

XXI

THE "LUSITANIA"

THE sinking of the *Lusitania* was a hideous tragedy and one of the most terrible examples of the barbarity of modern warfare, but, from the point of view of suffering and loss of life, was not to be compared with many other episodes in the war. The very crucial political significance of the catastrophe, however, gave it special propaganda value in inflaming popular indignation, specially in America. Here obviously was the necessary lever at last to bring America into the war. That Germany should not have recognized that this would be the result of such action on her part was one of the many illustrations of her total inability to grasp the psychology of other peoples.

From the point of view of propaganda it was necessary to show that the Germans had blown up a defenceless passenger ship flying the American flag and bearing only civilian passengers and an ordinary cargo. This was represented as a breach of international law and an act of piracy. The unsuccessful attempt to suppress certain facts which emerged leads naturally to the conclusion that other attempts were successful. No inquiry, such as the Mersey inquiry, conducted in war-time with regard to the action of the enemy, can in such circumstances be regarded as conclusive.

The whole truth with regard to the sinking of the *Lusitania* will probably never be cleared up. Four points may be considered here :

- (a) Whether she was armed.
- (b) Whether she was carrying Canadian troops.
- (c) Whether she had munitions on board.
- (d) Whether a medal was issued in Germany to commemorate the sinking of the *Lusitania*.

(a) On this point there was a conflict of evidence.

The *Lusitania* was registered as an auxiliary cruiser. The Germans declared she was carrying concealed guns. This was categorically denied by the captain in the inquiry. "She had no weapons of offence or defence and no masked guns." Lord Mersey therefore found this charge to be untrue.

(b) The same may be said about the charge made by the Germans that she was transporting Canadian troops.

(c) These two denials would be readily acceptable, were it not for the fact that at first a denial and then a suppression of the fact that she was carrying munitions was attempted.

It is equally untrue that the *Lusitania* was carrying ammunition on its final voyage.

"*Daily Express*," May 11, 1915.

In America there was a threat to expel Senator La Follette from the Senate because he had stated that the *Lusitania* carried munitions. But Mr. Dudley Field Malone, collector at the port of New York, confirmed this charge as true.

D. F. Malone revealed that the *Lusitania* carried large quantities of ammunition consigned to the British Government, including 4,200 cases of Springfield cartridges. The Wilson administration refused to permit the publication of the fact. One of the principal charges upon which the attempt to expel R. M. La Follette from the Senate was based was that he had falsely declared that the *Lusitania*

carried ammunition, and the prosecution of the Senator was dropped when Mr. Malone offered to testify on his behalf.

"*The Nation*" (*New York*), November 20, 1920.

It was eventually admitted that the *Lusitania* carried 5,400 cases of ammunition. The captain at the inquest at Kinsale said: "There was a second report, but that might possibly have been an internal explosion." The foreman of the Queenstown jury protested that all the victims were not drowned. "I have seen many of the bodies, and the people were killed; they were blown to pieces."

The ship sank in eighteen minutes, which accounted for the loss of so many lives. The Germans, in their reply to the American note, referred to this point and stated:

It is impossible to decide, for instance, the question whether the necessary opportunity was given to the passengers and crew to escape, until it has been determined whether or not the *Lusitania* provided bulkheads and boats as ordered by the *Titanic* Conference for corresponding emergencies in peace-time, and whether or not ammunition or explosives carried in defiance of the American laws accelerated the sinking of the ship, which might otherwise have been expected either to get out the boats safely or reach the coast.

Included in her cargo was a small consignment of rifle ammunition and shrapnel shells weighing about 173 tons. Warnings that the vessel would be sunk, afterwards traced to the German Government, were circulated in New York before she sailed.

"*The World Crisis*," by the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, M.P.

(d) The event having been condemned as a barbarous act of piracy, it became necessary to show that the Germans gloried in it.

The first rumour was that a special medal had been bestowed on the crew of the U-boat which sunk the *Lusitania* as a reward for gallantry. This was dropped when the medal turned out to be a commemoration medal, not a decoration.

It was then stated that the German Government had had a medal struck in commemoration of the event, but after the armistice had it withdrawn from circulation. In 1919 it was found in a shop in Berlin. In 1920 a traveller in Berlin, Frankfurt, and other parts of Germany could find no one who had ever heard of it or seen it, whereas in England the medals were well known and very easily obtained. It turned out that the medal was originally designed in Munich by a man of the name of Goetz and represents the *Lusitania* as carrying arms. Goetz may be described as a cartoonist in metal; his work was not official, and his *Lusitania* medal had a very limited circulation. Few Germans appear to have heard of its existence. The large number of casts of the medal, which gave the impression here that they must be as common as pence in Germany, was explained by Lord Newton, who was in charge of propaganda at the Foreign Office in 1916.

I asked a West End store if they could undertake the reproduction of it for propaganda purposes. They agreed to do so, and the medals were sold all over the world in neutral countries, especially in America and South America. After some initial difficulty a great success was achieved. I believe it to have been one of the best pieces of propaganda.

“*Evening Standard*,” November 1, 1926.

The Honorary Secretary of the *Lusitania* Medal Committee stated that 250,000 of the medals were sold, and the proceeds were given to the Red Cross and St. Dunstan's. Each medal was enclosed in a box on

which it was stated that the medals were replicas of the medal distributed in Germany "to commemorate the sinking of the *Lusitania*." But many of them in England could be purchased without any box.

In addition to the medal, leaflets were circulated with pictures of the medal. In one case in Sweden a sentence was printed from the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*: "We regard with joyous pride this newest exploit of our fleet." This sentence had been torn from its context, and had been originally used in quite another connection.

It therefore became clear that :

- (1) No medal was given to the crew of the German U-boat.
- (2) No medal was struck in commemoration of the event by the German Government.
- (3) The German Government could not have withdrawn a medal it never issued.
- (4) A metal-worker in Munich designed the medal, which was always rare in Germany.
- (5) The large number of medals in circulation was due to the reproduction of Goetz's medal in Great Britain.

The propaganda value of the medal was great, as Lord Newton admitted. The impression it created was absolutely and intentionally false.

XXII

REPORT OF A BROKEN-UP MEETING

THERE were official eavesdroppers, telephone-tappers, letter-openers, etc., by the score. We are not concerned with their activities here. But it may be imagined what a large crop of spy stories and "authentic" tales they originated. An amusing instance may be given of an official who was sent to attend and report on a meeting of the Union of Democratic Control, held at the Memorial Hall in November 1915. Major R. M. Mackay (Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders) was Assistant Provost-Marshal, and sent in a report, most of which was read out in the House of Commons by Mr. Tennant, Under-Secretary at the War Office, on December 7th. Attention was called to the meeting, because it was broken up by soldiers who had obtained forged tickets. The Assistant Provost-Marshal's report was so fantastic that it almost appeared as if he could not have been at the meeting at all. But, of course, the evidence of such a high-placed official was accepted as conclusive. He accused Mr. Ramsay MacDonald of having provoked the soldiers by sending a message to have some of them ejected. There was not a shred of truth in this. He reported that someone "whose name I could not ascertain" had used provocative language. He described stewardesses "who not only appeared to be Teutonic but could be classified as such from their accents," whose remarks he overheard. Needless to say, there was no Teuton or anyone with a Teutonic accent in the building.

On a subsequent occasion, when Mr. Tennant attempted to explain away parts of the report he had read out, the following comment appeared in the *Westminster Gazette*:

Mr. Tennant explained that his answer, with its references to stewardesses with "Teutonic accents" and its attribution to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald of words which were never used, was read hurriedly from a report made to him. Ministers are compelled to depend on such reports, but the language ought to be severely edited before it comes before the House of Commons. If that precaution is neglected, Ministers lay up for themselves an amount of irritation and resentment which is wholly unnecessary.

In 1917 the reliable Provost-Marshal was accused of wrongful arrest. In May 1918 he was charged with "lending" soldiers as gardeners, etc., to his personal friends, misuse of public money, etc. Some of the many charges against him were dismissed, but later in the same year it was announced that he was "dismissed the service by sentence of General Court Martial" (*London Gazette Supplement*, August 12, 1918).

It came out in evidence *that he had been deaf for years.*

ATROCITY STORIES

WAR is, in itself, an atrocity. Cruelty and suffering are inherent in it. Deeds of violence and barbarity occur, as everyone knows. Mankind is goaded by authority to indulge every elemental animal passion. But the exaggeration and invention of atrocities soon becomes the main staple of propaganda. Stories of German "frightfulness" in Belgium were circulated in such numbers as to give ample proof of the abominable cruelty of the German Army and so to infuriate popular opinion against them. A Belgian commission was appointed, and subsequently a commission, under the chairmanship of Lord Bryce, who was chosen in order that opinion in America, where he had been a very popular ambassador, might be impressed. Affidavits of single witnesses were accepted as conclusive proof.

At best, human testimony is unreliable, even in ordinary occurrences of no consequence, but where bias, sentiment, passion, and so-called patriotism disturb the emotions, a personal affirmation becomes of no value whatsoever.

To cover the whole ground on atrocity stories would be impossible. They were circulated in leaflets, pamphlets, letters, and speeches day after day. Prominent people of repute, who would have shrunk from condemning their bitterest personal enemy on the evidence, or rather lack of evidence, they had before them, did not hesitate to lead the way in charging a whole nation with every conceivable brutality and unnatural crime. *The*

Times issued "Marching Songs," written by a prominent Eton master, in which such lines as these occurred :

He shot the wives and children,
The wives and little children ;
He shot the wives and children,
And laughed to see them die.

