of domination and subordination” alongside the socially constructed sexual division of labor.¹⁴ Their work regarding European-American women in a chapter entitled “Whatever Your Fight, Don’t Be Ladylike” was particularly helpful in understanding white women’s labor activism of the early twentieth century.¹⁵

Regarding syndicalism and radical labor unionism of the period, Howard Kimeldorf’s *Battling for American Labor: Wobblies, Craft Workers, and the Making of the Union Movement* showed how rank-and-file workers successfully improved their working conditions through direct mass action at the point of production without the sanction or discipline associated with conservative contract unionism.¹⁶ Carl Weinberg also took up the theme of class-consciousness and political radicalism of the nearby coal miners of Southwestern Illinois in his study of the period under consideration in *Labor, Loyalty, and Rebellion: Southwestern Illinois Coal Miners and World War I*.¹⁷ The role of the military as a strikebreaking force has been thoroughly studied between the Civil War and the Spanish-American War by both Jerry M. Cooper and Barton C. Hacker.¹⁸ Yet, the single most important contribution to the field concerning the importance and implication of labor’s most powerful weapon continues to be Jeremy Brecher’s *Strike!* Brecher celebrates the solidarity of the rank and file through a sweeping history of some of the country’s largest labor disruptions although he admittedly ignored the syndicalism of women.

More recent studies by Kenneth Libartito, Stephen H. Norwood, and Venus Green, however, have explained the gendered aspects of telephone operators and radical grass-roots unionism in their respective works. Libartito’s “When Women Were Switches: Technology, Work, and Gender in the Telephone Industry, 1890-1920,” accurately describes the inherent patriarchy of the sexual division of labor.¹⁹ Although it was believed that “high school girls” were “less likely than men to resist, protest, or fight the requirements of the job,” Libartito also noted their growing dissent.²⁰ For instance, during World War I, the formerly docile employees who for awhile seemed to be “content to live on cream puffs and chocolate éclairs” began to resent the “strenuous demands of the work and the rigid oversight [of] managers” and began to unionize.²¹ Venus Green’s book-length treatment of the Bell System telephone operators analyzed “the impact of technology on telephone women’s work” and discussed the operators’ “frequent, militant, and sometimes effective resistance” to management’s policies by the end of World War I.²² And finally, although he omitted the Linton strike, Stephen Norwood’s *Labor’s Flaming Youth: Telephone Operators and Worker Militancy, 1878-1923* is the definitive work on the subject.²³ Norwood thoroughly maintained that telephone operators again and again “demonstrated that young, unmarried women could often surpass men in strike militancy.”²⁴

This brings us back to the Senior Class Prophecy of Linton, and to generals, and quarrels, and smoke and processions of ladies. Linton, Indiana sits seventy miles southwest of Indianapolis in the eastern part of Greene County as one of the state’s largest coalfields. It would not be inaccurate to refer to Linton as a coal town. In fact, in 1906 the Commercial Club—the forerunner to the Chamber of Commerce—published a short hard-bound book entitled *Linton, Indiana: The Magic Coal City and the Real Pittsburg of the West*. It laid out the benefits of investing capital in Linton in the true spirit of boosterism:

No mistake can be made by investing in real estate or in any kind of business in Linton. If you are going to change locations you had just as well come to a growing, progressive city, having all the comforts of life and where everybody is prosperous. Come to Linton.

The glad hand of welcome is extended to all good citizens to come and be one of us.²⁵

Unfortunately, Linton’s definition of “good citizens” was highly racialized. The Commerce Club gloated in its claim that, “There is not a negro [sic] in the city nor is one permitted to remain here. There is not a Chinese in the city. In fact, there are but few foreigners of any kind and those we have are mostly of the better class, such as the thrifty model Germans and the polite and polished French.”²⁶ The United States Census confirms their dubious claims and finds that 93 percent of the town’s 5,856 residents were “native whites” and indeed there was not one Negro or Chinese citizen in Linton in 1920.²⁷ Furthermore, of Greene County’s foreign-born whites, nearly forty percent were German and French while another thirty-five percent came from England and Scotland.²⁸

