

The University of North Carolina
at Greensboro

JACKSON LIBRARY



CQ
No. 1073

UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

FARLOWE, JOANNE TRIPP. The North Carolina Press and the World War, 1914-1917: A Study of Opinion. (1973) Directed by: Dr. Richard N. Current. Pp. 71.

The purpose of this study was to find out what some influential North Carolinians thought about the first World War from the beginning of hostilities in July, 1914, until United States intervention in April, 1917. Newspaper editorials were surveyed because newspaper editors were prominent members of the foreign policy public and did influence public opinion formation and change concerning foreign affairs. Nine North Carolina newspapers, two religious journals, and an agricultural journal were read for editorial comment on the war.

This study shows that German submarine warfare was by far the most important factor in steering editorial opinion towards an acceptance of United States intervention in the first World War on the side of the Allies. Although newspapers differed widely in editorial reaction to specific incidents in the war from 1914 to 1917, the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare by Germany on January 31, 1917, brought unanimous agreement among the editors that war with Germany was probable. With the exception of one newspaper which had felt intervention would occur in April, 1916, the papers did not recognize a real war threat until early February, 1917. By March 27, 1917, a full week before President Woodrow Wilson delivered his war message to Congress, eight of the nine papers had declared the existence of a state of war with Germany.

THE NORTH CAROLINA PRESS AND THE WORLD WAR, 1914-1917

A STUDY OF OPINION

by

Joanne Tripp Farlowe

Thesis
Adviser

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Greensboro
1973

Approved by

Richard N. Current

Thesis Adviser

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to all persons who have contributed inspiration, counsel, and assistance in the preparation of this study. The advice and guidance of Professor Richard N. Current, her Thesis Adviser, have been invaluable in the completion of this study. Appreciation also is extended to Professor Richard Bartholp for his constructive criticism and suggestions.

Finally, the author expresses her appreciation to her husband and her children for their patience and sacrifice during the course of this study.

Thesis
Adviser

Richard N. Current

Committee
Members

Richard Bartholp
Samuel H. H. H.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I. THE PROBLEM	7
CHAPTER II. THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
CHAPTER III. THE METHOD	19
CHAPTER IV. THE RESULTS	29
CHAPTER V. THE CONCLUSIONS	39
APPENDIX A. THE DATA	49
APPENDIX B. LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	59
APPENDIX C. A NOTE ON THE STUDY OF PUBLIC OPINION	69

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to all persons who have contributed inspiration, counsel, and assistance in the preparation of this study. The advice and guidance of Professor Richard N. Current, her Thesis Adviser, have been invaluable in the completion of this study. Appreciation also is extended to Professor Richard Bardolph for his constructive criticism and suggestions.

Finally, the author expresses her thanks to her husband, Horace, and her children for their patience and sacrifice during the course of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I. WAR IN EUROPE	7
CHAPTER II. THE NEW WAR MACHINE OF THE SEAS	14
CHAPTER III. THE <u>LUSITANIA</u> AND <u>ARABIC</u> CRISES	19
CHAPTER IV. THE <u>SUSSEX</u> CRISIS	29
CHAPTER V. THE END OF NEUTRALITY	34
CONCLUSION	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY	44
APPENDIX A. CLAUDE KITCHIN PAPERS	48
APPENDIX B. LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	54
APPENDIX C. A NOTE ON THE STUDY OF PUBLIC OPINION	59

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE 1. SURVEY SUMMARY FOR NORTH CAROLINA NEWSPAPERS, 1914-1917	43
---	----

This study is a content analysis of editorial opinion about the First World War in North Carolina newspapers during the years 1914 to 1917.¹ The original purpose of the study was to discern public opinion in North Carolina about the war; however, materials for a complete evaluation of public opinion are completely inadequate for this period.

A review of the literature on public opinion in the United States toward the First World War reveals a tendency on the part of historians to reach conclusions on nationwide opinion based on press surveys in such journals as The Literary Digest. For example, a poll of newspaper editors published in the November 14, 1914, issue of The Literary Digest has been widely used to document statements describing the status of American public opinion early in the war.² What an editor believed or what he believed the opinion predominant in his community to be is a questionable criterion for ascertaining public

¹For this study opinion is defined as the "position or stand—favorable, unfavorable, undecided, and variations thereof—held by individuals (or groups) on proposed, future, present, or past government actions." Lee Benson, "An Approach to the Scientific Study of Past Public Opinion," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXI (Winter, 1967-1968), 524.

²See Thomas A. Bailey, A Diplomatic History of the American People (7th ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 365; Alexander Deane, "The South and Isolationism," Journal of Southern History, XIV (August, 1958), 335-36; Arthur S. Link, Wilson, Vol. III: The Struggle for Neutrality, 1914-1915 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), p. 8; and Ernest R. May, The World War and American Isolation, 1914-1917 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 36-37.

INTRODUCTION

This study is a content analysis of editorial opinion about the first World War in North Carolina newspapers during the years 1914 to 1917.¹ The original purpose of the study was to discuss public opinion in North Carolina about the war; however, materials for a complete evaluation of public opinion are completely inadequate for this period.

A review of the literature on public opinion in the United States toward the first World War reveals a tendency on the part of historians to reach conclusions on nationwide opinion based on press surveys in such journals as The Literary Digest. For example, a poll of newspaper editors published in the November 14, 1914, issue of The Literary Digest has been widely used to document statements describing the status of American public opinion early in the war.² What an editor believed or what he believed the opinion predominant in his community to be is a questionable criterion for ascertaining public

¹For this study opinion is defined as the "position or stand—favorable, unfavorable, undecided, and variations thereof—held by individuals (or groups) on proposed, future, present, or past government actions." Lee Benson, "An Approach to the Scientific Study of Past Public Opinion," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXI (Winter, 1967-1968), 524.

²See Thomas A. Bailey, A Diplomatic History of the American People (7th ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 565; Alexander DeConde, "The South and Isolationism," Journal of Southern History, XXIV (August, 1958), 335-36; Arthur S. Link, Wilson, Vol. III: The Struggle for Neutrality, 1914-1915 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), p. 8; and Ernest R. May, The World War and American Isolation, 1914-1917 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 36-37.

opinion in the nation. The influence of the editorial policy of the local newspaper in shaping public opinion is relevant, but editorial opinion cannot be equated with public opinion.³

Editorial opinion was an important conditioning factor in the formation of public opinion, not so much on the editorial page as in selecting the news content of the paper.⁴ In all likelihood the

³Doris A. Graber's comments about the eighteenth century press hold true for the twentieth century:

The views of the press were deemed to be the personal views of the writers whose essays were published, or the views of the paper's editors or sponsors. Although not an image of public opinion, they could be taken as an indication of the influences to which the public would be subjected and which might be reflected in future public opinion.

