

Incident at Northline.

[s.l.]: [s.n.], [s.d.]

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/KP7EGTOKGRERG8W>

This material may be protected by copyright law (Title 17, US Code).

For information on re-use see:

<http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/Copyright>

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

INCIDENT AT NORTHLINE

JOHN ANTHONY TURCHENESKE, JR.
River Falls, Wisconsin

Throughout the United States today there is renewed racial and religious intolerance which is surfacing in reaction to increasing world and national social, political and economic instability and polarization. This illiberality is especially manifested by the preachments of hatred and bigotry on the part of such extremist organizations as the American Nazi Party, particularly vigorous in Illinois, California, New York and Maryland; a resurgent Ku Klux Klan which is currently not confining its endeavors to the South, but is also assiduously laboring in such fields as New Mexico, Arizona and California; and the Posse Comitatus which is currently conducting underground law and order campaigns and operations in Wisconsin. In view of this occurrence, it is well to recall what can befall a community's social fabric when residents succumb to the fears generated by agents of bigotry who would exploit the nation's ills for their own distorted ends. Nearly fifty-five years ago inhabitants of Hudson, then a sleepy hamlet located on the St. Croix River in northwestern Wisconsin, were so afflicted.

As a case study Hudson is both interesting and important since, in certain respects, this community continues to bear the scars inflicted by the societal plague experienced throughout this period. At that time, the United States as a whole was beset by the Red Scare and the urge to return to the false security of isolationism. Thus, during the decade of the twenties, there reappeared on the national scene fanatics who were fully determined not only to make the United States safe for Americans, but also to reconstitute this country's social fabric in their own warped image.

In Hudson the fanatics were the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. This organization spread its influence and invective throughout

the northern and western sections of the United States. Such ideology was introduced to Wisconsin from the Klan's stronghold in Indiana by specially trained agitators. One of the areas in Wisconsin to be particularly troubled by the Klan's presence was St. Croix County.

Though the Klan entered Wisconsin in the early twenties, the hooded order did not commence its operations in western St. Croix County until June 1926. Hudson, the county seat, was one locale which was especially torn asunder by the Klan activities. It was not long before Hudson's Roman Catholic community, whose members were the particular targets of these individuals, felt the sting of Klan vituperation and innuendo. What follows is an account of Catholic reaction to Klan malignities and the results thereof.

During the second week of June, there were rumblings in Hudson that some kind of Catholic protest was to be registered against the Ku Klux Klan's Northline meetings. Northline, approximately three miles northeast of Hudson, was both a junction and way station on the old Omaha Railroad. Located about one mile east of this junction, the Klan tent was pitched on a rented plot of ground. On a clear salubrious evening the Catholics chose to make their stand. At approximately eight o'clock on June 14, the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan began to assemble for their meeting. Marching as a body, the protesting Catholic delegation soon arrived. Arguments ensued and, to the dismay of the Klansmen, the Catholics managed to gain access to the tent.

Father Peter Rice, Pastor of St. Patrick's Catholic Church in Hudson, arrived soon thereafter. He approached the stage with the purpose of proving false the Klan attacks on the Catholic Church. Rice failed in his

attempt and general disruption ensued. Klan speakers soon fled the scene. Under what appeared to be suspicious circumstances, and as a final climax to the evening's proceedings, the Klan tent, with its appurtenances, burned to the ground. It was an incident which achieved instant notoriety and which resulted in acrimonious feelings for all involved.