In addition to its patent racism, the Commercial Club also painted a picture of peaceful labor relations, which the ruling class thought was in large part due to its “high class of progressive business men.”²⁹ Linton was being sold to other prospective capitalists as a town replete with hard-working citizens described throughout the work as “enterprising,” “wide-awake,” “hustling,” and “moral citizens.”³⁰ The ruling class also felt that their workers were not of the radical type. “Linton is as different from the western mining camps of rowdies and cowboys or the eastern coal mines with their negros [sic] and dagoes as day is from night.”³¹ Under the auspices of benefiting the workers, an interurban railroad was proposed that would reach all the mines within a fifteen-mile radius of Linton, “enabling the men to live in the city and enjoy its comforts and go to and from their work daily at a trifling cost.”³²

Of course, the mines were solely masculine spaces, and Linton’s women would have no use for the proposed interurban railroad. Yet Hoosier women were not entirely without wage work in 1920 either. According to the U.S. Census, of the females aged 10 to 44, over 146,000 out of 807,000, or a little over eighteen percent, were gainfully employed.³³ And of those working females, three-and-a-half percent, or 5067, were listed as telephone operators, while none of the state’s men classified themselves as such.³⁴ Thus, while the foundations for the cult of

domesticity may have shown some signs of cracking in 1919, the sexual division of labor both in the mines and in front of the telephone switches was inviolate.

Accordingly, Linton's local telephone exchange, the New Home Telephone Company, employed only young women as operators. Incorporated under Articles of Association on February 27, 1909, and capitalized with five hundred dollars, New Home Telephone Company proposed to "establish, maintain and operate telephones and telephone exchanges... in said state of Indiana."³⁵ Stephen H. Norwood explained the general desirability of the white-collar work that was somewhere between office employment and factory work: "The telephone operator's work was physically arduous to be sure, but she at least kept her hands clean."³⁶ The smart and fashionable appearance of telephone operators, however, did not alter the fact that their intense work, low pay, harsh discipline, and long hours deserved higher pay and better working conditions.³⁷

In order to seek a redress of grievances, thirteen Linton women took off their headsets, stopped making connections, and walked out on strike against the New Home Telephone Company on Thursday, April 24, 1919. Without any official union sanction or support, these young women bravely walked off their jobs, effectively shutting down the local telephone exchange, and set up pickets. They formally notified management of their demands, namely, a wage increase, a shorter workday, and recognition of the union.³⁸ In light of Miss Maude Sherb's refusal to join the walkout and choosing instead to remain at her post as chief operator, they sought her dismissal as well. They were very ambitious demands indeed. Yet management also had some bold counter plans as well. In a brazen attempt to crush the incipient union formation, the following day they brought in eight female replacement operators from Indianapolis to restart the telephone exchange, and service continued over the weekend "practically uninterrupted."³⁹ Nonetheless, Manager Harley Guthrie did continue to negotiate with the strikers to end the walkout. Later, the two parties came to a temporary settlement on Monday night, and the work stoppage appeared to be over.

Although we are not certain about the terms of the settlement, it quickly became obvious that the operators were no longer going to countenance management's constant oversight.

The *Indianapolis Star* explained, "the [striking] girls themselves refused to carry out the agreement because [Manager Harley Guthrie] insisted on remaining in the building" against the wishes of the operators.⁴⁰ The solidarity of the operators' coalesced during their brief work stoppage, and from that point on, they were going to work on their terms; they also realized that they would have community support to bolster their newfound militancy.



Figure 1: Editorial Cartoon, The Indianapolis Star (April 30, 1919)

The *Indianapolis Star* considered Linton to be a "one hundred percent union town."⁴¹ It should not be surprising, therefore, that hundreds of coal miners and the Retail Clerk Workers' Union joined in a wildcat sympathy strike alongside the

striking operators once the picket line was re-established.⁴² According to the papers, “all business was paralyzed.”⁴³ In order to capitalize on the community solidarity, an “indignation meeting” was called Monday night April 28, and Linton quickly moved to direct action. Over 500 persons “besieged” the telephone building and demanded that the strikebreakers leave town. Two recently returned World War I veterans in uniform scaled the building and removed the U. S. flag claiming that “it should not fly over such a man as [Harley] Guthrie.”⁴⁴ Miss Verna Talhoff, one of two scabs working in the building that night, fired a handgun at the veterans to no avail.⁴⁵ Shortly thereafter the crowd stood their ground and threw stones and smashed some windows causing the Linton police to fear for the safety of the strikebreakers.⁴⁶ Consequently, they “rescued the girls” from the roof and took them to a hotel.⁴⁷ The chief of police and the town’s force of two deputies, along with the prosecuting attorney, a deputy sheriff, and the telephone manager “took up a position in the building” and called on Republican Governor James P. Goodrich to send in the militia.⁴⁸