Public Opinion, the President, and Foreign Policy: Four Case Studies from the Formative Years (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. 27. See Allan Nevins, ed., American Press Opinion Washington to Coolidge: A Documentary Record of Editorial Leadership and Criticism, 1785-1927 (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1928) for the tendency to fail to differentiate editorial opinion and public opinion common to several journalist-historians of the 1930's.

⁴On this point Walter Lippmann's views, which appeared in 1922, are pertinent:

Every newspaper when it reaches the reader is the result of a whole series of selections as to what items shall be printed, in what position they shall be printed, how much space each shall occupy, what emphasis each shall have. . . .

It is in a combination of these elements that the power to create opinion resides. Editorials reinforce. Sometimes in a situation that on the news pages is too confusing to permit of identification, they give the reader a clue by means of which he engages himself. A clue he must have if, as most of us must, he is to seize the news in a hurry. A suggestion of some sort he demands, which tells him, so to speak, where he, a man conceiving himself to be

newspaper during the period 1914 to 1917 was the primary source of information for the average citizen.

What newspaper editors, who were opinion leaders, wrote has significance for the investigator studying the relationship between foreign policy and public opinion. However, editorial opinion must be considered with reservations with regard to public opinion, because the public in general, and Southerners in particular, are not avid readers of newspaper editorials about international events and generally hold vague views on foreign policy.⁵

Of interest, too, with regard to effective public opinion is the article by Kenneth P. Adler and Davis Bobrow in which they differentiate between public opinion leaders and "foreign policy influentials" who were found to be concentrated in the legal profession and business and industry executive positions. The difference was accounted for by the "remoteness of foreign policy decisions from the local community and consequent differences in the flow of influence."⁶

Perhaps the best evaluation of the relationship between the press, public opinion, and foreign policy is found in the book The Press and Foreign Policy by Bernard C. Cohen (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963). He and his assistants interviewed 150 people in staff or

such and such a person, shall integrate his feelings with the news he reads.

Public Opinion (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 223-24.

⁵Alfred O. Hero, Jr., The Southerner and World Affairs (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965), pp. 648-49.

⁶"Interest and Influence in Foreign Affairs," Public Opinion Quarterly, XX (Spring, 1956), 101.

policy positions throughout the Executive and Legislative branches of the federal government, and former holders of these positions, in 1953-1954 and 1960. He concluded that foreign policy officials regarded the press as an important measure of public opinion. However, the local press was downgraded in favor of the national press, in particular the New York Times and the Washington Post, as a source of foreign policy opinion due to the lack of editorial coverage devoted to foreign affairs in the local press.⁷ Consequently, the national press provided these officials with opinion on foreign policy matters to the virtual exclusion of the local press, which decreased the flow of opinion from sources which existed in closer proximity to the population at large.

The following study describes changes in North Carolina editorial opinion about the first World War. As prominent members of the foreign policy public—individuals informed and concerned about foreign affairs—newspaper editors did influence public opinion formation and change concerning the war. Since no means are available to ascertain the extent of this influence, the information contained herein is not a statement of what North Carolinians thought about the war but of what some influential North Carolinians thought about it.

In selecting the newspapers to be read for editorial comment, the most populous North Carolina cities were identified using the 1910 census. They were Charlotte, population 34,014; Wilmington, 25,748; Raleigh, 19,218; Asheville, 18,762; Durham, 18,241; Winston, 17,167; and

⁷In the interest of clarity, the city of origin will precede the title and will not be a part of the title in all newspaper citations.

Greensboro, 15,895.⁸ The newspapers selected for each city were: the Charlotte Daily Observer (after April 3, 1916, the Charlotte Observer) with a circulation of 11,319; the Wilmington Morning Star, 4,474; the Raleigh News and Observer, 18,000; the Asheville Citizen, 10,119; the Durham Morning Herald, 5,324; the Winston-Salem Journal, 5,116; and the Greensboro Daily News, 10,208. Of these, the Charlotte Daily Observer, the Wilmington Morning Star, the Raleigh News and Observer, and the Winston-Salem Journal were supporters of the Democratic Party; the Durham Morning Herald and the Greensboro Daily News were political independents. As a result, the Winston-Salem Union Republican, a Republican Party supporter with a circulation of 11,065, was included. In addition, a small-town paper was read: the Graham Alamance Gleaner with a circulation of 650 and Democratic Party affiliation.⁹ The Graham Alamance Gleaner and the Winston-Salem Union Republican were weeklies; the seven other papers were dailies.

The North Carolina Christian Advocate, a Methodist journal; the Biblical Recorder, a Baptist journal; and the Progressive Farmer, an agricultural journal, were also read but were found to contain little editorial comment on the war. All three were published in Raleigh.

The narrative throughout this study is based on Arthur S. Link, Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era, 1910-1917 (New York: Harper &

⁸The total population of North Carolina was 2,206,287. U. S., Bureau of the Census, Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913), III, 266.

⁹Circulation figures were obtained from N. W. Ayer & Son's American Newspaper Annual and Directory (Philadelphia: N. W. Ayer & Son, 1916), pp. 700-14.

CHAPTER I

WAR IN EUROPE

The Charlotte Daily Observer's editorial page had the most extensive coverage of the war in the early days of the conflict. A July 29, 1914, editorial expressed concern over the German refusal to consider mediation of the dispute between Austria-Hungary and Serbia, and the hope that if war did erupt, the combatants would restrict hostilities to a small area. On August 1 the editor of the Observer revealed a distinct antipathy toward Russia in an editorial entitled "Europe's Strange Lineup." This editorial is of more than usual interest because it applied contemporary racial theory to the war.¹ The editorial advanced the notion that ideally the war should pit Anglo-Saxons and Teutons against the Slavs; in other words, Great Britain should side with Germany against Russia. The editor was also concerned about the "unnatural" affiliation of France and Russia, and in particular, about the Anglo-Japanese alliance. If Japan entered the fray, "then the champions of the Western European civilization which we inherit would be indeed beset by natural antagonists on the east and by natural friends on the west, both foes." The editorial concluded with a

¹See John W. Burgess, Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1890), I, 38-39, 44-45; and John Fiske, "Manifest Destiny," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, LXX (March, 1885), 580-81. Of particular interest is Thomas F. Gossett, Race: The History of an Idea in America (New York: Schocken Books, 1968); see Chapter 5, "The Teutonic Origins Theory," pp. 84-122.

prediction of resentment in the United States if Britain decided to enter the war against Germany with her ally Japan. On August 7, 1914, the Observer editor accelerated his attack on Russia by declaring that "Russia is largely a mass of savage population likely to swarm down on any country at any time, like the barbarians of the North swarmed upon Rome." The Winston-Salem Journal joined in on August 19, 1914, to attribute to the Russian people an inferior brand of patriotism bred of oppression and the thought that the "spirit of the people" was reflected "in the mournful music of that country."

