University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1939

Henry Watterson and the World War propaganda.

Patrick S. Kirwan
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kirwan, Patrick S., "Henry Watterson and the World War propaganda." (1939). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1816.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1816>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

HENRY WATTERSON AND THE WORLD WAR PROPAGANDA ✓

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty

Of the Graduate School of the University of Louisville

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Of Master of Arts

Department of History

By

PATRICK S. KIRWAN ✓

1939

Name PATRICK S. KIRWAN
Title HENRY WATTERSON AND THE WORLD WAR PROPAGANDA
Director JAMES M. READ

Approved by:

_____ Director

_____)
_____) Reading
_____) Committee
_____)

_____) Representative
_____ of the English
_____ Department

Date May 22, 1939

25 9. 39 194.
... He that takes to print shall live or perish
by the press...

Lasswell

PREFACE

It is neither the expectation nor the hope of the author of this thesis to attempt to develop an altogether original attitude toward the employment of various types of propaganda by various nations at war. He is quite content to rely upon the intellectual honesty of those whose reputations as historians have been established through their employment of careful research and sensible interpretation. The quotations and footnote references contained herein will bear ample testimony to this acknowledged confidence.

It is the author's intention to study war propaganda from an isolated point of view, that of his own community, Louisville, Kentucky; and to discover how much this point of view reflected or influenced that of the rest of the nation. As has been intimated and as will be seen, quite a number of authorities have been consulted. The writer has attempted to use only those opinions and details which coincide with the limited topic and point of view mentioned.

That his own historical integrity has not been jeopardized by his faith in others is the author's sincere hope.

Patrick S. Kirwan

Louisville, Ky.

May 15, 1939

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.	1
	Definitions...Ethnological and geographical aspects of propaganda...Telegram of American correspondents regarding German atrocities.	
II.	SERAJEVO, AND SHORTLY THEREAFTER	7
	Watterson's "On to Panama" campaign...The Serajevo incident...Watterson's early attitude toward the belligerents...Severance of the cable.	
III.	WATTERSON SURRENDERS HIS NEUTRALITY	14
	Watterson cautions the reader...he espoused the Entente cause... "War of the Kaisers" ...Denunciation of German-Americans...Intolerance toward the "German side" of the news...Reaction of German-Americans toward Watterson...The portfolio of Dr. Albert.	
IV.	THE SUBMARINE AND THE AIRPLANE	39
	General attitude of Watterson toward airplanes...Declaration of war-zone by Germany...Watterson's skeptical attitude toward alleged atrocities.	
V.	WATTERSON HAS AN ATTACK OF "GERMOPHOBIA".	51
	Watterson praises Allied valor...the Belgian commission...Atrocity stories... "Poor little Belgium"...Preparedness... Pro-German propaganda...Dr. Eliot's committee.	
VI.	<u>THE LUSITANIA AND THE BRYCE REPORT.</u>	85
	<u>The Lusitania incident</u> ...Watterson's peculiar attitude about break with Germany...Controversy over munitions on <u>Lusitania</u> ... <u>The Bryce Report</u> ...Wilson urged to action...Watterson believes atrocity stories are true... <u>The Arabic incident</u> ..."The Case Made Up."	
VII.	INTERMISSION---HE KEPT US OUT OF WAR	122
	Mexican war scare...Allied successes...Presidential campaign...Watterson's back-tracking...Watterson's impatience.	

VIII.	AMERICA GOES TO WAR	125
	Against pacifists in general...	
	Unrestricted U-boat warfare...	
	"Everything Staked and Lost"...	
	Relations severed between Germany and the United States.	
IX.	CONCLUSION	129
X.	BIBLIOGRAPHY.	134

I. INTRODUCTION

HENRY WATTLERSON AND THE WORLD WAR PROPAGANDA

I. Introduction

Henry Wickham Steed¹ says:

...since the World War, when all belligerent countries undertook it as an adjunct to their diplomatic and military operations, propaganda has come to be looked upon as mere advocacy of special interests or as an attempt to gain credence for statements partially or wholly untrue. Though this meaning was and still is, justified, it is not exhaustive...²

Mr. Steed then proceeds to outline the discrepancies of his definition. One that he fails to note, however, is the ethnological and geographical influence upon propaganda. For example, in the case of the atrocity story, the most colorful form of propaganda, which has been defined as "a conspicuous act of cruelty" with "some dramatic element involved,"³ is that which seems conspicuous and dramatic cruelty to one man necessarily going to seem so to another? Or better, perhaps, do the English and the Germans, as nations and races, regard similar acts of war in the same light?

If we are to judge strictly from the evidence accum-

-
1. Proprietor and Editor of The Review of Reviews since 1923. Editor of The Times, London, 1919-1922. Lecturer on Central European History, King's College, London University. Engaged in propaganda in enemy countries, 1918.
 2. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Fourteenth Edition, vol.18, p. 583.
 3. Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences. Article written by H. N. Brailsford.

ulated during the last two decades relative to the World War, we most certainly will have to admit that nations entertain as widely differing opinions as do individuals. Taking the same two countries, England and Germany, we find many cases where English statesmen and English editors were horrified by German "atrocities," whereas German statesmen and German editors regarded identical Allied acts as legitimate warfare. A capital illustration of this point is the story of an American correspondent in Germany, who, being on intimate terms with the German officer who headed the propaganda bureau for the General Staff, chided him for failing to exploit the execution of two German nurses by the French, under practically identical circumstances as those which led to the execution of Edith Cavell by the Germans.¹ The American asked:

"Why don't you do something to counteract the British propaganda in America?"

"Why, what do you mean?"

"Raise the devil about those nurses the French shot the other day."

"What? Protest? The French had a perfect right to shoot them!"²

-
1. Courier-Journal, November 3, 1915, p.4. Some newspapers, among them the New York Sun, defended the execution. Watterson bitterly attacked the Sun's editorial writer. "This insensate brute is equally disloyal to his country and his kind---assuming him to be a man and not an animal." Quoted by Millis, Walter, Road to War, p. 235.
 2. Lasswell, H. D., Propaganda Technique of the World War, p. 32. Viereck, George Sylvester, Spreading Germs of Hate, p. 116. Viereck, a member of the German Propaganda "Cabinet" in America, says with reference to this incident: "They (the Germans) were always logical, but never psychological."

Of course it might be well argued that this does not represent a difference of opinion so much as a difference of quality in the propaganda bureaus of the two nations. That British propaganda was far more successful in America than that of Germany there can be little doubt,¹ but the fact that England enjoyed tremendous advantages of communication must be given consideration in this regard.² The degree of hatred which German propagandists were able to muster toward England over the blockade would seem to indicate that if there had been much material for intensifying anti-British feeling in Germany over the execution of the two nurses, the opportunity would not have been wasted.

Returning then to the definition of an atrocity, it might justly be said that, while there are certain acts internationally recognized as atrocities, there are also other atrocities which are peculiar to particular nationalities. The Germans, for example, regarded England's

-
1. Viereck, Geo. S., Op. Cit., p. 136. Viereck felt that the English propaganda was successful because it was better organized, with only one man, Sir William Wiseman, in "possession of all the facts." So far as the Germans were concerned, "too many cooks spoiled their broth."
 2. Riegel, O. W., Mobilizing For Chaos, pp. 19-28.

food blockade as an atrocity.¹ England, on the other hand, objected to Germany's submarine campaign and not only was supported by her allies in branding this as an atrocity, but was subsequently joined by the United States in so labelling it.²

Accepting the "conspicuous and dramatic cruelty" definition as final, neither Germany's complaint against England nor England's against Germany can be classified as atrocities. Surely England's food blockade was not a particularly dramatic act, nor was it conspicuous to the average person not living in Germany. Nevertheless, many a German digestive tract could vouch for the fact that, in Germany, the English blockade was far from inconspicuous, and German newspaper men denounced the block-

1. Pohl, Dr. Heinrich, Amerikas Waffenausfuhr und Neutralitaet, p. 9. Dr. Pohl clearly expresses the German attitude not only toward England's food blockade but toward the United States for furnishing the Allies with munitions. "Germany," he says, "finds herself in the position of a warrior, hemmed in on all sides, whose enemies are all aiming at his heart. Every time this warrior succeeds in disarming the foe most harmful to him, a so-called neutral comes running from behind and places a new weapon in the hand of the defeated foe." Quoted by Tansill, C. C., America Goes to War, p. 62

2. Sir Edward Grey to Colonel House, April 16, 1915. "...When German submarines are sinking merchant ships and drowning non-combatant crews and passengers off our coast, public opinion is naturally indignant at the idea of goods to and from Germany." Ibid., p. 197.

ade as the most damnable atrocity of the war.¹ While it is true that the English editors devoted more time to the more dramatic types of atrocities,² they by no means neglected the German submarine campaign.³ What was far more important, they kept the cables to America clogged up with every U-boat story they could lay their hands on. It did not take the English long to realize that Americans were far more concerned with the specific American tonnage which German submarines sank, not to mention the American lives which, from time to time, went along with the tonnage, than they were with more dramatic accounts of palsied Armenians disembowelled by the Kurds, or Belgian women and girls raped by Bavarian infantrymen. This attitude does not reflect cold-bloodedness of Americans so much as an honest doubt as to the credibility of all the atrocity stories. After all, they had the signed statements of such eminent American correspondents located in the German front lines as Roger Lewis, of the Associated Press; Irvin S. Cobb,

-
1. Parmelee, Maurice, Blockade and Sea Power (N.Y. 1924), pp. 214ff. The German National Board of Health stated that the blockade was responsible for the deaths of 763,000 civilians, and the prevention of 1,000,000 births. Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 506.
 2. The Bryce Report surpassed every thing else along this line.
 3. Viereck admits that the British were successful in putting over this bit of propaganda. "German propaganda...was wrecked by German submarines." Viereck, Geo. S., Op. Cit., p. 97.

of the Saturday Evening Post and the Philadelphia Public Ledger; Harry Hansen, of the Chicago Daily News; and James O'Donnell Bennett and John T. McCutcheon of the Chicago Tribune that

After spending two weeks with...the troops... we are unable to report a single instance unprovoked. We are also unable to confirm rumors of mistreatment of prisoners or non-combatants within the German columns. This is true of Louvain, Brussels, Luneville, and Nantes....Everywhere we have seen Germans paying for purchases and respecting property rights...

...After the Battle of Biass (Berse) we found Belgian women and children moving comfortably about....Refugees with stories of atrocities were unable to supply direct evidence....To the truth of these statements we pledge our professional and personal word.¹

In the fall of 1914 it was not hard for an open-minded American to discredit some of the atrocities that came over the cables. That, of course, was before any jingoists had really gotten down to business. These latter, however, were not long in getting started.

1. Courier-Journal, September 7, 1914, p. 2, Millis says that this message "was of no use, either then or later." Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 68. Tansill, however, states that this message, "for a while" caused Americans to discredit much of the anti-German propaganda. Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 298.

II. SERAJEVO, AND SHORTLY THEREAFTER

II. SERAJEVO AND SHORTLY THEREAFTER

It is hard to believe that there existed in America during the era of the World War a man more eager to open, read, swallow, and regurgitate the anti-German propaganda that came from England than Henry Watterson of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Perhaps the events of July, 1914 came too closely after Watterson's "On to Panama" campaign. Difficulties between the Mexican government and that of the United States having reached, in the early months of 1914, the state where a division of cavalry was of far more service than a corps of diplomats, the idea occurred to Watterson that the most logical solution to the problem was the conquest and annexation of not only troublesome Mexico but the compatible Central American states as well.¹ The sudden capitulation of the Mexican government to the demands of the United States had possibly left Watterson's mind in a state of mobilization with no one to mobilize against.² Be that as it may, he lost little time in training his editorial artillery against Germany.

-
1. Courier-Journal, July 5 to July 28, 1914.
 2. The press of the nation devoted more space to the Mexican question than to the European issue at this time. See The Literary Digest from July 4 issue to July 25 issue, 1914. Also Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 4, and Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 17.

The awful significance of the Serajevo assassination did not strike Watterson instantly. His first reaction to the news of Francis Ferdinand's death was one of sympathy for the aged emperor, Franz-Joseph.¹

A hand less ruthless than that of a plotter against members of royal houses who does not hesitate at the murder of a woman,² might have spared the old emperor this last blow.³

Even two months later, when the consequences of Serajevo had become brutally apparent, Watterson continued to display a kindly attitude toward the monarch of Austria-Hungary.

As the author of the war, Emperor Francis-Joseph is being more criticized than commended just now; yet as the crowned heads of Europe are looked over, the one looming figure is the venerable but vigorous Emperor of Austria-Hungary...

He has prosecuted the duties of his elevated position with serenity of demeanor and height of purpose reflecting a possible belief upon the part of a monarch that kings are indeed divinely appointed rulers of men...

One who knows him personally has described him as an exceedingly simple, sympathetic, frank and dependable man under whose hands the paternal system of government has taken on its kindest aspect....In the words of the London Daily Chronicle, "Centuries seem to separate the Austria of today from the Austria of Metternich."⁴

-
1. This was the attitude of the American press generally. See The Literary Digest, July 18 and 25, 1914. Also Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 17.
 2. Apparently murder was murder with Watterson except in the case of a woman; then it was something more abhorrent. The Edith Cavell case is another illustration of this. See p. 2 n.
 3. The Courier-Journal, June 30, 1914.
 4. Ibid., August 2, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

The editorial from which these excerpts have been quoted marked the peak of Franz-Joseph's popularity with Watterson. Three days later, in an editorial entitled "The End of Kings and Kingcraft," he damned with faint praise Franz-Joseph and William II of Germany, and with more than faint contempt Nicholas II of Russia.

One of the trio only is entitled to honorable consideration. We may dismiss the Emperors of Russia and Austria as unworthy of serious thought. Franz-Joseph was never in his prime more than a solid, stolid and soldierly fellow apparently untainted by the foul blood of the Hapsburgs... As for Nicholas...he is beneath contempt; a victim of the accident of birth, which had better made him a fiddler than a ruler, a pastry cook than a Czar...

We turn from them, with something that resembles loathing, to William the Hohenzollern, with something that resembles admiration. Let us try to be just.¹ Although the Kaiser is a sincere believer in the Divine Right of Kings "Meinself und Gott"

he is a modern, not an archaic....His dismissal of Bismarck showed him not merely a man of his own head but a man ahead of his own time, who had learned something of the new forces at work in Germany...

He has held (the reins of government) tautly from that time to this. Conceiving the import of public opinion, he has played to it....All the while a War Lord in fact, he has stood---has at least seemed---the peacemaker, much at variance with the character and aspects he is now revealing rather unexpectedly to those who have not looked beneath the surface.²

-
1. My underscoring. Obviously a case of justice conquering prejudice.
 2. Courier-Journal, August 5, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

From the above quotation it can readily be seen that, as early as the first week of August, 1914, Watterson was well on his way toward saddling the blame for the war on the Teuton War-horse.

Lasswell says:

When the public believes that the enemy began the war and blocks a permanent, profitable and godly peace, the propagandist has achieved his purpose.¹

Watterson was one of the first and, perhaps the most prominent American newspaperman to place all the blame on the Central Powers.

Just as his first expressed attitude toward Franz-Joseph and Wilhelm had been somewhat tolerant, so in the very earliest days of the war was he hesitant about placing the blame altogether on Austria and Germany. The Courier-Journal of July 2, 1914, carried a composite picture of the Kaiser, the Czar, Franz-Joseph, the Crown Prince of Serbia, and King Peter of Serbia, and under the picture, these words:

-
1. Lasswell, H. D., Op. Cit., p. 77. Ponsonby says that "the accusation against the enemy of sole responsibility for the war is common form in every nation and in every war....It is a necessary falsehood based on a momentary biased opinion..., and it becomes the indispensable basis of all subsequent propaganda." Ponsonby, A. P., Falsehood in War-Time, p. 57.

The various rulers, whose portraits are shown above, are lending every effort to preserve peace in the terror-ridden monarchy.¹

On August 3, Watterson discussed a reply by Alexander Konta² to an editorial in the New York Tribune which described Austria as being "hot for war." Konta asserted that Serbia was a "nest of assassins" and that it was Austria's duty to clean it out. Watterson agreed with Konta:

Serbia does not deserve nationality, and Austria-Hungary may be the object of popular sympathy, without its being any less lamentable that the peace of Europe may be destroyed by the ~~aggressive~~ action of one country against another and the un-Christian and uncivilized inability of other governments to refrain from making the situation a pretext.³

On the following day, in an editorial squib, Watterson asked:

And after the slaughter, and after the blood in the trenches has mingled with the mud; after the debt, devastation, disease and death have claimed their toll, will the other monarchs say, "Franz-Joseph started it"?⁴

In the same issue, in an editorial entitled "The Devil's Work of War," Watterson made no attempt to saddle the blame on any country or coalition of countries. His

-
1. Courier-Journal, July 2, 1914, p. 4. The reader is left to guess which is the "terror-ridden" monarchy.
 2. An intimate friend of Watterson's. Watterson's autobiography, Marse Henry, is dedicated to Konta.
 3. Courier-Journal, August 3, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
 4. Ibid., August 4, 1914, p. 4.

attitude was more fatalistic than judicial.

Today behold England, Germany, and France---the last syllable of recorded civilization upon their lips---the final word of science and art---at one another's throats, as barbaric as the Middle Ages.

The world has a long way to travel before it reaches the Mount of Olives. Lo, we build a house of cards in the low country. Comes a blast from the Hell the Hapsburgs made and not a stone remains. Truly the Home of Tragedy! A race accursed of God! Was it not enough that self-slaughter¹ and the assassin had done to work the Devil's will on the Danube that a desolate old man should be left to end the drama with a conflagration sweeping across the Rhine to the Rhone and the Seine? What is Servia to England, what to France that they should bleed for her? And after all is over how shall the Balance of Power stand?²

In the very early days of the war Watterson looked upon the European conflict as a battle between equally objectionable antagonists. His impartial reasoning at the outbreak of hostilities is quite remarkable when contrasted with his extremely sadistic tirades against the Kaiser, the Fatherland, and the pro-Germans a few months later. In an editorial called "A Family Fight," he called the struggle a war of "aggrandizement with members of the same clan on the various thrones hoping

-
1. The first Crown Prince committed suicide, reputedly on account of a frustrated love-affair.
 2. Courier-Journal, August 4, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

for advantage at the expense of the others."¹

And on the same day that the above was printed, the British severed the cable connecting Germany with America.² In less than a week Watterson had found Germany guilty on all counts and was preparing to sentence the Kaiser to hell. His editorials became vitriolic overnight. Henceforth, Germans, hyphenated or otherwise, were to receive an abundance of attention, but very little sympathetic consideration from the editor of the Courier-Journal.

-
1. Courier-Journal, August 5, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
"The war came to Europe as illness comes to a man of advancing years and weakened constitution, a disaster native to the system." Slosson, Preston William, The Great Crusade and After, p. 1.
 2. Courier-Journal, August 6, 1914, p. 1.

III. WATTERSON SURRENDERS HIS NEUTRALITY

III. WATTERSON SURRENDERS HIS NEUTRALITY

In spite of the fact that on August 6, 1914, Watterson cautioned the public that the severance of the cable on the previous day "virtually completes the isolation of Germany with the outside world " and that "hereafter all news of happenings in Germany will have to filter through hostile countries," his attitude toward the Central Powers rapidly assumed more belligerent proportions.¹

Riegel has pointed out that

The strategic importance of the international cable connections and their susceptibility to propaganda uses were clearly demonstrated during the World War....Great Britain was able to isolate the Central Powers so completely from Communication with the outside world that a virtual cultural blockade was clamped down.²

-
1. Courier-Journal, August 6, 1914, p. 4, Editorial. In all fairness to Watterson it should be mentioned that others whose fingers were deeper in the pie, underwent the same change. Theodore Roosevelt, writing in The Outlook, congratulated the country on the geographical location which insured its neutrality. Ambassador to Great Britain, Walter Hines Page who, a few months later, insisted that the United States break off relations with Germany, wrote to Colonel House on August 29, 1914, saying "what a magnificent spectacle our country presents! We escape murder, we escape brutalization; we will have to settle it; we gain in every way." Even Cecil Spring Rice, the British ambassador to America, wrote to Col. House on September 12, 1914, "I hope and believe that at any rate one part of the world will keep out of it." Seymour, Charles. Editor, The Intimate Papers of Colonel House. Vol. I, p. 286.
 2. Riegel, O. W., Mobilizing for Chaos, pp. 23-24.

Watterson's rapid about-face, following so soon after such sound advice, lends practical substantiation to Riegel's contention. On August 7 he issued another warning that it was unwise to accept as absolute truth the news of the heroic Belgian resistance, reminding the reader that all dispatches had, so far, emanated from only British and French sources.¹ And yet, only two days later, in reply to Germany's protest that America does not receive unbiased accounts of the war (especially the war in Belgium²), Watterson argued that Germany was as much to blame as anyone for prohibiting newspapermen from working freely, and the tone of his argument implied that she was more to blame than anyone else. "It will hardly profit Germany to blame the newspapers if the world gets news unfavorable to her military glory."³

-
1. Courier-Journal, August 7, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. The Kaiser, on September 7, 1914, in a personal message to President Wilson, said, in defense of repressive measures applied by Germans at Louvain, "My heart bleeds when I see that such measures have become unavoidable", but contends that the atrocious behavior of Belgian civilians necessitated such action. Millis, W., Op. Cit., p. 69.
 3. Another point to be considered here is the fact that "no American correspondents were allowed upon the Allied front....From September (1914) the New York Times, Tribune and World regularly bought the advance proofs of the London Chronicle, Morning Post, and Daily Telegraph, using this material in their own news columns and syndicating it throughout the United States." Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 63.