One or two instances of the proved falsity of statements made by people under the stress of excitement and indignation may be given.

It was reported that some thirty to thirty-five German soldiers entered the house of David Tordens, a carter, in Sempst ; they bound him, and then five or six of them assaulted and ravished in his presence his thirteen-year-old daughter, and afterwards fixed her on bayonets. After this horrible deed, they bayoneted his nine-year-old boy and then shot his wife. His life was saved through the timely arrival of Belgian soldiers. It was further asserted that all the girls in Sempst were assaulted and ravished by the Germans.

The secretary of the commune, Paul van Boeckpourt, the mayor, Peter van Asbroeck, and his son Louis van Asbroeck, in a sworn statement made on April 4, 1915, at Sempst, declared that the name given to the carter, David Tordens, was quite unknown to them ; that such a person did not live in Sempst before the war and was quite unknown in the commune ; that during the war no woman or child under fourteen was killed in Sempst, and if such an occurrence had taken place they would certainly have heard of it.¹

Another report published was that at Ternath the Germans met a boy and asked him the way to Thurt. As the boy did not understand them, they chopped off both his hands.

¹ Quoted in *Truth*: "A Path to Justice and Reconciliation," by "Verax."

Statement by the Mayor of Ternath, Dr. Poodt, on February 11, 1915 :

"I declare there is not a word of truth in it. I have been in Ternath since the beginning of the war, and it is impossible that such an occurrence should not have been reported to me ; it is a pure invention."

After the publication of the various reports, five American war correspondents issued the following declaration :

To let the truth be known, we unanimously declare the stories of German cruelties, from what we have been able to observe, were untrue. After having been with the German Army for two weeks, and having accompanied the troops for over one hundred miles, we are not able to report one single case of undeserved punishment or measure of retribution. We are neither able to confirm any rumours as regards maltreatment of prisoners and non-combatants. Having been with the German troops through Landen, Brussels, Nivelles, Buissière, Haute-Wiherie, Merbes-le-Château, Sorle-sur-Sambre, Beaumont, we have not the slightest basis for making up a case of excess. We found numerous rumours after investigation to be without foundation. German soldiers paid everywhere for what they bought, and respected private property and civil rights. We found Belgian women and children after the battle of Buissière to feel absolutely safe. A citizen was shot in Merbes-le-Château, but nobody could prove his innocence. Refugees, who told about cruelties and brutalities, could bring absolutely no proof. The discipline of the German soldiers is excellent ; no drunkenness. The Burgomaster of Sorle-sur-Sambre voluntarily disclaimed all rumours of cruelties in that district. For the truth of the above we pledge our word of honour as journalists.

(Signed) Roger Lewis, Associated Press ; Irwin Cobb, *Saturday Evening Post*, *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Philadelphia ; Harry Hansen, *Chicago Daily News*, Chicago ; James O'Donnell Bennett, *Chicago Tribune* ; John T. McCutcheon, *Chicago Tribune*, Chicago.

In the issue of the *New York World* of January 28, 1915, appeared the following dispatch :

Washington, January 27th.—Of the thousands of Belgian refugees who are now in England, not one has been subjected to atrocities by German soldiers. This, in effect, is the substance of a report received at the State Department. The report states that the British Government had investigated thousands of reports to the effect that German soldiers had perpetrated outrages on fleeing Belgians. During the early period of the war columns of British newspapers were filled with the accusation. Agents of the British Government, according to the report of the American Embassy in London, carefully investigated all these charges ; they interviewed the alleged victims and sifted all the evidence. As a result of the investigation, the British Foreign Office notified the American Embassy that the charges appeared to be based upon hysteria and natural prejudice. The report added that many of the Belgians had suffered hardships, but they should be charged up against the exigence of war rather than to brutality of the individual German soldiers.

The following passage occurs in a review by the *New York Times Literary Supplement* of March 19, 1918, of "Brave Belgians," by Baron C. Buttin, to which Baron de Brocqueville, the Belgian Minister of War, contributed a preface commending its truth and fairness :

The work gives eye-witness accounts of the first three months of the invasion of Belgium, and is made up of reports told by various people who did their share in that extraordinary resistance—colonels, majors, and army chaplains, lieutenants, etc. There is scarcely a hint of that "bugbear," German atrocities, or the nameless or needless horrors described in the report of the Bryce Commission.

An amazing instance of the way atrocity lies may still remain fixed in some people's minds, and how an

attempt may be made to propagate them even now, is afforded by a letter which appeared as recently as April 12, 1927, in the *Evening Star*, Dunedin, New Zealand. The writer, Mr. Gordon Catto, answering another correspondent on the subject of atrocities, wrote :

My wife, who in 1914-15 was a nurse in the Ramsgate General Hospital, England, actually nursed Belgian women and children refugees who were the victims of Hun rapacity and fiendishness, the women having had their breasts cut off and the children with their hands hacked off at the wrists.

Here was almost first-hand evidence noting both time and place. An inquiry was accordingly addressed by a lady investigator to the Secretary of the Ramsgate General Hospital, and the following reply was received :

Ramsgate General Hospital, 4, Cannon Road, Ramsgate,

11. 6. 27.

DEAR MADAM,

I am at a loss to know how the information about atrocities to women and children, committed by the German soldiers, could have originated in respect to Ramsgate, as there were no such cases received.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) SYDNEY W. SMITH.

An instance of a man being genuinely misled by the information given him, not having any desire himself to propagate lies, can be given in the case of a Baptist minister of Sheffield, who preached on atrocities. On February 28, 1915, preaching in Wash Lane Baptist Chapel, Letchford, Warrington, he told the congregation that there was a Belgian girl in Sheffield, about twelve years old, who had had her nose cut off and her stomach

ripped open by the Germans, but she was still living and getting better.

On inquiry being made as to whether he had made this statement, he replied :

I have written to our Belgian Consul here for the name and address of the girl whose case I quoted at Letchford. If all I hear is true, it is far worse than I stated.

I am also asking for another similar instance, which I shall be glad to transmit to you if, and as soon as, I can secure the facts.

The Belgian Consul, in a letter of March 11th, wrote :

Although I have heard of a number of cases of Belgian girls being maltreated in one way and another, I have on investigation not found a particle of truth in one of them, and I know of no girl in Sheffield who has had her nose cut off and her stomach ripped open.

I have also investigated cases in other towns, but have not yet succeeded in getting hold of any tangible confirmation.

The minister accordingly informed his correspondent :

I am writing a letter to my old church at Letchford to be read on Sunday next, contradicting the story which I told on what seemed to be unimpeachable authority. I am glad I did not give the whole alleged facts as they were given to me.

With many thanks for your note and inquiry.

It is to be feared, however, that his first congregation, satisfied with pulpit confirmation of the story, circulated it beyond the reach of the subsequent denial.

Atrocity stories from the foreign Press could scarcely be collected in a library. A glance through any foreign newspaper will show that hardly a page in hardly an issue is free from them. In Eastern Europe they were particularly horrible. They were the almost conven-

tional form of journalistic expression on all sides. The brutalization of the European mind was very thoroughly carried out. But moral indignation and even physical nausea were checked by the surfeit of horrors and the blatant exaggerations. There can be no more discreditable period in the history of journalism than the four years of the Great War.

A neutral paper (*Nieuwe Courant*), published at The Hague, summed up the effect of propaganda on January 17, 1916:

. . . The paper war-propaganda is a poison, which outsiders can only stand in very small doses. If the belligerents continue to administer it the effect will be the opposite to that expected. So it goes with the stream of literature on the Cavell case, and the varied forms in which the *Baralong* poison is presented to us. We leave it with a certain disgust, after tasting it, and are only annoyed at the bitter after-taste—the promised reprisals. . . .

XXIV

FAKED PHOTOGRAPHS

To the uninitiated there is something substantially reliable in a picture obviously taken from a photograph. Nothing would seem to be more authentic than a snapshot. It does not occur to anyone to question a photograph, and faked pictures therefore have special value, as they get a much better start than any mere statement, which may be criticized or denied. Only a long time after, if ever, can their falsity be detected. The faking of photographs must have amounted almost to an industry during the war. All countries were concerned, but the French were the most expert. Some of the originals have been collected and reproduced.¹

Descriptions of a few of them may be given here :

In *Das Echo*, October 29, 1914, there was a photograph of the German troops marching along a country road in Belgium.

This was reproduced by *Le Journal* on November 26, 1914, under the title :

LES ALLEMANDS EN RETRAITE.

Cette photographie fournit une vision saisissante de ce que fut la retraite de l'armée du général von Hindenburg après la bataille de la Vistule.

A photograph taken by Karl Delius, of Berlin, showed the delivery of mail-bags in front of the Field Post Office in Kavevara.

¹ *How the World Madness was Engineered*, by Ferdinand Avenarius.

This was reproduced in the *Daily Mirror* of December 3, 1915, with the title :

MADE TO WASH THE HUNS' DIRTY LINEN.

The blond beasts are sweating the Serbians, who are made to do the washing for the invaders. Like most customers who do not settle their bills, they are full of grumbles and complaints. Here a pile has just arrived from the wash.

Several photographs were taken during the pogrom in Russia in 1905; some of these were circulated by Jews in America. One of these photographs represented a row of corpses with a crowd round them, and was reproduced in *Le Miroir*, November 14, 1915, with the title :

LES CRIMES DES HORDES ALLEMANDES EN POLOGNE.

Several others of these were similarly reproduced in newspapers. The *Critica*, a newspaper in the Argentine, exposed German atrocities by this means.