After Japan entered the war, the Asheville Citizen of August 25, 1914, stated that the Japanese entry had an "un-Christianizing" effect on the war, adding the thought that possibly the "cunning" Japanese had bided their time "for an opportune moment to fling the 'yellow peril' on the world." The Winston-Salem Journal's editor was more emphatic on August 25, 1914:

In a war between Germany on the one side and Russia and Japan on the other it is the straight haired, blue eyed Teuton against the Slav and the Mongolian, both inferior to the Teutons, and neither any akin to us, while the Teutons are our own people.

The editor further postulated that public opinion in the United States would be solidly behind Germany if the war were limited to those three countries. The Wilmington Morning Star of August 16, 1914, remarked that the "yellow peril" had intruded into a "white man's fight," while the Durham Morning Herald of August 25, 1914, was even more direct: "While we would like to sympathize with Great Britain we cannot swallow the Jap." The Raleigh News and Observer of August 24, 1914, on the other hand, discounted the view that Japan was hostile to the interests

of the United States, and blamed the jingoes for stirring up needless trouble.

On the question of war guilt, however, Germany, primarily in the person of Kaiser Wilhelm II, was held responsible by a majority of the papers.² The exceptions were the Charlotte Daily Observer which blamed Russia, adding the idea that Britain would be equally guilty if she joined Russia against Germany; and the Durham Morning Herald which blamed Austria.³ The Graham Alamance Gleaner and the Wilmington Morning Star expressed no opinion. The Greensboro Daily News blamed Germany for the war on August 3, 1914, but by August 9 had reversed its position somewhat by pointing out that Germany had to fulfill her treaty obligations with Austria-Hungary when Russia "bared the Slavic saber" on the side of Serbia.

The North Carolina press offered several war causes in its editorial columns. The Charlotte Daily Observer of August 7, 1914, explained that the control of Asia was the basic source of the conflict: Russia wanted control of Asia, Germany wanted trade supremacy in Asia, and Britain wanted a continuance of her favored position in Asiatic trade. The Asheville Citizen on September 18 and October 17, 1914, attributed the war to Germany's excessive militarism and the lack of "sanity and reason" on the part of some European monarchs. According to

²For example, see the Winston-Salem Journal, August 4, 1914; the Asheville Citizen, August 3, 1914; the Raleigh News and Observer, August 6, 1914; and the Winston-Salem Union Republican, August 13, 1914.

³Charlotte Daily Observer, August 4, 1914; Durham Morning Herald, August 4, 1914.

the Winston-Salem Journal of August 6 and August 7, 1914, the causes of the war could be traced to the "abduction of Alsace and Lorraine" by the Germans in the Franco-Prussian War. The Journal also saw the conflict as a struggle of liberty against autocracy, admitting that Russia was on the wrong side and would have to be dealt with later. Along this same line of thought, the Greensboro Daily News on August 8, 1914, called it a war of self-defense on the part of the autocracies—Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Russia—to preserve their empires.

Of particular interest was the interpretation of the causes of the war furnished by the Progressive Farmer to a predominantly rural and agricultural public in North Carolina:

For years now Germany, led by an Emperor ambitious as Lucifer, and with all her sons compelled to train in her superb army, has longed for a chance to show herself the First Nation of Europe—superior to Great Britain alike in commerce and in warfare. At the same time she has feared the growing power of her next neighbor, Russia. In the face of all the circumstances, there can be but little doubt but that Germany has shrewdly calculated that this is the year for her to strike. Russia has not yet fully recovered from her struggle with Japan; England has been on the verge of civil war over Irish home rule—and then came the opportunity for Germany to shove Austria-Hungary on Serbia and line up Austria with her as an ally.⁴

As for the relation of the European war to the United States, most of the editors did not foresee intervention, although they did predict some effects on this country. The Raleigh News and Observer stated on August 3, 1914, that the United States would not be involved, but felt that Southern trade with Europe would suffer. However, by October 29 the paper was predicting a bright day for United States

⁴"Will the War Be Short?" Progressive Farmer, XXIX (August 15, 1914), 882.

industry because of the war. The editor of the Greensboro Daily News also rejected the idea of eventual United States involvement and predicted a decline in commerce in the August 2 and August 11, 1914, issues of the paper. In a burst of outraged Americanism on August 12, 1914, the Wilmington Morning Star declared that President Wilson should intervene at once in the conflict because American interests were being hurt by the war:

An easy way for us to get into it would be to demand that Great Britain, Germany, Russia, Austria and France should halt right where they are and salute the flag or else make it necessary for us to seize the key to the whole situation and put it in our pocket.

But by October 7, 1914, the Star's editor was writing that "nobody in the United States has thought for a moment of proposing to intervene in the war against civilization in Europe." As early as August 1, 1914, the Charlotte Daily Observer foresaw a business boom in the United States in the event of a European war; and on October 22, 1914, the Observer commented that although the war should be ended quickly "as a matter of course," the United States was "in a position to wait patiently for the end and still grow fat" on the increased trade. On August 5, 1914, the Observer was thankful that the United States was "safe," although on August 6, 1914, the paper predicted that the very size of the war that was developing might eventually draw in the United States. The Durham Morning Herald commented on August 7, 1914, that the United States might be involved in the war before it was over simply "to make the thing unanimous."

During this early period of the war only two papers abandoned neutrality, the Raleigh News and Observer on August 6, 1914, and the

Winston-Salem Journal on September 1, 1914. The News and Observer editorial termed Germany "a threat to the world and to civilization"; however, the Journal merely expressed its preference for the systems of government maintained by the French and British and its hope that these would not fall to the Germans. The Journal made a distinction between the German government and the German people, declaring no bias against the people.

The Charlotte Daily Observer went further toward expressing sympathy for Germany than any of the papers examined. Typical of its editorials was this statement of August 9, 1914:

The Germans have a warm place in the heart of the American people, and a manifestation of sympathy, along with the suppression of criticism, would the better become our people at this time.

More typical was the reaction of the Greensboro Daily News which did not declare for either side but was more critical of the Central Powers than of the Entente allies. An editorial of August 15, 1914, stated the hope that Europe would be a safer place if Germany got some of its pride knocked out in the war.

In a study of press opinion in the United States on the war during the period 1914 to April, 1917, Ralph O. Nafziger looked into a number of the leading newspapers across the country and concluded that in 1914 "the United States was viewed as an interested, neutral, and a horrified observer, but not as a prospective belligerent."⁵ As

⁵"The American Press and Public Opinion during the World War, 1914 to April 1917" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1936), p. 345. The newspapers used for the study were the following: New York Times, Tribune, Evening Post, Journal, World, and

previously mentioned, the Literary Digest on November 14, 1914, published the results of a national poll of newspaper editors and concluded that "the sympathy on either side is that of the distant observer. No belligerency is evident anywhere." The Digest included a breakdown of sympathies by geographical sections, and found editors of the New England states markedly pro-Ally, those of the midwestern states and regions of the northwestern states tending toward Germany, and the editors of the southern and southwestern states markedly pro-Ally, while those of the western states tended toward that direction.⁶

The results of the present survey of North Carolina newspapers support the findings of the Nafziger study by revealing no disposition for intervention in the editorial columns of the nine papers examined. However, the conclusion of the Literary Digest that southern editors were markedly pro-Ally is not borne out by the survey. Only two out of nine papers were distinctly pro-Ally in 1914, while the rest were maintaining a neutral stance that leaned toward the Allies.