Of course he either missed or ignored Germany's point--- the cable. Furthermore, in the next paragraph, he came forth in the colors which he was to wear for the remainder of the war.

Germany can hardly reasonably expect the press to see in the present struggle anything greatly creditable to the German arms.¹

And yet on August 22, discussing a protest from Paris over alleged German atrocities², Watterson again displays tolerance toward Germany.

Here in America we know the Germans, and Americans will be slower than others to believe that even if atrocities have been committed by excited soldiers, there is any intention upon the part of the German Government to violate the provisions of the Hague Convention....But in England and France and Russia everyone will be ready to believe anything that is derogatory to the German character and German civilization.³

Lasswell explains that,

It is always difficult for many simple minds inside a nation to attach personal traits to so dispersed an entity as a whole nation. They need to have some individual on whom to pin their hate. It is, therefore, important to single out a handful of enemy leaders and load them with the whole decalogue of sins.⁴

1. Courier-Journal, August 9, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

2. Ibid., August 21, 1914, p. 2.

3. Ibid., August 22, 1914, p. 4, Editorial. As a matter of fact, Americans were anything but slow about crediting the atrocity stories, but compared to Watterson, most of them were left at the post. Viereck says, "our extreme pro-Allies harbored war resentments longer than the French and the English," and it would seem that they were as quick to feel resentment. Viereck, G.S., Op. Cit., p. 27.

4. Lasswell, H.D., Op. Cit., p. 89.

Watterson was quick to feel this need and equally as quick to single out the necessary individual---the Kaiser. From the first week of August, 1914, on, the Czar and Franz-Joseph began gradually to fade out of Watterson's picture and, henceforth, his vitriol was reserved almost exclusively for Wilhelm. His attacks became so violent that on August 29, in an editorial called "The Whys and the Wherefores," he felt it necessary to defend himself against the criticism of a Mr. William J. H. Boetcher of Toledo, Ohio, who had written on August 26, complaining of the unfairness of the American press towards the Teutons. Watterson said that because he was a German, Boetcher could see but a single side of the issue; that anyone who had read the White Papers of England and Germany could see that Germany was solely to blame. England had obviously done her utmost to prevent war. If the Kaiser had been a great man, Marse Henry thought he would have forced Austria "to come down a peg or two, in the matter of Servia."¹ And speaking of Austria, "she was resolved on war, and on her rests the fullest measure of responsibility for the awful calamity."² Watterson then proceeded to sum up the guilt of the Central Powers in a nut-shell.

-
1. Three weeks earlier he had agreed with Austria that Servia was a "nest of assassins" and should be wiped out. See p. 11.
 2. Three weeks earlier he had ridiculed this idea. See p. 11.

With the events that followed Austria's declaration of war, the mobilization, Germany's demands upon Russia and France, her attempts to persuade or bribe England to keep out of the war, the attempts of some powers to put the blame upon others, and the refusal of Sir Edward Grey to make any war-like commitment on the part of England until Belgium's invasion, the invasion of Belgium and the immortal stand of the Belgians, all these things have united the American people against the Kaiser.

In concluding this long editorial, Watterson threw a sop to the pro-Germans and the real neutrals by asserting that none of the foregoing implied any kind of "sympathy for Russia, or sympathetic alliance with England or France. It means neutrality until the war is over."¹

A dispatch from St. Petersburg two days later, backed up this editorial. It stated that

Great Britain is making a final effort to find a formula acceptable to the antagonists, but there is little hope of success...owing to Germany's attitude.²

On September 1, Watterson continued his program of proving Germany's sole responsibility. He stated that the Courier-Journal had already³ published Germany's argument and it was therefore only fair to give "The British End of It." This came from the pen of F. E. Smith, M. P. and Privy Counsellor. Watterson stated that it was impossible in comparing the two arguments to

...escape the impression that the one writer stands for the arrogance of Absolutism and the other for the reasonableness of popular govern-

1. Courier-Journal, August 29, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

2. Ibid., August 31, 1914, p. 1.

3. This was the letter from W. J. H. Boetcher of Toledo, Ohio, appearing in the August 29 issue, p. 4, See p. 17 above.

ment. That is why the native¹people of the United States are to a man against the Kaiser and Arbitrary Power.²

The article referred to appeared on the same page under the heading "The British End of It, How England Was Forced Into War And Why There Was No Alternative."³

Although Watterson continued to call the war "The War of the Kaisers," another editorial of September 1 clearly shows that the responsibility for the conflict was, in his mind, no longer plural.

The Courier-Journal...conceives the War of the Kaisers to be the assertion of Arbitrary Power against Popular Government, and holding the German Autocrat and German Autocracy most responsible for this, its opinions go with its sympathies to those who---whatever their composite character and in the case of Russia their questionable companionship---are yet fighting the battle of Liberty against Despotism.

Waxing warmer, he continued with a denunciation of those German-Americans who persisted in defending the Kaiser and the Vaterland.

No man can uphold him and remain a good American...No man can uphold him and be a good German. He is no more entitled to the support of the German people than Louis Napoleon was entitled to the support of the French people...

...We may dismiss the question "who began it"

-
1. My underscoring. A rap at the "Hyphenated Americans."
 2. Courier-Journal, September 1, 1914, P. 4, Editorial.
 3. Ibid.

as now of secondary import. Austria began it.¹ But, all along...Germany...has refused every question of disarmament. Assuredly the German Kaiser could have held the Austrian Kaiser in restraint.²

Then, apparently losing all control of himself, Watterson accused the German Militarist³ of ideas of world conquest. The Germans hated England as a sea power; France as a historic and racial enemy. "But they hate us also because we are Republicans and they have by no means left us out of the contemplation of their ambitions." Quoting from the English translation of General von Edelsheim's⁴ paper, Operationen eber See, which only two days earlier he had regarded as merely "interesting,"⁵ he offered it as conclusive evidence of Germany's plan of world conquest. He recommended this translation to all German-Americans and especially to Herman Ridder⁶, publisher of the New York Die Staats-Zeitung.

1. See pp. 11 and 12 above for previous statements of Watterson which this contradicts.
2. Colonel House had somewhat the same opinion. House, however, was certain that the Kaiser did not want war, but had foolishly permitted Austria to make exorbitant demands on Servia on the assumption that England could not be stirred to war by any controversy in the southeast of Europe and that Russia and France would not fight without England's aid. "He went so far in what might be termed "bluff", that it was impossible for him at the last moment to recede, because the situation had gotten beyond him." Seymour, Charles. Editor, The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, vol. 1, p. 281.
3. "Militariat" is apparently one of Watterson's coined words.
4. A member of the Prussian General Staff.
5. Courier-Journal, August 30, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
6. A pet hate of Watterson's among the German-Americans.

We should like to know where he and they will stand...when (having conquered Europe) the Emperor of Europe, still unsated, sends his fleets and armies to kill our people and burn our cities because of our attacks on Germany.

In concluding this lengthy editorial, Watterson said that "already the Kaiser's War has inflicted serious losses upon us. First and foremost, our export and import trade has been shot to pieces." This is one of the strangest of the many oblique conclusions that he was to arrive at. At this stage of affairs the only interference with our trade had been at the hands of the British. Germany, far from being guilty of shooting our trade to pieces, was as loud as America in her protests to the British---was, in fact, howling for, and in dire need of some of the "pieces."¹

For the next ten months Watterson gave his readers regular doses of anti-Kaiser editorials. On September 3, in one entitled "Hapsburg and Hohenzollern," commenting on Franz-Joseph's bestowal upon Wilhelm of the Grand Cross of Maria Theresa, he said:

...The Hohenzollerns are so-called because they once lived upon a high hill. They have ridden a high horse for a long time. The Hapsburgs are so-called because their first castle was called "Hawk's Castle" or "Hawk's Nest".... Both the stronghold on Zollern Hill and that upon

1. Tansill shows that our export trade increased by tremendous leaps with each year of the war, particularly with reference to metals, munitions, and grain. See Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., pp. 115 ff.

the Wupelsburg...were feudal establishments from which the proprietors looked down upon the common people and their rights with contempt. In both establishments the theory of getting on in the world was based upon the philosophy similar to that of a Spanish duke of a later period who observed...that there was no difference of intelligent opinion as to the "people" being an ass, but many disputes and conflicts about who should occupy the saddle...

Is it surprising that the two men should decorate each other? Would it be surprising if each should pin a decoration, or a rose, upon himself? Is it surprising that a Hapsburg believes that his house is in partnership with heaven, or that a Hohenzollern believes that he walks with God.

The final words of this editorial are quoted by Millis:¹

May Heaven protect the Vaterland from contamination and give the German people a chance! To hell with the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs!²

Continuing, Millis says:

From this day forward Marse Henry "in the face of attack, abuse and deprecation"...stuck to his task of educating the whole world "to the belief that the military ideals and the conception of Kultur as personified in the Hohenzollern and Hapsburg dynasties could not exist on the same planet with the American conception of liberty."

The September 3 issue of the Courier-Journal also carried another editorial which, by its very title, "The Hohenzollern Is Doomed," relieved the tension on the Hapsburg and increased it upon Wilhelm. Watterson asserted that though to all appearances Germany was winning the war, she was, in reality, losing it. England and

1. Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., pp. 67-68.

2. Courier-Journal, September 3, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

France had just begun to fight, whereas Germany had shot her bolt. He said that the Kaiser underestimated France's powers of resistance and gave Belgium no consideration at all. In conclusion he said:

...The Hohenzollern is doomed. Even if his troops should occupy Paris he is doomed. But the likelihood is that the Russians will be in Berlin before the Germans get into Paris, with Wilhelm of Hohenzollern a prisoner-of-war as was Louis Napoleon, and the people of Prussia, of Hanover, of Bavaria, and of Wurttemberg free to establish whatever national autonomies they please, to establish as were the French after Sedan.¹

On September 7, in another edition of "The War of the Kaisers," in answering Herman Ridder's complaint about his use of the term "the Kaiser's war," Watterson asserted that he had always used the accusative plural rather than the possessive singular although it was his belief that Wilhelm was more to blame than "the doddering Old Man of Vienna and the measly little wretch of Petrograd." In a manner remarkable for its intolerance, he continued:

...The German writers in America chatter about civilization. They dare to talk of German civilization...They, too, are mad.

Instead of whooping up the hordes of death in Europe and hurling anathemas at their neighbors in the United States, the Germans of America should be down on their knees asking God to have mercy upon the wives, the mothers and the children of the Fatherland.

...All that happened to Napoleon the Great and Napoleon the Little---and maybe worse---

1. Courier-Journal, September 3, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

is about to happen to Wilhelm the Destroyer. Then, perhaps, the Social Democrats...rising from the ashes of the ruin he has made...may be able... to establish order and ordain Free Government, the Militarist and all its works and ways gone to Hell where they belong. Yea, and with the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs, and the Romanoffs.¹

On September 9, Watterson discussed the American policy of neutrality which had, so he said, his whole-hearted endorsement. He admitted that American sentiment was anti-Austro-German but contended that it was so only because it was anti-absolutism. He was astounded at the loyalty of the Germans in America for the Tyrant back home. They left Germany to better themselves, many to escape military service.²

Across the waters they have seen their less fortunate brothers precipitated into a war of invasion without the opportunity to utter a word of dissent---caught by the Berlin militarist like flies and served as food for powder--- literally slaughtered to make a Hapsburg and a Hohenzollern holiday...

...Just now it happens that the German Kaiser's voice is loudest (in his claims of divine right), his autocracy most assertive, his methods deadliest and cruelest...Today, therefore, it is the Hohenzollern. Tomorrow, the Hapsburg. The day after, the Romanoff.³ Ever and always, to Hell with the whole ship's crew of them and the bottom of the sea to the ship!

-
1. Courier-Journal, September 7, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. Newton D. Baker also felt that "American public opinion at the time the World War began already had a very definite conception of the German theory of life and generally disapproved it...That the people of the United States shrink from contemplating the consequences of German Victory is true." Why We Went to War p. 20.
 3. It is interesting to note that for the past few days, "the Hapsburg and the Romanoff" have been included as an after-thought.

But, the people---the poor, deluded, slaughtered people---the women and children---what of them? Truly the life of one little fair-haired German child were worth all the glory of Berlin, Vienna, and Petrograd combined. The people! What cares Hugo Munsterberg¹ for the people? He has pleasant, aristocratic personal relations with the German Kaiser. The people! the people! What cares Herman Ridder for the people? It was he who royally entertained the Kaiser's brother when he came to New York and was in turn royally entertained by the Kaiser when he went to Berlin. Yet because the Courier-Journal will not bow down and worship the War Lord of Germany we are charged with hostility to the German People, to German culture, to German civilization, science and art.²

It is a lie....This is not a war of the German people. It is the War of the Kaisers waged for glory and conquest, for absolutism and arbitrary power.³

In equal proportion to his rapidly developing credulity toward all pro-Ally propaganda was Watterson's absolute refusal to accredit not only all pro-German propaganda but also any denial or defense of an alleged atrocious act.⁴ In discussing a German report that the discovery

-
1. Hugo Munsterberg was a German-American psychologist and philosopher. He was in charge of the psychological laboratory at Harvard from 1892 to 1895. A few years later he became the head of the department of philosophy at Harvard. He was the exchange professor from Harvard at the University of Berlin in 1910 and 1911. He became professor of philosophy at Radcliffe College in 1912, where he remained until his death in 1916. He was one of the leading German sympathizers in America.
 2. And why shouldn't the Courier-Journal be so indicted. Can it be possible that Watterson had so soon forgotten the editorial of September 7? See p. 23 above.
 3. Courier-Journal, September 9, 1914, p. 4. Editorial.
 4. Perhaps Sir Gilbert Parker was not exaggerating when he said: "I was responsible for American publicity." Billis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 63.

of documents in Belgian archives proved that England planned to land an army in Belgium before Germany had even contemplated an invasion, and hence, such a thing as Belgian neutrality had never existed,¹ Watterson said:

All these things are lies out of the whole cloth, characteristic not only of the Militarist System and methods of Berlin, but of the pro-German propaganda in the United States.

Henceforward let him be called the Accursed Kaiser---Wilhelm the Damned---who, like the devil and Bonaparte before him, will live immortal as the father of lies and lying, his agents in the field and in the counsel of the same murderous and bloody kidney.

Let them enjoy while they may the riot of vandalism---the orgy of butchery---the dance of death, they have imposed upon Europe, but especially on the little brave land of Belgium, even whose good name they would assassinate; but their doom is before them; they await their Waterloo! when the word will ring around the universe, "To Hell with the Hapsburg and the Hohenzollern."²

An editorial which appeared on October 17 is significant in that the Romanoff was excluded for the first time, in a diatribe against autocrats. Toward Franz-Joseph, whom, less than three months previously he had regarded as "an exceedingly simple, sympathetic, frank, and dependable man,"³ Watterson was almost as violent as he was toward Wilhelm.

-
1. Ponsonby has pointed out that the French had planned, as early as 1910, to violate Belgian neutrality. Whether this is what the German report had in mind or whether the Germans were just making a wild guess has not been ascertained. The French plan is thoroughly outlined in Ponsonby, A.P., Op. Cit., 53-54.
 2. Courier-Journal, October 15, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
 3. See p. 8 above.

The Austrian Emperor is a cold-blooded gentleman who has never done a generous thing nor uttered an unheroic word in all his tragic reign... He allowed unspeakable cruelties to be inflicted upon the Hungarians---flogging of women, the butchery of civilians, the wholesale execution of brave and patriotic soldiers---when a word from his lips could have spared infinite brutality and wrong.

He was called in those days the "Child of the Gallows" and the best that has been said of him is that he has been "The sane champion of a mad family."

Wilhelm possesses the cold, gentleman-like brutality of nature...He has an unfeeling son. He has been a most heartless, crafty and power-seeking sovereign. The woes of the brave Belgians appeal to him no more than the woes of the brave Hungarians appealed to his unfeeling brother.¹

In fancy we may see Belgium, that stricken mother of murdered heroes, starvation in her eyes, her rags about her, standing upon the edge of Artemis---of that glorious forest that witnessed the loves of Orlando and Rosalind---exclaim to the Accursed of the Kaisers---this Wilhelm the Damned ---in the words of Thelma, the Persian,

"May yon wood deny thee shelter, Earth a home, the grave a resting place. For thee and thine alone the deeps of hell!"²

On October 26, in the "Degenerate," Watterson again subjected Wilhelm to a literary comparison, equally disadvantageous. This time it was not Shakespeare, but Ibsen.

-
1. And yet, on September 7, 1914, the Kaiser had despatched a personal message to Woodrow Wilson in which he said: "My heart bleeds...when I think of the numerous people (in Belgium) who lose their home and property." Quoted by Millis, Walter, *Op. Cit.*, p. 69.
 2. Courier-Journal, October 17, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

How insignificant the figure of Oswald Alving sitting in an arm-chair tonelessly demanding of Mrs. Alving "Give me the sun, mother." How significant the figure of Wilhelm II possessed of the power of life and death over millions of clean-lived clean-bodied men and women, riding at the head of the greatest army the world has seen, tricked out in the glittering theatric panoply of war, asking his clan through the voices of 50 c.m. guns: "Give me my place in the sun, cousins, Give me my place in the sun."¹

That he was not the only person who regarded the Kaiser with averted nostrils Watterson was ever eager to display.² On November 10 a letter appeared on the editorial page, under the Wattersonian title "Wilhelm the Damned." It was addressed to the Courier-Journal by a Mr. J. J. Conway from Paris.

There are monuments enough to Wilhelm II's barbarity to merit for him and his universal execration. His name so stinks in humanity's nostrils that the intellectuals of the world have ransacked their lexicons to find terms of opprobrium to heap upon him. His savage soul, hidden under the varnish of a false civilization, is responsible for the most appalling slaughter the world has ever witnessed. The blood of women and children and old people and non-combatants and wounded and members of the Red Cross is at his door, and cries to heaven for vengeance. As an incendiary he has covered himself with immortal infamy. As a ruler he has won for his people the foul Turkish title "The Unspeakable German." As protector of civilization he has left us the sack of Louvain, the destruction of its priceless library, and he has crowned his work as

-
1. Courier-Journal, October 26, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. The Literary Digest in its October and November, 1914 issues shows clearly that the American press generally was anti-German.

civilizer-in-chief with the ruins of that Thirteenth Century gem, the Cathedral of Rheims. It is commonplace to say that the exploits of Hun and Vandal are tame by comparison with Attila II. Nor do representatives of twenty centuries of Christianity forget the foul blow dealt by this student of the Sacred Scripture when he teaches such immorality as that international agreements impose no obligations.¹

In contrast with Watterson's attitude toward the Kaiser it might be well to regard that of Colonel House who had talked to Wilhelm on June 1 of the same year. House found that "he had all the versatility of Roosevelt with something more of charm, something less of force." His English was faultless and "though he talked with considerable force, he was obviously too much of a gentleman to monopolize the conversation. He had a clear idea of what he wished to say and said it without any hesitancy."²

It is safe to say that Watterson was more than mildly successful in his efforts to educate the public to the wickedness and culpability of the Kaiser and his friends. That the Germans of Louisville were worked up to a feverish pitch is certain. In one instance, an Italian organ-grinder with his "monk," his machine, and his hopes, arrived at Clay and Camp Streets, in the heart of the section known as Germantown. Either ignorant of, indifferent to, or forgetful of the sources or themes of

-
1. Courier-Journal, November 10, 1914, p.4, Editorial.
 2. Seymour, Charles, Editor, The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, vol. 1, p. 254.

his repertoire, or else, unaware of the abundance of Teutonic blood in the neighborhood, the Italian began, with the utmost complacency, to grind out "The Marseillaise." Doors and windows on all sides became the oversized frames for curious and angry faces. Before the man had time to realize the unpopularity of his performance, he was pounced upon and his instrument permanently silenced. Extracting himself from the kindling that had been his hurdy-gurdy and "uttering a curse in his native tongue---he seized his monk and fled."¹

There is ample evidence that Watterson's attitude was equally as distasteful to German-Americans in other sections of the country as to those in his own community. Herman Ridder was a prominent target in most of Watterson's attacks on the Hyphenated-Americans. Ridder wrote to Watterson, complaining about the abuse which the latter was heaping upon him and wondering whether the editor of the Louisville paper favored freedom of the press. He argued that if it were right for Watterson to present the Entente point of view, it could not be wrong for him (Ridder) to present the German. In reply, Watterson said:

The urgent danger comes from Berlin and Vienna, not from St. Petersburg. We can settle with

1. Courier-Journal, August 7, 1914, p. 5.

Russia when France, Belgium, Holland, Italy and Switzerland have been rescued from the destruction that menaces them. If Germany wins, they are lost.¹

The same edition of the Courier-Journal carried the letter of a Louisville German-American, Oskar Metzger, which attacked Watterson as the editor of an "English inspired paper." He said that Watterson asserted "We Americans like the German people...but...not...the... Government." This, Metzger maintained, was comparable to telling a man, "I like your flesh and your skin, but I do not like your bones. They are rotten."²

On the next day, Watterson admitted that his office had become flooded with letters from the German-Americans protesting against his attitude. He defended his position by using the very terms to which Metzger had objected---he loved the people but detested the government of Germany. In closing, Watterson reminded the pro-German element that it had no reason to complain because his attitude had been a very liberal one.³

The German Volksblatt of Cincinnati, in a published article, asked Watterson which he thought better, a Russian civilization or a German one. It defended the Kaiser and contended that he had exhausted himself in

1. Courier-Journal, Sept. 2, 1914, p. 4, Editorial

2. Ibid.

3. Courier-Journal, September 5, 1914, p. 5, Editorial.

his attentions to the French.¹ This article was translated, printed and discussed in the Courier-Journal.

