

- Stead, W. T. *The Americanisation of the World or The Trend of the Twentieth Century, The Review of Reviews Annual*. London: H. Markely, 1902. Accessed February 1, 2012. <http://archive.org/details/americanizationo00stea>.
- Stead, W. T. "Government by Journalism." *The Contemporary Review* 49 (1886): 653–674. Accessed February 2, 2012. <http://www.attackingthediabol.co.uk/steadworks/gov.php>.
- Ward, Alan J. *Ireland and Anglo American Relations, 1899–1921*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolsan, 1969.
- Werner, Walt. "On Political Cartoons and Social Studies Textbooks: Visual Analogies, Intertextuality, and Cultural Memory." *Canadian Social Studies* 38.2 (2004): 1–10. Accessed February 2, 2012. [www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css](http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css).
- Whelan, Bernadette. *United States Foreign Policy and Ireland: From Empire to Independence 1913–29*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006.
- Wiener, Joel H. *The Americanization of the British Press, 1830s–1914: Speed in the Age of Transatlantic Journalism*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Wiener, Joel H. "'Get the News! Get the News': Speed in Transatlantic Journalism, 1830–1914." In *Anglo-American Media Interactions, 1850–2000*, edited by Joel H. Wiener and Mark Hampton, 48–67. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

## Chapter Seven

### "A Great Deal of It Cannot Be Printed": W. T. Stead and E. J. Dillon

Kevin Rafter

In April 1912, W. T. Stead (1849–1912) and E. J. Dillon (1854–1933) had their final meeting in London, only weeks before the editor of the *Review of Reviews* set sail on the *Titanic*. Over lunch, the two men spoke of international politics and developments in Russia, the country about which they shared considerable interest. But Stead was also keen to inform his lunch partner about the latest news of his psychic powers. This embrace of spiritualism had already cost Stead credibility among his journalistic peers and political contacts. What Dillon thought of this conversation is left unrecorded, although he had been doubtful about Stead's previous claims to have been in communication with the ghost of C. S. Parnell. He also previously advised Stead against "warning the public that a certain Atlantic liner would go down with all passengers in mid-ocean."<sup>1</sup> Stead's death on the *Titanic* ended a 25-year association between the two men.

This chapter seeks to capture the nature of their relationship. Dillon, an Irish-born foreign correspondent, was based in Russia when he first started exchanging letters with Stead.<sup>2</sup> (The final letter between them is dated March 21, 1912.) In the relationship between Dillon and Stead, we discover important characteristics of Stead's outlook as an editor and his dealings with contributors. Moreover, we gain a deeper appreciation of how he was drawn to intellectual argument—and to those with conflicting views to his own. Stead may be associated with sensationalism, but as this chapter sets out to show, the editorial approach underpinning the practice of Stead's New Journalism went beyond moral crusade and personality. The chapter also argues that Stead had a deep interest in international affairs, promoted those whom he considered serious journalists, and maintained ongoing contact with them over many years. Other chapters in this volume have explored the influence of Stead's New Journalism on Irish journalistic practices. This chapter reveals aspects of New

Journalism in Stead's relationship with one Irish-born journalist whose professional life was based outside Ireland. Like other areas of Irish life in this period, the practice of Irish journalism should be considered in a wider international context.

The first section of this chapter explores the development of their professional and personal contacts. Here Stead's role as editor is evident, as are his forthright dealings with contributors. The second section examines the story on which Stead and Dillon had their closest collaboration—the publication of a controversial work by Leo Tolstoy. The circumstances in which the translated work was commissioned are explained, as is how Stead ended up buying out his business partner to ensure publication. The third section focuses on Dillon's preference for using pseudonyms in some of his published writings, and Stead's continued desire to expose his friend's identity as the author of these articles. The often-fraught nature of their relationship emerges from previously unpublished correspondence in Dillon's archive. This correspondence, and the contacts between Stead and Dillon, is important in providing evidence of Stead's *modus operandi* as a journalist and editor and in helping to understand more about his personality and character.

Stead and Dillon first met in London in 1884. Dillon was professor of comparative philology at the Imperial University of Kharkoff while Stead was editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Having abandoned his original plans of entering the priesthood, Dillon commenced doctoral studies at Louvain and later at Kharkoff. He had made his first visit to Russia in 1877. He threw himself into all aspects of life in St. Petersburg. While making influential friends, he also crossed swords with some university colleagues, which ultimately damaged his prospects of securing a professorial appointment. In this period, his career veered between academia and journalism as he sought to establish a regular source of income. Earning a secure living had taken on some importance. He had married in 1881 and by the end of that decade was the father of three young children. This first meeting with Stead in 1884 was one of several set up by Dillon while on a visit to London to establish interest in his journalistic services from Russia.

Stead and Dillon had several common points of interests: both came from relatively modest backgrounds where social advancement was encouraged and where strict religious worship was practiced. Nevertheless they must have made an unusual sight when together: Stead, the towering, disheveled, shaggy-bearded figure from the north of England, alongside the small, prim, and dapper Irishman with his acquired cosmopolitan outlook. Dillon recorded how he was taken

by Stead's enthusiasm: "It was contagious and irrepressible."<sup>3</sup> They shared an interest in political developments in Ireland: Stead as a supporter of Home Rule, while Dillon toyed for a time with returning to Dublin to seek a Westminster seat for Parnell's party. Over dinner they discussed the possibility of a political career for Dillon. "He assures me that I can get into parliament if I want to," Dillon wrote in his diary.<sup>4</sup> Dillon's family was nationalist in outlook. Although Dillon too favored a Home Rule solution, he did not publish widely on Irish affairs. As a foreign correspondent with the *Daily Telegraph*, he had limited visits to Dublin, but he maintained interest in Irish political developments.