Sun; Boston Christian Science Monitor and Transcript; Chicago Tribune and Herald-Examiner; Kansas City Star; Atlanta Constitution; Portland Oregonian; San Francisco Chronicle; Los Angeles Examiner; and London Westminster Gazette.

⁶"American Sympathies in the War," Literary Digest, XLIX (November 14, 1914), 939.

CHAPTER II

THE NEW WAR MACHINE OF THE SEAS

In the early days of the first World War, North Carolina editors made note of the role of submarines in the conflict. An editorial in the Charlotte Daily Observer of August 15, 1914, began with these prophetic words: "Watch the submarines." It went on to say that the Allies were in a better position numerically to wage submarine warfare than the Germans. On September 24, 1914, the Raleigh News and Observer pointed out that although the British had a superior navy, the Germans had "some very effective submarines"; and on October 19, 1914, it commented that although the Allies had more submarines than Germany, they were unable to have them in the right place at the right time. The Charlotte Daily Observer, November 29, 1914, included an editorial entitled "New Terror of War at Sea" and containing these significant words: "As a factor in war the submarine has developed more actual terror than the bomb-dropping flying machine." The Asheville Citizen on December 11, 1914, likened the submarine to the sniper who shoots at the pedestrian in the street; and the Winston-Salem Journal of January 21, 1915, referred to submarines as "death-dealing monsters" which "plow the deep." An editorial on April 27, 1915, in the Journal commented on the use of submarines and airplanes in warfare:

Even if we are to continue having wars, it is hoped the war in Europe will lead to some important changes in what are called the "rules of civilized warfare." The airship and the submarine should be

eliminated for all except purely observation purposes. Dropping deadly bombs from the sky and destroying ships from beneath the water savor too much of the methods of the assassin to be countenanced in war, "civilized" or otherwise.

After the Lusitania was sunk, the Raleigh News and Observer on June 12, 1915, stated the comprehensive case against submarine warfare. The editorial entitled "The Thief in the Night" appears to embody all of the contemporary sentiment against submarines:

Modern warfare in its savagery can take position side by side with the warfare of the ancient days. No longer are men tortured at the stake, no longer are men made living fagots, but the warfare of the submarine is upon us, and like the thief in the night it creeps its noiseless way of horrors.

And it is not the warring vessel which is bearing the brunt of its attacks. If that were so the German menace of the sea would not be so horrible to contemplate. But merchantmen of belligerent nations and of neutral nations alike suffer from the monster of the deep. On its unseen way it finds the path to the vitals of the vessel on the surface of the waters.

In honorable warfare the bravery of men is shown. The submarine is the coward fighter from the vantage point. Out of sight it discharges its deadly torpedo, and in safety slips away while on the waters men and women and children struggle for life only to sink beneath the surface, and all is over.

Silently, cautiously, the submarine makes its way, and when in the distance it sees the vessel which it would destroy it rides from sight in the waters below, and from that vantage point it sends its missile of death. Callous and cold and vengeful it spares none, and only exists that in secrecy it may bring to the end those who in fancied security sail the seas. It is the night thief of the ocean. It is the monster murderer of the day when it is directed by any power which is bereft of humanity. It is the outlaw of humanity and of justice. Its use should be bound within the lines of humanity and no submarine should be allowed to go into action against unwarned craft and passenger vessels on the pain of the severest punishment which can be meted out under the law which guides the conduct of civilized nations.

The image of submarine warfare as terrible and barbaric was developed by North Carolina newspaper editors before Germany declared its blockade of Great Britain on February 4, 1915. The Greensboro Daily News responded to the announcement with an editorial on February 9, 1915, entitled "The Most Serious Development of the War, to Us," which pointed out that Germany was attempting to establish a precedent contrary to international law by making neutral shipping completely responsible for its own safety in war zones, whereas heretofore the responsibility had rested on the belligerents. In an editorial of February 18, 1915, the Graham Alamance Gleaner foresaw "serious complications" between Germany and the United States as a result of the German announcement. The Charlotte Daily Observer of February 19, 1915, agreed, calling the action "fraught with great danger to the United States—danger of drawing this country into the European trouble in an active way." On the other hand, the editor of the Durham Morning Herald on February 9, 1915, simply commented that since the Germans had warned the United States in advance to stay out of the war zone, the United States should stay out. The Wilmington Morning Star took a similar viewpoint in an editorial on February 9, 1915, declaring that Great Britain had been obstructing neutral shipping and Germany had just as much right to do so.

On February 10, 1915, Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan sent simultaneous notes of protest to Great Britain and Germany regarding their interference with neutral shipping. By this time the Durham Morning Herald had taken a more belligerent stance, stating on February 13, 1915, that "Germany should understand that we are not going

to buy those ships to have her knock the bottom out of them." However, the Herald had vacillated by February 16, again advocating that the United States should keep its vessels out of the war zone around Great Britain.

On February 16, 1915, the Winston-Salem Journal took a decidedly impartial position by regarding Germany and Great Britain as equally guilty in violating international law in their treatment of neutral shipping.

The Asheville Citizen of February 8, 1915, commended the captain of the British liner Lusitania for flying the American flag on the basis that his action was taken to save the lives of Americans traveling on his ship, a practice objected to in the February 10 Bryan note to Great Britain. The Greensboro Daily News took an entirely different view of the British practice of flying neutral flags. In an editorial of February 17, 1915, the following comment appeared:

England could take an English vessel, hoist thereon the American flag, put the censor on the job at the other end of the English cable, and it would take several peace loving Bryans to keep us out of a war with Germany after a German submarine had got in its work.

The Winston-Salem Union Republican of February 25, 1915, echoed the Daily News in condemning the British use of the American flag, charging that the British were trying to involve the United States in the war by creating an incident involving American lives and property.

The papers that voiced opinions on the notes approved the United States position.¹ However, the papers commenting on the German and

¹See the Asheville Citizen, February 14, 1915, and the Wilmington Morning Star, February 12, 1915.

British replies of February 19, 1915, were united in their disapproval. The Greensboro Daily News on February 20, 1915, accused both belligerents of waging commercial warfare against the United States in attempts to involve this country on their respective sides. The editor of the Durham Morning Herald on February 26, 1915, found evidence, in the German and British replies, that Germany and Great Britain were equally guilty in starting and continuing the war. On February 24, 1915, the editor of the Wilmington Morning Star wrote that even though the United States might find an excuse for involvement in the replies, to his mind adequate cause was lacking and the United States should use negotiation instead to settle the matter. The Winston-Salem Journal published an editorial on February 28, 1915, entitled "England Is Losing Support," which accused the British of arrogance in their dealings with the United States since they had acted as if they had "a divine right to the Atlantic ocean." The Journal added that the change in public opinion was essentially against Great Britain and not necessarily in favor of Germany. The Greensboro Daily News on April 5, 1915, voiced a similar complaint against Great Britain, objecting to reminders "every four or five days" of the commercial servitude of the United States, and attributing to the British a world domination carried out "with hooks of steel and cables of copper and battleships."