The contested space of the telephone building became the locus of the community’s ire. That the constituted authorities capitulated and called in for military reinforcements suggests two possibilities. Either they genuinely feared for their lives against the strength of the crowd or they sought to be seen as cowardly, capricious, and incompetent. The state and national news reported the former, while the local and labor press took the latter position. Consider first those who thought the authorities’ claims were dubious. The oldest labor paper in the United States, the *Union*, carried a headline which mockingly proclaimed, “Boys Throw Rocks; Militia Turns Out.”⁴⁹ The nearby town of Jasonville, Indiana’s paper was even more indignant:

The good name of the city of Linton and its many hundreds of good law abiding citizens has been smirched by the coming of armed soldiers to quell a little three-girl riot...all the censure should be directed to the city and county officials who permitted the good name of the peaceful citizenry to become dragged into bad repute...The whole thing hinges on the fact that a bunch of officials who had at some time traded backbones with

a set of Goose Pond fishing worms crawled shirinkingly into the telephone building and yelled lustily for the state troops to come quickly...we’ll wager two bits there were less than six culprits...⁵⁰

Not to be outdone, Indiana’s Governor Goodrich also ratcheted up the rhetoric telling a reporter that “the riot at Linton last night is a disgrace to the citizenship of Linton and a blot upon the fair name of Indiana.”⁵¹ He further declared that “the state would strike hard in support of law and order” and that the duty of citizens was to keep their good name from “the smirch of lawlessness and *rebellion against the constituted authorities*” [emphasis mine].⁵² Goodrich clearly believed that Linton’s rank and file had fomented a revolutionary general strike, thus he issued a “Proclamation Declaring Martial Law,” which said, in part,

Whereas, There now exists within the city of Linton, Greene county, Indiana,...a state of riot and lawless insurrection against the laws of the state of Indiana involving frequent and continued breaches of the peace, and destruction of property and personal injury to peaceable and law-abiding citizens . . . I, James P. Goodrich . . . hereby proclaim martial law throughout said city. . .⁵³

A copy of Special Order No. 32 of the Adjutant General’s Office (AGO) revealed the government’s intent: First, the Adjutant General, Harry B. Smith, was to immediately proceed to Linton; and secondly, he was to order as many troops as he deemed necessary. Thus Companies A, C, E, F, and H, of First Infantry were to proceed to Linton while Second Infantry’s Companies D, E, H, and I, were to “assemble at their armories and hold themselves in readiness to move on telegraphic instructions.”⁵⁴ A special train from Terre Haute arrived in Linton at 1:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 29, 1919, with 6000 rounds of ammunition.⁵⁵ They were not, however, to be welcomed with open arms.

The mass mobilization of Linton intensified four-fold; for by Tuesday morning over 2000 strike sympathizers met the Indiana National Guard and jeered and “hooted” at the soldiers

as they marched into town.⁵⁶ Although the militia slowly and cautiously pressed through the crowd at a rate of fifteen minutes per block, the crowd immediately reformed behind them as they went.⁵⁷ Automobiles were defiantly driven through the military lines as the excited crowds cried, “Come on, come on through.”⁵⁸ The *Indianapolis News* reported that “Men who have gone through many strike troubles say the situation here was one of the most difficult and menacing ever met with.”⁵⁹ Inexplicably, General Smith called Governor Goodrich and proudly declared that “he had cleared the streets and order apparently had been restored as far as outward circumstances indicated.”⁶⁰