Aside from an interest in Ireland, Stead and Dillon also formed a common bond over the topic of Russia. At their first meeting, Stead sought to commission an article on Russian Christianity, which Dillon accepted immediately.<sup>5</sup> Stead had, in Dillon's opinion, "an irresistible attraction for Russia."<sup>6</sup> The origins of this special interest was said to have developed from his time as an apprentice in a merchant's office in Newcastle and the firm's dealings with counterparts in Russia. Stead's long-term adulterous affair with the Russian propagandist Madame Olga Novikoff may also have heightened his interest.<sup>7</sup> Dillon was also in contact with Novikoff; some years later Stead wrote, "I know that Mdme. Novikoff is mightily pleased with what you are writing at present, and sings your praises every time I see her. But that, of course, is another matter."<sup>8</sup> Stead championed an alliance between Russia and Britain and argued that the former would prosper through an alliance between the tsar and the intelligentsia. Dillon had a more negative prognosis. He was pessimistic about the tsar's ability to modernize the Russian state and to stabilize relations with the United Kingdom.

The two men corresponded about developments in Russia over many years. From the same correspondence, we also see Stead as a powerful advocate for the profession of journalism. In one of his letters with Dillon, he asserted, "I believe the newspaper to be the simplest means of getting people to work together for the attainment of common ends."<sup>9</sup> Both men were content to use their wordsmith to campaign on specific political issues. Dillon's reportage on international affairs for the *Daily Telegraph* and other publications was often the subject of debate at Westminster. But in seeing the role of editor as "solider[ing] against wrong,"<sup>10</sup> Stead was more forthright in pushing the boundaries of editorial content. Dillon, a stickler for factual accuracy, would most certainly have disapproved of Stead's sensationalism and willingness to embellish and to exaggerate. But

here we see evidence that Stead's brand of New Journalism had depth and was underpinned by a commitment to serious engagement with current affairs. In commissioning work from Dillon over a prolonged period, Stead was intent on ensuring that his readers received a real appreciation of developments in Russia as well as understanding their implications not just for British, but also for wider European affairs.

They held differing views on many of the great issues of the day including British foreign policy, the future of Russia, and the Boer War. In a tribute to Stead, published after his death, Dillon was described by a headline writer as "one who was often his antagonist."<sup>11</sup> The Irishman was, however, the type of "perfect-foil" to whom Stead was naturally drawn. As one contemporary noted of Stead, "He loved to develop his ideas dialectically, in discussion with someone personally congenial to him, but whose habit of mind was as dissimilar as possible to his own."<sup>12</sup> Stead would also have enjoyed Dillon's deep knowledge of Russian politics and his intellectualism; by one account, he spoke twenty-six languages, ten with complete fluency and "a mere five well enough to be taken for a native of the country."<sup>13</sup>

Dillon's personal diaries show that he traveled from St. Petersburg to London in June 1889, and among those with whom he had appointments was the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. The two men dined in Stead's home. Dillon was at that time seeking to expand commissions from British and American publications, and as they considered possible outlets, Stead outlined his own plans for a new publication. The conversation took in diamond businessman Cecil Rhodes and the situation in South Africa about which the two held differing views. It is not known if Stead revealed that he was in discussions with Rhodes about financing a new newspaper, and that the businessman had recently advanced him £2,000, which had been used to settle a libel suit at the *Pall Mall Gazette*.<sup>14</sup>

The new publication mentioned at the June 1889 meeting never happened: Rhodes secured Stead's editorial support for his African adventures but never delivered the necessary capital for the newspaper project. Instead, Stead entered a partnership with another businessman, George Newnes, to found the *Review of Reviews*, which they planned would be a compendium of the best articles in leading publications alongside relevant discussion articles taking up the themes and debates as printed in those same publications.

Having established the *Review of Reviews* in early 1890, Stead quickly looked to expand his successful venture. In December 1890, he wrote to Dillon: "I am making arrangements for the development

of REVIEW OF REVIEWS in America, and in that case it is possible we shall require somewhat more Russian than what we have been able to use from you hitherto."<sup>15</sup> As he proposed to Dillon, Stead was keen to publish authoritative commentary on articles appearing in leading Russian publications and, in the process, to make the Western world better informed about life in the tsarist empire:

I would like to know whether you could do a Literary Causerie for the first three months of this year...to be as vivid an account of the Russian Literary Movement of the Year, both in its Magazines and elsewhere, as you can make it...I have no doubt that you can hit upon the right thing, if you simply imagine yourself writing a letter to me telling me what was going on, and what was most interesting in the Russian world of letter and in the Periodical Literature.<sup>16</sup>

Stead was also interested in material that would give his new publication appeal beyond those exclusively interested in the political maneuverings in European capitals. His New Journalism might have been about influencing those in power through campaigns waged on the printed page, but Stead was also conscious of establishing a wide readership for the *Review of Reviews*. Stead planned an issue on the most attractive women in Europe and asked his St. Petersburg-based contributor, "Do you think Princess Radzivil will object to her portrait being published as a beautiful Pole, and who are you going to choose for my beautiful Russian?"<sup>17</sup>