CHAPTER III

THE LUSITANIA AND ARABIC CRISES

The second act in the controversy between the United States and Germany over submarine warfare was carried out in the aftermath of several incidents that involved the loss of American lives and resulted from the policies pursued by the United States, Great Britain, and Germany on the high seas. Leon C. Thrasher, an American, lost his life in the sinking of the British liner Falaba on March 28, 1915. On April 28 a German plane bombed the United States vessel Cushing, and on May 1 a German submarine torpedoed another United States vessel, the Gulflight, killing three Americans. Then on May 7, 1915, the British liner Lusitania went to the bottom carrying 128 Americans to their deaths.

The Nafziger study found that when Germany announced its submarine campaign in February, 1915, the newspapers focused criticism on the Central European powers and correspondingly decreased their attention to Allied restrictions on American shipping. The sinking of the Lusitania convinced these editors that the United States was involved in the conflict and "could no longer be an onlooker." However, no demands were made for intervention in the war following the sinking.¹

In North Carolina, editorial opinion in the newspapers surveyed was unanimous in condemning the sinkings and loss of life. The

¹Nafziger, American Press and Public Opinion, pp. 370, 372, 411.

Winston-Salem Union Republican of April 8, 1915, found the Falaba sinking "indefensible," but called only for a strong protest to Germany demanding that there be no repetition of such acts. The editor felt Germany would make just reparation for the death of Thrasher. On May 4, 1915, the Greensboro Daily News commented that the death of the Gulflight's captain ought "to convince the world that going anywhere outside the United States under the American flag is no job for a man with a weak heart." And the Charlotte Daily Observer of April 2, 1915, concluded after Thrasher's death that the sinkings were "outrages against the laws of humanity and civilization" which had given the neutral countries "a better knowledge of the desperate determination and pitiless character of the Government the Allies are warring against."

On May 6, 1915, one day before the Lusitania went down, the Wilmington Morning Star voiced concern over Americans continuing to travel on "armed belligerent ships" and taking "all sorts of chances on figuring in a disaster." The editorial went on to say that "a much more serious possibility would arise if the Lusitania or some other merchant-warship were sunk with Americans on board."

News of the Lusitania disaster brought angry responses from several North Carolina editors. The Winston-Salem Journal in an editorial on May 9, 1915, called the sinking "cold-blooded murder" which even war did not justify. However, on May 11 the Journal carried an editorial which deplored the foolishness of Americans who had undertaken travel through the war zone "at a time when such a trip meant taking their lives in their hands." The editor did not believe there was any danger of United States intervention in the war over the incident.

An Asheville Citizen editorial of May 13, 1915, was sharply critical of Germany:

One can state without exaggeration that no other nation in the world would have been guilty of the wanton slaughter of non-combatants, including women and children, as Germany was guilty when her submarines torpedoed the Lusitania without a minute's warning.

On May 26, 1915, the Citizen suggested the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany as a proper response for the United States, as well as the maintenance of strong armed forces.

The Graham Alamance Gleaner of May 13, 1915, proposed that the United States should answer Germany's attack on the Lusitania by supplying the Allies with credit and equipment while "withholding the same from Germany." On May 20 the Gleaner lashed out at German-Americans who sympathized with Germany:

There are many Germans, the hyphenated Americans, who gloat over the act just as the savage barbarians did two thousand years ago when women and children were slaughtered the same as soldiers. Any American citizen of German blood who approves of the sinking of the Lusitania is unworthy to live under the stars and stripes that wave over the land of the brave and the home of the free.

The editor of the Winston-Salem Union Republican of May 13, 1915, acknowledged that the United States could be drawn into the war over Germany's use of submarines, and proposed that the United States should keep its "ships and people away from declared war zones" and ban munitions shipments. The Raleigh News and Observer of May 9, 1915, cautioned restraint in the face of "deep provocation" by Germany. On May 8, 1915, the Charlotte Daily Observer editorialized:

There had been no reason to doubt the earnestness of the German intentions in regard to enforcing the war

zone warnings. The main responsibility for the loss of the steamer rests with the company that sent her out.

On the following day, May 9, the Observer condemned the sinking in strong terms calling it unparalleled "in the annals of piracy" for the "heartlessness of its brutality." On the other hand, the Observer editor did not believe the United States would engage in "active belligerent participation" in response. The next day, May 10, the Charlotte paper observed that the submarine was "pretty much of a law to itself" and "international law has slept while science has been at work."

An editorial entitled "The Force of Moral Principle" in the May 21, 1915, Greensboro Daily News made a strong case against United States involvement in the war on the basis of submarine warfare:

If Germany should sink an American passenger ship, flying the American flag, and engaged in a peaceful, mercantile mission, then every man would know what it was about if asked to rally to the colors. If we should go to war over the Lusitania affair we would not be fighting, primarily, for the protection of the rights and lives of American citizens. American citizens can find protection, if they desire to pursue a policy of safety first, and seek protection under the American flag. No matter what might be our avowed motive, the effect would be a fight for the right of every British vessel to carry war supplies wherever one or more American citizens should be included in the passenger list. We would be fighting for the right of every British captain to mix up picric acid, high explosives and American babies.

The first United States note on the Lusitania incident was sent to Germany on May 13, 1915. In it President Woodrow Wilson demanded the end of unrestricted submarine warfare, condemnation of the Lusitania sinking, and reparations for the American lives lost. The German reply of May 28 justified the attack on the grounds that the Lusitania was

carrying munitions and that British captains had been ordered to ram submarines on sight. The second United States note, sent on June 9, reiterated the demands of the first note and brought about the resignation of Secretary of State Bryan, who was afraid the note's demands would lead to war with Germany. Robert Lansing replaced Bryan as Secretary of State. The second German reply on July 8 made no concessions, although it did offer to allow one British passenger ship a week to go through the war zone unharmed. The note was unsatisfactory to President Wilson, and a third protest note was sent to Germany on July 21, 1915, warning that further sinkings would be regarded as unfriendly acts. On August 19, 1915, the British passenger liner Arabic was torpedoed and sunk, with two Americans killed. On September 1, 1915, the third German reply, the so-called "Arabic pledge," promised that liners would not be attacked without warning and without provision for the safety of noncombatants, provided the liners did not resist or attempt escape. Later Germany disavowed the sinkings and made reparations to the United States.

In commenting on the first United States note to Germany, the Charlotte Daily Observer on May 13, 1915, echoed the general approval of North Carolina editors of the Wilson administration's conduct of the affair:

The action of President Wilson and his Cabinet is of a character which we believe will meet with the instant approval of the people of the United States. While it does not mean war, it means justice to humanity, reparation to an outraged country and a guarantee for the preservation of the rights of neutral flags.