Watterson said:

...The facts are at variance with every line and word...The Kaiser's telegram to Paul Kruger before the outbreak of the Boer War has not yet been forgotten.² It was part of the campaign of provocation which culminated in the ultimate publication by members of the Imperial General Staff of detailed plans for the conquest of England...These likewise included plans for the conquest of the United States.³

...The Kaiser could have averted the war, instead, he forced it.⁴ The English did not want war. Neither did the French.⁵

Probably the most outstanding indication of the reaction of the German-Americans of Louisville to the policy of Watterson was the holding of a mass-meeting of the Louisville chapter of the German-American Alliance to protest formally against the anti-German editorials appearing in the Courier-Journal.⁶ Except for an occa-

-
1. Viereck, George S., in his latest book, The Kaiser on Trial (p. 19), prints a telegram, allegedly sent by the Kaiser to King George V. on August 1, 1914, promising not to mobilize against France if England would not allow France to "become jumpy".
 2. The Kaiser had wired congratulations to Kruger (dictator-president of Transvaal) on repelling a popular insurrection. This resulted in strained relations with the British.
 3. This refers to von Edelsheim's paper already mentioned on p. 20.
 4. On his first "peace trip" Colonel House found no one save Germany who was willing even to discuss peace terms. Seymour, Chas. Ed., Op. Cit., vol. I, p. 370. Tansill comes to the same conclusion. Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 446 ff. Sir Edward Grey said: "If matters had rested with him (the Kaiser) there would have been no European War arising out of the Austro-Serbian dispute." Twenty-Five Years, vol. II p. 25.
 5. Courier-Journal, September 6, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
 6. Ibid., October 1, 1914, p. 5.

sional editorial which attempted in a rather absurd manner to convince the German-Americans that he was really trying to help them by pointing out the "proper" American point of view, neither mass-meeting nor protesting letters could seriously affect Watterson. Impetuosity had charted the course which he was steering and had set the controls. Watterson was not the type of pilot that stops and seeks further instructions. Besides, impetuosity had always done him good service.¹

It is not surprising, therefore, that he should brazenly publish the following just (though undignified) indictment of his editorial policy:

My dear Sir:

Are you really sane? Do you have all of your faculties? Has there not been a case of lunacy in your family tree within the latter generations? Could you really be trusted to drive a flock of geese to water? Your article, produced in Sunday's (Cincinnati) Enquirer, would cause your own mother to doubt your mental condition. Should you have a few sane moments, kindly set yourself a-thinking and answer the following simple problem.

-
1. In 1909 Watterson made a wager with Joseph Pulitzer of the New York World. The stakes were a dinner for twenty-four persons, the World and the Courier-Journal each inviting twelve guests with the Chief Justice, the Vice-President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives serving as ex-officio guests. "The proposition to be that Taft and Roosevelt are at daggers points" before the Presidential election of 1912, by the Courier-Journal in the affirmative, the World in the negative.
Courier-Journal, November 22, 1909, p. 4, Editorial.

The writer then proposed a suppositious war between the United States and Great Britain. Germany, a neutral, was furnishing arms to Canada on English vessels. The United States warned Germans against travelling on these ships. Germans ignored the warning. Would the United States refuse to blow up this ship if she could? The letter continued:

A nation which would furnish war material to kill Americans is not worth American consideration. You do not expect Germans to think different...¹

Watterson's answer was extremely patronizing. He commented on the excited state of mind of the writer which prevented him and "all other pro-Germans" from recognizing the true facts of the case:

...that our arms-makers would as gladly sell to Germany as to England and France, and that it is no fault of theirs that the Germans do not and cannot buy of them for the reason that they have not the means of transportation.²

1. Amos Verder to the Courier-Journal, May 22, 1915, p. 4.

2. Verder was not the only one in America who was entertaining this idea of an arms embargo. On August 15 of the same year, President Wilson wrote to Secretary Lansing who had been pursuing a policy of trading with "those who can come to port": "Are we not ourselves about to urge the control of the manufacture of arms and munitions by every government in our proposed understandings and undertakings with the Latin-American countries; and do we not wish ultimately to strive for the same thing in the final European settlement?"

"...How far, do you think, the arguments we urge in this paper will estop us in future deliberations on the peace and security of the world?" Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., pp. 58-59.

...His suppositious case is at once foolish and farfetched. But he is too angry to see except through glasses alternately green, red, and yellow.¹

Watterson was now thoroughly enjoying himself and would brook no interference with his present excursion. When the New York Sun tried to slow him down a bit by accusing him of using inflammatory language, Watterson side-swiped the Sun with an editorial entitled "The Situation" and continued to run full steam ahead.

His answer to the Sun was devoted chiefly to a denunciation of the German Americans. He said that the program of the German propagandists in America was designed "to set up a Trojan Horse filled with Kaiser-Americans ready for action." The German press "has uttered nothing but treason whilst fomenting sedition." This editorial, incidentally, written a few weeks after the Lusitania disaster, contained Watterson's first call to arms. With more than a little perspicacity he foresaw that "the Kaiser cannot forego and will not forego his murderous submarine"² and that consequently "other

1. Courier-Journal, May 22, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

2. Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 230 says: The whole question of submarine warfare had greatly perturbed the Kaiser from the very outbreak of the World War, for its implications violated his deep-seated convictions in favor of the rights of private property on the high seas. He was also opposed to any type of warfare that menaced the lives of non-combatants, and in the autumn of 1914 he had voiced his strong objections to any program that would affect the lives of "women and children."

Iusitania's are bound to arrive at the bottom of the sea, and if we are to declare a state of war the sooner we issue the decree the better."¹

A few months later Watterson gave the New York Sun and anyone else who might be interested a real dose of inflammatory rhetoric. This editorial, entitled "The Activities of Alien Traitors," was devoted to a thorough denunciation of Bernstorff,² Viereck, and Boy-Ed.³ The incident which provoked Watterson's tirade was the publication in the New York World on August 15 of some of the manuscripts found in Dr. Albert's portfolio.⁴ In this

-
1. Courier-Journal, June 4, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. German ambassador to the United States.
 3. Naval Attaché of the German Embassy.
 4. Dr. Heinrich Albert was a member of the German propaganda "Cabinet" in America. He fell asleep on a street-car in New York. He awoke as the car stopped at his station. Dashing up, he had reached the platform when he remembered his portfolio. Returning to his seat, he found the bag missing and, looking up, saw a man (Mr. Frank Burke of the U.S. Secret Service) leaving the car with the portfolio under his arm. Dr. Albert gave chase but unsuccessfully. Burke turned the portfolio over to Mr. McAdoo, Secretary of State, who subsequently gave the "scoop" to the World. See Viereck, Geo. S., Op. Cit., p. 68 ff., and Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., pp. 356-357. In connection with the above, Viereck says that "the Germans were unable to keep anything for themselves. Every memorandum they ever had seems to have fallen into the hands of the British Secret Service or the Department of Justice. Some of the propagandists were in the habit of keeping diaries. All of them kept portfolios...These were minor misfortunes. They rocked the boat but did not destroy it. The German propaganda craft was wrecked by German torpedoes." Op. Cit., p. 59.

editorial, Watterson, for the first time, became critical of President Wilson. Contending that Bernstorff should be sent home and Boy-Ed imprisoned, he exclaimed,

...Heavens, haven't we told the German Government enough already? Has it not treated us with sufficient contumely and disdain? How can we make ourselves more emphatic unless we kick these incendiaries out? What more of proof do we need against the emissary Viereck? Why should not the known leaders of the Kaiser reservists be sent either back to Germany...or hurled into camps of detention? Appeals to the Kaiser? To hell with the Kaiser!²

A few weeks after the above appeared in the Courier-Journal, Watterson took another editorial thrust at the German-American Alliance. This one, "The Irrational Teuton and His Dual Allegiance," declared open war on the Alliance.

There is billed to meet in this town today an association which describes itself as the German American Alliance of the State of Kentucky, but which were more accurately entitled the Kentucky Branch of the National Encampment of Kaiser-Reservists in the United States.

To what may we owe the very equivocal honor of this visitation? Are the members called here to arrange for a Civil War---with which the viper German-American press in the pay of Berlin threatens us, in the event of the now

-
1. "The publication of the Albert papers was a German catastrophe...The stamp of propaganda was fastened upon the Germans." Op. Cit., p. 72, Viereck, G.S. "There was nothing in these documents that would incriminate any German agents so that legal action could be taken against them." Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 357.
 2. Courier-Journal, August 19, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

happily averted war with Germany¹---or do they come to organize a movement to defeat the re-election of Wilson next year? In either case are they not a little out of tune with prudence and ahead of time?²

Watterson said that the Courier-Journal had been very patient and tolerant toward the German-American Alliance of Louisville, warning the members from time to time that they were steering a dangerous course. Maintaining that the Alliance has thumbbed its nose at the Courier-Journal, he assured it that if it really wanted a fight, his paper was more than ready to take up the issue.

In other words, Watterson was warning the Alliance to "Take it" quietly or he would really give it something to cry about.

1. My underscoring. Can Watterson be serious here?

2. Courier-Journal, September, 15, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

IV. THE SUBMARINE AND THE AIRPLANE

IV. THE SUBMARINE AND THE AIRPLANE

Many men, at various times, have expressed preferences for certain types of death-dealing blows. Watterson is the first man I have ever heard of who was equally concerned with the direction from which death approached. Marse Henry definitely preferred for death to come along a horizontal plane. The idea of a bomb falling from the heavens or erupting from the bowels of the sea and destroying human beings impressed him as the height of atrocities. The death of two or three thousand men through the agency of the rifle, the hand-grenade, the machine-gun, and the Big Bertha went practically unnoticed by him if, on the same day, an aviator dropped a bomb which killed two or three farmers or a submarine destroyed a fishing smack and its handful of occupants. Of course, one has to admit that there is some difference between combatants and non-combatants, but Watterson went farther than that. He seems definitely to have felt that there was something inherently sinful about war which was not confined to terra firma. He wanted war on the good old established plan. He missed "the medieval grace of iron clothing."

The first account of an air-raid which goaded Watterson to action appeared on September 3, 1914. A maternity hospital at Belgrade was reported to have been

destroyed, killing a hundred children.¹ On the next day, in an editorial called "The Vandals," Watterson severely censured the Germans for the bombing of Antwerp and Paris from Zeppelins. Expressing only a slight doubt as to the veracity of the report, he said that it was only "what may be expected whenever airships throw bombs into cities from an elevation of 3,000 or 4,000 feet."

...It is not warfare of any kind. It is premeditated murder...It is vandalism which cares not at all what monuments of civilization it destroys...

Watterson went on to say that he would not be surprised to hear within the next few days that the Louvre had been blown up.²

The same issue of the Courier-Journal also carried an "official" account of the air-raid on Antwerp. The German aviators, allegedly dropped bombs in the vicinity of hospitals flying the Red Cross and furthermore,

An examination of the bombs thrown showed that they had a thin double covering, the two covers being joined together with mushroom shaped rivets, which act the part of bullets and are liable to cause terrible injury when the covers are burst by the explosion...³

-
1. Courier-Journal, September 3, 1914. From Paris to New York, via London. p. 2.
 2. Courier-Journal, Sept. 4, 1914. p. 4, Editorial.
 3. Ibid. p. 1, From Antwerp (via London)

A dispatch from Paris describing the bombing of that city from an airplane appeared in the Courier-Journal on September 28.¹ According to the dispatch, a man was decapitated and a child crippled by the explosion. A few days later, Watterson, in reference to the above said:

Old Franz-Joseph, who is more or less responsible for the inauguration of war, should decorate the courageous German aviator who maimed little Mlle. Cartier and destroyed her doll by dropping an infernal machine from an airship over Paris.²

In another editorial reference to the same incident Watterson asked whether it would be any more murderous for the United States to take Ambassador von Bernstorff to the top of Washington monument and push him off, than for the Kaiser to kill Ambassador Herrick by dropping a bomb on the American Embassy at Paris. Watterson said that heretofore

...we have called it the war of the Kaisers. But it is not war. It is the Dance of Death after the Banquet of Murder.
...Let us call it the Devil's own.³

Accounts of German air-raids became so numerous that Watterson was unable to keep up with them in his editorials. For example, the front page news on October 12, that German planes had dropped twenty bombs on Paris,

-
1. Courier-Journal, Sept. 28, 1914, p. 1, col. 4.
 2. Ibid., October 3, 1914. p. 4, editorial.
 3. Courier-Journal, Sept. 29, 1914. p. 6, Editorial.

killing four civilians and wounding twenty more, fourteen of whom were women and girls, got by the editorial page without comment.¹ A dispatch from London² about the bombardment of Dover provoked only a slight editorial squib from Watterson.

If the German attack on women and children of the English coast cities does not stimulate recruiting sufficiently to satisfy Kitchner³ that famous warrior may well become ashamed of the land whose banners he has borne to brilliant victories.⁴

With reference to an alleged Zeppelin attack on Sandringham Palace during a brief residence of George V, and a subsequent attack on towns in the vicinity by the same raiding party, a nun and a woman being killed at Yarmouth and a boy at King's Lynn, Watterson said:

The aboriginal Americans tomahawked individuals at arms length and could not plead "the natural and inevitable consequences of war" in defense. But when air-raids which could not possibly result in anything more than desultory killing and crippling of civilians are planned by military officers, and boasted of afterward by official press bureaus "the natural and evitable causes of war" will not do as an answer to the charge of savagery.⁵

The most successful, or at least the most destructive air-raid was one at Paris in which twenty-four persons were killed and twenty-seven injured. An account

-
1. Courier-Journal, October 12, 1914. p. 1, from Paris (via London).
 2. Ibid., December 10, 1914. p. 2.
 3. Horatio Herbert Kitchener, British field marshall. He was appointed head of the War Office at the outbreak of the war.
 4. Ibid., December 18, 1914. p. 4, Editorial.
 5. Courier-Journal, January 23, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

of this raid appeared on the front page of the January 1 issue,¹ but Watterson was tired of the Zeppelin and completely snubbed it, editorially speaking. All subsequent raids were similarly neglected.²

It would be wrong however, to infer that Watterson was making an about-face in his attitude toward the airplane and the Zeppelin. The truth of the matter is that the German navy was stirring up something new which was to entertain his wrath for the remainder of the war--- submarine warfare on a huge scale.³

On February 5, 1915, the front page carried the news that the waters of the English Channel had been declared a part of the war zone by Germany and that subsequent to

1. Courier-Journal, January 31, 1915, p. 1.
2. Ibid., See issues of March 19 and 22; June 14; Sept. 10; and Oct. 14, 1915. February 14, March 20, and May 7, 1915.
3. Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., pp. 226 ff., presents an interesting account of the discussion between Grand Admiral von Tirpitz, German Secretary of State for Naval Affairs, and Vice Admiral Pohl, Chief of the Naval Staff. Tirpitz favored restricting submarine activity to a blockade of England alone, starting with the Thames River. Pohl favored a declaration of a war zone embracing the same area as that outlined by Great Britain. Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 119, also notes this argument. Pohl contended that the United States could not possibly censure Germany for doing as the Britons did when around Great Britain. Tirpitz truthfully replied: "Our experiences have unfortunately made it clear that Germany must pay more respect to the commercial interests of the neutrals than England."

February 18, all enemy ships found therein would be destroyed, "regardless of dangers which threaten crews and passengers."¹ The dispatch further stated that neutral vessels would not be free from the hazards surrounding the British Isles and vicinity.²

On the next day, in an editorial, "About to Walk the Plank," Watterson exploded:

...It seems probable that the German Empire will be made by European civilization, to walk the plank if the atrocious plan that has been proclaimed is carried out. New flags will be seen upon the battlefront as a result of the introduction of this new theory of naval warfare by Hohenzollern homicidal mania.³

In a dispatch from London, appearing in the Courier-Journal on February 8, the German naval policy was characterized as "Open Piracy of High Seas."⁴ A few days later, in an editorial, "Germany Warned," which refers to and commends Wilson's "Strict Accountability" note to Berlin, Watterson said:

It is unimaginable that the United States would supinely submit to the injury of the property or persons of its citizens merely because

-
1. The Kaiser, on the day that he gave permission for the use of unrestricted submarine warfare, spoke to the officers in command of the submarines. "If it is possible for you to save the crews of the merchant ships, do it! If you cannot save them, then it cannot be helped." Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p.230.
 2. Courier-Journal, Feb. 5, 1915, p. 1, cols. 2,3,4.
 3. Ibid., Feb. 6, 1915, p. 4, editorial. Note the call to arms.
 4. Ibid.

one of several belligerent European powers has chosen to declare autocratically that the burden of proof is upon all vessels which venture into the declared war zone, and that execution without indictment and prosecution is a newly inaugurated method of procedure in civilized warfare, as against citizens of neutral countries.¹

The activity of the German submarines so engrossed the mind of Watterson, that even a thoroughly blood-curdling atrocity story failed to arouse in him more than a doubt as to the veracity of the report. In an editorial called "Hair-Raising But Incredible," he said that it was hard to doubt the veracity of Dr. Albert Tacquin, physician to the Belgian king, but harder still to believe his atrocity stories. "One of the most printable" was this:²

A heap of dead bodies, mostly of women and children, some entirely nude, was piled up and on top of it the German officers placed a little child, alive, amongst the dead, with its little legs wedged in by the corpses. Then they photographed this gruesome exhibit.³

Naturally the new war zone proclaimed by the Germans limited to a considerable extent the activity of the American commission interested in relief for the

-
1. Courier-Journal, February 8, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. And yet, in spite of his announcement that he does not believe the story, Watterson, by printing it, rendered the Allies valuable service. Pousonby, A. P., Op. Cit., presents innumerable instances where stories of alleged atrocities were almost universally believed even after indisputable proof of their falsity had been presented, frequently by the first recounter of the story.
 3. Courier-Journal, February 12, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

Belgians. On March 3, the front page carried the headline, "German Order Means Belgians Must Starve," and went on to say that

The German government has determined to refuse to grant any more safe conducts for American relief ships to touch at English ports for coal...and a permit for the return voyage to the United States will be given only to vessels which take the course north of the Shetland Islands.

The dispatch further stated that the feeling of the commission was that this German edict meant starvation for Belgium.¹

During the next three weeks the German submarine campaign was so successfully destructive to the navies and merchantmen of the Allies² that Watterson seems to have been somewhat spellbound by the magnitude of it.³ Almost every day the front page of the Courier-Journal was filled with news of sinkings of Allied vessels of

1. Courier-Journal, March 3, 1915, p. 1, dispatch from The Hague (via London). It is well to remember here the statement of the German National Board of Health as to the starvation of the German people as a result of the British blockade. See n. 1, p. 5, above.
2. Slosson, Preston M., Twentieth Century Europe, pp. 351-352, "By April, 1917, the submarines were sinking ships several times as rapidly as they could be put out by all the shipyards of the world."
3. Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., after a careful study of competent naval authorities from many countries, states that with a loss of only 5,087 men Germany was able to hold in check the 770,000 men required to man the British navy. p. 244 n.

all types, but it was not until April 3 that Watterson collected his faculties enough to attack the German regime on the editorial page. On that day, under the title of "Barbarism," he wrote:

It becomes clearer and clearer that Germany's submarine campaign is not to be burdened with even the slightest considerations of humanity...

...The Seven Seas, a British steamer, was sunk...without warning and with the loss of eleven of her crew of eighteen. On the day previous the French steamer Emma---again without warning---received a torpedo under her engine room, foundered in three minutes and carried down nineteen members of her crew of twenty-one.

This is a plain and shameless reversion to barbarism...The German admiralty stepped outside the limits of international law when it announced the destruction of the enemy's merchant vessels; its method of putting that program into effect transcends even the wide limits of war's inhumanities.¹

A day or two later, in an editorial entitled "Hang Cousin Wilhelm," apropos of the suggestion of the London Chronicle that after the war the Allies should hang Grand Admiral von Tirpitz as a murderer (for torpedoing merchantmen and even fishing vessels without warning), Watterson suggested that Wilhelm be hanged instead, as the real leader of the murderous German submarine campaign. He thought that it would be no more barbarous than some of the things the Kaiser had ordered done.

1. Courier-Journal, April 3, 1915. p. 4, Editorial.

Watterson really thought, however, that when the war was over "Georgie and Nickie and Willie will be as good friends as ever after having shaken hands and settled the matter of boundary lines and indemnities,"¹ This curious note in which Watterson expressed an almost equal contempt, not only for Nicholas of Russia for whom he had never treasured a great deal of respect, but also for England's George V, as he held for the Kaiser, found expression every now and then on the editorial page.²

In a long editorial, "The Beginning of the End," appearing in the Courier-Journal on April 6, Watterson summarized the case as it stood against Germany. He forecast the same destruction of the Teuton as took place in Belgium and France. He criticized the German-Americans for making America more anti-German than it should be through the use of their insidious propaganda. He said that there might have been some ground for

...division of opinion...among us if the German attitude had been less dominant and aggressive and an early appeal on the part

-
1. Courier-Journal, April 5, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. It is rather difficult to account for this strange attitude toward George V., especially after considering that Watterson had long ago publicly espoused the cause of the Allied Powers. It is possible that it represents merely a mild explosion of his pro-Irish temper.

of Germany's actual case had been made to our judgment. There was a certain case in commerce if not in law...It was quickly submerged and lost under the rush of events; the on-to-Paris movement over the mangled form of Belgium;¹ the atrocities by the way; the what-are-you-going-to-do-about-it defiance of the rest of the world.

In the beginning, we did not know much...We saw in Germany, and in no one else, the author and compeller of the crushing armaments of Europe...

Without any great feeling at first---indignation, horror, resentment coming later, and very much promoted by the pro-German propaganda that reared its head among us---we instinctively took ground against what was going forward.