Not only did Dillon contribute to the *Review of Reviews* but also his work in other publications was frequently referenced by Stead, often with glowing introductions. Of Dillon's reportage from Crete in 1887, Stead wrote, "His article, like everything that he writes, is brilliant and interesting."<sup>18</sup> Of his commentary from St Petersburg, Dillon was likewise judged "by far and away the ablest and most trustworthy chronicler of events in Russia."<sup>19</sup> Dillon was the subject of one of Stead's "Character Sketches" in 1901: "[He] is the most cultured, the most adventurous newspaper man all round I have ever met... He is an artist by temperament, a journalist by instinct, a scholar and philosopher by choice, a statesman in ambition."<sup>20</sup> Moreover, when Stead was asked whom, excluding himself, he considered the most brilliant living journalist, he replied, "a little man who hides his light under a bushel and shuns the public gaze as the plague, but is the honoured friend of sovereigns and statesmen. I take my hat off to Dr. Dillon."<sup>21</sup> Stead may have championed "celebrity journalism" and favored an elevated role for editors, but in his relationship with

Dillon—and in their correspondence—we find clear evidence of his admiration, indeed respect, not just for long form journalism but also for a journalistic practice that informed and educated its readers.

Yet, alongside this admiration for his friend's intellect and judgment, Stead was equally blunt in his dealings with Dillon, true to his often-abrasive personality. Shortly after Dillon started to contribute to the *Review of Reviews*, Stead recorded that one of his articles on Russian affairs was “quite the most malicious piece of journalism I have run for many a long day.”<sup>22</sup> They also had typical editor-contributor interactions. Dillon argued with all of his editors for the maximum space for his work. Stead was not always able to deliver. For example, words were exchanged over the nonpublication of a commissioned piece on Austria to which Stead replied that there was simply insufficient space.<sup>23</sup> But true to Stead's generosity in this latter instance—and others, including a short fictional story on Delhi commissioned in December 1903 but ultimately not used—payment was still forthcoming, an important factor for Dillon.

The relationship between the two men went beyond their professional interactions. Stead also gave some assistance to Dillon's sons who were educated in Britain and later worked there. In March 1903, and again in same month in 1906, Stead's letters mention meetings, visits to his home in London, and also lending Dillon's youngest son, Harold, a book of ghost stories.<sup>24</sup> Dillon was in many respects an “absentee parent,” and it is interesting to note that Stead was the one offering career advice and promising “to talk to him as if I were his grandfather.”<sup>25</sup> During a prolonged personal stand-off between the two men in 1906, Stead wrote, “I am glad to say that your boy at Westminster school has at last discovered that our house stands conveniently adjacent to that educational establishment, and much to our delight he comes in occasionally with his violin.”<sup>26</sup>

Dillon and Stead corresponded for almost two decades. The two men also met when their busy schedules allowed them to be in the same city at the same time. They dined together when Stead visited St. Petersburg (e.g., in 1898 and in 1908). Dillon was among those Stead met when he traveled to Russia for the opening of the first Duma in 1905. Stead was intent on promoting his campaign for reform in Russia and also for the benefits of an alliance with Great Britain. In the latter regard, he “addressed meetings throughout the country pleading for the acceptance of the Duma.”<sup>27</sup> Dillon was more pessimistic about Russia's future—and ultimately, more accurate—but he acknowledged Stead's earnest determination in advocating for the retention of the monarchy.

Besides their infrequent contacts in Russia, the two men also met when Dillon was in London. On one occasion, they met with the editor of the American publication *Success* for what was an obvious attempt by Stead to raise money to pursue his various journalistic campaigns. The meeting in December 1901 was a success although Dillon appears to have offered his own services as a contributor at rates similar to those he was receiving from British publications such as the *Fortnightly Review* and the *Contemporary Review* rather than higher American rates. Stead pointed this out in a subsequent letter: “I heard you going like a lamb to the slaughter and could not put out my hand to save you. Still I hope in the end you made good terms.”<sup>28</sup> Stead also offered an apology of sorts and provided insight into his own methods of work: “I hope you did not mind my chaffing you as the Wandering Jew. The fact of the matter is, when you are dealing with a gentleman like our friend, with whom we have got to do business, it is necessary to talk as American editors—news editors—scare-head their news.”<sup>29</sup>

The two men met in 1911 in Constantinople, where Dillon was on assignment for the *Daily Telegraph* and Stead—by now a diminished journalistic force—was promoting his international campaign for global peace. Their final dinner engagement was in London at the start of 1912. Plans for another meeting were contained in Stead's last letter to Dillon, written on March 21, 1912: “When are you coming over here? I am going to America on the 10th of April. I have been mediating on a run across to St. Petersburg more than once this last month but fate seems to have decided in favour of America.”<sup>30</sup>

Stead and Dillon had a shared interest in the fate of the Russian Empire and its relationship with the wider world. Stead opposed conflict over the Penjdeh incident in 1885; three years later, his book *The Truth about Russia* “sought to correct many misunderstandings.”<sup>31</sup> Stead had traveled to Russia in 1888, and while the trip was notable for his interview with the tsar, he was, like so many others at that time, keen to visit Leo Tolstoy's home at Yasnaya Polyana. Stead's “genuine admiration for Tolstoy”<sup>32</sup> was reinforced by his stay:

A man of genius who spends his time in planting potatoes and cobbling shoes, a great literary artists who has found a propaganda of Christian anarchy, an aristocrat who spends his life as a peasant—such a man in any country would command attention.<sup>33</sup>

Over the course of a week, the two men discussed religion and literature. Stead was also familiar with Tolstoy's work, and they talked about his

ongoing revisions to *The Kreutzer Sonata*, in which the writer sought to expose “the conventional illusion of romantic love.”<sup>34</sup> The story was, however, still in draft form and, in Tolstoy’s assessment, still “lacked sufficient action and was too much like a treatise.”<sup>35</sup> Stead remained a “frequent correspondent” with Tolstoy but his interest as a journalist had been raised by discussion of this new work.<sup>36</sup>

Dillon was also familiar with Tolstoy. He had taken part in discussions on Tolstoy’s work while at the University of Kharkoff: “Most of us had read his principle published works and all those unpublished writings of his which we were able to have smuggled in to us.”<sup>37</sup> While faculty members were willing to discuss Tolstoy’s literature and his writing style, little was said about his controversial views on religion: “We noted them, smiled and passed on without discussion.”<sup>38</sup> By Dillon’s own admission, he studied Tolstoy’s work “carefully with an eye to a future essay on the author’s living and working, on which they seemed to me to shed a powerful light.”<sup>39</sup> As was his working method, Dillon sought to establish contact with Tolstoy. When he was involved in a campaign supporting members of the Jewish community who had been expelled from Russia in 1889, Dillon sent the petition to Tolstoy.

In December 1889, Dillon was on the guest list for a reading in St. Petersburg of *The Kreutzer Sonata*, which was completed by Tolstoy but soon banned by the Russian authorities. “The manuscript was privately read...in the salon of a notable lady of the capital, whose house is the heart of the fashionable and intellectual life of the Empire, to a select audience of ten or twelve,” Dillon noted.<sup>40</sup> In the final version of Tolstoy’s story, a husband murders his wife, having suspected she was having an affair with a male visitor who had been merely playing Beethoven’s *Kreutzer Sonata*. The bleakness of the underlying message—its critical view of marriage and sexual love, and its apparent endorsement of chastity—was seen as a “treatise on the sins of the flesh and the unworthiness of marriage.”<sup>41</sup> Later critics described it as Tolstoy’s “most scandalous work yet.”<sup>42</sup>

At the private reading, Dillon described the audience’s reaction: “The widening eyes, the arching brows and the altered looks of several of the hearers...All were taken aback, some evidently were disillusioned, others scandalized, one or two seemed to be discreetly amused.”<sup>43</sup> Dillon was aware that this final version would draw controversy—“the story soon became the hottest property in St. Petersburg”<sup>44</sup>—and his journalistic antenna told him he had a story of considerable interest.

Having “telegraphed a sketch of the story” to the *Daily Telegraph*, Dillon set about seeking permission from Tolstoy to translate the

final version of *The Kreutzer Sonata* into English.<sup>45</sup> Although Tolstoy already had an arrangement with an American translator, he was happy for Dillon to quote from “the manuscript of the revised version so that the British public would have access to the translated work.”<sup>46</sup> Dillon’s first publication based on Tolstoy’s text appeared in the *Universal Review* in March 1890. But serious difficulties with publication of *The Kreutzer Sonata* were already emerging. The editor of the *Universal Review* “toned down” the translated text; even with the published version, “he feared it would still bring a blush to the cheek of the *jeune personne*.”<sup>47</sup> Dillon was also aware of the offense the work would cause, as he advised readers of the *Universal Review*:

No other work of his [Tolstoy’s] bears such unmistakable—nay, repulsive—tokens of his strong predilection for uncompromising realism, and when he offers us a flower he makes it a point to present it along with the thorns, the stem, the roots, the earth, and even the worms that live in the earth.<sup>48</sup>

Dillon’s involvement with the text continued further when the American translator withdrew: “She was utterly disgusted with it. She had never, she explained, read anything like it in her life before and she fervently hoped she might never see anything similar to it again.”<sup>49</sup> Among those who contacted Dillon about publishing the translated version of *The Kreutzer Sonata* was the editor of the *Review of Reviews*: “Mr. Stead was struck with my article [in the *Universal Review*], delighted with his own idea of the story, and indignant that the work of such a lofty moralist as Tolstoy, ‘who had united the genius of Shakespeare with the moral fervor of a Hebrew seer,’ should see ‘the ripest fruit of his genius’ forbidden in Russia ‘as too improper for publication’.”<sup>50</sup> Stead immediately commissioned Dillon to translate the finished work into English for the *Review of Reviews*: “Obviously he was resolved to give a lesson to the Russian authorities and to provide Tolstoy with a vast and appreciative circle of friends.”<sup>51</sup> Problems arose, however, when the final version as translated by Dillon arrived in London. Stead was “thunderstruck.”<sup>52</sup> He replied to Dillon on March 31, 1890: “I am afraid a great deal of it cannot be printed.”<sup>53</sup> In Dillon’s view, Stead had misunderstood the meaning of *The Kreutzer Sonata*, which he had discussed with Tolstoy two years previously. The underlying bleak message about the value of marriage and condemnation of sexual relations had already caused the story to be banned in Russia, and the translated text was now an issue for its British publisher.