The German reply of May 29, 1915, elicited the disapproval of North Carolina editors. The Winston-Salem Journal of June 1, 1915, found

the reply "extremely disappointing" and felt conditions were critical between the two countries. Later, on June 11, the Journal in another editorial commented on the "friendly tone" and "conciliatory spirit" of the German note, and predicted that "before negotiations end Germany will yield sufficiently to retain America as her friend." A Raleigh News and Observer editorial on June 2, 1915, accused Germany of not being "frank and 'open-minded'" in its reply; and a June 2, 1915, editorial in the Asheville Citizen found the German reply defiant and indicative of a willingness to have the United States enter the war. A Greensboro Daily News editorial of June 1, 1915, declared the perceptions of Washington and Berlin "antipodal" concerning the issues involved in the controversy. On June 3, 1915, the Winston-Salem Union Republican called for a "firm and determined policy" on the part of the United States in answer to the German note.

The United States's second Lusitania note was sent on June 9, 1915. The Winston-Salem Journal of June 12, 1915, found nothing offensive to Germany in the note and remarked that it was "less drastic" than the first note. The June 17, 1915, Winston-Salem Union Republican was highly critical of the Wilson administration complaining that the note was a "kindly remonstrance" when a "spirited tone" was needed. According to the Union Republican editor, Germany would have to pledge adherence to international law or the United States would be forced to sever diplomatic relations, which might lead to a United States declaration of war.

The second German reply on July 8, 1915, elicited more criticism from North Carolina editors. The Raleigh News and Observer of

July 11, 1915, regarded with "deepest disappointment" Germany's slighting treatment of the Lusitania tragedy by "the bald statement that it was not expected that the Lusitania would sink so quickly." The Winston-Salem Union Republican on July 15, 1915, took the opportunity to fire another volley at the Democratic administration stating that "a firm and decisive policy at first" would have prevented the volume of "unsatisfactory correspondence."

A tone of caution prevailed in several newspapers, however. The July 13, 1915, Charlotte Daily Observer declared itself a member of the antiwar party, which it believed embraced most Americans, and called for restraint on the "dogs of war." A Greensboro Daily News editorial of July 18, 1915, called for the United States to stop ignoring British transgressions and adopt a neutral stance with regard to the antagonists. The editorial warned:

If we are going to demand virtual immunity for ships loaded with munitions, it will be only a matter of time before Germany will sink another one of these vessels, and then the United States will not be drawn, but led, directly into the conflict by our own leaders, backed up by a thoughtless and hysterical press.

The North Carolina Christian Advocate, the publication of the Western North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was sharply critical of British actions toward the United States, and pointed out that Britain had never answered a note of protest sent by the United States government in April, 1915.² The Advocate also deplored the newspaper editors who had "been bellowing day and night

²LX (July 15, 1915), 3.

for the smell of German blood" and discerned a "pathetic lack of vision" in several North Carolina editors: "These might be able to wield a rifle better than a pen. At least the rifle would only get them into difficulty. As it is, their pen may lead to holes blown through other men."

The third Lusitania note was forwarded to Germany on July 21, 1915. The Charlotte Daily Observer of July 22, 1915, remarked that a German decision to ignore the views of the United States would leave no choice but for the United States to sever diplomatic relations. On July 23, 1915, the Winston-Salem Journal applauded the Wilson administration for giving Germany another chance to "yield to the American demands regarding the sinking of the Lusitania." The Raleigh News and Observer of July 24, 1915, was even more pleased with President Wilson's actions:

His note is one which sweeps aside the evasions of the German notes, and with a firmness and a solemnity which are significant, pins that country down to the real issue.

Reaction to the Arabic sinking on August 19, 1915, was predictable: North Carolina editors were appalled and apprehensive of future developments. The Greensboro Daily News of August 21, 1915, warned that it would be "a matter of time" until another ship would be sunk and "a few more Americans" killed, and then the United States would "march off to war for our sacred rights." The editorial charged that the United States had "virtually demanded immunity for munition ships" going to Britain, and said the matter would be resolved if the United States would "make it worth while for Germany to grant this virtual immunity." The Asheville Citizen on August 26, 1915, declared that if the United

States were to go to war over the sinking of the Arabic, it would have been forced into it by American citizens who persisted in traveling on belligerent ships. As stated in the North Carolina Christian Advocate,

No one denies the right of Americans to travel the seas, and so has a man the right to stand on the railroad track in front of an approaching train, but he is none the less a fool for doing so, and a nation fighting to defend such action is as foolish as the man.³

An editorial in the August 21, 1915, Raleigh News and Observer recognized only one course of action for the United States if Germany upheld the Arabic sinking: to sever diplomatic relations with Germany. The Winston-Salem Journal of August 22, 1915, also saw the possibility of breaking off with Germany, but was optimistic that the two countries could still resolve their differences.

The German reply of September 1, 1915—the "Arabic pledge"—brought accolades for the Wilson administration from the North Carolina editors. The Winston-Salem Journal of September 2, 1915, praised President Wilson for "the greatest diplomatic victory of the century." In the September 2, 1915, Raleigh News and Observer the German pledge was called "a victory of the most complete kind for President Wilson." Further, the editor of the Asheville Citizen in the September 6, 1915, issue termed the Arabic pledge a national triumph and a personal victory for President Wilson, to whom "must go the credit of achievement." On the other hand, the Charlotte Daily Observer of September 1, 1915, had a kind word for Germany: "By yielding to America, Germany

³LX (August 26, 1915), 3.

will secure the aid of this country's powerful influence in wringing concessions from Great Britain."

CHAPTER IV

THE SUNKEN CRUISE

During the first part of 1916 North Carolina editors were primarily concerned with events in Mexico. Revolutionary Pancho Villa made raids against United States border towns culminating in the Columbus, New Mexico, raid on March 9, 1916, in which 17 people died. General John J. Pershing commanded an expedition into Mexico which began on March 15, 1916, and remained in Mexico until February, 1917.

However, in late March the editors' attention was brought back to the war in Europe by the increasing activity of German submarines. German submarine commanders observed the Arabic pledge until March 24, 1916, when the unarmed French channel steamer Suzanne was torpedoed and sunk. Several Americans aboard were wounded.

The Asheville Citizen rushed into the fray on March 30, 1916, by declaring that Germany was due a "crushing blow" for its conduct in the war, particularly for playing amateurism and then lying about it. The editor of the Greensboro Daily News, however, on April 1, 1916, urged action on the part of the United States government. The Daily News argued that Germany had the right to attack belligerent vessels, and Americans who traveled on them had to accept that risk. However, if Germany sank a neutral vessel with Americans on board, the United States would enter the hostilities with a "clear conscience." The editorial

CHAPTER IV

THE SUSSEX CRISIS

During the first part of 1916 North Carolina editors were primarily concerned with events in Mexico. Revolutionary Pancho Villa made raids against United States border towns culminating in the Columbus, New Mexico, raid on March 9, 1916, in which 17 people died. General John J. Pershing commanded an expedition into Mexico which began on March 15, 1916, and remained in Mexico until February, 1917.