A photograph was taken in Berlin of a crowd before the royal palace on July 13, 1914 (before the outbreak of war). This was reproduced in *Le Monde Illustré*, August 21, 1915, with the heading :

ENTHOUSIASME ET JOIE DE BARBARES,

with an explanation that it was a demonstration to celebrate the sinking of the *Lusitania*.

A photograph which appeared in the *Berlin Tag*, on August 13, 1914, represented a long queue of men with basins. Under it was written :

How we treat interned Russian and French; lining up the interned before the distribution of food.

This was reproduced in the *Daily News* on April 2, 1915, with the title :

GERMAN WORKERS FEEL THE PINCH.

The above crowd lining up for rations is a familiar sight in Germany. It reveals one aspect of our naval power.

A photograph of German officers inspecting munition cases was reproduced by *War Illustrated*, January 30, 1915, as "German officers pillaging chests in a French château."

A photograph of a German soldier bending over a fallen German comrade was reproduced in *War Illustrated*, April 17, 1915, with the title :

Definite proof of the Hun's abuse of the rules of war. German ghoul actually caught in the act of robbing a Russian.

In the *Berlin Lokalanzeiger* of June 9, 1914, a photograph was published of three cavalry officers who had won cups and other trophies, which they are holding, at the Army steeplechase in the Grunewald.

This was first reproduced in *Wes Mir*, a Russian newspaper, with the title "The German Looters in Warsaw," and also, on August 8, 1915, by the *Daily Mirror* with the title :

THREE GERMAN CAVALRYMEN LOADED WITH GOLD AND SILVER LOOT.

Faked photographs were, of course, sent in great numbers to neutral countries.

A German photograph of the town of Schwirwindt, after the Russian occupation, was reproduced in *Illustreret Familieblad* (Denmark) as, "A French City after a German Bombardment."

A photograph from *Das Leben in Bild*, in 1917, of three young German soldiers laughing, was entitled :

Home again. Three sturdy young Germans who succeeded in escaping from French imprisonment.

This came out in a Danish family paper on May 2, 1917, as :

Escaped from drumfire hell. Three German soldiers apparently very happy to have become French prisoners of war.

The citadel at Brest-Litovsk was fired by the retreating Russians, and a photograph appeared in *Zeitbilder*, September 5, 1915, showing Germans carrying out the corn in sacks.

This was reproduced in the *Graphic*, September 18, 1915, as, "German soldiers plundering a factory at Brest-Litovsk, which was fired by the retreating Russians."

Illustrated War News, December 29, 1915, gave a photograph of war trophies. A sergeant is holding up a sort of cat-o'-nine-tails whip.

WHAT WAS IT USED FOR? A GERMAN WHIP AMONG A COLLECTION OF WAR TROPHIES.

These war trophies captured from the Germans in Flanders have been presented to the Irish Rifles by a sergeant. The presence of the whip is of curious significance.

The "whip," as a matter of fact, was an ordinary German carpet-beater.

A Russian film represented German nurses in the garb of religious sisters stabbing the wounded on the battlefield.

A picture, not a photograph, which had a great

circulation, was called *Chemin de la gloire* (the Road of Glory) in the *Choses Vues* (Things Seen) series.

In the background is a cathedral in flames, a long road is strewn with bottles, and in the foreground is the body of a little boy impaled to the ground by a bayonet.

But if pictures and caricatures were to be described, there would be no end of it. Undoubtedly the cartoonist had a great influence in all countries, especially *Raemakers* and *Punch*. The unfortunate neutral countries were bombarded with them from both sides.

A remarkable series of photographs was taken by a Mr. F. J. Mortimer, Fellow of the Royal Photographic Society, and published in 1912. They were widely reproduced in illustrated periodicals. Among them was a photograph of the *Arden Craig* sinking off the Scilly Isles in January 1911. On March 31, 1917, a popular illustrated weekly devoted a page to "Camera Records of Prussian Piracy," and this particular photograph was reproduced in a succession of pictures to illustrate "a windjammer torpedoed off the English coast by the criminally indiscriminate U-boat pirates."

Mr. Mortimer's photographs of British ships were also reproduced in Germany under the heading of "Scenes from the German Navy."

On September 28, 1916, the *Daily Sketch* gave a photograph of a crowd of German prisoners under the heading "Still They Come!" "Between 3,000 and 4,000 prisoners have been taken in the past forty-eight hours." (Official.)

On October 10, 1918, the *Daily Mirror* reproduced precisely the same photograph, under which was printed: "Just a very small portion of the Allies' unique collection of Hun war prisoners of the 1918 season."

THE DOCTORING OF OFFICIAL PAPERS

PRESS lies and private lies may in certain circumstances carry much weight. At the same time there are often sections of the public who are less credulous, and therefore more suspicious. But when printed documents appear with an official imprimatur—in this country the royal arms and the superscription “Presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty,” or “Printed by order of the House of Commons”—everyone believes that in these papers, at any rate, they have got the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Only a minority, perhaps, study them, but this minority writes and furnishes the Press with indisputably authentic information from “command papers.” The blue books, yellow books, white books, orange books, etc., become the basis of all propaganda.

It comes as a shock therefore to those who patriotically accept their Government's story to find that instances of *suppressio veri* abound in the form of passages carefully and intentionally suppressed from published official documents.

This practice, of course, did not originate during the Great War. It is an old diplomatic tradition, justified conceivably in cases where the concealment of injudicious language on the part of a foreign statesman may prevent the inflammation of public opinion, but carried to unjustifiable lengths when a concealment or distortion of the facts of the case is aimed at.

Sir Edward Grey's speech on August 3rd was a very meagre and incomplete recital of events given to a House which had been deliberately kept ignorant for years. But it was well framed to have the desired effect. Amongst the omissions was the German Ambassador's proposal of August 1st, in which he suggested that Germany might be willing to guarantee not only Belgian neutrality but also the integrity of France and that of her colonies, and the Foreign Secretary further omitted to mention that in this interview he had definitely refused to formulate any conditions on which the neutrality of the country might be guaranteed, though the Ambassador requested him to do so. But by far the most serious omission was his failure to read to the House the last sentence in his letter to M. Cambon, a sentence of vital importance. The sentence ran :

If these measures involved action, the plans of the General Staff would at once be taken into consideration, and the Government would then decide what effect should be given to them.

This omission is far from being satisfactorily explained in *Twenty-Five Years* by the casual statement, "Perhaps I thought the last sentence unimportant."

The speeches of Ministers in the other European Governments concerned at the time were, of course, all patriotically distorted, and any information with regard to facts which might qualify or mitigate the iniquity of the opposite party was carefully suppressed.

The omission of dispatches or suppressions of passages in the official books of all the Governments are far too numerous even to give as a list.

Some of the British suppressions are now apparent, since the publication by the Foreign Office of further

diplomatic documents. Only a couple of examples need be given.

In a telegram of July 24, 1914, from our Ambassador at St. Petersburg, a passage was completely suppressed, in which he indicated the agreement arrived at between France and Russia during the visit of the President, according to which they settled not to tolerate any interference on the part of Austria in the interior affairs of Serbia. In view of what was going on in Serbia, this was highly significant.

A telegram appeared in the White Paper of 1914 from the French Government, dated July 20th, saying that "reservists have been called up by tens of thousands in Germany." But a telegram from the British Ambassador in Berlin of August 1st, saying that no calling up of reserves had yet taken place (404), was suppressed.

Special official reports had to be given the necessary war bias. Here is an instance from one of the Dominions :

A unanimous resolution was adopted on June 29, 1926, by the Council of South-West Africa. This body considered the Blue Book of the South African Union directed against the administration of German South-West Africa merely as an instrument of war, and asked the Government to destroy copies of the book existing among official documents or in the bookshops. In his reply, the Prime Minister of South Africa, General Hertzog, declared that he and his colleagues in the Government could appreciate the causes of the Council's resolution, and that he was prepared to fall in as far as possible with its wishes. In his opinion, the unreliable and unworthy character of this document condemned it to dishonourable burial, together with all kindred publications of the war period.

Dr. Schnee's complaint re mandated African territories.
"The Times," May 16, 1927.

The French Yellow Book was a mass of suppressions,

mutilations, and even falsifications. As a French writer who has carefully examined this whole question writes :¹ "The Government cut out of the Yellow Book everything which concerned the Russian mobilization like a criminal obliterates all traces of his crime." M. Demartial devotes a volume to the various ways in which this official record was tampered with in order to deceive the French people, and he asks : "If the French Government is innocent with regard to the war, why has it falsified the collection of diplomatic documents which expose the origins ?"

There were omissions, too, in the German official White Book, as, for instance, a telegram from the Czar, in which he proposed to submit the Austro-Serbian dispute to arbitration.

A famous case of falsification was the report issued by the Kurt Eisner revolutionary Government at Munich in November 1918 which purported to give the text of a dispatch from the Bavarian Minister at Berlin. As published, this report showed the German Government cynically contemplating the explosion of a world war as the result of Austria's proposed coercive measures against Serbia. The incident gave rise to a libel action. Twelve foreign authorities examined the document, and all of them came to the conclusion that there had been falsification. The French Professor of the Sorbonne, M. Edouard Dujardin, declared : "I am of opinion that the text such as published by the *Bayerische Staatszeitung* is one of the most manifest and most criminal falsifications known to history." The full text showed that the German Government was contemplating not a world war but a localized war between Austria and Serbia.

¹ *L'Évangile du Quai d'Orsay*, by George Demartial.