As reported by the *St. Paul Dispatch*, the Klan tent was alleged to have been burned after the meeting ended in a near riot. Several hundred men were said to have protested against anti-Catholic statements made by Alfred Brown, a Klan speaker. One thousand persons had gathered to hear Brown. Rice was said to have gone to the platform protesting that the meetings, held at Northline for the past week, were anti-Catholic in nature. Still, the lecturer attempted to continue. Subsequently, the meetings ended with several encounters between opposing factions, though none was serious. It was at this point that the tent was burned.¹

In its version of the incident, the *New Richmond News* noted that the Klan tent was destroyed by fire of an unknown origin "together with the piano, seats and everything." Prior to the fire a rather boisterous meeting was held. "There was no storm during the night, so the tent evidently was not struck by lightning."² According to the *Spring Valley Sun*, 1000 people were gathered to hear Alfred Brown. Brown was said to have challenged a Catholic priest to answer him. Rice appeared with several hundred supporters. After he proceeded to the platform, a row developed.³

Warrants were soon sworn out for the fourteen individuals suspected of being involved in the Klan tent burning. Charging the suspects with disturbing a public meeting, the warrants were issued on the complaint of J. H. Neff who was said to be the Ku Klux Klan organizer at the meetings. On Saturday, June 19, eleven of the defendants were arraigned before Judge Otto A. Arnquist at Hudson Court House. All concerned pleaded not guilty and were later released on

a one hundred dollar bond, with their cases being adjourned until June 28.⁴

In an editorial entitled "He Who Casts the First Stone," the *Spring Valley Sun* stated that the burning of the tent was to be regretted particularly because of the effects the incident would produce. No one, explained this journal, believed that the Klan would fail to retaliate. It was now time for cooler heads to prevail lest serious consequences follow. Violence would beget violence. Hatreds created as a result of this affair would last a lifetime.⁵

At the preliminary hearing, on the morning of June 28, Judge Arnquist opened the proceedings. Describing the hearing's setting, the *St. Paul Dispatch* said the fourteen defendants were under an armed guard of ten deputy sheriffs. Five hundred persons jammed the court room one half hour before the hearing commenced. "Hudson is filled with automobiles of farmers and persons from neighboring cities and towns. They began arriving early today and were still coming at noon." Excitement was said to be at fever pitch. Not only was the court room filled to capacity, but hundreds were said to be milling also about the halls and the Court House grounds. There was jeering from the crowd when organizer Neff testified. Arnquist issued a severe rebuke. Later in the morning, he announced that due to wide interest in the proceedings he would permit "wide latitude in the testimony in order that the truth about the Klan might be made known and to discourage and set right some of the rumors that have been circulated."⁶

According to the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, five hundred persons braved the heat and jammed the court room to overflowing. "Two girls in the crowded court room fainted from heat in the forenoon session and several others succumbed to the heat in the afternoon." Hudson was said to be sharply divided on the matter. Due to a manifestation of partisanship during the hearing, St. Croix County Sheriff M. C. Emerson was ordered to clear the court room at the next display of such action.

"This order was issued after repeated cautionings and rebukes from the bench."

Further tension was added, said the *Pioneer Press*, when Ray C. Twining, an attorney from Milwaukee, arrived on the scene. His purpose in coming to Hudson was soon evident. It was Twining's intention to sue fifty Hudson businessmen for the sum of \$2000 in damages in connection with the tent burning affair. This "intention to sue for damages was made in letters received by the businessmen a week ago, but was not taken seriously until late today when Twining arrived to gather evidence for his case."⁷ Twining said he definitely planned to go on with the suit.

Any excitement that was evident during the first day of the hearing, said the *St. Paul Dispatch*, had disappeared by the second day of the hearings. Hudson had returned to an orderly condition.⁸ Paralleling the *Dispatch's* story in this regard, the *New Richmond News* noted that the interest in the proceedings appeared to have waned materially as the "morbid curiosity seekers concluded the day before that there wasn't going to be anything doing in their line." Reporters described the day as "sweltering" and "torrid" with the court room packed to the suffocating point. As to disorder in the court room, the *News* remarked that there was not foundation to the stories appearing in a certain St. Paul paper, items which were to be chalked up to the excitement and imagination of the young reporter. What fever pitch existed was due to the torrid temperatures and lack of ventilation. People were standing in the aisles, along the sides and in the rear, with others standing on chairs or perched on window sills, radiators and tables. Still others stood within the rail. The "court room was a sort of a Turkish bath on a large scale. People perspired gallons and gallons and everybody reduced very materially."