...The Courier-Journal hates no land and no people. It loves none except its own. It is a Republican, a Democrat, an American. It started out under the shibboleth, "To Hell with the Hapsburg and the Hohenzollern," and as to both, "to Hell" it is and shall be to the end...²

But the ancient Cronus could look down upon these words of tolerance and chuckle, for an examination of his scroll just thirty-one days hence revealed an incident that was to remove every vestige of open-mindedness in Watterson's system. Twenty-four days after the above editorial appeared in the Courier-Journal, the German U-20, under the command of Senior Lieutenant

-
1. Ponsonby says that the invasion of Belgium was not a cause of the war. "It was one of the first results of war. Nor was it even the reason for our (England) entry into the war." Ponsonby, A.P., Op. Cit., p.50. Later Ponsonby becomes more definite. "The invasion of Belgium was not the cause of the war; the invasion of Belgium was not unexpected; the invasion of Belgium did not shock the susceptibilities of the British or the French Governments." p. 56.
 2. Courier-Journal, April 6, 1915, p.4, Editorial.

Schwieger,¹ slipped her moorings at Wilhelmshaven and moved westward to take up her station along the Irish coast.² On May 7, Schwieger, returning home with only two old torpedoes--"not so good"--remaining, by a combination of poor navigation on the part of Captain Turner of the Lusitania and mere chance, encountered the great Cunard liner and sent it and 1,446 of its occupants to the bottom of the Irish sea.³

-
1. Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 154 ff.
 2. Bailey, Thomas A., "The Sinking of the Lusitania," American Historical Review, vol. 41, 1935-1936, p. 54.
 3. Ibid., p. 162 ff; also Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., pp. 88-89; also Bailey, Thos. A., Loc. Cit., pp. 55-56.

V. WATTERSON HAS AN ATTACK OF "GERMOPHOBIA"

V. WATTERSON HAS AN ATTACK OF "GERMOPHOBIA"

Lasswell states that there are four major objectives of propaganda:

1. To mobilize hatred against the enemy;
2. To preserve the friendship of the allies;
3. To preserve the friendship, and if possible to procure the co-operation of neutrals;
4. To demoralize the enemy.¹

The Entente propagandists were certainly successful in at least two of these objectives, if Watterson's reaction to their treatment may be used as a gauge. Watterson's hate for Germany has already been discussed at considerable length and will receive still more attention later. The difficulties attendant upon any serious pursuance of the third and fourth objectives can be readily appreciated if we remind ourselves that technically, the United States was a neutral and that, technically, there was no enemy for the propagandist to demoralize. Objectives three and four must necessarily, therefore, follow the actual declaration of war. That still leaves the second objective for Watterson to work on and it is to his work on that score that we would now devote our attention.

Just as Watterson had been quick to denounce the Kaiser and the German "Militariat" he was equally quick

1. Lasswell, H. D., Op. Cit., p. 195.

to extol and publicize all Entente successes or, where that was impossible, to praise the heroism of the vanquished Entente forces. Any statement favorable to the Entente was given space and, what was far more important, these statements, unlike similar pro-German statements, were not challenged on the editorial page.

As early in the War as August 1914 the Courier-Journal carried an article from London which quoted Premier Asquith as telling Parliament that "no nation ever entered into a great contest with a cleaner conscience or a stronger conviction."¹

A few days later the paper displayed a picture, best described by its caption, "Crowd Cheering French Patriots Just Before They Left America For The War."²

Watterson himself followed these up a few days later with a squib on the editorial page, saying that "the country around Liege is somewhat rough, but not nearly so rough as the reception accorded the Germans."³

On August 21 there appeared a letter written by the Reverend Dr. E. L. Powell, pastor of the First Christian Church of Louisville, in which the reverend gentleman stated that "every sword drawn against Germany is a sword of peace." Dr. Powell wrote from Keswick, England.

-
1. Courier-Journal, August 7, 1914, p. 4. With this same clean conscience, Asquith, the following March, announced the intention of the British Government to prevent "commodities of any kind" from reaching Germany. Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., p. 190.
 2. Ibid., August 9, 1914, section 2, p. 9.
 3. Ibid., August 12, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

He also said:

If I were not an American I should choose to be an Englishman. From King to Boy Scout; from Prime Minister to shopkeeper; from rich and poor in Britain there is now but one breath.¹

A week later, a drawing by Mantina of the London Sphere appeared on the front page which depicted a group of Uhlans entangled in barbed wire at Liege, and another picture by the same artist showing the Prince of Wales at the Front.²

On August 30, two dispatches from London were printed in the Courier-Journal which said the same thing.

1. British At Tournai Made Heroic But Vain Defense.
2. Britons Fought Bravely Only To Be Overwhelmed.³

On the same page appeared an article about a letter written by a Sergeant Loftus to his brother in England, relating some of his experiences in the battle of Mons. This article is interesting because it is hard to believe that, had Loftus been German instead of English, Watterson would have refrained from attacking him on the editorial page as a blood-thirsty demon. Among other gory pranks, Loftus and his companions "received them

-
1. Courier-Journal, August 21, 1914, p. 2.
 2. Ibid., August 27, 1914, p. 1.
 3. Courier-Journal, August 30, 1914, Section I, p. 9

(the Germans) in the good old way, the front ranks with the bayonet and the rear ranks keeping up an incessant fire."¹

A strangely discordant note appeared on August 31, under the headline,

English Defeat Is Pitiful Story, Says Man Near Allies' Battle Line

London, Aug. 30.

(Amiens correspondent of London Weekly Dispatch)

This is a pitiful story I have to write. The time for secrecy is past. What you know in England may be something like the truth, but I write with the Germans advancing incessantly while all the rest of France believes that they are still near the frontier.

...So far the Germans have carried all before them, partly by sheer weight of numbers and partly by a deadly hail of bullets from their numberless machine guns.²

On September 1, the Courier-Journal printed a picture which took up half of a page. Its self-explanatory caption read,

Belgian Infantry Take Well-Earned Rest
After Driving Germans Back At Haarlem.³

On the next day, in an editorial, Watterson extolled the French for their spirit of self-sacrifice in their defense of their country.⁴

1. Courier-Journal, August 30, 1914, Section I, p. 9.

2. Ibid., August 31, 1914, p. 2. How such a pessimistic dispatch ever got by the British censor will probably never be known. Accounts of German victories were not uncommon in the American press, but accounts of British despair were rare indeed.

3. Ibid., September 1, 1914, p. 3.

4. Courier-Journal, Sept. 2, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

But the German successes became so pronounced during the first few months of the war that it became impossible, even for Watterson, to continue to extoll an Entente valor that persisted in displaying itself only in heroic defeat. He had striven for three months to make the Allies the betting favorite in America with no better argument than "There is no holier spot of ground than where defeated valor lies." If he hoped to keep the front position for his choice, he had to find a newer and better argument.

Lasswell says that

A handy rule for arousing hate is, if at first they do not enrage, use an atrocity... Originality, while often advantageous, is far from indispensable. In the early days of the War of 1914 a very pathetic story was told of a seven-year old youngster, who had pointed his wooden gun at a patrol of invading Uhlans, who had dispatched him on the spot.¹ This story had done excellent duty in the Franco-Prussian War, over forty years before. But many of the most successful tales have a far more venerable history. There is one about the Turks, which rattled down Christendom since the first crusades. According to this account, a tub-full of eyes was discovered at a certain point, where captives were being tortured for the amusement of Turkish generals.

Stress can always be laid upon the wounding of women, children, old people, priests and nuns, and upon sexual enormities, mutilated prisoners and mutilated non-combatants...

A certain fringe of novelty is always permissible, because the conditions of warfare are never precisely the same. Since the discovery

1. Ponsonby runs this story into the ground and proves its falsity. Ponsonby, A.P., Op. Cit., p. 27.

of germs the enemy may be accused of infecting the wells, cattle, and food, not to speak of wounds...If the enemy shows any signs of believing that a campaign of frightfulness is sound military strategy, there need be no hesitation about calling God and man to witness that such an abomination is the new-born creation of the diabolical enemy.¹

No sooner did it become apparent to Watterson that the Germans were being more than slightly successful in their engagements with the heroic Allies than he grasped at this last and most trustworthy of all propaganda straws.² While it is true that prior to September 1, 1914,³ there had been accounts of German atrocities in dispatches from Allied countries, until that date, these, for the most part, were either discountenanced or taken with a grain of salt on the editorial page. For example, on August 6, the front page carried a dispatch from Brussels which stated that "a platoon of Prussian cavalry was almost annihilated by the Belgians...near Wise... The Prussians in revenge...fired on civilians."⁴ In an

-
1. Lasswell, H.D., Op. Cit., p. 81.
 Hillis, Walter, says, Op. Cit., p. 68, "As the Allied armies fell back, the correspondents were naturally debarred from reporting what was actually going on. The atrocity filled the void."
 2. Barnes, H.E., In Quest of Truth and Justice, p. 95, says: "The Atrocities Myth was the chief instrument utilized by the British propagandists and the American financial interests in 'educating' American opinion up to the point where we were willing to enter the war."
 3. The approximate date upon which Watterson seems to have realized that German successes were more than rumor.
 4. Courier-Journal, August 6, 1914, p. 1.

editorial squib on the following day, Watterson said:
"If this is true"¹ Prussians need no longer lay claim
 to participation in the civilization of Europe."²

The same edition carried two more accounts of the fighting in Belgium, each of which referred to German atrocities. The first described the heroic repulsion of the Germans at Liege (by the Belgians) and stated that "The invaders committed repressions against the civil population of Vise, burning the city and shooting many residents." The second dispatch agreed in substance with the first but reduced the "many residents" (shot by the Germans) to "several."³

On August 13, the front page carried the following dispatch:

Paris, Aug. 13 (via London) (Official statement)⁴

A wounded French cavalryman at Megieres declares he saw a German cavalryman shoot a wounded Frenchman. He says he heard five or six other shots and saved himself by feigning death.

The Germans are wearing uniforms taken from Belgians killed in battle.⁵

-
1. My underscoring. Note the skeptical subjunctive mood.
 2. Courier-Journal, August 7, 1914, p. 4, Editorial. On the same day another blunder was committed by the British censor. The New York Times carried a dispatch from Antwerp which, in praising Belgian heroism, says: "Even the women fought, and a girl of eighteen shot an officer dead with a pistol. She was captured and executed." This civilian warfare was of course, a direct violation of international law. Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., pp. 65-66.
 3. Courier-Journal, August 6, 1914, p. 1.
 4. Official and office unnamed.
 5. Courier-Journal, August 13, 1914, p. 1.

On August 21, a similar dispatch, headlined "Uncivilized Acts Charged Against German Troops," was printed on the front page.

London, Aug. 21.

The French Government says it will address the next Hague Convention as follows:

"...German troops dispatched a number of wounded by firing shots in their faces and... the wounds of other wounded people were deliberately made worse by being torn open.

On August 11 German troops burned villages, massacred their inhabitants and drove women and children to the battlefield, and on other occasions they murdered prisoners and shot the wounded.

The French Government will leave to the earnest consideration of the Powers such reprehensible acts and criminal deeds that have never before so dishonored civilized belligerents."¹

On August 26, an account of the charges made by the Belgian minister to London was carried under the headline, "Barbarities Charged Against The German Army." This article dealt with such atrocities as the shooting of civilians, firing on farms, burning humans, and using women as shields. "...The appalling details of these atrocities are vouched for by a committee of inquiry recently formed by the Belgian Minister of Justice..."²

-
1. Courier-Journal, August 21, 1914, p. 1. Note Lasswell's comment (see p. 55 above).
 2. Courier-Journal, August 26, 1914, p. 3.

The first news of the German attack on Louvain appeared on August 29. Two dispatches were carried on the same page, one supporting the headline, "Belgian City of Louvain Burned By Germans," the other, "Red Cross Nurses Slain By German Officer Is French Sworn Statement."¹

On the following day, sensational dispatches arrived from all Allied sectors, describing the German atrocities in dramatic² terms. One of these, headlined "Stories of Belgian Battlefields Sent Out By Spectators And Participants," came from Amsterdam (via London). A newspaper correspondent interviewed a fugitive from Louvain who said:

...We hastily packed our valuables and hurried to the railway station. There the refugees were parted, the men being placed on one side and women and children on the other...We could see the bodies of six burghers...

The town was now one flaming mass.³ At last, escorted by German soldiers we walked to Campehout, where we witnessed the shooting of seven priests in a group.

Our party of seventy-three men were handcuffed like criminals and locked in a church with only the cold floor to lie upon...Outside the cries and lamentations of women and children arose...

...We were told that we would be set free, but must return to Louvain. Returning to that city I was once more taken prisoner and driven in front of German soldiers across the country without rest or food as a cover for the troops.

1. Courier-Journal, August 29, 1914, p. 2.
2. Melodramatic would probably be a more accurate word.
3. "As a matter of fact, it was estimated that about an eighth of the town had suffered." Ponsonby, Sir A. P., Op. Cit., p. 21.

...I was told, though I did not see it myself, that the burgomaster and a number of prominent men of Louvain were shot.¹

A war bulletin from London, published on the same day, stated that "All able-bodied men of Louvain... have been sent by train to Germany to aid in harvesting the crops."²

Also printed in this edition was a German version of these atrocities. This stated that a detachment of Germans was sent forth from the German garrison at Louvain to meet an attack of Belgian troops from Antwerp. Priests at Louvain,

...thinking this was a retreat...gave the people ammunition and civilians began to shoot at...German troops³...A fight lasting twenty-four hours took place between the German soldiers and the people...Parts of the city are burning and civilians met carrying arms are killed.⁴

Ambassador von Bernstorff backed up this German version with a statement that it was "absolutely unjustifiable to suppose that Zeppelin bombs were thrown against anything else but fortifications." He added that it was inconceivable that any group of nations which would employ Orientals and Africans "to fight

-
1. Courier-Journal, August 30, 1914, Section I, p. 9.
 2. Fansill, C. C., Op. Cit., p. 615, says that the burden of supporting 650,000 Belgians became too great for Germany. In 1915 the idle workmen were required to accept employment in Germany unless adequate excuses were offered.
 3. Note the similarity between the German accusation and the Belgian admission. See n. 2, p. 57, above.
 4. Courier-Journal, August 30, 1914, Section I, p. 8.

their battles for them" could give the Germans lessons in the proper manner of conducting a European War.¹

Watterson was quite upset by the burning of Louvain which, he said, "serves no defensible end and seems to have been a wanton act, a crime against civilization." However, with unaccountable tolerance, in the next paragraph, though he still roundly censured Germany, he was willing to give her a chance to vindicate her position.

...It matters not why Louvain was burned---provided the Germans are unable to show proof of actual necessity for its destruction---the world, and not merely stricken Belgium or the Allies, has a right to protest. The Emperor of Germany, as commander-in-chief of the German forces, will be held to account in history for the conduct of his men in the field.²

Colonel House tells us that President Wilson was also tremendously disturbed by the destruction of Louvain. On the same day as Marse Henry penned the above, the Colonel confided to his diary that he

...found him (Wilson) as unsympathetic with the German attitude as is the balance of America. He goes even farther than I in his condemnation of Germany's part in this war, and almost allows

1. Courier-Journal, August 30, 1914, Section I, p. 6.
 2. Ibid., Section II, p. 6, Editorial.

his feelings to include the German people as a whole rather than the leaders alone.¹

Even greater tolerance was expressed by Watterson on the following day in an editorial called "Much Too One-Sided." He pointed out the fact that there were so many tales of German atrocities in circulation, and all of them emanating from anti-German sources, that the indication was apparent of "a deliberate intention to create anti-German sentiment" in America.²

Again on September 1, in an editorial called "A Fantastic Tale," Watterson was hesitant about believing all that he read in his newspaper. This discussed a dispatch from Holland containing stories by refugees of the burning, sacking, and massacring at Louvain.³ Watterson said that these accounts were "More likely to be impassioned exaggeration than accurate reports."

...The burning of Louvain...was an act of vandalism for which no sufficient excuse has been offered. But the slaughter of men, women, and children by German soldiers must be a nightmare which cannot be shaken off by refugees....⁴

An atrocity with a tinge of novelty was dispatched from Paris on August 29, and appeared in the Courier-

-
1. Seymour, Charles, Op. Cit. vol. 1, p. 293. If House found Wilson too belligerent in August 1914, he was to find him far too pacific in March 1917, when he had to show him the proper course. See Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 657.
 2. Courier-Journal, August 31, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
 3. See pp. 59-60 above.
 4. Courier-Journal, September 1, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

Journal on the following day. According to this dispatch, a victorious detachment of French troops, approaching the conquered German force with the purpose of disarming its members, was suddenly and treacherously surprised when the ranks of the latter parted somewhat to allow machine-guns concealed behind them to pour a "murderous fire into the ranks of the advancing Frenchmen."¹

Exasperated by this treachery...the French charged furiously with fixed bayonets and exterminated the German soldiers with the exception of this lieutenant who survived for a few days with his jaw fractured and his tongue cut off.²

It is rather strange that the propagandist who dispatched the above item failed to recognize a somewhat natural and definitely damaging inference to be drawn by the unbiased reader should he happen to associate the severed tongue of the German officer with the furious assault of the French.

On August 31, it was announced in the Courier-Journal that a commission of the Belgians was on its way to America to give first-hand information about the German atrocities in their country. A very interesting

-
1. Apparently this story made the rounds of all the warring nations. Ponsonby, A.P., Cp. Cit., p. 32, cites it as a German accusation against the British.
 2. Courier-Journal, Aug. 30, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

statement of this dispatch is that "The commission will remain in London for a few days to confer with the English leaders."¹

On the next day, the same item was elaborated upon.

...The Belgian Minister of Justice, Carton de Wiart chairman of the commission, has arranged a conference with Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary, after which² an official statement will be made regarding the Belgian grievances.³

On September 2, a cartoon from Life, entitled "Back to Barbarism," appeared in the Courier-Journal. The Barbarian has the winged helmet of the Tauton and a Wilhelmsque mustache.⁴

Two days later, the story of another refugee from Louvain was printed. This one was dispatched from Rotterdam (via London) on September 2.

...German soldiers drove...300 men and lads to the corner of the Boulevard van Tienen and Maria Theresa street...There they were shot...

Suddenly about 10 o'clock...we were ordered to kneel and soldiers stood behind us, with their rifles ready to fire, using us as a shield. (This was a false alarm, as no attack followed)

We were locked in a church...At 5 o'clock the next morning all the priests were taken out and shot, together with eight Belgian soldiers, six bicyclists and two game keepers...⁵

-
1. Courier-Journal, August 31, 1914. p. 3.
 2. My underscoring. Evidently the statement would be less authoritative if Sir Edward's name failed to appear under it.
 3. Courier-Journal, Sept. 1, 1914. p. 2.
 4. Ibid., Sept. 2, 1914. p. 2.
 5. Courier-Journal, September 3, 1914. p. 1.

The September 6 issue carried a bulletin of atrocities perpetrated by the Austrians.

...125 citizens were bayonnetted to death in the Cathedral Square before the eyes of 1,500 women and children...A woman doctor... had seen petroleum poured over a wounded Servian and then set on fire.¹

Two days later, an account of another German atrocity was dispatched from London.

...The Germans appeared at a branch of the National Bank, where they demanded the cash in the safe. The manager, M. Hasscize, refused to hand it over, whereupon he, together with his two sons, was shot.

There is no evidence, so far as is known, that the alleged (by the Germans) shooting from the heights resulted in the killing of any Germans.²

The Belgian Committee, with a better understanding of the horrors its members had witnessed in their native land since their conference with Sir Edward Grey, arrived in America on September 15. On September 17, Matterson, long the champion of "poor stricken Belgium", honored the committee by devoting three-fourths of his front page to it and an account of its grievances. One of the more dramatic tales concerned the killing of a German cavalry officer in an engagement between Belgian and German forces. The officer was buried on the order

1. Courier-Journal, September 6, 1914. Sec. I, p. 2.

2. Ibid., September 8, 1914. p. 1. The definite implication here is that the allegation of the Germans was correct. The fact that no one was killed does not absolve the civilians of guilt.

of the Belgian commanding officer. In spite of the fact that no civilians had taken part in the encounter, a strong German force invaded the village at dusk one day and destroyed two farms and six outlying houses by gunfire. The male population was then gathered together and, after their arms were confiscated (none had been recently fired), were divided into three groups. "Those in one group were bound and eleven of them placed in a ditch, where they were afterwards found,¹ their skulls fractured by the butts of rifles."

On the same night (August 10) another German force invaded the village of Velm and, for no apparent reason, fired on and broke into the house of M. Deglimme.

...They carried off Mme. Deglimme half-naked to a place two miles away. She was then released, and as she fled, was fired upon without being hit, however. Her husband was carried to a point in another direction and fired upon; he is dying...

An old man had his arm cut in three longitudinal slices. He was then hanged head downwards and burned alive. Young girls were raped and little children outraged at Oramael, and mutilations, too horrible to describe, were inflicted

-
1. It is amazing how many of the atrocity stories lack this one definite clinching factor, the eye-witness. The Bryce Report contains an almost countless number of such instances. The witness will see the victim captured; he will see him prepared for torture; he will see the implements of torture; and he will see the victim after he has been tortured. But he doesn't actually see the victim tortured. Rather similar to seeing a Shakespearian play with Act Three omitted.

on other inhabitants. Prisoners were hanged, while others were tied to telegraph poles and shot.

After an engagement at Haecien, Commandant van Damme was so severely wounded that he was lying prone on his back. He was murdered by German infantry firing their revolvers into his mouth...