But whatever may be said about suppressions by other Governments, there is nothing to equal the doctoring and garbling of the Russian Orange Book. The omission not only of passages but of a whole series of important telegrams and dispatches which passed between the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Sazonov, and the Russian Ambassador in Paris, Isvolsky, shows the determination to conceal the real attitude of Russia and France during the critical days, and the insertion of these suppressed documents, which was subsequently made possible, puts a very different complexion on the origins of the outbreak of war than that which was accepted at the time.¹

Among the suppressions were a telegram stating that "Germany ardently desired the localization of the conflict" (July 24th)—"Counsels of moderation. . . . We have to reject all these at the outset"; telegrams showing the German Ambassador's anxiety for peace; telegrams showing the warlike spirit of France and instructions to the Russians to continue their preparations as quickly as possible (July 30-31). "The French Government have firmly decided upon war and begged me to confirm the hope of the French General Staff that all our efforts will be directed against Germany and that Austria will be treated as a *quantité négligeable*." In some cases sentences were omitted and in many cases the whole telegram was suppressed.

Statesmen in all countries, whom it would be foolish to describe as dishonourable men, would shrink with disgust from falsifying their own private or business correspondence. Were they to do so, they would be convicted by their own law courts as criminals and

¹ The text of the suppressed documents is given in *Duty to Civilization*, by Francis Nielson.

condemned by public opinion. Yet, acting on behalf of their country, with issues at stake of such vast significance, they do not hesitate to lend themselves to a deliberate attempt to mislead their people and the world, and to endeavour to justify their attitude by resorting to the meanest tricks.

XXVI

HYPOCRITICAL INDIGNATION

GAS warfare and submarine warfare offered instances of violent outbursts of indignation on the part of the Press, which events showed were gross hypocrisy. This is an attitude rather than an expression of falsehood.

We must expect the Germans to fight like savages who have acquired a knowledge of chemistry.

"Daily Express," April 27, 1915.

This atrocious method of warfare . . . this diabolical contrivance. . . . The wilful and systematic attempt to choke and poison our soldiers can have but one effect upon the British peoples and upon all the non-German peoples of the earth. It will deepen our indignation and our resolution, and it will fill all races with a horror of the German name.

"The Times," April 29, 1915.

But it turned out that the Germans had not been the first to use poison gas. M. Turpin's discoveries in poison explosives had been advertised in the French Press before this date, and the French War Ministry's official instructions with regard to the use of gas hand-grenades had been issued in the autumn of 1914.

In May 1915 Colonel Maude wrote in *Land and Water* :

All shells, all fires, all mining charges, give out asphyxiating gases, and from some shells the fumes are poisonous. The use of these has been discussed for years, because the explosive that liberates the deadly gas is said to possess a quite unusual power ; but the reason why many of these

types were not adopted was because they were considered too dangerous for our gunners to transport and handle, not that when they burst they would have poisoned the enemy. At this time this quality of deadliness was defended on the ground of humanity, as the death inflicted would be absolutely certain and painless, and hence there would be no wounded. In any case, at the beginning of this war it was stated in all the French papers that the difficulty of handling these shells had been overcome, and that they had been employed on certain sectors of the French front with admirable results. When the time comes to defend their use, shall we really have the effrontery to claim for our shells that they poison but do not asphyxiate? Moreover, is not poisoning also covered by the Hague Convention? In spirit it undoubtedly is; but as I have not the text at hand to refer to, it may possibly leave a loophole on this question, through which our international lawyers might escape.

Subsequently, of course, we adopted gas warfare and perfected it.

MR. BILLING: Is it not a fact . . . that we have a better gas and a better protection and that now the Huns are squealing?

MR. BONAR LAW: I wish I were as sure of that as the Honourable Member.

House of Commons, February 25, 1918.

Their (the British and French) gas masks to-day are more efficient than the German; their gas is better and is better used.

"Daily Mail," February 25, 1918.

The Allies vied with one another in the production of poison gas, and the following article, by Mr. Ed. Berwick, an American, shows the extent to which it had reached before the end.

There were sixty-three different kinds of poison gas used before the war ended, and in November 1918 our chemical

warfare service (established in June of that year) was engaged in sixty-five "major research problems," including eight gases more deadly than any used up to that date. . . . One kind rendered the soil barren for seven years, and a few drops on a tree-trunk causes it to "wither in an hour." Our arsenal at Edgewood, Maryland, and its tributaries was turning out 810 tons weekly against 385 tons by France, 410 tons Britain, and only 210 Germany.

It was almost ready to increase its output to 3,000 tons a week. . . . Congress had appropriated 100,000,000 dollars for this chemical warfare service and allotted 48,000 men for its use. The armistice rendered needless both allotment and appropriation in such magnitude.

Foreign Affairs, July 1922.

Poison gas of incredible malignity, against which only a secret mask (which the Germans could not obtain in time) was proof, would have stifled all resistance and paralysed all life on the hostile front subject to attack.

"*What War in 1919 would have Meant*," by Mr. Winston Churchill, "*Nash's Pall Mall Magazine*," September 1924.

Since the war, research and experiments have continued, and Great Britain is now said to lead the way in this "atrocious method of warfare," "this diabolical contrivance," the weapon of "savages."

Submarine warfare produced the same effect.

Germany cannot be allowed to adopt a system of open piracy and murder.

Mr. Churchill, House of Commons, February 15, 1915.

To-day for the first time in history one of the Great Powers in Europe proposes to engage in the systematic conduct of maritime war by means hitherto condemned by all nations as piratical.

"The Times," February 18, 1915.

It is unnecessary to multiply the instances of violent and righteous indignation on the part of the Press and

individuals. But long before this event the other side of the question had been put by no less a person than Sir Percy Scott, who, writing in reply to Lord Sydenham in *The Times* on July 16, 1914, that is, before the outbreak of war, gave the following quotation from a letter written by a foreign naval officer, and his comment on it:

If we went to war with an insular country depending for its food supplies from overseas, it would be our business to stop that supply. On the declaration of war we should notify the enemy that she should warn those of her merchant ships coming home not to approach the island, as we were establishing a blockade of mines and submarines.

Similarly we should notify all neutrals that such a blockade had been established, and that if any of their vessels approached the island they would be liable to destruction either by mines or submarines, and therefore would do so at their own risk.

Commentary furnished by Sir Percy Scott :

Such a proclamation would, in my opinion, be perfectly in order, and once it had been made, if any British or neutral ships disregarded it, they could not be held to be engaged in the peaceful avocations referred to by Lord Sydenham, and, if they were sunk in the attempt, it could not be described as a relapse into savagery or piracy in its blackest form. If Lord Sydenham will look up the accounts of what usually happened to the blockade-runners into Charleston during the Civil War in America, I think he will find that the blockading cruisers seldom had any scruples about firing into the vessels they were chasing or driving them ashore, and even peppering them, when stranded, with grape and shell. The mine and the submarine torpedo will be newer deterrents.

In one of his characteristically facetious letters (addressed to Admiral Tirpitz on his resignation, March 29, 1916), Lord Fisher wrote :

I don't blame you for the submarine business. I'd have done the same myself, only our idiots in England wouldn't believe it when I told 'em.

There was the same outburst over air-raids. We were given the impression that the Huns were the first to rain down death from the sky. But among the lantern lectures for propaganda purposes given in 1918 by the National War Service Committee, there were slides illustrating bomb-dropping on German towns. The printed synopsis of one of these slides ran :

These early raids by R.N.A.S. were the first examples of bomb-dropping attacks from the air in any war, and the pity is that we had not enough aeroplanes at the beginning of the war.

Lord Montagu said in the House of Lords in July 1917 that

it was absolute humbug to talk of London being an undefended city. The Germans had a perfect right to raid London. London was defended by guns and aeroplanes, and it was the chief centre of the production of munitions. We were therefore but deluding ourselves in talking about London being an undefended city, and about the Germans in attacking it being guilty of an act unworthy of a civilized nation. That might be an unpopular thing to say at the moment, but it was the actual fact of the situation. The right line for the Government to take was to say to the civil population : " This is a war of nations, and not alone of armies, and you must endeavour to bear the casualties you suffer in the same way as the French and Belgian civil populations are bearing the casualties incidental to this kind of warfare.

Raids on German towns such as Karlsruhe were undertaken by the Allies, and all talk of inhumanity was dropped.

Who does not remember the fierce indignation in Great Britain at the news that the Germans had sunk to such unspeakable depths as to use poisonous gases? The British censors gladly passed the most horrifying details as to the suffering caused by this new method of torture. Soon the London censor forbade further reference of any kind to the use of gas, which meant, of course, that England was going to do a little poisoning on her own account. To-day the use of gas by the British is hailed, not only without shame, but with joyous satisfaction. Like the Allied killing of innocent women and children in German towns by their fliers, it shows again how rapidly one's ideals go by the board in war.

"New York Evening Post," June 30, 1916.

XXVII

OTHER LIES

WITH such profusion was falsehood sown that it would be impossible at this already distant date to gather in the whole crop. A mere assertion, even from a private individual, was often enough to set the ball rolling. The Press was only too grateful for any suggestion which might release another flood of lies, and the Government, when it was not concerned with its own subterfuges, was always ready, by disowning responsibility, to avoid direct denial of popular lies.

A few cases of some less important and some more ridiculous tales may be given.

THE GOVERNESS.

Almost every foreign governess or waiter in the country was under grave suspicion, and numberless were the stories invented about them. The best edition of the governess story is given by Sir Basil Thomson :¹

A classic version was that the governess was missing from the midday meal, and that when the family came to open her trunks, they discovered under a false bottom a store of high-explosive bombs. Everyone who told this story knew the woman's employer; some had even seen the governess herself in happier days: "Such a nice, quiet person, so fond of the children; but now one comes to think of it, there was something in her face, impossible to describe, but a something."