As to the matter of the armed guard, Sheriff Emerson said "Why, there's absolutely nothing to the "ten deputies" story." There was on duty "but one deputy and myself

and nothing for us to do in the way of maintaining order. There was no disorder of any sort." Emerson never saw a "crowd of that size more orderly despite the lack of chairs and despite the torrid heat." Whatever violence there was, said the *News*, "was confined entirely to the vigorous use of fans" and whatever could be converted into such.⁹ Still, the *Hudson Star Observer* noted that "considerable partisanship was manifested and on two occasions Judge Arnquist threatened to have the court room cleared by Sheriff Emerson unless better order prevailed."¹⁰

During the course of these proceedings, the *New Richmond News* also noted the appearance of attorney Twining from Milwaukee. Twining told a *News* correspondent that he represented the state organization of the Ku Klux Klan and was keenly interested in the deliberations. A civil suit would be brought against fifty Hudson businessmen to recover damages for the Klan tent destruction. These businessmen had received a letter from Twining stating that he had been retained by A. McMaster, J. H. Neff, Ben Anderson and Arley Martin "to collect damages from you and others associated with you in the destruction of the tent, piano and other personal property burned and destroyed at the Klan meeting held at the Town of Hudson on June 14." Twining also had the names of sixty other individuals who were involved in this matter. "Unless settlement of the damages is made within one week or some satisfactory arrangements made for a settlement, suit will be commenced against you and the others for the amount of \$2000."¹¹ Initially, they did not give the letter serious consideration. But with Twining's arrival "for the purpose of getting evidence in the matter affairs took a new turn, and the parties concluded that he means business."¹²

William T. Doar, a New Richmond attorney, represented the defendants when the preliminary hearing opened at Hudson Court House.¹³ William R. Kirk, District Attorney for St. Croix County, was the

prosecutor. J. H. Neff was the prosecution's chief witness. Neff, who swore out the original complaint, was the Klan organizer present at the tent affair.

Neff stated that he was the Grand Titan of the Fourth Province, Realm of Wisconsin, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. Klan meetings had been held one week prior to the events of June 14. Advertisements for these meetings consisted of handbills distributed in that part of the state. He described the tent as being forty by one hundred twenty feet with plank seating and a platform twelve by twenty feet in size. Decorations consisted of American flags and bunting. There was also a player piano and Klan paraphernalia such as robes, signs and handbills.

That evening, the Klan meeting was scheduled to begin at eight thirty. At eight fifteen, said Neff, a large mob gathered at the gate and demanded to be admitted. Because the meeting was for Protestants only, the crowd was told that it could not enter. Also, since the grounds were rented, it would be illegal to do so. But the crowd advanced in a boisterous manner "stating that they were there to commit violence, stating to me that fact."

Neff said the crowd was excited, "and naturally they cursed me; they God-damned me, if that is admissable. I hate to say it, yet I must." He was "called other names; the tent was filled up to its full capacity of a howling, cursing—you couldn't hardly call it an audience—call it a mob." According to Neff, the Klansmen tried to defend themselves. Dr. Brown was taken to shelter. Neff said he then went to the platform and attempted to ameliorate the situation by a recitation of the Lord's Prayer and the singing of "America." This was met by jeers, cursing and general disturbance by the anti-Klan element. Neff explained that after telling the mob it was acting illegally, an attempt was made to explain the principles of the Klan; "but I was told that they did not want to hear anything about the Klan. They knew it all, but they wanted to know about those damn lies that had been told about the Roman Catholic Church." Neff, seeing that

all was futile, said he was about to dismiss the meeting when Father Rice walked to the platform. Rice said he was representing several local priests and the Catholic people with the intention of protesting the meeting and driving the Klansmen out.¹⁴

Neff testified that he finally dismissed the meeting, but immediately saw several guns pointing at him. Neff then went to the back of the tent to the yells of "'kill him, lynch him, mob him; we want Pat Malone, where is he? Where is Dr. Brown? We want him; we want Neff!'" Neff said he managed to escape through the side of the tent to his car, after managing to hastily rebuke the crowd for its destruction. Then he and several of his associates drove to the Fillbach house where his wife and family were located. Neff said he remained at the house until he saw the tent in flames, at which point he drove to River Falls.¹⁵