This article continued with an account of the German behavior at Aerschot (where more than forty men were massacred) and at Louvain (where women and children were outraged by the invaders). It concluded as follows:

The procedure of the Germans seems to be the same everywhere---first of all they requisition food and drink, of which they partake to the point of drunkenness. Then they begin to shoot wildly from the windows of abandoned houses...Then the firing and shooting scenes begin, and murder and especially pillage and acts of cold cruelty are witnessed, neither age nor sex is respected...¹

The same page carried the announcement that President Wilson was reserving his decision about the matter, being of the opinion that the United States had not yet been selected as arbitrator of the European dispute.²

But an item of far more interest than Wilson's attitude toward the Belgians was to be found on the same page. This contained a dispatch from a correspondent of the Associated Press which directly contradicted the

1. Courier-Journal, September 17, 1914, p. 1, col. 4.

2. Ibid., col. 5.

statements of the Belgian Committee, asserting that the moral conduct of the German troops was exemplary and that there had been, so far as he had been able to ascertain, no atrocities. This statement recalls to mind the statement of the American foreign correspondents relative to alleged German atrocities which had appeared in the Courier-Journal more than a month previously.¹

On September 20, another newspaper man, E. Alexander Powell of the Chicago Tribune, had his views of German atrocities printed in the Courier-Journal. Powell had spent some time with the Headquarters of the Ninth Imperial Army and dates his piece on September 9 from Renaix, Belgium. It appeared in the form of a conversation between Powell and General von Boehn of the Prussian staff.

- P.-Three days ago I was in Aerschot. The whole town is now but a ghastly, blood-stained ruin.
- B.-When we entered Aerschot the son of the burgomaster came into the room, drew a revolver and assassinated my chief of staff. What followed was only retribution. The townspeople only got what they deserved.
- P.-But why wreak your vengeance on women and children.
- B.-None has been killed.
- P.-I am sorry to contradict you, General, but I have myself seen there mutilated bodies. So has Mr. Ginson, secretary of the American Legation at Brussels, who was present at the destruction of Louvain.
- B.-Of course there always is danger of women and children being killed during street fighting if they insist on coming into the street. It is unfortunate, but it is war.

1. Courier-Journal, September 17, 1914, p.1. See page 6 above for the statement of the correspondents.

- P.-But how about a woman's body I saw, with her hands and feet cut off? How about a white-haired man and his son whom I helped to bury outside Sompstad, who had been killed merely because a retreating Belgian had shot a German outside their house? There were twenty-two bayonet wounds on the old man's face. I counted them! How about the little girl two years old who was shot while in her mother's arms by a Uhlan and whose funeral I attended at Beystopdenberg? How about the old man who was hung from the rafters in his house and roasted to death by a bonfire being built beneath him? (The General seemed somewhat taken aback by the amount and exactness of my data.)
- B.-Such things are horrible, if true. Of course, our soldiers, like soldiers of all armies, sometimes get out of hand and do things which we would never tolerate if we knew it. At Louvain, for example, I sentenced two soldiers to twelve years' penal servitude apiece for assaulting a woman.
- P.-Apropos of Louvain, why did you destroy the library? It was one of the literary storehouses of the world.
- B.-We regretted that as much as anyone else. It caught fire from burning houses and we could not save it.
- P.-But why did you burn Louvain at all?
- B.-Because the townspeople fired on our troops. (Smashing his hand down on the table) Whenever civilians fire upon our troops we will teach them a lasting lesson. If women and children insist on getting in the way of bullets, so much the worse for the women and children.
- P.-How do you explain the bombardment of Antwerp by Zeppelins?
- B.-Zeppelins have orders to drop their bombs only on fortifications and soldiers.
- P.-As a matter of fact, they only destroyed houses and civilians, several of them women. If one of these bombs had dropped two hundred yards nearer my hotel I wouldn't be smoking one of your excellent cigars today.

- B.--That is a calamity which I thank God didn't happen.
- P.--If you feel for my safety as deeply as that, General, you can make quite sure of my coming to no harm by sending no more Meppelins.
- B.--Well (laughingly), we will think about it. (Gravely) I trust you will tell the American people through your paper what I have told you today. Let them hear our side of this atrocity business. It is only justice that they should be familiar with both sides of the question.

Powell ended the lengthy conversation with this statement to his reading public:

I will leave it to my readers to decide for themselves just how convincing are the answers of the German General Staff to the Belgian accusations.¹

On September 22, the Courier-Journal carried a story, the bark of which (i.e. the headline) was much worse than the bite.

GERMANS ROLLED THROUGH BELGIUM LIKE FLOOD TIDE

Moved Irresistibly Forward, Engulfing What They
Could Not Destroy, And Leaving Heart-Break-
ing Scenes Behind.

The article was extremely mild in comparison to this headline. It even stated that those Belgian villages which did not molest the Germans were not injured at all.²

Another cartoon appeared on September 24 under

-
1. Courier-Journal, September 20, 1914. Sec. II, p. 1.
 2. Courier-Journal, September 22, 1914. p. 3.

the heading, "A Survival of the Dark Ages." This depicted a monstrous reptile crawling along the ground. The head, which was semi-human in shape, was covered by a military helmet adorned with the Prussian spike. The body, which resembled that of a Gila monster, was composed of Prussian-helmeted men in squad formation. In the midst of these marching men was a heavy piece of artillery, which gave the appearance of a huge scale on the back. The tail, which apparently was supposed to represent the tail of a scorpion, was a smaller gun. Underneath the cartoon these words appeared:

LAST SEEN IN THE SWAMPS OF FRANCE.¹

On September 24, Watterson published under the title of "The Horror of War," a letter received from an American woman who "has spent nine happy summers" in Brittany, describing what she has seen.

...Last night in the garage of the Grand Hotel slept seven little girls, all under seven...They have lost all: parents, home... Their feet are bleeding from tramping fields; their tear-stained faces pinched from starvation...

I have talked with a young mother whose baby we buried last night. A German musket battered in its chest when its mother tried to push aside the barrel which shot her husband.

A child of seven has one hand gone, cut from his mother's clasp, because he detained

1. Courier-Journal, September 24, 1914. p. 7.

his mother's flight from a home the Germans¹ were in haste to burn. An old man is alive and here because he was so clever as to lie down² as though dead when Germans who had locked forty such in a room told them to dance for their lives while they shot at them through the shutters from the street.

This story is corroborated by four witnesses. A baker at Mons was bidden to bake by Germans. He complied until flour was exhausted. He was then shot before his wife, because they claimed he refused to tell where more flour was hidden. Then his wife was bidden to divulge, and to punish her "obstinacy" her husband, before her eyes, was thrust into the furnace. She is quite demented and sits gazing silently at unknown horrors.

Mina Lorrey Duryea
Hotel Windsor, Dinard.
Ille-et-Vilaine, France.³

On October 1, a dispatch dated from London on the previous day, appeared in the Courier-Journal, which gave an account of the contents of a book seized by the English from an alien entering port. This book contained reports by an alleged German officer on tragic events of the war. Among some of the more interesting excerpts were the following:

-
1. According to Ponsonby, this story also was extremely popular. Belgian babies without hands were reported to be scattered all over England. A sympathetic English lady, however, anxious to be of assistance to any she could find, was unable to locate any. Ponsonby, A.E., Op. Cit., p. 28.
 2. According to the Bryce Report, lying down was a popular practice among Belgian refugees. Many escaped by this ruse. See pp. 22, 26, 31.
 3. Courier-Journal, September 24, 1914. p. 4.

...The countryside was full of our troops. Nevertheless the stupid peasants must needs shoot at our men as they marched by from lurking places. Day before yesterday morning the Prussian troops surrounded a village, put the women, children, and old people aside, and shot all the men. The village was then burned to the ground...

A traitor has just been shot. He was a little French lad belonging to one of the French gymnastic societies which wear the tri-color ribbons, a poor young fellow, who, in his infatuation, wanted to be a hero.

...He was caught and asked whether the French were about. He refused to give information. Fifty yards farther there was fire from the cover of the woods. The prisoner was asked in French if he knew that the enemy was in the forest and he did not deny it.

He went with a firm step to a telegraph pole...and received the volley of a firing squad with a proud smile on his face. Infatuated youth. It was a pity to see such wasted courage.¹

It was seldom indeed that any news got into the Courier-Journal relative to atrocities committed by any of the Allies. The edition of October 3 is particularly interesting because it does contain such news. An official report from Berlin released in Washington by Ambassador von Bernstorff accused the French of mutilating thirty German prisoners.

...Their noses and ears had been cut off and they were suffocated by inserting saw-

1. Courier-Journal, October 1, 1914. p. 1. This is the famous Französling shooting case. "The word Französling is used exclusively to describe German subjects with French proclivities. In Alsace and Lorraine there exist societies of these...who wear the French colors. They are not boys but grown men." Ponsonby, A.P., Op. Cit., pp. 94-95.

dust into their mouths and noses. Correctness of the evidence taken was authenticated by two French priests...¹

Another part of the report contained a dispatch from the Milan Avanti, which allegedly stated that

...They (the Germans) should be shown no pity if they fall into our hands, those nefarious criminals against human law of whom Wilhelm probably formed his bodyguard, but who are worth being butchered like pigs.²

But unlike most of the accounts of the German atrocities, this statement was not to go unchallenged. Two days later, Jusserand, the French Ambassador to the United States, published a contradiction of the German charges. He said that

...The kind of men (French, of course) who cause the German wounded to receive exactly the same treatment as the French ones in the French hospitals, and who risked their lives to save those of the German wounded harbored in the Rheims cathedral, when that sanctuary was set on fire by German shells, are unlikely to commit atrocities.³

For some time now, Watterson had been allowing the war bulletins to speak for themselves for the most part.⁴ Starting with the middle of October, however, hardly a

1. Courier-Journal, October 3, 1914. p. 3.

2. Courier-Journal, October 3, 1914. p. 3.

3. Ibid., October 5, 1914. p. 2.

4. Illis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 72, says: "Where the Allied case was now absorbed unconsciously through every morning newspaper, the German case was noisily presented by an angry and plainly ill-informed minority."

day passed that he did not make some editorial comment on the German atrocities. On the 14th he said:

Poor little Belgium! A town is built and grows mossy with age, filled with fruitful gardens. A German war chief tears up a scrap of paper, unlimbers his guns, and knocks the cathedral, the university, the villas of the rich and the homes of the poor into a heap. Under the heap some of the inhabitants lie. From under it some of them crawl. About it a few weep. Away from it many creep to hobble to devastated fields, splintered forests, the ruins of other cities. Homeless, helpless, hopeless; they are guilty only of having built their nests at the edge of a crater.¹

On the following day, contrasting the rapaciousness of huge corporations in the world of business with the horrors of war, Watterson said:

Now benign in execution, now amiable in conception, is the most dastardly work of the most criminal corporation compared with what Germany has done in Belgium, purely in the interest of business, at the behest of a Hohenzollern, under the slogan "Deutschland Uber Alles," and under the pious pretense, "To und Gott," the Emperor's personal war cry.²

In discussing a speech by Congressman Gardner on "Preparedness for the United States," Watterson, two days later, swung off into the European situation to the following tune:

That the war in Europe will end with the annihilation of the Imperial Militarist of Germany and Austria we do not doubt. Any other finish would mean world conquest by

-
1. Courier-Journal, October 14, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. Courier-Journal, October 15, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

the War Lord of Berlin and the vassalage of humanity to the rule and principle of absolutism and martial power. The universe, or what was left of it, would become an armed camp.

It is just as essential to destroy Wilhelm now as it was to destroy Bonaparte a century ago. With the vast fighting machine broken up, with Krupp's admirable imitation of hell at Essen put out of commission, the most urgent proposed military establishment would disappear.¹

A week later, Watterson used the discovery of "Twilight Sleep" by German doctors as an excuse for denouncing the Kaiser and his war lords.

It will be strange if Germany gives to the world in the same year the benefits of the virtual elimination of the anguish of parturition and the 60 cm. cannon. Cynics might say² that, inasmuch as the slaughter of the sons of women is now possible upon a large scale, Germany owes to motherhood a debt which will not be overpaid if "Twilight Sleep" shall hereafter take women through happy dreams to maternity.³

In an editorial entitled "Can It Be True," discussing the report that Germany had ordered the Prince of Monaco to pay \$500,000.00 or else have his chateau at Rheims bombarded, Watterson said that this act made Germany a highwayman. This editorial was followed up a week later by another which was far more scathing after confirmation of the report.⁴

-
1. Courier-Journal, October 17, 1914. p. 4, Editorial.
 2. Is this the "stuck pig" squealing?
 3. Courier-Journal, October 25, 1914. p. 4, Editorial.
 4. Courier-Journal, October 30, 1914. p. 4, Editorial.

An extremely long editorial, "Shall Our American Republic Be Prussianized," appearing in the December 8 issue, is interesting chiefly because, in it, Patterson thoroughly condemned an attitude which he was, not so long after, to espouse wholeheartedly. He censured the Republicans severely for attempting to make Preparedness an issue in the ensuing Presidential campaign. Quite naturally, in carrying out the subject suggested by the title, he was able to sandwich in some strong epithets about German militarism in general and the Kaiser in particular.¹

On December 30, a dispatch from London quoted General Joffre as saying

...We have proof that...the General commanding the Fifty-Eighth Brigade of the Fourth Bavarian Corps (has issued this order):

"From today no more prisoners will be made. All prisoners will be put to death. The wounded, with or without arms, will be put to death. Prisoners, even if taken in large bodies, will be put to death. No living man must be left behind us..."

(Signed) Joffre.²

On January 8, 1915, in an editorial entitled "The Mailed Fist," commenting on an article in the Paris

1. Courier-Journal, December 8, 1914. p. 6, Editorial.

2. Ibid., December 30, 1914. p. 3. Ponsonby points out that this practice of accusing the enemy of cruelty to its prisoners of war is a common one and is necessary to prevent desertions, "whereas naturally each side tries to treat its prisoners as well as possible so as to attract others." Ponsonby, A.P., Op. Cit., p. 22.

edition of the New York Herald which strongly censured Germany's lack of humanity in firing shells from her cruisers at unfortified English towns and killing the inhabitants thereof, Patterson said:

...It is nevertheless, not the German point of view, but that of the onlooking world, astounded, appalled, resentful, that the Herald comments upon...

...The wanton destruction of the lives of non-combatants seems like an exhibition of homicidal mania. As such it does not recommend the Kaiser as a suitable overlord of creation.¹

The complaint of a British officer about the brutal treatment accorded English prisoners by the Germans was printed in the January 23 issue of the Courier-Journal. This officer stated that sixty Englishmen were forced to travel in a box car formerly used for transporting horses. Traces of the horses were still quite apparent in the car. The prisoners were kept in the car for thirty hours, and received no food during their undesired excursion. They were, furthermore, deprived of their overcoats and one officer had his face spat upon.²

The insipidity of the last mentioned atrocity--- and the few preceding ones, for that matter---is accounted for, of course, by the fact that, as in all wars, there is less activity in the field and, consequently, less

1. Courier-Journal, January 8, 1915. p. 4, Editorial.
 2. Ibid., January 23, 1915. p. 1. The note on p. 77 above applies here too, of course.

to talk about in the press during the winter season. But as the year 1915 advanced into the warmer months the tempests of war, the tempers of war-mongers, and the temperature of the Fahrenheit thermometer began to rise simultaneously.

On April 14, in an editorial called "More Reprisals," Watterson said:

There is no surprise in the German announcement that British prisoners are to be treated with severity by way of reprisal for the treatment that German submarine prisoners are reported to be receiving in Great Britain.¹ Sir Edward Grey's denial of these reports, sent in reply to a German inquiry several weeks ago, will, of course, be given no weight whatever.

...What reliability attaches to the belligerent press, everybody---even Germany---knows full well.²

The impartial person might very reasonably wonder why Mr. Watterson attached so much reliability to the belligerent press, especially when the fact is considered that the dispatch upon which Watterson's editorial was based came from Amsterdam, via London.³

1. The "Baralong Incident" is illustrative of the dangers encountered by the submarine operators. The German U-27 stopped the British freighter Nicosian and permitted the crew to disembark. A torpedo was then fired into the freighter with the purpose of sinking it. Meanwhile a vessel drew near flying the American flag. The U-27 watched it approach until suddenly it opened fire on the submarine, which sank almost instantly. Some of the crew of the latter managed to swim to the Nicosian which was still afloat. Five of them were killed by British marines. The ship which sank the submarine was H.M.S. Baralong. See Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 379.
2. Courier-Journal, April 14, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.
3. Ibid., p. 2.

If the press was unreliable, why should he believe this dispatch.

On April 18, Watterson said that the pro-German propaganda, "which has done so much to embitter American feeling, having done not a little to unite it,"¹ had been anticipated by the Courier-Journal. He reminded the German-Americans that his paper had done everything possible to divert them from a course which was certain to prove troublesome.

...The answers we got from the highbrows of "Kultur" was that we knew nothing about it. We knew nothing about the invasion of Belgium tearing treaties to tatters. We knew nothing about the hideous destruction of Louvain, the wanton descent upon Antwerp, and the cruel mistreatment of civilians and non-combatants. And, as the atrocities of invasion proceeded---every one of them heralded and approved by the organs of Pan-Germany, and its agents in this country, led by Bernstorff, its Ambassador...We knew nothing about the dropping of bombs and the killing of defenseless women and children in undefended places, nor the murderous submarine decree extending the Kaiser-law of assassination from the land to the sea, directly involving the lives of our people

-
1. Vieroek, G.S., Op. Cit., p. 55, says that "the objective of German propaganda was three-fold; to strengthen and replenish Germany; to weaken and embarrass Germany's foes; and to keep America out of war by spreading the truth as the Germans saw it." Vieroek admits the failure of German propaganda. "It suffered from psychological, lingual, and geographical handicaps. French propaganda bore too obviously the label Made in France. Great Britain surpassed both her allies and her foes in the great game of propaganda...German submarines challenged, at times successfully, her supremacy on the seas. But German propaganda produced no Tizpitz." Ibid., pp. 25-26.

and the rights of our commerce.¹

But the straw that broke the American camel's back, Hatterson thought, was the German Government's undertaking "to instruct the government of the United States in tones and terms little short of insolent... upon its duties as a neutral." Wilson would miss a grand opportunity if he didn't "give Bernstorff his walking papers" and deport Dernberg² "as an undesirable citizen if not a dangerous agitator and spy." Hatterson was of the belief that the dismissal of Bernstorff would terminate relations between Germany and America until the conclusion of the war. "It would be a drastic measure. Yet it would meet the universal approval of the American people."³

On April 20, Wilson's first ultimatum to Germany was printed in the Courier-Journal. An excerpt from this note which was perfectly seasoned to Hatterson's taste was this:

...It has become painfully evident that the use of submarines for the destruction of an enemy's commerce is utterly incompatible with the principle of humanity,

-
1. As Millis points out, and as Hatterson here illustrates, "no one paid much attention to the disappearance of the German side of the story" after the cables were cut. Hatterson said that he was going to, but it is obvious that he was caught in the same maelstrom of propaganda as was all America. Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 62.
 2. Ambassador to the United States from Austria-Hungary.
 3. Courier-Journal, April 12, 1915. p. 4, Editorial.

the long-established and incontrovertible rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants.¹

On April 24, the front page carried a London dispatch which announced a new type of German atrocity, the use of poisonous gas. The sub-title quoted Field Marshal French as accusing the Germans of "deliberate violation of The Hague Convention." The following was the most interesting item of the dispatch:

...The false statement made by the Germans a week ago to the effect that we were using such gases is now explained. It obviously was an effort to diminish neutral criticism in advance.²

On April 28, a bit of English propaganda appeared on the front page. This dispatch dealt with speeches made in the Houses of Parliament. To make it especially savory for the American palates, the United States was praised for her efforts to improve the conditions existing in the German prison camps. The first condition complained about---and this, surely, is bitterly ironic---was a scarcity of food.³

1. Courier-Journal, April 20, 1915. p. 1.

2. Ibid., April 24, 1915. p. 1. See Ponsonby, A.L., Cp. Cit., p. 146. Ponsonby says: "But it turned out that the Germans had not been the first to use poisonous gas. H. 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."

3. Ibid., April 28, 1915. p. 1.

On May 7, in an editorial called "Austrian Kultur" Matterson told his public that henceforth it should believe all accounts of atrocities committed by the Central Powers because "The Serbian Agricultural Relief Committee, of which Dr. Charles W. Eliot¹ is president" had published a list of atrocities committed by Austrians in Serbia. A portion of the report stated that

In Yarebitza the throats of a woman and her four infants were cut and their bodies piled together.

In a field near Krivaya were found fifteen bodies of men and women with their throats cut. The face of a young girl had been transfixed by a bayonet, which had entered the left side of the lower jaw and come out by the upper part of the right cheek.

In Mayova was found a young woman killed and upon her breast a young nursing baby still living.

Old men of eighty and infants of one year were killed.

In Tsculkovitch, infants of one year were chopped up with knives.

In Lechnitsa all the male children over eight years were killed.

At Tsikote the nose and ears of Illia Aleksitch were cut off; chunks of flesh were then cut from his thighs.

At Dvorska, Maxime Vassitch was tied to a mill wheel and he was stuck with knives as he turned.

At Bovossavats a young woman who was about to become a mother was killed, her unborn infant torn from her and spitted on a knife. Most women who were killed were left naked.

At Chabats, in a hotel where a number of inhabitants had been held, all girls over

1. President Emeritus of Harvard University.

ten years were violated in the presence of their mothers, who were killed with axes if they attempted to defend their children.