Unfortunately, General Smith was not aware of the crowd gathering in the business district.⁶¹ A “large group of returned soldiers” and citizens rallied around a flag and commenced to parade through the town.⁶² “Several militiamen patrolling the streets were grabbed by the mob, their guns torn from their hands and thrown to the street and the men cuffed and kicked aside.”⁶³ Their destination was the telephone building. Once they arrived, General Smith came out to confront the veterans for their audacity to commit lawlessness while in uniform. The crowd taunted the general and someone told the veterans to “slug him.”⁶⁴ Although General Smith retorted, “There will be no such tactics,” he quickly removed to the protection of the building.⁶⁵

Hoosier workers commenced to stone the building with bricks and coal.⁶⁶ One brick struck General Smith’s knee, cut his pants, and caused him to bleed.⁶⁷ Two other Indiana National Guard soldiers were struck in the head causing one to bleed profusely and the other to develop “a knot the size of an egg on his head.”⁶⁸ The Adjutant General then ordered his soldiers to shoot into the crowd; however, since “scores of women and children were in the front ranks of the strike sympathizers and the troops hesitated to fire point blank at them.”⁶⁹ In fact, “children were pushed right under the bayonets of the soldiers pointed out the door.”⁷⁰ The gravity of such a tactic cannot be overstated for it displays the lengths to which the militant union women were willing to go in order to defy the state army sent to protect federal property. Since the telephone operators were mostly unmarried young women, it was other women with young

children who stood side by side with the striking operators and willingly shoved their children under the barrels of the soldiers’ rifles.

At this critical juncture, the working class solidarity faced down the Indiana National Guardsmen and quite literally risked death. The militia therefore chose to fire at an “upward angle” in order “to avoid shooting the children.”⁷¹ Several Hoosier veterans took advantage of their disinclination and forcibly removed the eight strikebreakers from Indianapolis and four other “Linton girls” who crossed the picket line and scabbed on the unionists.⁷² “The twelve girls filed between two lines of returned soldiers in their uniforms and were escorted from the city with a howling mob at their backs.”⁷³ Cries of “scab” could be heard as the crowd hurled eggs at the young women.⁷⁴ One of them reported that the crowd “threw things at us, grabbed our coats and hair and we thought we should never get [out].”⁷⁵

With the removal of the strikebreakers, the community of Linton now turned their attention to the indignity of military occupation. Thousands of militant unionists in Linton and nearby towns refused to work until the National Guard had been removed.⁷⁶ Edward Stewart, President of District 11 United Mine Workers, “informed the Governor that the miners in the Linton field have taken the stand that they would not return to work so long as the militia remains in their city and he assured the Governor that no violence would result after the departure of the troops.”⁷⁷ Even John L. Lewis, acting president of the National United Mine Workers intoned, “I am afraid that the presence of troops will only serve to increase the tensify [sic] of the situation.”⁷⁸ The striking telephone operators themselves demanded the removal of the Indiana National Guardsmen as a prelude to any settlement.⁷⁹

In a clear demonstration of cross-class solidarity, members outside the working class also called for the removal of the state’s army.⁸⁰ The *petite bourgeoisie* played a critical role in supporting the general strike. For example, the New Linton Hotel refused to quarter the strikebreaking girls the night before they were run out of town and a local restaurant refused them service, even though the scabs were escorted by a military detail and the restaurant was ordered to feed the hungry girls by General Smith himself.⁸¹ As we have noted earlier, the town’s stores were

closed, “all the mines were closed,” all business was halted, and in addition, residents and shopkeepers began boycotting the New Home Telephone Company.⁸² The *Indianapolis Star* reported that “homes and business” had requested a cancellation of their telephone services.⁸³ Even the mayor and police chief opted for an expedient “cut and run strategy” and asked General Smith three times to order the troops away and to lift martial law *in order to get the people back to work*.⁸⁴ When that did not work, they bargained with management on behalf of the strikers: “A committee consisting of the mayor, deputy sheriff and the prosecuting attorney of Greene county held a conference during the day with Mr. Wampler, the general manager in the state for the Central Union [Telephone Company] in which they ask [sic] him to discharge Miss Maud Scherb, chief operator, and that he recognize the union and take the striking telephone girls back.”⁸⁵