Under questioning by attorney Doar, Neff maintained that he did not have an arrest record. Testifying that he had been connected with the Ku Klux Klan since 1922 when he joined the organization in Indiana, Neff said that he earned his living by working for them as an organizer. At first, Neff refused to divulge information about his wages and other interests in the Ku Klux Klan. Later, he stated that his income was four dollars per man enrolled, which funds came out of an initiation fee. As to whether his living depended on enrolling as many members as possible, Neff said that this was not the case since he was interested in building the Klan out of the best timber he could get, regardless of the commission he received. Still, it was his living.

Neff said that he had been connected with the entire province of the Ku Klux Klan for one year. Meetings had been conducted in the St. Croix Valley only during the two previous weeks and these had been at Northline. Prior to that, he had been in River Falls for a month. As the Grand Titan of Province Number Four, it was his job to supervise Klan activities in twenty-one counties, an area which included St. Croix County.

Pat Malone's affiliation with the Klan was only as a lecturer, as was Dr. Brown's. Only Protestants were admitted to the meetings because these were of a private, Protestant and invitational nature. Hence not all American citizens were permitted to attend.

Neff insisted that the uninvited crowd poured through the gate. As to Father Rice being recognized as a Catholic priest, the organizer stated that Rice introduced himself explaining that he was there on behalf of his colleagues and people. Neff said that he had no knowledge of an invitation being issued to a priest; that no charges were leveled against the priesthood; and that he never heard about any reflections being made against the Catholic Church, its priests, sisters and faithful, at least not at Northline. Neff admitted to hearing these accusations at River Falls. But the challenge to debate was issued to Father Fassbender by Pat Malone. Neff insisted that Father Rice was never challenged at Hudson.¹⁶

Father Peter Rice was the chief witness for the defense. Answering attorney Doar, Rice testified that he knew of the Klan meetings at Northline through the Klan placards he had seen displayed. In addition, he received anonymous letters from several places in the county, letters which had Pat Malone's picture on them. Contained in the letters were charges made against the morality of every Catholic priest in the county. These letters arrived after the first of the River Falls meetings.¹⁷

Rice testified that the substance of an earlier sermon was that "our Catholic people should protest, not by way of violence or physical force, but by pamphlets in writing and by requested permission to attend" Klan meetings. Klan members were to be asked whether "we could get a chance to refute their statements as to the moral character of the Catholic priesthood in general and the priests of the county in particular." As to the remarks made at the Catholic Guild meeting that Sunday afternoon, Rice told the ladies that they should defend the Sisters' and their honor by

protesting in a dignified manner against individuals who saw fit to admit anti-Catholic lecturers within their home. Catholic nuns were charged with being "the mistresses of Catholic priests." These statements were made at River Falls and at Northline, only with more inuendo.

Rice admitted attending the Klan meetings, but said that it was more a spur of the moment type of thing. Initially, he had no intention of doing so. If there were to be a debate, the priest expected that the confrontation would take place at Hudson. Rice went to the meeting at the request of Joe O'Connell and James McMahon. Also, the Klan had issued an invitation. "That was the sole reason I went, because I was a man and wouldn't back down where challenge was made." Rice said he went into the tent, quieted the people down, and asked Neff if he could say a few words. Neff said "certainly." He told Neff that "I had come out here in response to repeated challenges brought to me, conveyed to me, to refute or ask for proof of any charges against the morality of any Catholic priest in this county, any sister, or his housekeeper." Rice then told the people to keep quiet. Rice also told Neff that "I wanted proof given of any statement that any of the Klan members had to make against any Catholic priest in the county, to make it now." Neff, in a low tone, replied that none had been made.

Neff seemed to be a little excited at this juncture. Rice then said as a "Catholic priest I protest against being slandered or my brother priests being slandered. I did not say that they must be driven out." He had no intention to incite violence and denied any "literal expression that can be interpreted, legally, with intent toward physical force or disrupting their "meeting. After his speech Rice immediately went home.