Watterson closed his editorial by saying that most Americans had regarded as "publicity stories" the early accounts of German atrocities. He even granted that very probably there would be some instances in the future when stories about the Germans would be exaggerated for purposes of propaganda. But that there must have been considerable truth to the repeated accusations of the Allies there could be, no longer, any doubt.¹ Would "such a man as Dr. Eliot lend his name to an organization which would publish such horrors as this merely as a part of a campaign of publicity."²

Meanwhile, Cronus, whom we left chuckling to himself at the close of the last chapter, had surveyed the events of May 7, 1915, with god-like complacency. With a sardonic smile on his Titanic countenance, he handed the schedule of events for May 8 to his lieutenant, Horus, and retired to his celestial chamber.

-
1. In other words, repetition lends to credibility.
 2. Courier-Journal, May 7, 1915, p. 4, Editorial. That Dr. Eliot might have been both sincere and mistaken doesn't seem to have occurred to Watterson. Millis, for example, thinks that "the overwhelming effectiveness of the Allied propaganda in the United States is not to be explained by any particular superiority in technique or subtlety in misrepresentation. Rather it is to be found in the predisposition of the American public to receive the propaganda, in the near absolute Allied command over the channels of communication and opinion and in the passionate and sincere conviction of the Allied propagandists." Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 64 (My underscoring)

VI. THE LUSITANIA AND THE BRYCE REPORT

VI. THE LUSITANIA AND THE BRYCE REPORT

On May 8, everything except the weather, the date, and the price of the newspaper was crowded off the front page to make room for the dispatches about the sinking of the Lusitania. A picture of the giant Cunard liner took up more than a quarter of the page. Screaming headlines announced the number of persons lost and every column dealt with some phase of the great disaster.¹

Either the dispatch arrived too late or he was too stunned by the occurrence of an event which, strangely enough, he had been forecasting for several weeks, for Watterson did not get active editorially on May 8. But on the next day, in an editorial entitled "The Heart of Christ---The Sword of the Lord and Gideon," which occupied one-half of the editorial page, Marse Henry blasted forth.

That which the Courier-Journal has feared--- which it has been for weeks forecasting²--- has come to pass. A great ocean liner, passing peacefully to and from an American port--- carrying a harmless ship's company of non-combatant men, women, and children,³ many of them American citizens---has, without chance

-
1. Courier-Journal, May 8, 1915, p. 1.
 2. This is quite true. Viereck did the same. See p. 87 below.
 3. To say nothing of ten and one-half tons of explosives. See p. 91 below.

of escape,¹ or time for prayer, been ruthlessly sent to the bottom of the deep and some thousand, or more, gone to their death, drowned and mangled by the murderous onset of a German submarine. Truly, the Nation of the black hand and the bloody heart has got in its work...

-
1. Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., p. 281, contends that "if Captain Turner (commander of the Lusitania) had obeyed orders it is likely that the tragedy would never have happened. He had been instructed to steer a mid-channel course; to avoid capes or headlands; to sail at high speed; and to zig-zag. He ignored each one of these important instructions and thereby assisted in the destruction of his own vessel."
- Tansill implies that England might have been offering the Lusitania as bait for German submarines, hoping that if Germany "bit," the United States would be drawn into the war. He points out that "in Queenstown harbor three torpedo boat destroyers lay at anchor while the Lusitania neared the Irish coast, but they received no orders to meet the giant Cunard liner. Such inaction is hard to explain when one remembers that the British Admiralty was constantly sending wireless reports to the Lusitania, warning it of the appearance of submarines at different points along the Irish coast." Ibid., p. 288.
- The most thorough account of the Lusitania disaster is that of Bailey, Thomas A., The Sinking of the Lusitania, American Historical Review, vol. 41 (1935-36) pp. 54-73. Professor Bailey says that "no evidence has ever been presented to support the theory" that England had co-operated with the Germans to have the Lusitania sunk. Bailey agrees with Tansill, however, that "the Lusitania was doing almost everything possible to make easier her destruction. On a clear day she was steaming at reduced speed, she was following her usual course; she was near what was known to be a submarine infested headland; she was not in midchannel; she was not zig-zaging, and she was without armed escort." p. 71.
- Captain Schweiger recorded surprise at reading the name, Lusitania, on the bow of the sinking ship because he had sunk two steamers near the same place the day previous and thought that the British Admiralty would not allow such a large ship as the Lusitania to travel the peace-time course. Ibid., pp. 56-57.

Nothing in the annals of piracy can in wanton and cruel ferocity equal the destruction of the Lusitania.

...Berlin has lost all the perspectives of civilization...The decree of Satan went forth from Berlin. The instruments of Satan were forged at Essen. There was but a single Satanic abatement. Satan's ambassador at Washington---shameless in his infamy, under the Sign Manual of Satan's Embassy, insolent in its disregard of law or consequences---gave warning that the deed was hatched, that the tools were ready and that those who went upon this English boat, trusting to her convoy and her speed, took their lives in their hands, not recking the Devil's hatred, nor his devices. This was done not to save, but to intimidate; not to warn, but to terrorize.¹

Watterson said that no honest man could truthfully say that Ambassador von Bernstorff was not a murderer, not that any German or "pretended German-American," who applauded this deed was not a "murderer at heart."

The "call to arms" again sounded forth when Watterson asked, "What are we going to do about it? Are we at the mercy of the insane² Hohenzollern?" Marse Henry wondered.

...What the President could have meant when he declared that the Government of the United States would hold...Germany to a "strict accountability" in the event that its war-zone pronouncement resulted in the loss of a single American...?

-
1. Viereck, Geo. S., Op. Cit., pp. 60-62, says that this idea of publishing a warning in the newspapers originated at a meeting of the German Propaganda Cabinet. At this meeting, he made the statement that "Sooner or later, a German U-boat will sink a large passenger steamer carrying many Americans." The Cabinet agreed that the safest thing to do was to publish a warning. The fact that the warning appeared so close to the tragedy was purely coincidental.
 2. My underscoring. Watterson's opinion of the Kaiser's sanity underwent considerable change during the war. See p. 93 below for comparison.

Please God, as all men on earth shall behold, we are a Nation; please God, as Europe and all the world shall know, we are Americans.¹

Watterson then went off into another tirade against the outstanding German-Americans in this country, urging the deportation of Bernstorff, Munsterberg, and Bartholdt;² saying that Dernberg³ should have been halted at Ellis Island; arguing that Herman Ridder should have been forced to put up bond.

...Each of the latter is a German, not an American, and, in event of war...would become a German spy...In all their newspapers they threaten us⁴. In spite of the President's patience, his equal and exact neutrality⁵, they are already abusing him and saying what they are going to do to him in 1916.

Watterson said that he would not be so presumptuous as to say that the President should assemble Congress

-
1. Watterson's frequent appeals to God must not be construed as cheap propaganda designed to play upon religious minds. He was an intensely religious man himself. In his autobiography he says: "I found in the life and death of the Man of Galilee inspiration enough to fill my heart's desire." Watterson, Henry, Marse Henry, an Autobiography, p. 22
 2. German-American congressman from Missouri.
 3. German propagandist in America; a member of the propaganda "Cabinet."
 4. As evidence that the pro-German Americans were not as pro-German as they were pro-American we quote from the issue of the "Fatherland" immediately after the publication of the famous Zimmerman note to Ambassador Bernstorff regarding an alliance between Mexico and Germany against the United States. "We cannot remain the friends of a country that is plotting to destroy our own." Viereck, G. S., Op. Cit., p. 114.
 5. This, of course, was disputed by Germany during the War, and by many competent writers since. See Seymour, Chas., American Neutrality, 1914-1917.

and ask it to declare a State of War existing with Germany. It is rather strange, but Watterson, in spite of the fact that he possessed a disproportionate amount of self-assurance on nearly every occasion, always seemed to get flustered when it came to the actual break with Germany. Although he became violently irritated with Wilson's innumerable warnings to the Germans, he seems to have felt really that nothing more serious than a diplomatic breach could exist between Germany and the United States.¹ "Actual war," he said, "is not possible."

...Germany having no fleet we can swipe off the briny deep, nor army near enough to be met face to face and exterminated---yet we are not wholly without reprisal for the murder of our citizens and the destruction of our property. There are many German ships...worth many million dollars, within our reach to make our losses---repudiated by Germany---good...

...Civilization should abjure its neutrality. It should rise as one mighty, God-like force, and, as far as its moral influence and physical appliance can be made to prevail, forbid the riot of hate and debauch of blood that, like a madman, is running amuck among the innocent and the unprotected.

-
1. Viereck, G. S., Op. Cit., p. 28, felt that this attitude of Watterson was similar to that of most Americans. He found that "to the average American, the war that was stalking through Europe seemed remote." Lawrence, D. H., The True Story of Woodrow Wilson, says: "while a few people on the eastern seaboard were clamoring for war, a careful examination of the editorials showed that out of 1,000 compiled by telegraph in the three days after the Lusitania was sunk in May, 1915, less than one-half dozen indicated a belief that war should be declared." p. 197.

This lengthy and befuddled editorial concluded with a religious tone.

This holy Sabbath every pulpit in America should send a prayer to God in protest; every patriotic Minister of the Gospel of Christ should lift his voice in protest, and more than all---the Christian President of the United States, a cool and brave man, sprung from a line of heroes and saints---ceasing longer to protest¹, should act, leaving no doubt in the mind and hearts of any that he is not merely a leader in Christ², but a leader of men and nations, and that he holds aloft the Sword of the Lord and Gideon.³

The same issue of the Courier-Journal carried a letter of Theodore Roosevelt which said that the sinking of the Lusitania

...represents not merely piracy, but piracy on a vaster scale of murder than any old-time pirate ever practiced. This is the warfare that destroyed Louvain and Dinant and hundreds of men, women, and children, travelling on the ocean, and to our fellow countrywomen, who are among the sufferers. (sic)

It seems inconceivable that we can refrain from taking action in this matter, for we owe it not only to humanity, but to our own national self-respect.⁴

On May 10, the front page printed a dispatch which literally added insult to injury. This dispatch, coming from Venice (via London) stated that all the Vienna newspapers published the story of the sinking of the Lusitania as if it contained glad tidings of great joy

1. Note the mild criticism of Wilson.
2. Could not this be interpreted as the American form of "Meinself und Gott?"
3. Courier-Journal, May 9, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.
4. Ibid., p. 4.

for their readers. The Vienna Neue Freie Presse said:

German submarines have registered an immense success. Perhaps Messrs. Churchill and Asquith will now speak less contemptuously of the German blockade, and the dread of the submarine will increase still more.

We rejoice over this new success of the German navy, which will show everywhere that as the allied armies in common attack have accomplished seemingly impossible things, so also the allied¹ navies will go on with equal bravery to brilliant success.²

A denial by Dudley Field Malone, collector of the New York port, that the Lusitania was armed³ was also printed on the front page of this issue. Malone stated that there was "no warrant under law for the act."⁴

It has of course, been definitely proven that the Lusitania was carrying 4,200 cases of metallic cartridges, and 1,250 cases of shrapnel. The powder contained in these explosives amounted to some ten and one-half tons or better. As Professor Bailey points out, the possibility that the torpedo struck that part

-
1. The word allied, of course, here applies to the Central Powers.
 2. Courier-Journal, May 10, 1915, p. 1.
 3. Professor Bailey points out that it is foolish to argue the point about the Lusitania's being armed. The port authorities at New York would never have permitted her to clear port if she had been. Bailey, T. A., Op. Cit., p. 58.
 4. Mr. Malone at first denied that the Lusitania was armed, or that she carried any munitions. Later he admitted that 4,200 cases of Springfield cartridges were stored in her hold. See Ponsonby, A. P., Op. Cit., pp. 122-123.

of the ship which contained these explosives lends support to the theory first suggested by Capt. Schweiger that the real cause of the rapid sinking of the vessel was exploding munitions.¹

On May 10, a picture of the Lusitania disaster, drawn from a description sent by cable, took up a great portion of the front page.² Underneath this picture, a dispatch from Kinsale, Ireland, quoted Coroner Horgan of that community as charging the Germans with murder. Horgan further stated that:

...the first torpedo fired by the German submarine did serious damage...but...not satisfied with this, the Germans discharged another torpedo. The second torpedo must have been more deadly, because it went right through the ship, hastening the work of destruction.³

In refutation of the coroner's charge we have the words of Captain Schweiger, written in the log of the U-20. "I could not," he recorded as he watched the huge liner sink, "have fired a second torpedo into this thing

-
1. Another article by Professor Bailey in the Journal of Modern History, vol. 8, pp. 320-337, reprints facsimiles of Capt. Schweiger's log. Schweiger was astounded at the rapidity with which the Lusitania sank. He knew it was equipped with devices to render it unsinkable. Furthermore, he had noted that on the previous day vessels one-fifth the size did not sink at all with one torpedo. p. 332.
 2. The artist was G. A. Coffin.
 3. Courier-Journal, May 10, 1915, p. 1.

of humanity attempting to save themselves."¹

On May 11, Watterson boomed forth again, this time under the title, "Wilhelm the Murderer." The chief interest of this editorial is that it directly contradicted one of the preceding August 16. In the earlier editorial, commenting on the rumored insanity of the Kaiser, he said:

...The story that the Emperor of Germany is insane...which has been printed and reprinted in England, originated, no doubt, in the Germophobia² that has been in evidence in England for some time.³

But a great deal of water had rolled over the sunken tonnage of American merchants in the ten intervening months, and enough had rolled over American bodies in the past seventy-two hours to cause Watterson to reconsider.

1. Bailey, T. A., Journal of Modern History, pp. 335-336. In defense of Schweiger, Bailey points out that "On February 10, 1915, the British Admiralty issued secret orders in which the masters of British merchantmen were instructed as follows: 'If a submarine comes up suddenly close ahead of you with obvious hostile intention, steer straight for her at utmost speed, altering course as necessary to keep her ahead.' In other words, orders were given to attack before the enemy craft could possibly give the warning prescribed by law." Captain Turner admitted under oath that he had received these instructions. Bailey, T. A., The Sinking of the Lusitania, American Historical Review, vol. 41, 1935-36, p. 60. For other accounts of the Lusitania disaster see Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., pp. 162-191 and Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., pp. 88-91.

2. Watterson's spelling.

3. Courier-Journal, August 16, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.

...The degenerate Hohenzollern---believed for many years before the war to be of unsound mind---applies in a broader field of operations the philosophy which Nero applied in the regulation of his domestic affairs.¹

A cartoon entitled "Brothers," drawn by W. A. Rogers of the New York Herald, was printed in the May 12 issue of the Courier-Journal. The artist depicted the Kaiser in full military regalia with his arm around the shoulder of Jack the Ripper. To the Kaiser's coat sleeve was pinned this note:

Dear Uncle Sam,
Beware!!! I will kill your citizens on sight.
William the Pirate.

To Jack the Ripper's coat, this note:

Dear Miss Colum,
I will kill your child Monday sure.
Jack the Ripper.²

The sinking of the Lusitania had furnished Watterson with a target large enough to withstand the barrage of his editorials indefinitely.³ Nevertheless, as if to

-
1. Courier-Journal, May 11, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. Ibid., May 12, 1915, p. 7.
 3. Viereck, G. S., Spreading Germs of Hate. "Whether the sinking of the Lusitania itself was due to the blunder of a German commander, or whether it was part of a deep-laid plot to terrorize the seas, Germany paid for it with the loss of the war." p. 67.

guarantee the devotion of editorial writers in America to their heavy artillery practice,¹ the British propagandists released the Bryce Report,² excerpts from which were printed in the Courier-Journal on May 13.³ This report surpassed everything else in the way of dramatic atrocities. It ran the gamut of the accusations enumerated by Lasswell;⁴ everything was admirably covered with specific and gruesome detail. The report started off with a few general charges. It stated that it had been proved that in many parts of Belgium there had been "deliberate and systematically organized massacres,"⁵ as well as "many isolated murders and other

-
1. The New York Evening Post for May 12, 1915, said: "It may be rashly charged that the publication of this report in America was skillfully timed so as to deepen the feeling aroused by the sinking of the Lusitania. But this is absurd." Quoted by Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., pp. 297-298. Tansill is of the opinion that any other deduction than the one scoffed at by the paper would be absurd. It was probably in reference to such timing as this that Lasswell remarked: "Successful propaganda depends upon the adroit use of means under favourable conditions." Lasswell, H. D., Op. Cit., p. 185.
 2. James Bryce Bryce, 1st Viscount (1838-1922), English statesman, jurist, and author. He was chairman of the British commission appointed to study the stories of German outrages in Belgium and France. The full title of this report is, Report of the Committee on Alleged German Outrages Appointed by His Majesty's Government, hereinafter referred to as Bryce Report.
 3. The report itself is quite long but full of countless repetitions because of appendices containing the texts of testimony by witnesses.
 4. See pp. 55-56 above.
 5. Bryce Report, p. 48.

outrages." Noncombatants were murdered in large numbers, and women and children were violated and murdered. Houses and property were destroyed, not by individual monsters in the ranks but on the orders of commanding officers. The commission had become convinced that the Germans, long in advance, had determined to employ in this war "a system of general terrorization."

...Sensible as they are to the gravity of these conclusions, the committee conceive that they would be doing less than their duty if they failed to regard them as fully established by the evidence. Murder, lust and pillage prevailed over many parts of Belgium on a scale unparalleled in any war between civilized nations during the last three centuries.

The committee believed that its job would be well done if its disclosures should "touch and rouse the conscience of mankind"¹ and it expressed hopes that

...as soon as the present war is over the nations of the world in council will consider what means can be provided and sanctions devised to prevent the recurrence of such horrors as our generation is now witnessing.²

The committee had instructed its examiners not to ask the witnesses leading questions, but to cross-examine each of them carefully in an effort to bring out the truth.³ Extracts from the diaries of German soldiers

-
1. In order that "mankind" might readily peruse this report, it was put on sale at the nominal price of one penny.
 2. Bryce Report, p. 48.
 3. Bryce Report, p. 5.

were also offered for purposes of authenticating the committee's report, and facsimiles of pages from several diaries were printed in the appendix.

The committee said that, at first, it had its doubts as to whether anything positive could be obtained, "but the farther we went and the more evidence we examined so much the more was our skepticism reduced."¹

The report then went into specific cases that had been investigated. The first case mentioned by Watter-son was one at Havre where

...The murder of an innocent fugitive citizen was a prelude to the burning and pillage of the town and other villages in the neighborhood... In one household alone the father and mother (names given) were shot, the daughter died after being repeatedly outraged, and the son was wounded.²

The report of the massacres at Soumagne and Miche-

-
1. Barnes, H. E., Op. Cit., pp. 95-96, says that the report was fantastic. Barnes, of course, leans backwards so far that he loses his balance. He is not content with proving the Germans as humane as the Entente. He tries to canonize the German army. More than that, he tries to prove that the Entente was guilty of the atrocities. However, he is undoubtedly correct in his refutation of the Bryce Report. Lloyd George and Premier Nitti of Italy authorized an investigation of the alleged atrocities. "Their investigators were unable to uncover a single case of wilful mutilation, whereas the Bryce Report...alleged that they existed by the thousand." Ibid., p. 95. Ponsonby, A. P., Op. Cit., also points out this fact.
 2. Bryce Report, p. 10.

roux said that many civilians were slain and many

...corpses were seen in the field...One, at least, had been mutilated...The eye-witness of the massacre saw on his way home twenty bodies, one that of a young girl of thirteen...¹

Various cases of murder, pillage, and incendiarism were said to have been perpetrated at Heure le Romain, where officers were reported as directing the atrocities.²

Extracts from the diary of a German soldier were next discussed by the committee.³ These showed that on the night of August 19, the Teutons gave themselves up to a night of debauchery in the streets of Liege and on the following night indulged themselves still further with a massacre.

...The Rue des Pitteurs and houses in the Place Pitteurs were systematically fired with benzine, and many inhabitants were burned alive in their houses, their efforts to escape being prevented by rifle fire...The Liege fire brigade turned out, but was not allowed to extinguish the fire. Its carts, however, were usefully employed in removing heaps of civilian corpses to the town hall...⁴

The scene switched to the massacre of Andenne where

1. Bryce Report, p. 11.

2. Ibid., p. 11.

3. Barnes points out that "General Charteris has recently ...told...of faking a diary to be put in the pocket of a dead German." Barnes, H. E., Op. Cit., p. 96.

4. Bryce Report, p. 11.

four hundred civilians were destroyed. One man was placed close to the muzzle of a machine gun and slain by having its bullets fired through his body.

...His wife brought his body home on a wheelbarrow. The Germans broke into her house and ransacked it, and piled up all the eatables on the floor and relieved themselves upon it.¹

The report of the massacres at Dinant said that ninety bodies were piled together on a grassy plot in front of the convent. Sixty more were said to have been recovered from a hole in the yard of a brewery and forty-eight bodies of women and children were discovered in a garden.²

The report of specific cases was here interrupted and an editorial comment of the committee inserted. It is as follows:

...The committee is especially impressed by the character of the outrages committed in the smaller villages. Many of these are exceptionally shocking and cannot be regarded as contemplated or described by the responsible commanders of the troops by whom they were committed. The inference, however, which we draw from these occurrences is that when once troops have been encouraged in a career of terrorism the more savage and brutal natures,

1. Bryce Report, pp. 13-14
2. Ibid., p. 16.

of whom there are some in every large army¹ are liable to run to wild excess, more particularly in these regions where they are the least subject to observation and control.²

Returning to definite cases, the committee gave some more dramatic illustrations of atrocities. The first took place in Malines where an eye-witness saw

...a German soldier cut a woman's breast after he had murdered her, and saw many other dead bodies of women in the street...

...On a side road at Hofstade the corpse of a civilian was seen on his doorstep with a bayonet wound in his stomach, and by his side the dead body of a boy of five or six with his hand nearly severed.

Two young women were lying in the back yard of a house. One had her breasts cut off, the other had been stabbed.