However, in late March the editors' attention was brought back to the war in Europe by the increasing activity of German submarines. German submarine commanders observed the Arabic pledge until March 24, 1916, when the unarmed French channel steamer Sussex was torpedoed and sunk. Several Americans aboard were wounded.

The Asheville Citizen rushed into the fray on March 30, 1916, by declaring that Germany was due a "crushing blow" for its conduct in the war, particularly for slaying noncombatants and then lying about it. The editor of the Greensboro Daily News, however, on April 1, 1916, urged caution on the part of the United States government. The Daily News argued that Germany had the right to attack belligerent vessels, and Americans who traveled on them had to accept that risk. However, if Germany sank a neutral vessel with Americans on board, the United States would enter the hostilities with a "clear conscience." The editorial concluded:

If we go to war over anything else, we are, at best, sacrificing our men and our money in defense of a technicality; and America doesn't want to fight for technicalities.

The Durham Morning Herald took a similar position in an editorial on April 19, 1916, stating that Germany could not be blamed for not doing anything about the Sussex sinking. And two days later, on April 21, the Herald editor declared that although Britain had not "drowned American citizens on the high seas," it had "treated American vessels and American citizens with every discourtesy."

On April 18, 1916, the Wilson administration sent a strongly worded protest to the German government. The note stated that unless Germany ended unrestricted submarine warfare, the United States would have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations.

The Raleigh News and Observer of April 19, 1916, offered immediate support of President Wilson, declaring that he represented "the American spirit" in the matter. The Winston-Salem Journal also supported the President's stand and observed that it was up to Germany to keep the United States out of the war. The Charlotte Observer praised the United States note as "a masterly and accurate summing up of the continued expansion of submarine atrocities" in the April 20, 1916, issue and went on to say that "the President has, in this crisis, clearly and forcibly manifested that the time has come when America can no longer maintain mere submissive patience in the face of a continuance of such horrors." The Wilmington Morning Star of April 20, 1916, also recognized that a crisis was occurring over the submarine issue between the United States and Germany with the possibility of a break in

diplomatic relations. Furthermore, the Asheville Citizen of April 20, 1916, believed that a break was almost inevitable: "It seems, indeed, that America's hour is striking, and that she is about to be revealed to the world as the fearless champion of human rights and liberty."

Germany's reply was sent on May 4, 1916. In it Germany promised that its submarine commanders would henceforth observe strict rules of cruiser warfare to visit and search merchant ships before sinking them in and out of the war zones.

The Asheville Citizen of May 6, 1916, acknowledged the German concessions, but detected a certain amount of scorn in the German reply. The Wilmington Morning Star of May 6, 1916, found the tone of the German note objectionable; but the paper's editor conceded that if Germany adhered to the concessions it had made, it would be doing all that the United States had asked. The editor of the Charlotte Observer on May 6, 1916, was pleased with Germany's reply: "It strikes the Observer that Germany has made frank admission, adequate submission and just contention." In a later editorial the Observer of May 11, 1916, praised President Wilson's conduct of the affair: "Again the President is proved to have been in the right and his good judgment vindicated." The Winston-Salem Journal of May 7, 1916, believed that Germany's cause would be helped in the United States by its concessions to the United States:

A careful reading of Germany's answer leaves no room for doubt that the German authorities are anxious to keep their country at peace with the United States and, indeed, are practically in accord with President Wilson's views regarding the rights of humanity.

The Durham Morning Herald commented on May 12, 1916: "Mr. Wilson has won. But then Germany was not in position to pick other troubles."

The Greensboro Daily News of May 6, 1916, suggested that the United States should answer the German concessions by demanding that Britain lift the food blockade of Germany and acknowledge the freedom of the seas. The Raleigh News and Observer on May 7, 1916, also called for more attention to settling the differences with Great Britain. Finally, the Winston-Salem Union Republican on May 18, 1916, proposed strict neutrality for the United States in dealing with the belligerents, remarking that Germany was being "called to account" whereas Britain was "allowed a 'do as you please' policy."

Resolving the Sussex crisis brought about markedly improved relations between the United States and Germany. At the same time relations deteriorated rapidly between Great Britain and the United States over British attempts to bring all neutral trade under British control. A crisis was precipitated over publication by Great Britain on July 19, 1916, of a blacklist of North and South American firms with whom British subjects were not to do business. President Wilson obtained the power from Congress to take retaliatory measures against Britain, although he never had the opportunity to use it. The 1916 election campaign intervened to detract presidential attention as well as editorial attention from the war.

However, on November 17, 1916, the Winston-Salem Journal sounded an ominous note:

It has been extremely difficult for the United States to assert its rights without declaring war, and this may

be still more difficult as time goes on. For the longer and more desperate the war, the more heedless of neutral rights the hard-pressed belligerents are likely to become.

THE END OF NEUTRALITY

In a futile effort at mediation, President Wilson appealed to the belligerents on December 18, 1916, to define their war aims. On December 26 Germany promised to define its aims and invited for a conference of the belligerents. The Allies replied on January 10, 1917, that they wanted high seas neutrality and to prevent power in Europe. The President's invitation was to deliver an address to the United States Senate on January 22, 1917, outlining his plan for a peace settlement.

On January 31, 1917, the German government announced its resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare, thereby repudiating its pledge after the Lusitania sinking. The day was lost. On February 3, 1917, President Wilson severed diplomatic relations with Germany. On the same day a United States ship, the *Houston*, was sunk.

The English study of the national press while the reaction to the German Declaration of war was significant influence on press opinion in the United States since the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915.¹ The German resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare evoked shocked responses from North Carolina editors. The editor of the *Winston-Salem Journal* of February 1, 1917, wrote that the German situation must be extremely serious to do away with "the friendship of a great people to

¹ *Walsiger, American Press and Public Opinion*, p. 422.

CHAPTER V

THE END OF NEUTRALITY

In a futile effort at mediation, President Wilson appealed to the belligerents on December 18, 1916, to define their war aims. On December 26 Germany declined to state its aims and instead called for a conference of the belligerents. The Allies replied on January 10, 1917, that they wanted huge reparations from Germany and an end to German power in Europe. The President's answer was to deliver an address to the United States Senate on January 22, 1917, outlining his plan for a peace settlement.

On January 31, 1917, the German government announced the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare, thereby repudiating its pledge after the Sussex sinking. The die was cast. On February 3, 1917, President Wilson severed diplomatic relations with Germany. On the same day a United States ship, the Housatonic, was sunk.