¹ *Queer People*, by Sir Basil Thomson.

THE WAITER.

A Swiss waiter who had drawn on a menu-card a plan of the tables in the hotel dining-room where he was in charge was actually brought in hot haste to Scotland Yard on the urgent representations of a visitor to the hotel, who was convinced that the plan was of military importance.

A German servant girl at Bearsden, near Glasgow, with a trunk full of plans and photographs, was another fabrication.

ENAMELLED ADVERTISEMENTS.

There was a report that enamelled iron advertisements for "Maggi soup," which were attached to hoardings in Belgium, were unscrewed by German officers in order that they might read the information about local resources which was painted in German on the back by spies who had preceded them. Whether this was true or not, it was generally accepted, and screwdriver parties were formed in the London suburbs for the examination of the backs of enamelled advertisements.

CONCRETE PLATFORMS.

The emplacements laid down for guns at Maubeuge, made in the shape of tennis-courts, led to an amazingly widespread belief that all hard courts, paved back gardens, or concrete roofs were designed for this purpose. Anyone who possessed one of these came under suspicion, not only in the British Isles but in America, and the scare actually spread to California.

The *Bystander* had a cartoon in March 1915 of Bernhardt writing his books, a sword in his teeth and a revolver in his left hand, on the wall a plan labelled "proposed concrete bed at Golders Green."

THE TUBES.

The Tube as a refuge from Zeppelin raids naturally came in for attention. Sir Basil Thomson gives one of the forms of an invention in this connection.

An English nurse had brought a German officer back from death's door. In a burst of gratitude, he said, at parting, "I must not tell you more, but beware of the Tubes in April (1915)." As time wore on the date was shifted forward month by month. We took the trouble to trace this story from mouth to mouth until we reached the second mistress in a London boarding-school. She declared that she had heard it from the charwoman who cleaned the school, but that lady stoutly denied she had ever told so ridiculous a story.

BOMBING OF HOSPITALS.

In May 1918 the Press was filled with articles of the most violent indignation at the deliberate bombing of hospitals by the Germans. *The Times* (May 24, 1918), said: "It was on a par with all the abominations that have caused the German name to stink in the nostrils of humanity since the war began, and will cause it to stink while memory endures," and recommended, after they had been vanquished, "ostracism from the society of civilized nations." There was a *Punch* cartoon, and the rest of the Press yelled. The soldiers, however, as usual, did not indulge in hysterics, and explained the matter of the bombing of the hospitals at Etaples, after which the following appeared in a leader published by the *Manchester Guardian*.

Towards the end of last month and the beginning of this public opinion here—and, for the matter of that, we imagine in most other countries too—was horrified by messages from correspondents in France who described the deliberate

bombing of British hospitals by German airmen. In one case the correspondent asserted categorically that there could have been no mistake ; the hospitals, and not anything of military value, were the objects at whose destruction the raiders aimed. Well might such news cause even a fiercer fire of indignation than now burns against the Germans, since inhumanity could reach no lower depth than an attack on the sick and wounded and those who minister to them. There was no apparent room to doubt the accuracy of these reports, for there is a censorship in the field which not only prevents the correspondent from saying anything that it disapproves, but can overtake an error if by some mischance he has fallen, as he may easily do, into inaccuracy. So long, then, as these reports arrived and went uncorrected, it was right to suppose that they represented the facts. But we believe it is the view of the military authorities that there is no sufficient evidence to show that these were deliberate attacks on hospitals. The military view is that hospitals must sometimes, on both sides of the front, be placed near objects of military importance, such as railways or camps or ammunition dumps, and that in a night raid hospitals run the risk of being hit when the military objects round them are attacked. But if this is the authoritative military view, how comes it that correspondents were allowed to send misleading messages to this country, or that when messages had been sent, steps were not taken to remove the impression they had caused? Our case against the Germans is strong enough in all conscience, and thoroughly established. We can afford to do justice even to them, and we ought to do no less.

"Manchester Guardian," June 15, 1918.

The constant assertion that on no occasion were hospital ships used for the carrying of any war material or soldiers was contrary to fact.

THE CROWN PRINCE.

The German Crown Prince, when he was not dead, was always represented as stealing valuables from

French châteaux. The following is a sample of what it was thought necessary to write on this subject :

The Crown Prince of Prussia may yet be immortalized as a prince among burglars and a burglar among princes ! . . . Germany makes war in a manner that would have commended itself to Bill Sikes, and the Kaiser's eldest son, in his eagerness to secure the "swag," has merited the right to be considered an imperial Fagin. . . . This modern Germany, whose spirit is epitomized in the Crown Prince, fights like a valiant blackguard. It will die like a hero, but it will murder like an apache and will steal like a mean pickpocket.

Thefts by the Crown Prince, "Daily Express," November 1, 1914.

An article appeared in *La Nouvelle Revue* in 1915, written by an Irish lady whose friend had witnessed a secret ceremony at Menin at which "the German Crown Prince was crowned King of Belgium in the marketplace." This was reproduced in the English Press.

TUBERCULOSIS GERMS.

The Germans were accused of having inoculated French prisoners with tuberculosis germs. So emphatic was this assertion that a question was asked in Parliament on the subject on April 24, 1917. The Government, however, disclaimed having any information on the subject, and the story was dropped.

THE PATRIOTIC LIAR.

The method of the patriotic liar can be illustrated by the case of a clergyman, who informed the Manchester Geographical Society on October 7, 1914 : "You will hear only one hundredth part of the actual atrocities this war has produced. The civilized world could not stand the truth. It will never hear it. There are,

up and down England to-day, scores—I am understating the number—of Belgian girls who have had their hands cut off. That is nothing to what we could tell you.” Later in the same month the reverend gentleman wrote to the *Daily News*, asking, “Will anyone who has actually *seen* such cases here in England send me full particulars?” He had made his statement first and was endeavouring to get his evidence afterwards.

MINERS BURIED ALIVE.

On August 29th the *Daily Citizen* of Glasgow had a paragraph headed “Miners Buried Alive! Enemy Block Shafts of Belgian Pits.” On December 1st the *Daily Citizen* (without heading the paragraph) gave the statement of M. Lombard (General Secretary of the Belgian Miners) to the Executive of the Miners’ Federation of Great Britain, in which he “denied that there was any truth in the rumour circulated so freely in this country that the Germans had shut up the pit mouths in various places, thus suffocating miners underground.”

WAR NEWS FOR THE U.S.A.

A former agent of the Standard Oil Company, living at Crieff, Scotland, supplied “war news” to the U.S.A. The *Strathearn Herald*, in December 1914, gave some samples. There was, of course, the handless Belgian baby who had arrived in Glasgow.

Over a hundred Germans were found with cages full of homing pigeons in Glasgow and Edinburgh.

But the most elaborate bit of news was that

when the British Army had to retreat in France about a month ago, General French asked for reinforcements from

some of the French Generals, and was refused. Kitchener went over to the Continent the next day, and the only excuse was that the French troops were tired. Upon investigation, however, it was found that two of the French Generals had German wives. Kitchener ordered two of them to be shot.

A SOLDIER'S LETTER.

At a recent meeting in the North of England, an ex-service man in the audience related the following experience :

He was wounded and taken prisoner on the Western front, and for some time was in hospital in Germany. When well on the road to recovery, he learned that he was to be removed from the hospital, as beds were wanted for wounded Germans, and that he was being sent to a special camp for convalescents. In a short note to his relatives he informed them of the removal.

On returning home after the war, he was amazed to find that the local Press had obtained permission from his people to use the letter, and had woven around it an "atrocious" story telling how, when at the point of death, he had been taken from bed in order to make room for a slightly wounded German, and had been sent on a journey of very many miles to a camp, where his wounds could not possibly receive proper attention, so there was practically no chance of his recovery owing to this barbarism on the part of the Germans.

FAKED GERMAN ORDER.

A private serving in the 24th Division relates how, in 1917, while in the Somme area, a typed copy of a translation of an alleged German order was circulated among the troops. The order required German women

to cohabit with civilians and soldiers on leave so that there might be no shortage of children to make up for war losses. Rewards were offered for those who zealously carried out the order. Typed out by official machines, the circular was posted up in the canteens.

RUSSIAN ARSENAL DESTROYED.

On September 15, 1915, in the *Evening News*, there were large headlines :

BLOW THAT CRIPPLED RUSSIA

ONLY ARSENAL WRECKED BY VAST EXPLOSION

and there was a full description of how, through German spies and treachery, "the Russian Woolwich had been blown to pieces." "Ochta was the Russian Woolwich, and much more than the Russian Woolwich. It was the only munition factory in the whole of Russia."

It subsequently turned out that the Ochta explosion was not at an arsenal at all, but was due to an accident in a factory which had been temporarily turned into a munition factory. No German spies had had anything to do with it. It was an inconsiderable affair, and a small paragraph with the true version was inserted in a later issue of the paper.

Amusingly enough, in the same issue and on the very same page, there appeared a satirical article on "The Rumour Microbe," laughing at a man who said "That a relative of his had a relation who had seen a Zeppelin come down on Hampstead Heath, and a man went to some stables and got out a number of horses, which towed it away."

The careful perusal of the files of newspapers, British and foreign, during these four years, would yield an

amazing harvest of falsehood. As the public mind is always impressed by anything that appears in print, the influence of the Press in inflaming one people against the other must have been very considerable, and in many people's opinion very laudable.

XXVIII

THE MANUFACTURE OF NEWS

THE FALL OF ANTWERP.

November 1914.

When the fall of Antwerp got known, the church bells were rung (meaning in Germany).