A young man had been hacked with a bayonet until his entrails protruded. He also had his hands joined in the attitude of prayer.

In Sempst the corpse of a man with his legs cut off, who was partly bound, was seen by a witness, who also saw a girl of seventeen dressed only in a chemise and in great distress. She alleged that she herself and other girls had been dragged into a field stripped naked and violated, and that some of them had been killed with a bayonet.

At Elewyt a man's naked body was tied up to a ring in the wall in the back yard of a house. He was dead and his corpse was mutilated in a manner too horribly to record. A woman's naked body was also found in a stable abutting on the same back yard.

-
1. A dangerous admission it seems to me, probably put in as proof of the honesty of the commission's intentions. Or perhaps it was the historian in Bryce shining through for a brief moment. Barnes, in this connection, says: "A friend of the writer approached James Bryce about the Bryce Report some time before Mr. Bryce's death, but Bryce refused to attempt any defense beyond the assertion that one must expect almost anything in war time." Barnes, H. E., Op. Cit., p. 96.
 2. Bryce Report, p. 20.

At Haecht a child of three, with its stomach cut open by a bayonet was lying near a house. At Werchter the corpses of a man and a woman and four younger persons were found in one house. It is said that they had been murdered because one of the latter, a girl, would not permit the Germans to outrage her...

...Several children had been murdered, one of two or three years old was found nailed to the door of a farmhouse by its hands and feet, a crime which seems almost incredible but the evidence for which we feel bound to accept...

At Eppegem the body of a child of two was seen pinned to the ground with a German lance. The same witness saw a mutilated woman alive near Weerde on the same day...¹

Again the report of the committee was interrupted for further editorial comment by the committee. The conclusion reached this time was that all the molesting of the Belgian villages, the burning and massacring at Louvain, and the arresting of civilians with their subsequent transportation to Cologne

...were due to a calculated policy carried out scientifically and deliberately, not merely with the sanction, but under the direction of higher military authorities, and were not due to any provocation by the civilian population...²

An unusual (to say nothing of unbelievable) atrocity was next reported by the committee. According to this, a witness reported a story "very circumstantial in its details," about Belgian women being publicly raped in the market square of Louvain by German troops assisted by five young German officers.³

-
1. Bryce Report, pp. 20-23. Also Bryce Report Appendix, p. 19.
 2. Ibid., p. 28.
 3. Courier-Journal, May 13, 1915. p. 2.

Watterson's attitude toward the Bryce Report was remarkably similar to the one he expressed toward that of Dr. Eliot.¹ On May 14, in an editorial entitled "The Rape of Belgium," he discussed Belgium's plight in the light of the "new evidence" contained in the report of the commission.

The last hope that German atrocities in Belgium might have been the subject of exaggeration is dissipated by the report of the British investigating committee, under the chairmanship of Viscount Bryce.²

Watterson felt that the report must be accepted as authentic because the committee's procedure "is convincing of its integrity of purpose" and because Viscount Bryce, "the historian and the man," could not be associated with "any suspicion of the exaggeration or distortion."³ The accounts of rape, murder, arson, and

1. See pp. 83-84 above.

2. This sentence was quoted by the Literary Digest for May 25, 1915.

3. Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., p. 81, says: "There is no mistaking the fact that the...report of the Bryce Commission had far-reaching effects in America." His record as Ambassador (1907-1912 to America) and his American Commonwealth "had stamped him as a penetrating though friendly critic of American institutions...There would be few critics to assail any report that he signed." According to Tansill, President Wilson was completely "taken in" by the report. "There was no reason for him (Wilson---and we might justifiably include Watterson) to suspect that Lord Bryce had become so senile that he could no longer weigh evidence impartially or that he was a mere propaganda agent for the British Government." Ibid., p. 298. Barnes, H. E., Op. Cit., thinks that England made a "great stroke" in getting Bryce's signature to the report because of his popularity in America. p. 95.

pillage, Watterson said were not news. The committee had merely supplied "names and other particular circumstances" which authenticated some old material. The editor felt that the report would be of eternal interest and would "take its place as the blackest page in the history of civilized nations."¹

Again, on May 17, in an editorial called "Civilization Protests," Watterson proclaimed his esteem for Viscount Bryce. He published an extract from the report with the announcement that it was one atrocity story which Americans could surely believe "because they know Viscount Bryce."

The peasant came and asked what they were doing.² The officer said he did not come quickly enough, and that they had "trained up" plenty of others. His hands were tied behind his back and he was shot at once without a moment's delay.³

The wife came out with a little suckling child. She put the child down and sprang at the Germans like a lioness. She clawed their faces. One of the Germans took a rifle and struck her a tremendous blow with the butt on the head. Another took his bayonet and fixed it and thrust it through the child. He then put his rifle on his shoulder with the child upon it. Its little arms stretched out once or twice.

The officers ordered the house to be set on fire, and straw was obtained and it was done. The man and his wife and the child were thrown on top of the straw. There were about forty other peasant prisoners there also, and the officer said: "I am doing this as a lesson and example to you. When a

-
1. Courier-Journal, May 14, 1914, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. As a matter of fact they were kicking his door down. Bryce Report, p. 40.
 3. This syntactical redundancy is in the original report. Ibid., p. 40.

German tells you to do something next time you must move more quickly."¹

Watterson's comment at the close of this extracted case was very brief but quite momentous. We may, in fact, regard it as the I-now-pronounce-you-man-and-wife clause in the marriage (in Watterson's mind) of the Lusitania catastrophe and the Bryce Report, which was hinted at earlier in the chapter. He said: "This is the spirit of the wholesale murders of the Lusitania."²

On the following day, in "The President's Opportunity for a Master Strike,"³ Watterson urged Wilson to act immediately. The strange idea that actual war between the United States and Germany was impossible

1. See Bryce Report, pp. 40-41.

2. Courier-Journal, May 17, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

3. The "i" in "Strike" is probably a compositor's error; such errors, because of Watterson's notoriously bad handwriting, were a common occurrence. As one biographer points out: "His wretched handwriting led to many amusing blunders in print... In the course of a long editorial he used the familiar phrase 'from Alpha to Omega.' The intelligent compositor, who was more accustomed to geography than to literature, set it up as 'from Alton to Omaha'". Marccosson, Isaac F., Adventures in Interviewing, New York: John Lane Company, 1919, p. 31.

was expressed once more.¹

...The circumstance that war between the United States and Germany is, under prevailing conditions, physically impossible, lends itself to lines of consideration and discussion outside the immediate issue in dispute, and these might be made to embrace the whole question of modern armament and warfare...

...Can submarines be used at all---against either battleships² or merchantmen---without the violation of every principle not only of "justice and humanity", but of honorable and manly war?...

...What are we coming to? Where is our boasted world progress? Is murder to be the last word of science? Must Kruppism become universal?

...The German that seemed yesterday an inspiring, indefatigable student---that was the day before yesterday a lover, a musician, a poet---today is a madman bent upon murder; rejoicing in cruelty; in Germany, an imperialized barbarian; in America, where he has followed the German lead, a traitor to freedom; everywhere a monster of self-inflated vanity, fancying himself a superman. He must be brought to his senses. And then?

-
1. Millis, Walter, Op. Cit., p. 68, says: "It was a long time before the notion was to penetrate his (Watterson's) mind that the United States might reasonably be expected to do its share in eliminating the Hohenzollern from the planet." Strangely enough, Colonel House makes the same complaint about Wilson at this time. Wilson had referred to Germany as a "madman that should be curbed". House asked the President if he thought it reasonable to expect the Allies to do all the curbing. Seymour, Charles, Intimate Papers of Colonel House, vol. II, pp. 440-441.
 2. A capital illustration of Watterson's romantic attitude toward war. It backs up the point previously made (see p. 39 above) that he considered the submarine as an immoral, a sinful weapon.

Watterson said that Wilson should step in and achieve a master stroke by outlawing the submarine, the airship, the brutality that had become so rampant in this war. Wilson, he thought, was Heaven sent.

As God raised up Washington to create the republic and Lincoln to save the Union, may he not have raised up Woodrow Wilson to rescue our Christianity and our civilization from the jaws of death wide open and ready to swallow them.¹

On May 20, the Lusitania and the "Rape of Belgium" were given a holiday in order that Watterson might reply to the complaint of Count von Reventlow that America, by selling armaments to the Allied Powers, had manifested an unfriendly attitude toward Germany. The editorial was entitled "Prussian Pigheadedness" and contained a patented argument of Marse Henry in more than usually concise terms.

It is perfectly well known in Germany, as elsewhere...that the custom is and has been, and must always be, for neutral nations to trade with the belligerent nations who can come to market. If Germany cannot come to market, that is no fault of the United States, which would gladly trade with Germany. As Great Britain can come to market the refusal of America to trade with her would end, definitely America's neutrality. This country would be attempting to nullify the effect of Great Britain's naval position and would, by that attempt,

1. Courier-Journal, May 18, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

be giving Germany material aid.¹

On May 31, Watterson published the German reply to Wilson's Lusitania note² and also, right beside it, a cartoon entitled "Here Are the Facts," which depicted Uncle Sam with outstretched arms, standing over six little girls who were draped in a large American flag. All seven were appealing to Wilhelm who stood, with a haughty sneer upon his face.³

On June 1, came the announcement from Captain Persius, a German naval expert, that Germany would continue her submarine warfare. Persius defended the sinking of the Lusitania and condemned the New York port authorities for criminal negligence in permitting women and children

-
1. Courier-Journal, May 20, 1915, p. 4, Editorial. It is interesting here to note that with regard to the Mexican civil war, Wilson had said in 1913: "I shall follow the best practice of nations in the matter of neutrality by forbidding the exportation of arms or munitions of war of any kind from the United States to any part of the Republic of Mexico." Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 16, p. 7888.
 2. The German reply claimed "justified self-defense." Courier-Journal, May 20, 1915, p. 1.
 3. Courier-Journal, May 31, 1915, p. 1.

to sail on a boat carrying ammunition to England.¹ Watterson attacked this the next day with the editorial, "In Defense of Pirates." Maintaining that the widespread use of the term "common piracy" to describe the submarine warfare of the Kaiser was rank injustice to the Viking, Malay, Barbary Coast, Spanish Main, and all other pirates of international renown. Surely, he exclaimed,

there are degrees of crime and difference in the quality and character of murders...The Kaiser in some respects is a common pirate...But the common pirate was a more or less picturesque figure...and carried with him a mental picture of the end of a yard, a manila line with a hangman's knot at the loop, and a dangling corpse...

-
1. Courier-Journal, June 1, 1915, p. 2. Professor Bailey has pointed out that there is no question but that "those Americans who sailed on the Lusitania were well within their rights but," he adds significantly, "they were not prudent." Furthermore, the New York, a steamship of the American Line, which was sailing two hours later than the Lusitania, had "room for 300 more passengers, or all of the 197 Americans who departed on the Lusitania." Bailey, T. A., American Historical Review, vol. 41, pp. 67-68.

Watterson's argument is the same, practically, as the answer sent by Secretary of State Lansing to Austria-Hungary on August 12, 1915. The note said, in effect, that the United States would be dependent to a considerable extent, on neutral countries for munitions in the event of a war. "That right, which it claims for itself, it cannot deny to others." Foreign Relations, 1915, Supplement, pp. 794-798. Quoted by Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., p. 60.

A pirate of a very different sort---a desk pirate, who pushes a button to call a varlet to order an admiral to murder one hundred women and children---is Wilhelm II...Capable of every diabolism, he may be called a pirate. But no common pirate. It is outside the code of the ancient profession. Mention of him in the same breath with Blackbeard is a gratuitous insult to a gentry, which with all its faults, contributed a little color to the narrative of social development.¹

Meanwhile, the foreign policy which the Wilson administration had been pursuing became far too pugnacious for the one completely and sincerely pacifistic member of the Government, William Jennings Bryan, the Secretary of State. Finding himself unable to reconcile his conscience to the point where he could bring himself to sign Wilson's second Lusitania note, which he felt certain, was bound to lead to war, he determined to resign.² On June 8, President Wilson with a "feeling of personal sorrow" accepted his resignation.

Watterson flew into a violent rage over the "treachery" of the Secretary of State. On June 12, he stated that "Men have been shot and beheaded, even hanged,

1. Courier-Journal, June 2, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., pp. 354-358.

drawn and quartered for treason less heinous."¹

Wilhelm, "The Pirate," gave way on June 16 to "Wilhelm the Damned," a masterpiece of Wattersonian invective.

Attila the Hun; Genseric the Vandal; William the German. That leaves out Macbeth the Scot and Richard the Third of England; but the thane of Cawdor was a hero and the hump-backed tyrant a saint by comparison with the assassin of the women and children in the Irish Sea. There lies before us a cartoon by "Caezare," which depicts a human brute kneeling with clasped hands and a bill book under his arm, and a poor widowed mother in an attitude of supplication to the high court of "Civilization." The moral of the picture would have been enhanced if the brute had been named Herod and the mother Rachel, that "grieved for her children that were not." Herod is now a back number. To the destruction of the Lusitania he held the seat of supreme infamy, as the "Murderer of the Innocents." The place will henceforward belong to Wilhelm the Hohenzollern.²

On July 18, a dispatch from London announced the opinion of the court of inquiry investigating the sinking of the Lusitania. This opinion was that

-
1. Quoted by Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., p. 338. Tansill shows that this was the general reaction of the American press. This reaction came as no surprise to Bryan, however. At a conference with Secretary of Treasury McAdoo on May 7, the latter had warned Bryan that resignation would mean political suicide. Bryan replied: "I believe you are right; I think this will destroy me; but...I must do my duty according to my conscience, and if I am destroyed, it is, after all, merely the sacrifice that one must not hesitate to make to serve his God and his country." Ibid., pp. 335-336.
 2. Courier-Journal, June 16, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

...the act was done, not merely with the intention of sinking the ship, but also with the intention of destroying the lives of the people on board.¹

A more dramatic atrocity appeared on another page of the same edition. This told of the massacre of Armenians by the Kurds at Bashkalla. Out of five hundred Armenian men, an Associated Press correspondent was said to have found only sixty remaining alive while all the women and children had been either slain or carried away after the Kurds had used them "as they chose."

...After the defeat of the Turkish troops... the Kurds foresaw their expulsion and made an end of such of the female and youthful population as they did not take away in slavery...Five hundred women have been carried away and divided between the harems of Hassem Bey and Hashi Bey, Kurdish chiefs.²

Five weeks of almost constant editorial work had apparently taken their toll on the aged Watterson,³ for he allowed the above atrocity to slip by without comment. An attack upon the Orduna by a submarine,⁴ however, stirred him to another blast on July 19. The editorial entitled "No Further Delay" argued that

-
1. Courier-Journal, July 18, 1915, p. 6. In answer to this, we have already noted Schweiger's surprise at finding the name Lusitania on the sinking ship (see p. 86 above) and his statement of horror at the idea of shooting a second torpedo. (see p. 92 above)
 2. Courier-Journal, July 18, 1915, p. 1.
 3. He had just passed his seventy-fifth birthday.
 4. The Orduna was fired upon but not struck, the torpedo "churning the water" behind the ship.

nothing is to be gained by further parley between Washington and Berlin. That a second Lusitania horror did not follow the attack reflects on the marksmanship but does not minimize the murderous purpose of the Kaiser assassin. It is only a question of time when the hell-hounds of the black hand and the bloody heart will add another victim to the catalogue of crime. Shall we invite this catastrophe by longer waiting?

Why should we quibble with Jagow and Tirpitz whilst these monsters of the deep, under their orders, roam the seas at will, seeking whom they may to devour?¹

A week later, in discussing a speech of Rudyard Kipling, Watterson stated that the entire world was aware that there was "no crime, no cruelty, no abomination" that the Germans had failed to employ. Kipling had declared in his speech that "however the world pretends to divide itself, there are only two divisions in the world today----human beings and Germans." Watterson presented proof of this by pointing to conditions in Belgium where "several million" were compelled at the point of a bayonet to manufacture munitions or fortifications for Germany, with only enough food to "support life as the Germans think it should be supported."

Watterson's statements in this editorial are obviously based upon the Bryce Report, and they indicate clearly his complete acceptance of that pamphlet. If

1. Courier-Journal, July 19, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

the Belgians complained about the food or the work they were shot, said Watterson.

Their factories, their houses and their public buildings have long ago been gutted, and everything in them that was available or useful has been packed up and sent to Germany. They have no property and no more rights than cattle; and they cannot lift a hand to protect the honor of their women...

...The "Fatherland" of today is the Kaiserland organized like the army of Atilla, for the use and benefit of a blood-thirsty leader.¹

On August 4 an article appeared in the Courier-Journal which stated in its headline that 50,000 Armenians had been massacred by the Turks and that innumerable women and children had been thrown into the river. The dispatch itself accounted for only nine thousand in the massacre. Presumably the remaining forty-one thousand were killed in action.²

On August 8, in lieu of any atrocity story or submarine attack, Watterson delved into romance. In the "Kaiser's Triumph" he visualized Wilhelm's triumphal entry into Warsaw.

...As the procession ascends Capitoline Hill distinguished captives are withdrawn to be murdered to emphasize the authority of the conqueror. Their execution is announced and the news that they are being sacrificed.³

A picture of the Belgian orphans on board a vessel docking in New York appeared on August 9. The accompanying article lauded extravagantly the heroism of their

1. Courier-Journal, July 25, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

2. Ibid., August 4, 1915, p. 2.

3. Ibid., August 18, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

dead fathers and denounced their destroyers.¹

Two days later, another dispatch about the aforementioned massacre of the Armenians corroborated with the original in refuting the misleading headline Waterson had tacked on to the former. Only 10,000 were "massacred."²

On August 19, a German submarine fired a torpedo which sent the Arabic to the bottom of the sea with twenty-six Americans;³ and on August 21, Waterson fired an editorial, "Up With the Flag," which contained his strongest "call to arms" to date. Marse Henry could still see nothing more serious than a severance of diplomatic relations, however.

It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back.

Long ago should Count von Bernstorff have been given his passports. Now he must. And along with him the whole Imperial outfit will have to walk the plank. The country has suffered enough in its dignity and in its peace. Invaded by a horde of Secret Service Agents, who found here a body of Reservists already organized and prepared to meet them, there has been no time when Germany has not been making

1. Courier-Journal, August 9, 1915, p. 1.

2. Ibid., August 11, 1915, p. 1.

3. Ibid., August 20, 1915, p. 1. Only two American lives were lost. As Tansill points out, this was a direct violation of Germany's agreement of the previous June to refrain from attacking large passenger vessels. The Arabic carried more munitions from the United States to the Allies than did any other vessel, and this fact may have had a lot to do with the attack. Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., P.358 and 358n.

war upon us. Its hirelings have threatened us with political destruction. The time has come when we shall send the officials away and compel the domestic leaders, the subsidized editors and volunteer spies, to know their place. It may be that not until we have hanged a few of them will they learn that the United States is a government and that America belongs to Americans.

We have neither right nor reason to doubt the President. His attitude admits of no further parley, equivocation or delay. The people en masse demand the suspension of all relations with Germany, and we believe he will promptly answer the summons. Berlin will ascertain, when it is too late, where we stand.

To Hell with the Hohenzollern and all his agents, his works and his ways and up with the flag of the Republic!¹

Watterson waited just five days for Wilson to take his advice about dismissing Bernstorff, and the President, not having seen fit by that time, to follow his advice, the editor launched a mild attack against him on August 26, in an editorial called "Muddling the Situation." Commenting on the futility of listening to Germany's explanation of the sinking of the Arabic, Watterson urged an immediate break. The editorial closed with

How long, oh, Lord, how long!
To Hell with-----!²

On September 4, in an editorial squib, Watterson said that

-
1. Courier-Journal, August 20, 1915, p. 4, Editorial. Colonel House wrote to Wilson two days later in much the same vein. "For the first time in the history of the world, a great nation has run amuck, and it is not certain that it is not a part of our duty to put forth a restraining hand." The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, vol II, p. 51. quoted by Tansill, p.361
 2. Ibid., August 26, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.

The Germans boast the capture of 1,000,000 Russians. As they cannot afford to feed so many, what's the cause of jollification? A cannibal feast ahead?¹

A picture appeared on the front page on September 19, under this heading:

LAST OF BIG BRITISH TROOPSHIP STRUCK BY A
TORPEDO FROM A GERMAN SUBMARINE

More interesting than either the title or the picture, however, was the legend which appeared under it.

A British transport loaded with troops going to reinforce some section of the Allies' army is seen in this picture...the big boat, with its great mass of humanity, went to the bottom soon after it was struck by a German submarine torpedo...The underseas boat immediately left the scene of the wreck to look for more prey on the wide expanse of the ocean.²

Turkish atrocities "Rivaling Records of History" were printed on the front page of the October 4 issue. This report was made by a committee formed by Charles R. Crane, Cleveland H. Dodge and others. The committee stated that

...the evidence was collected from sources that are unquestioned as to the veracity and authority of the writers, but that for obvious reasons their names cannot be given; and in most cases names of towns and cities must be concealed...

In many cases the men were bound tightly

-
1. Courier-Journal, September 4, 1915, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. Ibid., September 19, 1915, p. 1.

together with ropes and chains. Women with little children in their arms, or in the last days of pregnancy, were driven along under the whip like cattle.

Another witness tells of the cruel use of the bastinado in a certain prison where Armenians were held.

...200, 300, 500, and even 800 strokes were administered. A young man was beaten to death within the space of five minutes. ...Other methods were employed, too, such as putting hot irons on the chest.¹

As perhaps has been noted, things had been slowing up a bit for the past month or so. The remainder of the year 1915 was likewise to roll by without much jingoistic comment from Hatterson. This was partly because there was naturally less military activity during the cold months and partly because the Germans had let up somewhat on their submarine campaign.² It was not until January 4, 1916 that Hatterson's dander was aroused again, this time by the sinking of the British liner, Persia, in the Mediterranean on the preceding December 30. In an editorial, "Washington and the Teutons," he said:

...It becomes more and more apparent that something more threatening than the necessity for "reparation and satisfaction" will be needed to restrain the Teutonic Powers from further submarine outrages...