As to the matter of the challenge, Rice testified that it was direct inasmuch as the placard issued at the River Falls meetings challenged Father Fassbender and other priests. It did not matter who authorized the placard as it was still the same organization.

Besides, "they would be alike in their dirty methods." With regard to the statements made at Northline, the Pastor said that he was informed "they were asking for the Catholic priest out there, people in Klan uniform." Several individuals yelled "why don't you bring out your old priest." Rice said he ignored previous challenges. "But I thought I would back down before no man when he challenged my character." Kirk then asked whether Rice was directly attacked. Rice explained that a general attack was made against all Catholic priests in the county and the "fact that I was a priest in the county was a specific attack, because there are only five priests in the county."

Rice had no prior knowledge that there was to be a crowd of several hundred parishioners at Northline; although he had heard rumors that a Catholic crowd would be there. Even so, the purpose in going out was to defend the character of the Catholic priesthood and sisterhood. Rice also testified that he did not believe that his concern over the statements of the Ku Klux Klan would serve to influence his parishioners. He did not advocate physical violence and testified that "my Catholic people were instructed in church to avoid physical violence with anybody."

But he also told his parishioners "that when your Catholic priesthood is attacked and the honor of Catholic women and sisterhood, that you should answer back and ask for proof of the statements they were making." As to instructing the Ladies Guild to go down to Disney's, Rice said that "I did; pardon me, that is incomplete. On Sunday afternoon the 13th, I think," Rice suggested to the ladies that they visit these individuals and ask them "if it was their intent to insult their Catholic neighbors by keeping anti-Catholic lecturers in their home." He did not know that this was the Disney's only source of income. Rice did not want anyone put out. It was just to be a protest. As to whether harboring the Klan lecturers indicated the Disney's true feelings in the matter, Rice replied that "under the circumstances it

would indicate at least sympathy." It was his belief that there existed no connection between the action of the Ladies Guild and the Klan tent burning. Under additional questioning, Rice said he did not rile up the Catholic men, but did impress upon them the necessity of upholding the honor of their women.

Kirk then asked Rice whether he gave advance notice that he would engage Klan leaders in debate. Rice explained that "I mentioned in a lecture given in the church to Catholics and non-Catholics earlier in the year, that I stood ready to meet at any place, any time, any anti-Catholic lecturer as long as" Rice was given a "fair show and fair hearing for debate. That was sometime in March, and I believe you were present in the Catholic church the same night Mr. Kirk, because I saw you."

Replying to defense attorney Doar's question relative to a printed challenge, Rice said that he had one in his possession which read as follows. "'As a rule I debate only with priests but due to the fact that Father Fassbender is too big a coward to meet me in open debate, I will be glad to meet your man Emil E. Holmes.'" As to the Pastor's feelings toward Hudson's Protestant community, Rice testified that "my experience generally is the Protestant people are as fine people as there is in America; I want no religious bigotry."¹⁸ Thus was concluded the priest's testimony in the matter.

In his summation for the State, Kirk demanded that all defendants be bound over to the Circuit Court for trial. Rice was said to be morally responsible for the riot.¹⁹ Doar, in a complete and total condemnation of the Klan, demanded that the cases be dismissed.²⁰ As County Judge, Arnquist was only empowered to determine whether the defendants should be turned over to the Circuit Court for trial.²¹

In arriving at his decision, Judge Arnquist issued a ringing denunciation of the Klan. Arnquist said it was "regrettable that any such organization should have come here. There is no question but that it tends to

make bitterness, strife and violence." There "have been a number of such movements in the past, and many of them created violence." One could not "blame Father Rice for being indignant at the charges of immorality made against him and the Catholic priesthood in Klan meetings." As such, Rice could not be condemned for "going to the Klan tent when told, through bad judgement, that he was invited there to defend himself against them."