Kölnische Zeitung.

According to the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the clergy of Antwerp were compelled to ring the church bells when the fortress was taken.

Le Matin.

According to what *Le Matin* has heard from Cologne, the Belgian priests who refused to ring the church bells when Antwerp was taken have been driven away from their places.

The Times.

According to what *The Times* has heard from Cologne via Paris, the unfortunate Belgian priests who refused to ring the church bells when Antwerp was taken have been sentenced to hard labour.

Corrière della Sera.

According to information to the *Corrière della Sera* from Cologne via London, it is confirmed that the barbaric conquerors of Antwerp punished the unfortunate Belgian priests for their heroic refusal to ring the church bells by hanging them as living clappers to the bells with their heads down.

Le Matin.

XXIX

WAR AIMS

As there was great uncertainty how, if victory were achieved, the spoils would be divided, it was impossible for statesmen, in the Allied nations, to be precise as to what specific aims with regard to territorial adjustments and colonial acquisitions could be laid down as desirable objects, without rousing jealousy and suspicion amongst themselves. It became necessary therefore to announce some general high-sounding moral ideals which might give the war the character of an almost religious crusade. They were particularly unfortunate in selecting a number of cries everyone of which has proved, in the long run, to be false.

A WAR TO CRUSH MILITARISM.

Everyone knows now that militarism cannot be crushed by war. Even if it is removed from one quarter it only grows stronger elsewhere. Militarism can only be crushed by the growth of real democracy in an era of peace. Only a few figures are required to show how false this cry was if it was ever believed by anyone. The *Morning Post* was honest enough to refer to it as "this absurd talk."

THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

EXPENDITURE ON FIGHTING SERVICES.

1913-14.	1924-25.
£110,750,000	£117,525,000

While fully taking into account the fall in the value of money, which would show a slight decrease in the

second figure rather than increase, no substantial reduction, which might be expected as a consequence of a war to end militarism, is in any way apparent.

For the same period the aggregate totals for the four Allied powers, France, Italy, the United States, and Japan are :

1913.	1925.
£194,380,625	£244,864,477

Since the war, that is to say, from 1918 to 1926, Great Britain has spent over £1,300,000,000 on armaments. To have said therefore that the war would crush militarism, was the most extravagant and foolish of all speculations. It would be an insult to the intelligence of any of the statesmen to suggest that they ever for a moment believed it would be true.

A WAR TO DEFEND SMALL NATIONALITIES.

The ultimatum to Serbia and the infringement of Belgian neutrality led to the widespread cry that we were fighting "for the rights of small nationalities."

It means next that room must be found and kept for the independent existence and free development of the smaller nationalities, each with a corporate consciousness of its own.

Mr. Asquith on War Aims, Dublin, September 26, 1914.

There were a host of other declarations from responsible Ministers of a similar character.

But this was no more true than any of the other cries. Apart from the minorities placed under alien rule by frontier delimitations drawn for strategic purposes and not according to race or nationality, Montenegro was wiped off the map by the Peace Treaties, although the restoration of Montenegro was specially mentioned by the Prime Minister on January 5, 1918 (National War Aims pamphlet No. 33), the British

occupation of Egypt continues, the Syrians have been subjected to severe repression by the French (the bombing of Damascus), the attempt of the Riffs at securing independence led to their being blotted out, Nicaragua and Panama are being subjected to the political domination of the United States, and other instances might be given in which the struggle of "small nationalities" is simply regarded as a revolutionary or subversive move. There may be good political reasons for the instances given in the eyes of the Great Powers, but the endeavour to persuade the people that we were fighting for small nationalities was the purest hypocrisy.

A WAR TO MAKE THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY.

The absurdity of this meaningless cry on the part of the Allies, amongst whom was Czarist Russia, is obvious. Its insincerity is proved by results. There is now the most ruthless dictatorship ever established in Italy; an imitation of it in Spain; a veiled dictatorship in Poland; a series of attempted dictatorships in Greece; something which approaches near to a dictatorship in Hungary; Turkey and Persia are both dominated by individuals with almost sovereign prerogatives, and the Soviet system is a form of dictatorship. In fact, except in Great Britain, the United States, the Scandinavian countries, Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland, parliamentary government has been in grave danger where it has not been entirely superseded.

A WAR TO END WAR.

This was hardly an original cry. It has been uttered in previous wars, although every schoolboy knows that war breeds war.

We have long been deceived by the false counsels of politicians and sentimentalists who are even now pretending that this is a war that will end war. War will never end as long as human nature continues to be human nature.

"Morning Post," October 20, 1915.

So far as the Great War is concerned, the *Morning Post* seems to be correct up to date. Since 1918 fighting has never ceased in the world. There has been war on the part of the Allies against Russia, war between Turkey and Greece, the Black and Tan exploits in Ireland, the armed occupation of the Ruhr, war of France and Spain against the Riffs, war of France against the Syrians, military action on the part of the U.S.A. in Nicaragua, fighting in Mexico, and incessant war in China.

NO TERRITORY FOR GREAT BRITAIN.

The statement that whatever we were fighting for we desired no fresh territory was frequently made. Considering that the British Empire comprised over thirteen million square miles of the earth's surface in 1914, the statement was accepted as wise and sensible. A few of the chief declarations on the subject may be given.

We have no desire to add to our Imperial burdens either in area or in responsibility.

Mr. Asquith, October 1914.

Our direct and selfish interests are small.

Mr. Asquith, November 1914.

We are not fighting for territory.

Mr. Bonar Law, December 1916.

We are not fighting a war of conquest.

Mr. Lloyd George, February 1917.

Such a victory as will give not aggrandizement of territory nor any extension of our Empire.

Mr. Long, February 1917.

So much for the protestations for public consumption. Now as to the facts with regard to what "fell to us" when it was all over.

	Square Miles.
<i>Egypt</i> , formerly under Turkish suzerainty, became part of the British Empire	350,000
<i>Cyprus</i> , formerly under Turkish suzerainty, became part of the British Empire	3,584
<i>German South-West Africa</i> , mandate held by the Union of South Africa	322,450
<i>German East Africa</i> , mandate held by Great Britain	384,180
<i>Togoland and Cameroons</i> , divided between Great Britain and France (say half)	112,415
<i>Samoa</i> , mandate held by New Zealand	1,050
<i>German New Guinea and Island south of Equator</i> , mandate held by Australia	90,000
<i>Palestine</i> , mandate held by Great Britain	9,000
<i>Mesopotamia</i> (Iraq), mandate held by Great Britain	143,250
<hr/>	
Total in square miles	1,415,929

This is not a bad total of "conquest" "territory," "addition to Imperial burdens in area and responsibility," and "extension of Empire." But surely it would have been better not to make the false declarations which inevitably bring against us the charge of hypocrisy.

XXX

FOREIGN LIES

(A) GERMANY.

THE similarity of the lines on which lying was conducted in Germany to our own in this country shows well how duping the people is a necessary adjunct of war all the world over.

Within the nation the censorship was stricter than it was here. No decent word with regard to the enemy was allowed, and the good treatment of prisoners in British camps was suppressed. The same amazing stupidity with regard to concealments was shown as in this country. But a worse mistake was made in depicting the situation up to the end in rose colour and with exaggerated optimism. The real truth as to the course of events was concealed, every enemy success was understated, the effect of American intervention was minimized, the condition of German resources exaggerated, so that when the final catastrophe came, many people were taken by surprise. In this connection the Germans have got a stronger indictment against their authorities than we have. Cautions and warnings were not omitted in this country.

The Press Bureau (Pressekonferenz) was presided over by a soldier. Casualties were, so far as possible, concealed. On November 15, 1914, the Pressekonferenz stated there were a few hundred casualties, while the official list contained at the time 55,000 names. One of the members of the Pressekonferenz echoed our War

Office circular¹ when he said, on one occasion, in dealing with a false official report : " It is not so much the accuracy of the news as its effect that matters." ²

The Turks were embarrassing allies. The massacres of Armenians had to be concealed, although attempts were made in some papers to defend them.

Our poet-writers and professors had their exact counterparts in Germany and gave orthodox " patriotism " an intellectual and literary tone.

Abroad, German lying was not very skilful. It was either too subtle or too clumsy. They had a wide field to cover with so many nations against them. " Encirclement " was the chief cry and, in the case of Russia and France, aggression.

In October 1914 Prince Rupprecht of Bavaria declared that England's ambition " for years had been turned to surround us with a ring of enemies in order to strangle us " (uns mit einem Ring von Feinden zu umgeben um uns zu erdrosseln), and there were many similar declarations.

With regard to the deliberate policy of encirclement, so far as Great Britain is concerned, Herr Rudolf Kircher remarks, in his book *Engländer* (1926) :

Grey's personality is the living proof that a policy of encirclement as a war aim, as was imagined in Germany, never existed. All these were fantastic suppositions, as fantastic as the idea that the German people were ripe and ready for an attack and struggle for world supremacy.

The German Government, like all the other Governments, was blameless and at the mercy of the machinations of enemy Governments. They had no chief Monster to depict as the Allies had, but only a number

¹ See page 20.

² *Die grosse Zeit der Lüge*, Hellmut v. Gerlach.

of not very distinguished statesmen. In the early days of panic they started with "a military report" that "French aviators had dropped bombs in the vicinity of Nuremberg" on August 3, 1914, and flaming headlines appeared in the newspapers. But the Prussian Minister at Munich telegraphed to Berlin that there was "no evidence of dropping of bombs and still less, naturally, that the aviators were French" (Kautsky documents, No. 758). At the same time there was a report from the Governor of Düsseldorf that "eighty French officers in the uniform of Prussian officers, in twelve automobiles, had made a vain attempt to cross the frontier at Walbeck." Both these reports were telegraphed by Herr Jagow, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the Ministers at Brussels and The Hague, to be brought to the attention of the Governments as a violation of international law. Both were no doubt believed, but neither of them had any foundation. On the other hand, there were several instances of the violation of French territory by German frontier patrols before August 3, 1914.