What is wanted (in America) is a cessation of the slaughter of the innocents on the high seas in contravention of international

1. Courier-Journal, October 4, 1915. p. 1.
 2. Willis, Walter, Op. cit., pp. 213 ff.

law. If this cannot be brought about by such expedients as we have tried, and are trying, that fact should be sufficient to indicate plainly the necessary course for the government to follow.¹

On March 14 Watterson, in a frivolously sarcastic mood, said that William, "denie" his dinner in Paris, will, before the close, be content with a mess of pottage at Potsdam," if he should be so fortunate as to have that city left to him after the German people had discovered what his reign had done to them.²

The resumption of the submarine warfare in the spring of 1916 by Germany,³ led Watterson once more to urge an abrupt break between Uncle Sam and the Teuton. The French steamer "Sussex," plying her daily route across the English channel with three hundred passengers

-
1. Courier-Journal, January 4, 1916, p. 4, Editorial. Representative Jeff McLemore of Texas had a different idea of the "necessary course for the government to follow." On February 17, 1916, he introduced a bill to warn Americans from travelling on merchant ships carrying armaments. Congressional Record, vol. 53, p. 2756. Quoted from Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 462. Tansill adds that it was greatly feared by many of the outstanding Democrats in Congress that President Wilson was leading America into war. "His insistence upon the rights of American citizens to take passage upon armed merchant ships of belligerent powers was regarded by some Democratic leaders as quixotic and war-provoking." Ibid., p. 475.
 2. Ibid., March 14, 1916, p. 4, Editorial.
 3. Ludendorff, Erich von, Ludendorff's Own Story, p. 369. "Unrestricted submarine warfare was now the only means left to secure in any reasonable time a victorious end to the war."

aboard, was struck by a torpedo on March 24, and though she managed to reach port, eighty persons, some of them Americans, were killed in the explosion. The case was almost identical with that of the Lusitania. The Sussex was unarmed and unwarned.¹

On April 1, the hospital ship, Portugal, flying the Red Cross flag was sunk by a torpedo. A large number of wounded were aboard.²

Watterson kept quiet while charges and counter-charges were flung back and forth; while denials and disavowals came from Berlin. Finally, on May 6, in an editorial entitled "The Case Made Up," he discussed the German reply to the United States' protest against the indiscriminate destruction of merchant vessels. Berlin had agreed to stop her U-boat warfare on condition that the United States demand that England restore complete freedom of seas to humanity. Watterson said that the German reply would have been satisfactory were it not for two points.

One is that Germany is a bankrupt in good faith, a promise now issued by her having very little face value.

The other is her willingness to observe the law if we force others to do so. The idea that Germany has a right to sink our ships just as much as Eng-

1. Courier-Journal, March 25 (p. 1), 1916. Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., pp. 499-502, says that there was considerable doubt in Germany that the Sussex had been struck by a torpedo rather than a mine.

2. Ibid., April 1, 1916, p. 1.

land has to seize them is all hooey.¹

The Louisville chapter of the German-American Alliance had been given a long period of rest by Watterson. But on May 7, he turned on them once more. In an editorial, "To Our German-American Fellow Citizens," he referred to a pamphlet circulated by the Alliance soliciting funds for the erection of a German House (Turngemeinde). Watterson publicly declined to contribute and said to his "German-American" friends:

...If you are faithful to your oaths of allegiance---if you truly conceive the difference between the institutions of American freedom and the traditions of German feudalism---between Kaiserism and liberty---come with us into the American place in the sun and rally with us under the flag of the free heart's hope and home, shouting, "Down with Medieval Castism; down with the Autocracy and the Right Divine of Kings; to Hell with the Hohenzollern and the Hapsburg."²

This was to be Watterson's last direct attack on the Kaiser and his allies for some months. This sudden application of the soft pedal is, in some respects, the most interesting performance of Marse Henry during the whole war. The United States was closer to a break

-
1. Courier-Journal, May 6, 1916, p. 4, Editorial. Lansing took the same stand as Watterson. Lansing had become deeply concerned over Wilson's increasingly antagonistic attitude toward England. He said: "On no account must we range ourselves even indirectly on the side of Germany, no matter how great the provocation may be...I only hope the President will adopt the true policy, which is 'join the Allies as soon as possible and crush down the German autocrats.'" Lansing, Robert, War Memoirs, pp. 171-173.
 2. Ibid., May 7, 1916, Section 2, p. 4, Editorial.

with Germany than it had been at any time during the war.¹ Yet Watterson, who had been howling for that break for more than two years, became suddenly silent. But, like Miniver Cheevy, he had reasons.

1. Lansing, on April 10, tried to get the President to send a note to Germany regarding the sinking of the Sussex, stating that "no apology, no disavowal, no admission of wrong-doing will satisfy the Government of the United States." Lansing, Robert, Op. Cit., p. 136.

VII. INTERMISSION---HE KEPT US OUT OF WAR

VII. INTERMISSION---HE KEPT US OUT OF WAR

There were several reasons for Watterson's sudden silence. First of all, during the latter part of June the Mexican war scare shoved almost everything else off the front page. It should be remembered that only two years before, Watterson had waged his "On to Panama" campaign,¹ and he may have seen, in this disturbance, the opportunity to realize that fantastic dream. Secondly, from the first part of July on, Allied successes were so overwhelming² that there was little need of bothering Americans with the atrocities of what was beginning to look like a defeated group of nations. Watterson became so indulgent toward the Teutons that he even waxed enthusiastic over the feat of the submarine, Deutschland, in making a commercial trip to America under water.

But by far the most important reason for Watterson's let-up on the European war was the coming election. He was preparing to back Wilson on the "He Kept Us Out of War" slogan, and he apparently realized that his hitherto jingoistic policy could hardly be retained if he were to manifest any degree of consistency. Hughes, incidentally, in his campaign, had severely criticised Wilson

1. See page 7 above.

2. Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., p. 601, The British were making their great Somme drive.

3. Courier-Journal, July 10, 1916, p. 4, Editorial.

for not taking a more aggressive stand with regard to Germany. It is somewhat pathetic, therefore, to see Watterson on June 17, just after the adjournment of the Republican and Democratic conventions, as he hastened to yell a final and almost despairing "To Hell with the Hohenzollern and the Hapsburg."¹

Watterson's back-tracking became highly amusing at times. For example, on October 9, a front page streamer announced

SIX STEAMERS SUNK OFF U. S. COAST;
GERMAN U-BOATS TERRORIZE SHIPPING

and Watterson, commenting on this a few days later, praised Germany for her "new type of U-boat warfare."²

In spite of the fact that a major item in Hughes' campaign was a criticism of Wilson for his placating attitude toward Germany,³ Watterson did his best to put over the idea that the election of Hughes would delight the Kaiser. For example, on October 19, he published a caricature of Hughes under the title, "The Kaiser's Choice."⁴

1. Courier-Journal, June 17, 1916, p. 4, Editorial.

2. Ibid., October 12, 1916, p. 4, Editorial.

3. In all probability it was this attitude that insured Wilson's reelection. "The high point of the convention (Democratic) was the impassioned speech of Senator Ollie James, in which the President was pictured as a...bulwark against...war." Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., p. 602.

4. Courier-Journal, October 19, 1916. p. 6.

The election was so close and exciting and the outcome so long in doubt that there was nothing but election news in the Courier-Journal for the greater part of November. Even when Wilson was finally proclaimed the winner Watterson thought it best to "lay off" the Germans for a while. It would hardly do to attempt too suddenly to incite the man who "Kept Us Out Of War" to hurl us abruptly into one. Watterson had become so peaceable that he even refused to comment on several torpedoings, one of which killed a half-dozen Americans.

But the hypocrisy of his present position was unquestionably telling upon Watterson. He was chafing to get back into his war-saddle and was impatiently awaiting an incident of enough importance to allow him to escape from his costume with dignity.

He had not long to wait.

VIII. AMERICA GOES TO WAR

VIII. AMERICA GOES TO WAR

With the turning of the year, Germany launched its great submarine offensive.¹ On January 18, the front page of the Courier-Journal, carried an account of the sinking of fifteen Allied vessels, with fifty American citizens reported missing.²

This was what Watterson had been waiting for. He had masqueraded long enough. Here was another "new type" of submarine warfare and, fortunately, this one came at a time when he could express his real opinion on it, as well as on all types of submarine warfare. Still, at first, he must move with dignity.

Dignity held him in check until the next day when he finally burst forth with all the vitriol which he had been storing up for the past six months.

Although he made no specific mention of them, there is little reason to doubt that the spark was ignited by the news of the great German naval successes on the previous day.

After a few yaps at the German-American Alliance and a few "To H---with the H---'s and the H---'s," he struck a new vein against pacifists in general.

-
1. von Tirpitz had resigned on the previous March 5 because of Germany's decision, at that time, to restrict submarine warfare. Now, when it was too late, Germany was adopting his policy. Tansill, C.C., Op. Cit., p. 491.
 2. Courier-Journal, January 18, 1917, p. 1.

...The slobbering flabbergast about peace which we hear from nymcompoops and mollycoddles deceives no one with a spoonful of sense. England, like her allies, wants peace. She has refused no peace terms because England was offered none.¹ She was offered a trap baited with fine words.² "We all desire peace," says Lloyd George, "but it must be a real peace."³

We had not much farther to go. On February 1, the front page streamer,

U. S. IS FACING SUPER-CRISIS,

prefaced news of the German announcement of the unrestricted U-boat warfare which was to begin on that day. A few of the subtitles were interesting and probably express Watterson's opinion better than the editorial page.

1. It should be remembered that Germany was the only nation even remotely interested in peace when House made his second mission.
2. Of whom is this an indictment? Col. House had made the only proposals at this time.
3. Courier-Journal, January 19, 1917, p. 4, Editorial. Very likely Wilson was the object of this outburst, for he unquestionably had become definitely anti-war since his election. Apparently "He Kept Us Out of War" meant more to him than just a campaign slogan. Tansill, C. C., Op. Cit., p. 631, says that "for the first time since the outbreak of the World War, he was (in January 1917) really neutral in his attitude toward the belligerents." Wilson wrote to House in January: "We are the only one of the great white nations that is free from war today, and it would be a crime against civilization for us to go in." Intimate Papers of Colonel House, vol. 2, p. 412. Lansing, Robert, Op. Cit., pp. 208-209 said: "I hope those blundering Germans will blunder soon because there is no doubt that the Allies in the West are having a hard time. The Allies must not be beaten...War cannot come too soon to suit me."

Ruthlessness Beyond That Planned By Von Tirpitz
Conceived And To Be Executed Under Von Hinden-
berg Commencing Today.

Severance of Diplomatic Ties Possibility Ameri-
ca Beholds

Peace Goes Glimmering---President Studies Note,
But Retires For Night Without Announcing
Government Plan Of Action.¹

On the editorial page of the same issue Watterson
interpreted the German note as a

...suave invitation to us to go to the devil
with our pratings about our rights on the sea.
Now indeed we shall see just what manner of
American we have in the White House...²
Germany's action is a virtual challenge of war
to mankind. It is a direct challenge of war
to the United States...That challenge should be
accepted within twenty-four hours, and the war
thus entered on by America should not end un-
til the imperial despotism of Germany, which
dares plunge the world into such a war, is com-
pletely and eternally crushed.³

On February 2, in an editorial, "Everything Staked
and Lost," Watterson, after quoting von Bethmann-
Hollweg's⁴ statement, "We stake everything, and we shall
be victorious," said:

...She (Germany) confesses that she has been
driven to the last ditch; that there is no
hope for her to overcome her enemies except by
this last resort to barbarism, and like some
crazed beast at bay she fights furiously in

-
1. Courier-Journal, February 1, 1917, p. 1.
 2. Note this very sudden and violent attack on his pet,
Wilson. Obviously Watterson is resentful toward the
President for the hypocritical role he had been com-
pelled to play in order to assist in his re-election.
 3. Courier-Journal, February 1, 1917, p. 4, Editorial.
 4. Chancellor of Germany.

any way she can.¹

On February 3, the front page streamer announced:

CLASH WITH GERMANY MATTER OF HOURS;
ONLY QUESTION OF FORM UNDETERMINED²

Down near the bottom of column four on the same page the wee, small voice of Bryan³, declaring that it was "A crime for the United States to enter the war," was drowned out by the more prominently located and more patriotically eloquent pro-war articles.⁴

On February 4, the announcement of the severance of relations with Germany was spread across the top of the front page. American flags, linked together, bordered the page on all four sides.⁵

Although the actual declaration of war was still two months distant, all was over save the shouting, and Marse Henry could justifiably feel that he had done his bit toward developing the throats of his reading public.

-
1. Courier-Journal, February 2, 1917, p. 4, Editorial.
 2. Ibid., February 3, 1917, p. 1.
 3. William Jennings Bryan, the recently resigned Secretary of State. He said that he was unable to follow the President's policy.
 4. Courier-Journal, February 3, 1917, p. 1.
 5. Ibid., February 4, 1917, p. 1.

IX. CONCLUSION

IX. CONCLUSION

At the outbreak of the World War, as has been noted, Watterson's mind was completely occupied with the Mexican situation. As facetious as he deliberately tried to be at times, there can be no doubt that his "On to Panama" campaign was conducted in an absolutely serious manner. His imperialistic mind definitely envisioned an Empire of the United States, ranging from the Canadian border through the Isthmus of Panama. Consequently, we found him, at the time of Francis-Ferdinand's assassination, thoroughly neutral so far as the situation in Europe was concerned. While it is true that he suffered (as did most Americans) from the affliction of Anglo-mania because of ethnological and linguistical affinities, his defense of Franz-Joseph and his tolerance toward Wilhelm II in the earliest stages of the holocaust, certainly stamped him as a neutral.

Not until the cables uniting America and Germany had been severed did Watterson manifest a partial attitude toward the conflicting powers. And yet, although he was wise enough to note the importance of the cable and to warn his readers that, henceforward, no reliability could be placed upon the War-bulletins coming from abroad, he seemed unable to restrain himself from succumbing to the influence of these same bulletins. This,

it seems, is a phase of propaganda which most writers on the subject have failed to emphasize properly; the subtle influence that is a combination of repetition and one-sidedness. It is a simple matter to doubt the veracity of a story heard for the first time. Credence increases in direct proportion to the increase of new sources for the same story and, if the story be of an acrimonious or accusatory nature, credence matures in direct proportion to the elapse of time plus the absence of refutation.

Whether the theory outlined above will ever become an axiom is beyond the author's ability to prognosticate. Nevertheless, it is undeniably true that Watterson's neutrality began to sink immediately with the cutting of the cable. From time to time, in the first twelve months of the war, common sense would seize hold of him and he would express doubt as to the truth of a particular dispatch. Whenever this happened, the victory of rationality was a short-lived one for he would immediately accept a dozen stories which were equally as incredible. The most colorful battle Watterson's intelligence waged with propaganda during the War was with the atrocity story. Intelligence lost in the spring of 1915 when the sinking of the Lusitania threw it into a state of frenzy; rationality sold its birthright for the Bryce Report.

When Watterson first took sides in the European conflict, however, he had not accepted the atrocity stories. He entered the lists as a foe of the "Militariat" system in Germany. In spite of his fantastic imperialistic hopes for the United States, he viciously attacked the imperialism of Germany. He recognized the danger of espousing the Allied cause as the cause of democracy, because of Russia's presence in the Allied camp, and made it plain that he held no brief for Russia. But Russia could be attended to after the world had been made safe for democracy. The Russian Revolution, of course, subsequently cleared the Entente camp of this unpleasant aroma and made, in Watterson's mind, the cause of the Allies the cause of America.

Long before the Lusitania was sunk, long before Viscount Bryce's Committee had made its report Watterson had determined that Germany must lose the War. What he could not, at first, determine was what the United States could do to insure the defeat of Germany. An actual combat between German and American forces, in spite of the fact that he warned his readers that Germany's plans included the conquest of America, seemed inconceivable to him. Even at the height of his fury over the Lusitania incident, even after he had acknowledged that the reports of Professors Lowell and Bryce had made the acceptance of the atrocity stories unavoid-

able, he could still think of no more drastic a measure than the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany.

It must have been sometime during the summer or fall of 1916 that Watterson realized that it was possible to send American troops to France to fight Germany. At that time, he was campaigning for Wilson (he had always been an ardent Democrat) and the pacifistic platform of Wilson's campaign made it incumbent upon him, if he were to render his candidate any service, to restrain his belligerency toward Germany. At any rate, by January, 1917, Watterson was definitely in favor of a declaration of war and his irritation with Wilson became more and more violent with the constantly increasing efforts of the President to arrive at a peaceful solution of the troublous state of affairs that had accumulated between America and Germany during the Presidential campaign. He was on the verge of an open break with the President when Bernstorff was finally given his passports.

The influence of Watterson in directing America toward war was unquestionably not a slight one. His controversies with Herman Ridder of the New York Die Staats-Zeitung and The Volksblatt of Cincinnati indicate clearly that his potency was recognized by the German-Americans. The New York Sun became "alarmed" at

his inflammatory language. Scarcely an issue of the Literary Digest from the summer of 1914 through the spring of 1917 fails to quote him. Walter Millis in his Road to War devotes three times as much space to him as to any other editor. Charles Tansill in his America Goes to War, quotes several choice specimens of his vitriol. George Sylvester Viereck in his Spreading Germs of Hate, acknowledges receipt of the Watterssonian title, "a venom-bloated toad of treason."

And now, in closing, a word in defense of Warse Henry surely cannot be out of order. In spite of his desire to annex Mexico and Central America, it would be ridiculous to regard him as a foe of democracy. He was ever willing to do battle for the cause of personal liberty. In the days before his commitment to the Allied cause, he had criticized Germany on this score. While it is undeniably true that he became excessively violent toward the Central Powers, it should be remembered that his best literary tools were humor and scorn and, in the European conflict he could find very little material for exercising his humor.

Undoubtedly Wattersson succumbed to Allied propaganda and the absence of unbiased information; but it is hardly reasonable to assume that his affliction was more malignant than that of most Americans.

X. BIBLIOGRAPHY

X BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Baker, Newton D., Why We Went to War, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1936.
- Barnes, Harry Elmer, In Quest of Truth and Justice, Chicago, National Historical Society, 1928.
- Gerard, James W., My Four Years in Germany, New York, George H. Doran Company, 1917.
- Grey, Sir Edward, Twenty-Five Years, 2 volumes, New York, Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1925.
- Lansing, Robert, War Memoirs, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1935.
- Lasswell, H. D., Propaganda Technique of the World War, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.
- Lawrence, David, The True Story of Woodrow Wilson, New York, George H. Doran, 1924.
- Lloyd George, David, War Memoirs, Boston, Little Brown, and Company, 1933.
- Ludendorff, Erich von, Ludendorff's Own Story, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1919.
- Marcasson, Isaac F., Adventures in Interviewing, New York, John Lane Company, 1919.
- Millis, Walter, Road to War, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1935.
- Parmelee, Maurice, Blockade and Sea Power, New York, T. Y. Crowell Company, 1924.
- Pohl, Dr. Winrich, Amerikas Waffenausfuhr und Neutralitaet, Berlin, 1917. (quoted by Tansill, C.C.)
- Pensonby, Sir Arthur P., Falsehood in War-Time, New York, E. P. Dutton & Company, Incorporated, 1928.
- Richardson, James D., Editor, Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents. 20 volumes, Washington, Bureau of National Literature, 1896-1927.

Niegel, Oscar Wetherhold, Mobilizing for Chaos, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1934.

Seymour, Charles, American Neutrality, 1914-1917, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1935.

Seymour, Charles, Editor, The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, 2 volumes, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1926.

Slosson, Preston William, Twentieth Century Europe, New York, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1927.

Slosson, Preston William, The Great Crusade and After, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1930.

Tansill, Charles C., America Goes to War, New York, E. P. Dutton & Company, Incorporated, 1938.

Viereck, George Sylvester, Spreading Germs of Hate, New York, Horace Liverwright, 1930.

Viereck, George Sylvester, The Kaiser on Trial, New York, Greystone Press, Incorporated, 1938.

Watterson, Henry, Marse Henry, an Autobiography, New York, George E. Doran Company, 1919.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

NEWSPAPERS

With the exception of the Courier-Journal, the various newspapers listed here and elsewhere in the bibliography are mentioned because they were quoted by Watterson. No direct research has been made with regard to them.

Louisville, Ky., The Courier-Journal, January, 1914-June 1917.

New York, N. Y., Herald
Staats-Zeitung
Sun
Times
Tribune
World

Chicago, Ill. Tribune

London, England, Chronicle
Daily Telegraph
Morning Post

Vienna, Austria, Neue Freie Presse

PERIODICALS

Bailey, Thomas A., "The Sinking of the Iusitania,"
American Historical Review, vol., 41, 1935-
 1936. pp. 54-73.

Bailey, Thomas A., "German Documents Relating to the
Iusitania," Journal of Modern History, vol. VIII,
 1936, pp. 320-337.

Congressional Record, vol. 53, p. 2756 (quoted by Mansill)

Life Magazine (Cartoon reprinted by Courier-Journal)

Outlook Magazine (Article by Theodore Roosevelt quoted
 by Colonel House).

Encyclopaedia Britannica, New York, The Encyclopaedia
 Britannica Company, 1938.

Brailsford, H. W., "Atrocity," Encyclopaedia of Social
 Sciences.