Furthermore, said Arnquist, the "doctrines for which the Klan stand are well known, and are antagonistic to those of the Catholic Church." Because of this, and the charges made against him, Rice "was naturally against the Klan." As such, Rice "said in his church that a protest should be made against the charges." He had "no violence in his mind, only protection of the Church and himself from the charges." From this, noted the Judge, the "District Attorney has deduced a moral responsibility of Father Rice for the riot." Yet there was "no legal responsibility attaching to him, and that is what we are examining here. Therefore, it is my duty to discharge Father Rice."²² Tony Lombard and George Hennesy were also acquitted.²³ Eleven remaining defendants were bound over for the Fall Term of the Circuit Court.²⁴

In the aftermath of the hearing, the *Hammond News* noted that a great deal of feeling was being created over the incident. Many different stories were said to be circulating. These had gotten to be so out of proportion that it was getting difficult to obtain any accurate information on the happenings.²⁵ Feeling, observed the *Baldwin Bulletin*, was running rather high in Hudson. Sheriff Emerson was said to be taking precautions to prevent any reprisals that might occur. After the hearing was concluded, Klan members and sympathizers gathered to discuss Arnquist's decision. Those who sympathized with the defendants did the same.²⁶

Hudson, noted the *New Richmond News*, was indeed getting plenty of publicity. Most of it, however, was of an undesirable nature.

This Klan rumpus managed to push the town right onto the front page. Said the *News* of the publicity: "It reminds one of what the manager of a 10-20-30 show once said to this writer: 'I don't care whether you write us up or write us down, but great Scott, don't ignore us any longer!'"²⁷ Still, the end to the Klan tent affair had yet to be written.

In October, the *Woodville Times* noted that the Klan riot case was scheduled for the Fall Term of the Circuit Court. Yet there was some talk that this case might not be called. District Attorney Kirk, though, insisted that, if at all possible, he would bring the matter to trial.²⁸ In a succeeding issue, the *Times* said that the Klan riot case was not to be tried that Fall after all. Indeed, it was exceedingly doubtful that the case would ever come to trial. This was particularly so because "with the present evidence," or lack thereof, "no conviction could be secured," and Kirk did "not want to make a fizzle of it."²⁹ Thus the case was put over to the March Term.

In November, the County Claims Commission was approached with a claim for \$1967 for the loss of the Klan tent. This was said to be the biggest item before the Claims Commission.³⁰ Members of this body, composed of N. E. Fraher, J. W. Hanley and Elmer Afdahl, dissallowed the claim. As to the reason for its action, the Commission stated that it was a matter for the courts to handle.³¹

Even so, the Klan tent affair did not reach the Circuit Court for the Spring Term of 1927. In the interest of a peaceful settlement of the issue, Spencer Haven appeared before the St. Croix County Board which convened a special session on Saturday, May 7. Haven said that the Catholics had subscribed five hundred dollars to this end. Various Hudson businessmen contributed a total of four hundred dollars. It was Haven's belief that if the County were to contribute five hundred dollars, the case would be settled out of court.³²

Acceding to this request, the County Board charged this claim to the next year's

tax receipts.³³ One source noted that "the Klan will accept the \$1400 in full for all damages and drop the suit, which was bothering a number of people quite badly."³⁴ The identity of the individuals who instigated the incident at Northline would remain a mystery. The Klan riot case was closed.

Finally, it is to be hoped that the lessons emanating from the social divisiveness, experienced not only by Hudson and other Wisconsin communities, but also similar localities throughout the land, have not been forgotten; and having remembered, citizens will not succumb to the irrational fear generated by such revitalized hate organizations.

NOTES

¹ *St. Paul Dispatch* (St. Paul, Minnesota), June 15, 1926. In a postscript to the article, the *Dispatch* noted that Brown's remarks had been resented. Several days prior to the incident, a delegation of twenty-five Catholics went to the place where Brown was rooming with the demand that the landlady evict him. Brown volunteered to move to a different residence.

² *New Richmond News* (New Richmond, Wisconsin) June 16, 1926.

³ *Spring Valley Sun* (Spring Valley, Wisconsin), June 17, 1926.