Despite being shocked at Tolstoy's text and his view of marriage, Stead was still willing to publish part of the work; George Newnes, the owner of the *Review of Reviews*, opposed any publication, however. Relations between Stead and Newnes were already difficult, and the Tolstoy novella was one of the reasons that contributed to their parting.<sup>54</sup> Dillon recalled the period: "After a heated discussion with his inexorable associate, Stead rushed out of the office, paid hurried visits to some wealthy friends and ended by borrowing three thousand pounds, the sum requisite for buying Newnes out of the *Review*."<sup>55</sup> Stead replaced the opening sections with an overview and made significant cuts to render the text acceptable for publication.<sup>56</sup> While the story generated considerable international reaction, the three principal parties involved emerged favorably: Tolstoy the author saw his story acceptably translated and printed for English-language audiences; Stead the editor got his scoop; and Dillon the newsman enhanced both his journalistic reputation and his freelance income. Stead sent Dillon a generous check for £40 in addition to another £29 for the translation, the cost of cables, and other pieces published in the previous two issues.<sup>57</sup>

Dillon remained in the employment of the *Daily Telegraph* from 1889 until just after World War I. He was one of the newspaper's most prominent writers on foreign affairs, although colleagues viewed their St. Petersburg correspondent as "a man of mystery."<sup>58</sup> Dillon also continued to write prolifically for publications such as the *Contemporary Review*, *Fortnightly Review*, and *Review of Reviews*. This "extra curricular" activity was not always to the liking of his employers at the *Daily Telegraph*, especially when he submitted informed, if opinionated articles detailing the inner workings of the Russian regime. Whereas these latter articles were signed in Dillon's name, he was also the author of many other pieces published under a number of pseudonyms. The most prominent pseudonym used by Dillon was E. B. Lanin, whose work focused largely on theological issues and international matters.

Dillon resisted requests from the editor of the *Contemporary Review* to put his own name to his writings on religious topics, perhaps because he anticipated the reaction they would receive.<sup>59</sup> The Lanin articles in the early 1890s certainly caused considerable controversy in senior Catholic church circles. One of Dillon's senior Church confidantes observed, "Your anonymous article has been much spoken of. There is much controversy as to whether the writer is a Catholic or a protestant in disguise. A teaching member of the Society of Jesus told me it was thought the writer was an ecclesiastical dignitary—perhaps a bishop!!!"<sup>60</sup> Stead was, however, much quicker at solving the Lanin

puzzle. As early as July 1890, he identified Dillon's writing style in a piece published under the Lanin pseudonym in an article in the *Fortnight Review*.<sup>61</sup> Lanin's criticisms of the Russian tsar and elaborations on attitudes toward sexual morality in Russia were seen as "an attempt at giving his Victorian compatriots some kind of understanding of the crudity of the Kreuzer [*sic*] Sonata."<sup>62</sup> As Moller has argued, the opening sentence in the September 1890 Lanin article was actually addressed to Stead: "The most didactically moral of Russian novelists has just succeeded in shocking even his friends by completing his indictment of the civilized world in *The Kreutzer Sonata*, a work of almost repulsive pessimism."<sup>63</sup> Whatever Dillon's intentions, Stead was unimpressed: in a letter to Dillon he concluded, "the article is a disgusting one."<sup>64</sup>

Dillon repeatedly insisted that he was not Lanin. Although Stead was not persuaded, he nevertheless covered for Dillon; he explained in a letter, "John Morley [Stead's predecessor as *Pall Mall Gazette* editor] told me the other day that it was quite understood that you were Lanin. I told him you were not—only Lanin's guest."<sup>65</sup> Stead knew he had touched on a sensitive issue with his friend, but he still persisted in reminding Dillon about his "pseudonym activity." Moreover, Stead was highly alert to his activity. Writing in February 1898, Stead observed, "I suppose we must add 'Prorok' to your other multitudinous pseudonyms."<sup>66</sup> Stead's persistence in raising the unsigned articles in his correspondence was problematic for Dillon on several levels. First, although an obvious source of additional freelance income, the Lanin articles would have been viewed as inappropriately biased by his employers at the *Daily Telegraph*. Second, he was fearful, whether necessary or not, of the consequences of Stead mentioning Lanin in correspondence sent to St. Petersburg, correspondence which the official censor might open.

Following a Lanin article published in Britain that was critical of the Russian regime, Stead wrote with advice: "A word in your ear—I fear that the Roll of the Authorities is rising high against you, and I should not be surprised if you found it convenient, or even necessary, to take your abode outside the Dominion of the Tsar."<sup>67</sup> A source in Russia, Stead explained, had warned that the Russian government was considering expelling Dillon, and that they were aware he was the author of articles published under the Lanin name. Dillon was not happy with Stead's activities, and observed to a mutual acquaintance of his and Stead's: "He is evidently extremely anxious to get me expelled from Russia."<sup>68</sup> This acquaintance, H. R. Battersby, took the provocative course of sending Dillon's correspondence to Stead,

who took umbrage at Dillon's assertion: "I am afraid that our mutual friend's [Dr. Dillon's] head must be affected by the illness which he has contracted in the interior of Russia; otherwise he would never have asked you to insult me by putting such a question as that which is found in your letter."<sup>69</sup>