Apart from the absurdities of "Gott strafe England" and "the Hymn of Hate," Great Britain was naturally singled out for special attention. On September 3, 1914, the *Frankfurter Zeitung* printed a speech by Mr. John Burns which was purely imaginary. In October there appeared in the New York American an interview with a "highly placed representative of the British Government" which was proved to be entirely false. Aeroplanes were used to drop on French trenches and billets picture-postcards of ruined French churches with the legend on them, "Wrecked by the English." There were the usual exaggerated reports and startling statements as to what was going on in enemy countries,

despair, demoralization and panic, accusations of abuse of the "white flag," specially against British troops, and other "necessary" war lies.

Neutral countries, of course, received propaganda from both sides. There was a German film depicting German soldiers feeding Belgian and French children, and English prisoners grinning with delight as they worked under the stern eyes of the Prussian soldiers.

On November 25, 1914, the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* published in facsimile a translation of a report written by General Ducarne to the Belgian War Minister on April 10, 1906, recording the visit of Colonel Barnardiston with regard to the dispatch of the Expeditionary Force in the event of war between Germany and France. In the translation which was reproduced in other newspapers without the facsimile there were three mistakes.

(a) An interpolation, which was an integral part of the text, ran as follows: "L'entrée des Anglais en Belgique ne se ferait qu'après la violation de notre neutralité par l'Allemagne." (The entry of the British into Belgium will only take place after the violation of our neutrality by Germany.) This was represented as a marginal note and given in French, so that many readers would not understand it.

(b) In the passage: "He (Colonel Barnardiston) emphasized that our conversation must be absolutely confidential," the word "conversation" was translated by *Abkommen*, as if it were "convention."

(c) The final date in French, "Fin Septembre 1906," was translated "Abgeschlossen September 1906," i.e. "concluded," giving the impression of "a convention" having been "concluded."

The mistakes, each taken separately, might have been

errors of carelessness, but taken all three together, undoubtedly point to a deliberate attempt at falsification.

In the early months of the war the Wolff Bureau circulated a report in the papers: "To-day a French doctor, assisted by two French officers in disguise, attempted to infect a well at Metz with plague and cholera bacillus; the criminals were caught and shot." An official *démenti* of this story was subsequently issued.

The greatest tunnel in Germany, at Cochen, on the frontier, was reported to have been destroyed by an innkeeper, Nicolai, of Cochen, and his son, both of whom were shot. The *Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung* stated that after careful investigation it was discovered that Nicolai was a naturalized German, French by birth, and it was a matter for congratulation that the criminal was not a genuine German. The following day the sub-Prefect of Cochen announced that there was not a word of truth in the supposed plot; Nicolai was alive and a highly respected citizen, whilst his son was serving in a Prussian regiment.

Atrocity lies abounded in Germany just as in this country. Gouging out of eyes there seems to have been as great a favourite as the Belgian babies without hands here.

In September 1914 a lady of Cologne was informed that a whole room was given up in a hospital at Aix-la-Chapelle to wounded soldiers who had had their eyes gouged out in Belgium. On inquiry, a leading doctor at Aix-la-Chapelle declared there was no such room and no single case of the sort had been observed. But the story wandered from Aix-la-Chapelle to Bonn, where again the chief doctor of the hospitals had to deny it. Then it travelled to Sigmaringen. The *Weser Zeitung* in Bremen took it up and wrote in a similar way about

a hospital in Berlin. This was denied by the Kommandatur der Residenz. It reached its climax when it was reported that a small boy of ten had seen "a whole bucketful of soldiers' eyes" (ein ganzer Eimer voll Soldaten-äugen).

Die Zeit in Bild (January 12, No. 38) gave circumstantial accounts of a priest who wore a chain round his neck made up of rings taken from fingers he had cut off.

An official report from Lüttich, where this was supposed to have happened, stated there was no such case.

In the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, September 15, 1914, it was related how a company of German soldiers were marching through a Belgian village when the priest, who stood before the door of the church, invited the captain to come in with his soldiers, "for it was good," he said, "even in these dark times, to think of God (da es doch in dieser schweren Zeit gut sei auch an den lieben Gott zu denken). The captain accepted the invitation. A machine gun was concealed behind the altar. When the church was full the machine gun was unmasked and the whole company shot down.

Such stories as these¹ arose chiefly from anti-Catholic bias. Priests were accused of harbouring French soldiers in their houses, but no case was proved. An incident of which many and varied versions were given was that of Demange, priest of Lagarde. He was said to have betrayed the position of the German troops to the enemy, to have put a machine gun in the tower of his church with which to shoot down Germans. He was reported to have been shot, and his body pierced by thirty bayonet wounds was seen before the church door

¹ See *Der Lügegeist in Völkerkrieg*, by Bernard Duhr.

of Lagarde. Not only was the whole thing an invention, but it turned out, from official information, that Demange, who was alive, had behaved with heroism in resisting the enemy, and had been praised by German officers.

The variations of the story and its exposure as a falsehood appeared in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* (September 18, 1914) and the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* (October 11, 1914).

On August 31, 1914, the *Berliner Lokalanzeiger* reported that a nurse in Amsterdam had heard from a German officer how, after Löwen had been occupied, all was quiet. But later the bodies of fifty German soldiers, shot by the monks, were found in the cellar of the monastery. The inmates were thereupon arrested and the Superior shot.

This story was widely circulated, and as it was likely to embitter religious feeling General von Bissing issued a complete denial of the report and an order that it should not be circulated in the Press (Münster, September 6, 1914). Nevertheless the story has been incorporated in several German books on the war.

In September 1914 Sergeant (Unteroffizier) Adolf Schmidt related, in a letter to his parents, how he and his troop had been invited by a French priest to have some coffee. Being suspicious, he called a doctor to examine the coffee, and found it had strychnine mixed with it. The priest and his cook were shot the next morning (*Schwarzwälder Chronik*, September 18, 1914).

The whole story proved to be an invention of the sergeant, who retracted it.

In April 1915 the *Vossische Zeitung* reported the invasion of Egypt by the Senussi with an army of 70,000 men. This invention was reproduced in the

Corrière della Sera in Italy and denied by the British Embassy.

A letter (August 26, 1914) to the *Hamburger Fremdenblatt* related how the Belgians supplied the German troops with cigars filled with gunpowder, which blinded them when they lit them. Another letter to the *Berliner Tageblatt* (August 26th) reported that the Belgians filled the letters of the Germans with narcotic powder.

On January 23, 1915, the *Kölnische Zeitung* gave the most gruesome description, by an eye-witness, of a scene on the Eastern front in which a boy of twelve years old had been secured to a table by nails driven through each of his fingers. Judge Rosenberg, of Essen, took the matter up and asked the name of the place where this had happened. After delay and evasions and considerable difficulty in discovering the author of the tale, he ascertained that it had taken place at Prostken. Accordingly he wrote to the authorities there, and received a reply on September 14, 1916, to the effect that nothing was known of any such incident in the district.

That there were incidents of cruelty and barbarity on the Eastern front there can be no doubt. But these were exaggerated until wholesale accusations were made against the Russians for habitually cutting off men's arms and legs and women's breasts.

Both on the East and West, atrocity stories were circulated without the names of place or person.

The following is an instance of the kind of story which the German public was made to accept as typical of the methods of their enemies.

On October 29, 1915, the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* described the following incident :

In consequence of the proclamation of the Holy War, a number of British Askari of Mohammedan religion refused to fight against the Germans of East Africa; thereupon these 112 "rebels" were handcuffed and thrashed and taken to Nairobi, where they were condemned by court martial to be hanged. But a few days later, instead of hanging them, a new order was given, according to which the condemned men were to be used as living targets for the black recruits in their rifle practice. One morning in November of last year ten of these prisoners were taken to a place south of Nairobi, where some British Askaris were in camp. The condemned men had first of all to dig a huge pit, where they were afterwards to be buried. They were then bound, hand and foot, gagged, and placed in the bushes, tall grass or on trees, so that only a small part of their bodies was visible. English officers gave the instructions in shooting. At a distance of from 100 to 300 paces the recruits shot at their living targets. This practice lasted the whole morning and afternoon, and by the evening two men were found to be dead, and the others, who were terribly wounded, were then killed. The bodies were then thrown into the pit. This shooting practice was continued daily until all the condemned men were killed.

An Englishman who was in Berlin in the early days of the war heard, at the International Trade Union headquarters, continual discussions as to the possibility of reaching and attacking the British coast. It was argued that such an attack would shatter the prestige of Great Britain. The Englishman maintained that it would only greatly assist recruiting.

When the actual bombardment of Hartlepool, Scarborough, and Whitby took place, the morning Press gave large type to the event. "Fortified Towns of Hartlepool, Whitby, and Scarborough Bombarded." Then followed the Wolff Telegraph Bureau description of the nature of the fortifications on the hill at Scarborough and again at Whitby. The text carried the

implication that it was because these were well-known fortified towns that they had been selected for bombardment. The matter was discussed on the day the newspaper was published, and the German Trade Unionists pointed again and again to the evidence in the Press of the military nature of these three towns. The Englishman accurately described Hartlepool and Scarborough as favourite holiday resorts of British children and Whitby as a place of pilgrimage for visitors both from England and America. But he made no impression. They were greatly annoyed and preferred their own lie, which was universally accepted in Germany. It will be remembered that the *Daily Mail* replied with a row of photographs of babies.