⁴ *New Richmond News*, June 23, 1926.

⁵ *Spring Valley Sun*, June 24, 1926.

⁶ *St. Paul Dispatch*, June 28, 1926.

⁷ *St. Paul Pioneer Press* (St. Paul, Minnesota), June 29, 1926. Twining was one of three signers of the Articles of Incorporation, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Realm of Wisconsin.

⁸ *St. Paul Dispatch*, June 29, 1926.

⁹ *New Richmond News*, June 30, 1926.

¹⁰ *Hudson Star Observer* (Hudson, Wisconsin), July 1, 1926.

¹¹ *New Richmond News*, June 20, 1926.

¹² *New Richmond News*, June 30, 1926.

¹³ The fourteen defendants were: Alex Lomnes, William Burton, Jr., Edward Christoph, Robert O'Rourke, Father Peter Rice, Gregg Busby, Henry Zorn, Mrs. Joe Miller, Tony Lombard, Henry Klein, George Hennessey, Harry Kinney, Eugene Ritchey and Tony Muchie.

¹⁴ Testimony of J. H. Neff, *State of Wisconsin v. Alex Lomnes, et al*, June 28-29, 1926, File Number

9506, St. Croix County Court House, Hudson, Wisconsin (hereafter cited as Preliminary Hearing), pp. 1-4. Father Rice was present on behalf of Father Fassbender of River Falls and Father Shanaghy of Ellsworth.

¹⁵ Testimony of J. H. Neff, Preliminary Hearing, p. 5. The Fillbach's were the people who rented part of their acreage to the Klan.

¹⁶ Testimony of J. H. Neff, Preliminary Hearing, pp. 7-15. It should be noted that Pat Malone, whose headquarters was at Chetek, Wisconsin, was a circuit lecturer for the Klan in Wisconsin. Anti-Catholic and one hundred percent American in approach, Malone was a big drawing card at Klan gatherings. Interestingly enough, Malone was not a member of the Klan. Prior to working for the hooded order as a lecturer, Malone rode the anti-Catholic lecture circuit causing community dissension, disruption and acrimony in such diverse areas as Elm Creek, Nebraska and Oakland, California.

¹⁷ Testimony of Father Peter Rice, Preliminary Hearing, p. 78. Of interest here is that Rod Chinook, owner of a River Falls printing shop, printed a large amount of the Klan's propaganda. This material was used for the River Falls and Northline campaigns.

¹⁸ Testimony of Father Peter Rice, Preliminary Hearing, pp. 79-89. It should be noted that the Klan were mistaken in their belief that Holmes was a Catholic representative. Holmes, president of the World War Veterans Association, located in Minneapolis, Minnesota, debated on his own account with Pat Malone at River Falls in April 1926.

¹⁹ *Baldwin Bulletin* (Baldwin, Wisconsin), July 2, 1926.

²⁰ *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, June 30, 1926.

²¹ *St. Paul Dispatch*, June 29, 1926.

²² *Baldwin Bulletin*, July 2, 1926.

²³ *New Richmond News*, June 30, 1926.

²⁴ *Hudson Star Observer*, July 1, 1926.

²⁵ *Hammond News* (Hammond, Wisconsin), July 1, 1926.

²⁶ *Baldwin Bulletin*, July 2, 1926.

²⁷ *New Richmond News*, June 30, 1926.

²⁸ *Woodville Times* (Woodville, Wisconsin), October 1, 1926.

²⁹ *Woodville Times*, October 8, 1926.

³⁰ *Baldwin Bulletin*, November 26, 1926.

³¹ *New Richmond News*, November 26, 1926.

³² *Hudson Star Observer*, May 12, 1927.

³³ St. Croix County Board Proceedings, Special Session, St. Croix County Court House, Hudson, Wisconsin, May 7, 1927, 055/1/2, Area Research Center, Chalmer-Davee Library, University of Wisconsin, River Falls, Wisconsin, VII, p. 66.

³⁴ *Woodville Times*, May 11, 1927.