Stead saw his original correspondence as a "warning as a friend" and asked Battersby if the situation was "equivalent to a refusal on his part to contribute any longer to the REVIEW OF REVIEWS."<sup>70</sup> Several more items of correspondence were exchanged between Dillon (in St. Petersburg), Stead, and Battersby (the latter two in London). Stead was annoyed that "friendly action on my part should be so misconstrued."<sup>71</sup> When Dillon did not reply to Stead's subsequent correspondence, Stead wrote, asking if the silence was due to "a temporary phase caused by your fever."<sup>72</sup> By early March 1891, Stead sought to end the row despite further critical correspondence from Dillon: "I am glad to get your letter although I am somewhat surprised at its contents. I have said nothing whatever in my letter that was not very well known to the Russian Government without any need for them learning the facts by spying into my Correspondence. However, as that is the past, let it pass."<sup>73</sup>

Stead was incapable of letting the matter rest. He resurrected the subject on a regular basis over many years. Having read an unsigned article in the *Contemporary Review* in March 1898, Stead wrote to Dillon, "What an unconscionable man you are! I really cannot undertake to respect your anonymity any longer."<sup>74</sup> In typical Stead fashion, the contentious letter came with an invitation to dinner. These anonymous articles were not just mentioned in correspondence between the two men; Stead included references in the *Review of Reviews*: "There is only one living man who could have written the Lanin papers, and that man is Dr. E. J. Dillon... [He] no doubt had collaborators but 'E. J. Dillon: his mark' is stamped conspicuously over every page of the Lanin papers."<sup>75</sup>

Like many writers who were outed by Stead, Dillon was riled by Stead's insistence that his journalistic style was so easily noticeable, and he continued to deny being Lanin. Stead, for his part, brought up the association at every opportunity, including in a letter in 1904 after reading an article in the *Quarterly Review*:

What an absolutely incorrigible man you are! I really cannot see why you should take such a perverse pleasure in hiding yourself behind so many aliases. There might be some sense in it if you disguise your style but as nearly, I won't say every, but nearly every article you have ever

written in English periodicals have been instantly spotted as yours, don't you think that next time you try to disguise yourself you should get some one to rub off some of the brilliancy and to blunt some of the sarcasm of your style?<sup>76</sup>

Here we see something of the working relationship Stead developed with contributors to his publications. Clearly aware of Dillon's wish to remain anonymous in these articles, Stead could not let the matter rest and was obviously intent in having fun at Dillon's expense, as he playfully added: "I shall carefully avoid saying anything in the Review that is calculated to give away the very open secret as to its author."<sup>77</sup> Stead's letter understandably reopened the issue. Dillon replied from St. Petersburg in the strongest of terms:

You plainly formulate these accusations in a letter which you were well aware would be opened and read by the authorities here... I did not write it; I did not inspire it; I did not forward it. To say that I did any of those things is to utter mischievous falsehood, and to say it as you have done to the Russian policy is—an act which I shrink from qualifying.<sup>78</sup>

Dillon advised Stead he was taking legal action. Although he never followed through, Dillon claimed the suit would reveal to Stead's professional colleagues and associates "an idea of what is implied by friendship and acquaintanceship with the first of English journalists."<sup>79</sup> At this time, Dillon would have been particularly sensitive about publicity related to his "extra-curricular" writings. An explicit order had arrived from the *Daily Telegraph* on March 17, 1903, denying his request to continue contributing signed political articles and noting that the proprietors "consider it necessary that all our Foreign Correspondents should be regarded by the officials of the country to which they are accredited as absolutely independent and impartial."<sup>80</sup> Although Dillon was resisting this demand in relation to signed articles, Stead's renewed focus on his unsigned articles risked making the situation even more problematic.

Contact between the two men cooled somewhat following the exchange of correspondence in July 1904. Stead continued to send copies of the *Review of Reviews* but the remnants of the affair still lingered when he wrote to Dillon in December 1905: "I do not know whether you will get this letter, but I am sending it on chance, and sincerely hope that there is nothing in its contents which would do you any harm, even if it were read by all the secret police of the Empire."<sup>81</sup> Stead signed off this letter with Christmas wishes and the observation: "Believe me to be Your affectionate friend in spite

of everything.” Dillon proved less eager to take the hand of friendship. Following receipt of copies of the October 1906 edition of the *Review of Reviews*, he replied in a highly hostile tone. Stead’s offer of friendship, Dillon declared, smelled like “perfumed stink.”<sup>82</sup> The correspondence signed off in Latin: “Coelum non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt” (those who hurry across the sea change the sky [upon them], not their souls or state of mind). To his credit, Stead was not prepared to let the row continue. He replied within days:

You know perfectly well that I have always been your very good friend and shall always remain so, no matter what names you call me, nor have I ever understood that you regarded friendship as incompatible with the heartiest pummeling and the frankest criticism of the views which we respectively hold. This being the case I can only assume that you are not well and are taking a very jaundiced view of the world and those who dwell therein.<sup>83</sup>

The letter concluded with an offer of dinner when Dillon was next in London and Stead’s hope that “notwithstanding the ‘perfume stink’ you will not vanish before we have a chance of talking things over face to face as in the good old times.”<sup>84</sup> Dillon would later concede that Stead was “incapable of bearing a grudge against anyone.”<sup>85</sup> Typical of Stead was an undated telegram in Dillon’s archives from St. Petersburg—where both men were at the time—in which he asked: “Have Buried the Hatchet Will you smoke pipe of peace and dine with me tonight Stead Europhotel.”<sup>86</sup>

It is not clear if the two men met on that occasion, but their prolonged correspondence clearly provides important insight into how Stead worked as an editor, how he valued the intellectual ballast offered by his Irish contributor, and how his brand of New Journalism was also defined by the drive for an exclusive story. The correspondence in Dillon’s archives offers a more rounded sense of Stead as a journalist and editor. As this chapter has argued, Stead was drawn to intellectual argument, was not afraid of hearing alternative viewpoints, and was prepared to encourage the careers of those who practiced serious journalism.