A lie exposed by no less a person than the Foreign Secretary must certainly be recorded. Sir Edward Grey, speaking on May 25, 1916, in the House of Commons, referred to a statement of the German Chancellor (Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg) in the following terms :

I did find one new thing in the statement of the German Chancellor with regard to the terms of peace. That is the statement as to what the attitude of the British Government was in the time of diplomatic difficulty about Bosnia. That statement is untrue so far as we are concerned. The charge that our attitude was bellicose about the negotiations concerning Bosnia is a first-class lie. The idea that we attempted to urge Russia to war and that we said that this country would be ready to go to war about Bosnia is directly contrary to the truth.

(B) FRANCE.

Whatever criticisms may be made of the French, we can never accuse them of being hypocrites. They realized the great importance of "propaganda" and

went to work with a will. They are neither ashamed of the fact nor attempt to conceal it. We always mixed our lies up with righteous indignation and high morality, and tried to make them as statesmanlike and genteel as possible, although the *Kadaver* story was perhaps the most atrocious as well as the most successful lie in the war. The French authorities were delighted with it, and an English war correspondent has related how the French correspondents were made to send in reports of the corpse factory over their own signatures.

It will be remembered that in the eventful days before August 4, 1914, the French Government declared that they showed their pacific disposition by retiring all their troops ten kilometres from the frontier—a gesture which was acclaimed here and in France as magnificent and magnanimous and heroic. The truth, however, was that the French desired to delay, as long as possible, the declaration of war so as to give full time for the preparations in Great Britain and Russia. This is how a Frenchman writes of it :

It was evident that if this order were in the least degree to compromise the success of our plans, our generals would not have tolerated it. One can say with absolute certainty that if there were any points where our troops could keep back ten kilometres from the frontier, it would be at points where it would not be inconvenient, and in the places where it would be necessary for them to be nearer they would be nearer. In fact, there were certain points where they remained on the frontier, and many, according to M. Messimy (Minister for War), where they were withdrawn only four or five kilometres. Moreover, after August 2nd, 5.30 p.m., that is, a whole day before Germany's declaration of war, the order was suppressed on the pretext that three German patrols had in the morning made an incursion into our territory.

Without doubt the ten-kilometre retreat was only a fool's trap specially designed to make the English believe that the French mobilization was a pacific mobilization.

M. Demartial, in "*L'Évangile du Quai d'Orsay*," 1926.

A good many of the lies circulated in Great Britain originated from across the channel. The French were adepts at faked photographs; instances are given under that heading. The insinuations in their merciless caricatures also had considerable influence with those to whom pictures appeal.

Lies in France were, many of them, the same as those with which we were provided here. But their method was more extensive and thorough, as is shown by the disclosures in *Behind the Scenes of French Journalism*, by "A French Chief Editor," from the eighth chapter of which book the following extracts are taken.

. . . If you reduce the lie to a scientific system, put it on thick and heavy, with great effort and sufficient finances scatter it all over the world as the pure truth, you can deceive whole nations for a long time and drive them to slaughter for causes in which they have not the slightest interest. We have seen that sufficiently during the last war, and will see it in the next one, by which a kind providence will clumsily try to solve the problem of over-population.

We concluded immediately, and very correctly, that it is not sufficient to inflame the masses for war, and, in order to escape the accusation of the war-guilt, to represent the enemy as a dangerous disturber of the peace and the most terrible enemy of mankind.

We have not waited for Lord Northcliffe's procedure. On the spur of the moment we appreciated the great importance to enthuse public opinion for our more or less just cause. As early as three days after the outbreak of the war, Viviani promulgated a law which on the same day was passed by the House and the Senate, and which provided as the first instalment of a powerful propaganda the trifling amount of

twenty-five million francs in gold for the establishment of

LA MAISON DE LA PRESSE,

a gigantic building, François Street 3, five stories high, without the basement, where the printing-presses are located, and the ground-floor with its large meeting hall. A busy, lively going and coming, as in a beehive; trucks arriving, elegant autos with pretentious-looking persons. The two hundred rooms contain the workshops, offices, parlours, and reception-rooms, where those war-mad heroes are domiciled whose courage grows with the degree of distance from the trenches. From the basement up to the fifth story covered with a glass roof, all is the embodiment of concentrated propaganda. In the basement stood the machinery necessary for printing and reproduction, under the glass roof operated the photo-chemigraphic department. Its principal work consisted in making photographs and cuts of wooden figures with cut-off hands, torn-out tongues, gouged-out eyes, crushed skulls and brains laid bare. The pictures thus made were sent as unassailable evidence of German atrocities to all parts of the globe, where they did not fail to produce the desired effect. In the same rooms fictitious photographs were made of bombarded French and Belgian churches, violated graves and monuments and scenes of ruin and desolation. The staging and painting of these scenes were done by the best scene-painters of the Paris Grand Opera. . . . The Press House was the indefatigable geyser which belched forth incessantly false war reports and fictitious news from the rear and the front, the meanest and most brutal slanders of the opponents, the astonishing fictions of infamous acts attributed to them. The insidious but efficacious poison thus broadcast has misled and infected a host of well-meaning but unsophisticated people. . . . During the war the lie became a patriotic virtue. It was forced upon us by the Government and the censor, and through the peril of losing the war considered a necessity; besides, lying was profitable and often publicly honoured. It would be useless to deny the success of the lie, which used the Press as the best means of an extended and rapid circulation. The greatest efforts were made to stamp every word of the enemies as a lie and every lie of

our own as absolute truth. Everything sailed under the flag of "Propaganda."

Children's education was not neglected. In *Le Matin*, November 12, 1915, there was a paragraph headed, "To Teachers."

All French schools must possess a collection of the cards "German crimes," in order to impress for ever upon the children the atrocities of the barbarians. It went on to say that an artist of note had created a dozen compositions relating to "the most striking episodes among German crimes." . . . "Teachers, subscribe to-day and place these pictures in your schools."

Press distortions were as common in France as in other countries. As early as July 25, 1914, M. Berthelot, M. Poincaré's permanent head of the Foreign Office, caused a gravely distorted account of the Pacific conversations between Bienvenu Martin and Baron Schoen to be published in the *Écho de Paris* and *Le Matin*. Public opinion can be far more easily dragooned by Government and Press in France than it can be in this country. There was, therefore, less need for subtlety, more chance for concealment, and little fear of the crudest lies not being accepted, provided they had the hall-mark of some sort of authority. Moreover, in France there is less disposition to examine the stories and statements by which they were deceived and expose their falsity now that it is all over. Nevertheless, no people is more intelligently aware of the imbecile futility of war and its senseless barbarity than the common people of France.

(C) THE UNITED STATES.

There was no richer field for propaganda than the United States of America in the first years of the war.

The Allied Powers and the Central Powers were both hard at work competing. The German method began by being too subtle. A wireless news agency, under German control, gave at first the best, most authentic, unbiased, and by far the cheapest war news, and thus attracted a large number of subscribers and fed the American Press. As the months passed, their news began to be ingeniously "slanted" in favour of the Central Powers. But they relied too much on argument. The cruder British methods were far more successful, and intensive work was done by the British War Mission, which (as Lord Northcliffe stated in *The Times*, November 16, 1917) comprised 500 officials with 10,000 assistants. Atrocities, Germany's sole responsibility, the criminal Kaiser, and all the other fabrications started in Great Britain, were worked up by American liars with great effect. The Belgian baby without hands was a special favourite. There was hardly a household in which it was not discussed all over that vast continent, and even so ridiculous a scare as the concrete platforms for German guns was current in California. Spy stories abounded and effective films were produced by those who were pressing for America to come into the war. One particularly good one dealt with the pacific spirit which at first prevailed. Instead of deriding it, the pacifist hero was depicted as a fine, noble figure standing out against the excited agitation which surrounded him. The incursions of a foreign army were graphically and dramatically produced. Villages were burned, women carried off, and various cruelties perpetrated. The representative of a foreign Power, with an unmistakably German cast of countenance, was depicted as a hideous villain plotting and scheming with evil intent. There was a particularly fine "close-

up" of him, rolling his eyes with Mephistophelian cunning, in the gallery of Congress. Finally the pacifist hero, carried away by his patriotic feelings, succumbs and supports the war with enthusiasm.

After America entered into the war a number of "actual war picture" films (prepared at Hollywood) were released. An immense army of speakers and pamphleteers were employed by the Committee on Public Information, and the country was flooded with literature describing the iniquities of the Hun.

The tragedy of the sinking of the *Lusitania*, which was of course the turning-point, was distorted to the utmost limit. Atrocity stories and faked films worked more especially on the feelings of the women, so that when neutrality was abandoned and "Uncle Sam needs you" was substituted, it took very few days to bring the whole country round. Once America was in the war, all the propaganda of the Allied nations was used and further exaggerated.

Among active patriots, John R. Rathom was conspicuous with his articles in the *Providence Journal* and with his numerous lectures. During 1917 and 1918 he led the campaign against any who could be suspected of having German sympathies. His spy stories were sensational, and he was said to be coached by the British Secret Service. In February 1918 he was issuing a series of articles on "Germany's Plot Exposed," when the *New York World* discontinued them, as they were suspicious and believed that the articles were faked. In 1920 he was charged by Franklin D. Roosevelt for circulating false and defamatory libels, and in the course of examination he admitted "drawing freely on his imagination." He was finally utterly discredited, but not till after "Rathomania" had