Faced with the overwhelming militancy and community solidarity of the rank-and-file workers, Governor Goodrich capitulated and appointed a commission to investigate the Linton labor troubles and authorized them to arbitrate an agreement.⁸⁶ Therefore, in the evening of April 29, 1919, “An armistice was signed” and an agreement was made between “the representatives of the striking telephone girls” and management, whereby the Indiana National Guard was to be quartered indoors and remain off the streets until the governor recalled them and his commission could begin their inquiry. The following morning, less than two days after promulgating martial law, Goodrich ordered the soldiers off the streets of Linton.⁸⁷ The *Indianapolis Star*’s front-page headlines proclaimed, “Truce Follows Linton Battle” and it was undeniably clear that the workers had won the “Battle for Linton.”⁸⁸

Linton boldly displayed its community solidarity by literally and figuratively standing behind “Thelma Anderson, Edna Craft, Myrtle Tincher, Veda White, Roberta Chapman, Lila Howe, Mae Froescheke, Margaret Browning, Madge Porter, Hazel Clausheld, Ester Arprister, Martha Pope, Gladys Campbell, and Ruby Slinger.”⁸⁹ For in addition to walking out on strike, these women also constituted the entire local union, and as a bargaining unit, they negotiated a contract. Mrs. Thelma Anderson, president of the newly founded operators’ union, led

negotiations and was installed as the new chief operator.⁹⁰ Miss Maude Sherb, the ex-chief operator who refused to honor the pickets, was fired as per the union’s demand.⁹¹ The operators received an eight-hour day in lieu of their previous nine-hour day and garnered a forty per cent increase in pay.⁹² Although management insisted that they could not legally recognize the union until gaining the U. S. Postmaster General’s approval, Manager Harley Guthrie announced that, “all the striking telephone girls [would] receive full pay for the time they were on strike.”⁹³

While it seems clear that the striking telephone operators were successful in bargaining an agreement, Governor Goodrich himself in his unpublished autobiography has contested the history of the event. The governor claimed that he “had to declare martial law at Linton on April 30 on account of the people of the city which was a strong union town demanding that the telephone girls join the union.”⁹⁴ With that, he made them victims. “I held to the proposition that it was the right of the girls to belong [sic] or not belong and it was their undoubted right to work without any interference.”⁹⁵ He further inferred that the operators were being coerced into trade unionism and then set himself up as their heroic protector: “The local authorities refused to protect them and I declared marital law.”⁹⁶ His hubris then extended to co-opt the community’s militancy of shutting down the exchange: “We cut off Linton from telephone service a few days and the strike was soon over.”⁹⁷

Irrespective of the governor’s revisionist reductionism, it is undeniably clear that the militant workers in Linton succeeded as a community to forcibly remove the strikebreakers and impose their will against the forces of the state. Neither the local authorities nor the National Guard succeeded in protecting the replacement workers, and the latter two were effectively run out of town. That historians have failed to recount the remarkable events at Linton unquestionably reflects a gender bias against the unseemly notion that women can be successful militant unionists in their own right. The telephone operators in Linton directly challenged management’s prerogatives, the state’s control, and the notion of female docility.