## Notes

1. EJD to WTS July 20, 1904, Green Library, Stanford University. Collection Number M0935, Series 1 Box 27 Folder 13 (1/27/13).

2. For EJD’s biographical profile see Kevin Rafter, “E. J. Dillon: From Our Special Correspondent,” in *Irish Journalism before Independence: More a Disease Than a Profession*, ed. Kevin Rafter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 91–105.
3. Emile Joseph Dillon, “The World Pays Its Tribute,” *The Review of Reviews* (May 1912): 483.
4. EJD National Library of Scotland (NLS), 12382: 50.
5. *Ibid.*, 483.
6. *Ibid.*, 484.
7. W. Sydney Robinson, *Muckraker: The Scandalous Life and Times of W. T. Stead, Britain’s First Investigative Journalist* (London: Robson Press, 2012), 34.
8. WTS to EJD, November 21, 1906, Stanford 1/2711.
9. WTS to EJD, December 24, 1903, Stanford 1/27/7.
10. J. O. Baylen, “The ‘New Journalism’ in Late Victorian Britain,” *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, (1972): 368–369.
11. See introduction to Dillon, “The World Pays Its Tribute,” 483.
12. Viscount Milner, “The World Pays Its Tribute,” *The Review of Reviews* (May 1912): 478.
13. Edward Frederick Lawson Burham, *Peterborough Court: The Story of the Daily Telegraph* (London: Cassell, 1955), 45.
14. Robinson, *Muckraker*, 157–160.
15. WTS to EJD, December 20, 1890, Stanford 1/27/3.
16. WTS to EJD, March 2, 1891, Stanford 1/27/5.
17. WTS to EJD, October 25, 1890, Stanford 1/27/3.
18. “The Case of the Cretans,” *The Review of Reviews* (May 1897): 453.
19. “The Russian Revolution from Various Points of View,” *The Review of Reviews* (December 1905): 606.
20. W. T. Stead, “Character Sketch: Dr. E. J. Dillon: Our Premier Journalists,” *The Review of Reviews* (July 15, 1901): 23.
21. W. Lacy, “Dr. Emile Dillon: A Great Irish Journalist,” *Everyman*, September 19, 1913, 707–708.
22. WTS to EJD, May 16, 1890, Stanford 1/27/7.
23. WTS to EJD, February 22, 1893, Stanford 1/27/7.
24. WTS to EJD, March 7, 1903, Stanford 1/27/7; WTS to EJD March 17 and 28, 1903, Stanford 1/27/11.
25. WTS to EJD, April 15, 1903, Stanford 1/27/10.
26. WTS to EJD, November 21, 1906, Stanford 1/27/11.
27. Edith K. Harper, *Stead: The Man Personal Reminiscences* (London: William Rider, 1914), 261.
28. WTS to EJD, December 20, 1901, Stanford 1/27/8.
29. *Ibid.*
30. WTS to EJD, March 21, 1912, Stanford 1/27/13.
31. “The World Pays Its Tribute,” *The Review of Reviews* (May 1912): 476.



32. R. F. Christian, "The Road to Yasnaya Polyana: Some Pilgrims from Britain and Their Reminiscences," in *Tolstoy and Britain*, ed. Gareth W. Jones (Oxford and Washington: Berg, 1995), 185–216, 192.
33. W. T. Stead, *The Truth about Russia* (London: Cassell & Company Limited, 1888), 346.
34. Christian, "The Road to Yasnaya Polyana," 190.
35. *Ibid.*, 191.
36. R. F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Diaries Volume I 1847–1894*, ed. and trans. Christian (London: The Athlone Press, 1985), 186.
37. E. J. Dillon, *Russia Today and Yesterday—An Impartial View of Soviet Russia* (New York: Doubleday, 1930)
38. *Ibid.*, 108.
39. *Ibid.*, 109.
40. E. J. Dillon, "The Kreutzer Sonata," *Universal Review*, March 1890, 293–294.
41. Patricia Chute, *Tolstoy at Yasnaya Polyana: His Life and Work in the Charmed World of His Estate* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991), 106.
42. Rosamund Bartlett, *Tolstoy: A Russia Life* (London: Profile Books, 2010), 324.
43. Dillon, *Russia Today*, 118.
44. Bartlett, *Tolstoy: A Russia Life*, 328.
45. E. J. Dillon, *Count Leo Tolstoy: A New Portrait* (London: Hutchinson, 1934), 121.
46. Dillon, *Universal Review*, 294 (footnote 1).
47. Dillon, *Count Leo Tolstoy*, 123.
48. Dillon, *Universal Review*, 311.
49. Dillon, *Count Leo Tolstoy*, 123.
50. Dillon, "The World Pays Its Tribute," 483.
51. *Ibid.*, 483.
52. Dillon, *Count Leo Tolstoy*, 126.
53. WTS to EJD, March 31, 1890, Stanford 1/27/1.
54. Robinson, *Muckraker*, 172.
55. Dillon, *Count Leo Tolstoy*, 127.
56. Grace Eckley, *Maiden Tribute: A Life of W. T. Stead* (Philadelphia, PA: Xlibris Corporation, 2007), 186.
57. WTS to EJD, April 3, 1890, Stanford 1/27/1.
58. Note from E. L. Goodman to EJD, November 1938, National Library of Scotland (NLS) 12382:49.
59. Percy William Bunting to EJD, April 1893, NLS 12382:2.
60. John Baptist Hogan to EJD, November 1892, NLS 12382:3.
61. WTS to EJD, July 1, 1890, Stanford 1/27/2.
62. Peter Ulf Moller, quoted in Anton Fedyashin, "'A Public Manifestly Thirsting for Moral Shocks': E. J. Dillon on Russian Sexual Morals in the Late Imperial Era," paper delivered at American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), Philadelphia, November 2008.

63. See *ibid.*
64. WTS to EJD, September 1, 1890, Stanford 1/27/3.
65. WTS to EJD, October 25, 1890, Stanford 1/27/3.
66. WTS to EJD, February 15, 1898, Stanford 1/27/7.
67. WTS to EJD, January 7, 1891, Stanford 1/27/4.
68. EJD to H. R. Battersby, January 11, 1891, Stanford 1/27/4.
69. WTS to Battersby, January 12, 1891, Stanford 1/27/4.
70. *Ibid.*
71. WTS to Battersby, January 15, 1891, Stanford 1/27/4.
72. WTS to EJD, February 16, 1891, Stanford 1/27/5.
73. WTS to EJD, March 2, 1891, Stanford 1/27/5.
74. WTS to EJD, March 30, 1898, Stanford 1/27/7.
75. "Fortnightly" Retrospect, *The Review of Reviews* (1901): 47.
76. WTS to EJD, July 16, 1904, Stanford 1/27/10.
77. *Ibid.*
78. EJD to WTS, July 20, 1904, Stanford 1/27/13.
79. *Ibid.*
80. John Le Sage to EJD, March 17, 1903, NLS 12382:19.
81. WTS to EJD, December 19, 1905, Stanford 1/27/11.
82. EJD to WTS, November 15, 1906, Stanford 1/27/11.
83. WTS to EJD, November 21, 1906, Stanford 1/27/11.
84. *Ibid.*
85. Dillon, "The World Pays Its Tribute," 483.
86. WTS to EJD, undated telegram, Stanford 1/27/7.

## Bibliography

- Baylen, Joseph, O. "The 'New Journalism' in Late Victorian Britain." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 18 (1972): 367–385.
- Burham, Edward Frederick Lawson. *Peterborough Court: The Story of the Daily Telegraph*. London: Cassell, 1955.
- Christian, Reginald Frank. "The Road to Yasnaya Polyana: Some Pilgrims from Britain and Their Reminiscences." In *Tolstoy and Britain*, edited by Gareth W. Jones, 185–216. Oxford and Washington: Berg, 1995.
- Christian, Reginald Frank, ed. and trans. *Tolstoy's Diaries Volume I 1847–1894*. London: Athlone Press, 1985.
- Chute, Patricia. *Tolstoy at Yasnaya Polyana: His Life and Work in the Charmed World of His Estate*. New York: Harper Collins, 1991.
- Dillon, Emile Joseph. "The Kreutzer Sonata." *Universal Review* (March 1890): 293–311.
- Dillon, Emile Joseph. *Russia Today and Yesterday—An Impartial View of Soviet Russia*. New York: Doubleday, 1930.
- Dillon, Emile Joseph. "The World Pays Its Tribute." *The Review of Reviews* (May 1912): 483–488.

- Eckley, Grace. *Maiden Tribute: A Life of W. T. Stead*. Philadelphia, PA: Xlibris, 2007.
- Fedyashin, Anton. "‘A Public Manifestly Thirsting for Moral Shocks’: E. J. Dillon on Russian Sexual Morals in the Late Imperial Era." Paper delivered at American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), Philadelphia, November 2008.
- Harper, Edith K. *Stead: The Man. Personal Reminiscences*. London: William Rider, 1914.
- Lacy, W. "Dr. Emile Dillon: A Great Irish Journalist." *Everyman* (September 19, 1913): 707–708.
- Milner, Viscount. "The World Pays Its Tribute." *The Review of Reviews* (May 1912): 477–478.
- Rafter, Kevin. "E. J. Dillon: From Our Special Correspondent." In *Irish Journalism before Independence: More a Disease Than a Profession*, edited by Kevin Rafter, 91–105. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.
- Robinson, W. Sydney. *Muckraker: The Scandalous Life and Times of W. T. Stead: Britain's First Investigative Journalist*. London: Robson, 2012.
- Stead, W. T. "Character Sketch: Dr. E. J. Dillon: Our Premier Journalists." *The Review of Reviews* (July 15, 1901): 21–26.
- Stead, W. T. *The Truth about Russia*. London: Cassell & Company Limited, 1888.

## Part IV

### *New Journalism and Modernism*