Notes

- ¹ The *Review*, “Yearbook of Senior Class of '17.” Special collections of the Linton Public Library. p. 26.
- ² *Ibid.* 27.
- ³ The *Indianapolis News*, April 29, 1919; *The Indianapolis News* reported that “Stores, as a Rule Close for the Day.”
- ⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁷ The *Indianapolis Star*, April 29, 1919.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, April 30, 1919.
- ⁹ *Jasonville Leader*, May 7, 1919.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, April 29, 1919.
- ¹¹ Clifton J. Phillips, *Indiana in Transition: The Emergence of an Industrial Commonwealth 1880-1920*. (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau & Indiana Historical Society, 1968), p. 358.
- ¹² Dane Starbuck, “James P. Goodrich: The Consummate Politician.” Part II of *The Goodriches: An American Family*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund Inc., 2001. and Benjamin D. Rhodes, *James P. Goodrich, Indiana's Governor Strangelove: A Republican's infatuation with Soviet Russia*. (Selinsgrove, Penn.: Susquehanna University Press, 1996).
- ¹³ William J. Watt and James R. H. Spears, eds., *Indiana's Citizen Soldiers: The Militia and National Guard in Indiana History*. (Indianapolis: The Indiana State Armory Board, 1980), p.81.
- ¹⁴ Teresa Amott and Julie Matthaei, *Race, Gender, and Work: A Multicultural Economic History of Women in the United States, Revised Edition*. (Boston: South End Press, 1996), p.6.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁶ Howard Kimeldorf, *Battling for American Labor: Wobblies, Craft Workers, and the Making of the Union Movement*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).
- ¹⁷ Carl Weinberg, *Labor, Loyalty, and Rebellion: Southwestern Illinois Coal Miners and World War I*. (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005)
- ¹⁸ Jerry M. Cooper, *The Army and Civil Disorder: Federal Military Intervention in Labor Disputes 1877-1900*. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980) and Barton C. Hacker, “The United States Army as a National Police Force: The Federal Policing of Labor Disputes 1877-1898.” *Military Affairs*, 33, no. 1 (Apr. 1969).
- ¹⁹ Kenneth Lipartito, “When Women Were Switches: Technology, Work, and Gender in the Telephone Industry, 1890-1920,” *The American Historical Review*, (Vol. 99, No. 4, October 1994), 1084,1088.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1088.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 1098.
- ²² Venus Green, *Race on the Line: Gender, Labor, and Technology in the Bell System, 1880-1980*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001). p.115.
- ²³ Stephen H. Norwood, *Labor's Flaming Youth: Telephone Operators and Worker Militancy 1878-1923*. (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990).
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p.97.
- ²⁵ Author unknown. *Linton, Indiana: The Magic Coal City and the Real Pittsburg of the West*. (Linton: Commercial Club, 1906).
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*
- ²⁷ United States Census. *Composition and Characteristics for the state of Indiana, 1920*. p. 301.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 303.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*
- ³⁰ *Linton, Indiana: The Magic Coal City*
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² *Ibid.*
- ³³ United States Census. *Composition and Characteristics for the state of Indiana, 1920*. pps. 67, 283.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 67.
- ³⁵ Indiana State Archives, Box 57-J-4 R227 no 2811, Articles of Association.
- ³⁶ Norwood, p. 45.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 48.
- ³⁸ *The Indianapolis Star*, April 30, 1919.
- ³⁹ *The Indianapolis Star*, April 29, 1919.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁴¹ *The Indianapolis Star*, May 1, 1919.
- ⁴² *The Indianapolis Star*, April 30, 1919.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁴ *The Indianapolis News*, April 29, 1919.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁹ *The Union*, May 2, 1919.
- ⁵⁰ *Jasonville (Ind.) Leader*, May 7, 1919.
- ⁵¹ *The Indianapolis News*, April 29, 1919.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁴ Indiana State Archives, Adjutant General, Indiana National Guard Special Orders 1915-1928, box 1HB.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁶ *The Indianapolis Star*, April 29, 1919.
- ⁵⁷ *The Indianapolis News*, April 30, 1919.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, April 29, 1919.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, April 30, 1919.
- ⁶² *Ibid.*
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁴ *The Indianapolis Star*, April 30, 1919.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁸ *The Indianapolis News*, April 30, 1919.
- ⁶⁹ *The Indianapolis Star*, April 30, 1919.

⁷⁰ *The Indianapolis News*, April 30, 1919.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *The Indianapolis News*, April 30, 1919.

⁷⁶ *The Indianapolis Star*, April 30, 1919.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ *The Indianapolis News*, April 30, 1919.

⁷⁹ *The Indianapolis Star*, April 30, 1919.

⁸⁰ *The Indianapolis News*, April 30, 1919.

⁸¹ *The Indianapolis News*, April 29, 1919.

⁸² *The Indianapolis News*, April 30, 1919.

⁸³ *The Indianapolis Star*, May 1, 1919.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ *The Indianapolis News*, April 29, 1919.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ *The Indianapolis Star*, May 1, 1919.

⁹⁰ *The Indianapolis Star*, May 1, 1919.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ James P. Goodrich, *Autobiography*. Unpublished mss. Housed in the Herbert Hoover Presidential Library, pps. 167, 168.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*