The Nafziger study of the national press calls the reaction to the German declaration "the most significant influence on press opinion in the United States since the sinking of the Lusitania in 1915."¹ The German resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare evoked shocked responses from North Carolina editors. The editor of the Winston-Salem Journal of February 1, 1917, wrote that the German situation must be extremely serious to do away with "the friendship of a great people to

¹Nafziger, American Press and Public Opinion, p. 422.

accomplish ends of doubtful benefit" and that if Germany shed "any more American blood," there would be a "reckoning." The Asheville Citizen on February 2, 1917, declared that the United States was entitled to sever diplomatic relations with Germany over the declaration even though it might lead to war. The February 1, 1917, Raleigh News and Observer greeted the declaration as "a bolt from a clear sky." However, the editorial stated that the paper supported President Wilson no matter what steps he had to take to preserve the "honor and safety" of the United States. The Durham Morning Herald of February 2, 1917, accused Germany of planning "to make the bloodiest of strokes" in indulging in "maritime murder on a monumental scale," and blamed the Kaiser for the policy.

The editor of the Greensboro Daily News of February 1, 1917, wrote that "the evil, the inevitable day, has come" and attributed Germany's action to the Allied blockade which was meant to starve the Central Powers. On February 2, 1917, the Daily News declared that the United States had pursued a policy which had forced Germany to resume unrestricted submarine warfare:

The United States has yielded the neutral rights of our citizens, even in their dealings with neutral nations, when the enemies of Germany were the aggressors, and this has meant shells with which to kill German soldiers, but no bread for German women and children.

On February 3, 1917, the Daily News remarked that war would presently exist between the United States and the Central Powers. In fact, seven of the nine papers surveyed recognized the distinct possibility of war

as a result of the German declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare and the subsequent severance of diplomatic relations.²

The Wilmington Morning Star of February 2, 1917, also displayed some understanding of the German position. The Star's editor felt Germany was forced to resume unrestricted submarine warfare to counter an extension of the Allied blockade announced on January 28, 1917. The Charlotte Observer of February 3, 1917, explained the German action as a result of the Allied rejection of a German offer for peace negotiations made in December, 1916.

After diplomatic relations were severed on February 3, 1917, the somewhat hawkish Asheville Citizen on February 4, 1917, blasted forth in an editorial set in large type:

Today all isms, all politics, all creeds and all cults, every trace of sectional feeling and partisanship are swept away in the great wave of patriotic fervor that is thrilling every true American to his very soul. We are about to show the world once again in our history that as in the brave days of '76 so it is now; classes and caste are but the thin disguises that hide the external brotherhood of the soul.

On the other hand, the February 4, 1917, Greensboro Daily News asked:

Are the American people, by force of circumstances, possibly over which they have no control, to be asked to pledge their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor, in support of highly dangerous "equipoises of power," which can only result, as it has resulted for centuries, in starting another cycle of world wars?

²See the Raleigh News and Observer for February 1, 1917; the Charlotte Observer, February 2, 1917; the Winston-Salem Journal, February 2, 1917; the Greensboro Daily News, February 3, 1917; the Wilmington Morning Star, February 4, 1917; the Graham Alamance Gleaner, February 8, 1917; and the Winston-Salem Union Republican, February 8, 1917.

Of interest is the fact that within a short time, seven of the papers had editorials concerning an "overt act" which would precipitate war.³ The eighth paper mentioned it before the end of February.⁴ These editors defined an "overt act" as the loss of American life on a torpedoed neutral ship. As the Greensboro Daily News stated on February 5, 1917, "The main problem now is how to avert an overt act." The Raleigh News and Observer of February 6, 1917, remarked that war would not come between the United States and Germany "unless Germany wilfully oversteps the bounds of international law."

Of the newspapers surveyed, seven editorially expressed hopes for a peaceful solution of the dispute between the United States and Germany throughout the month of February.⁵ However, on February 25, 1917, the British liner Laconia was sunk and three Americans were killed. To the editors of the Asheville Citizen, Charlotte Observer, Greensboro Daily News, and Wilmington Morning Star, the sinking was an "overt act," yet none of these editors regarded war as inevitable for the United States.⁶

³The seven newspapers were: the Raleigh News and Observer on February 4, 1917; the Winston-Salem Journal, February 4, 1917; the Greensboro Daily News, February 5, 1917; the Asheville Citizen, February 7, 1917; the Durham Morning Herald, February 8, 1917; the Graham Alamance Gleaner, February 8, 1917; and the Charlotte Observer, February 13, 1917.

⁴The Wilmington Morning Star, February 27, 1917.

⁵These newspapers were: the Asheville Citizen, the Charlotte Observer, the Durham Morning Herald, the Graham Alamance Gleaner, the Greensboro Daily News, the Raleigh News and Observer, and the Winston-Salem Union Republican.

⁶Asheville Citizen, February 27, 1917; Charlotte Observer, February 28, 1917; Greensboro Daily News, February 28, 1917; and Wilmington Morning Star, March 1, 1917.

On February 24, 1917, the British government gave Walter Hines Page, United States Ambassador to Great Britain, a copy of a telegram which had been intercepted on January 19, 1917. The telegram was sent by German Foreign Secretary Arthur Zimmermann to the German Minister in Mexico. It instructed the German envoy to propose an alliance with Germany to the Mexican government if war was declared between the United States and Germany. Mexico was to recover territory in New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas. The text of the Zimmermann note was released to the press on March 1, 1917. It constituted an "overt act" for the Durham Morning Herald, the Raleigh News and Observer, and the Winston-Salem Journal, and all of the papers believed war was highly probable.⁷

Of the two remaining newspapers, the Graham Alamance Gleaner had identified the "overt act" on February 8, 1917, as the sinking of the American ship California on February 7. The editorials of the Winston-Salem Union Republican recognized no "overt act," and opposed a declaration of war until it had been made.

Five United States ships were sunk in mid-March, 1917: the Algonquin on March 12; the Vigilancia, March 16; the City of Memphis, March 17; the Illinois, March 18; and the Healdton, March 21 with 21 Americans killed. North Carolina editors rapidly recognized the existence of a state of war with Germany: the Charlotte Observer on March 19; the Raleigh News and Observer, March 19; the Wilmington Morning Star, March 20; the Graham Alamance Gleaner, March 22; the Greensboro

⁷Durham Morning Herald, March 10, 1917; Raleigh News and Observer, March 2, 1917; and Winston-Salem Journal, March 2, 1917.

Daily News, March 23; the Asheville Citizen, March 24; the Durham Morning Herald, March 27; the Winston-Salem Journal, March 27. The editor of the Raleigh News and Observer wrote that "the sinking of three unarmed American merchant vessels with the resulting death of Americans is recognized as clearly the 'overt act' so long threatened." The Wilmington Morning Star's editor wrote: "Submarine attacks on American vessels, including the four steamships sunk within the last few days, actually mark the beginning of hostilities." The Asheville Citizen's editorial stated:

No longer need we look for or expect the "overt act" whereon President Wilson hinged the declaration of war; each day brings news of such acts, of one outrage after another, involving the loss of American lives and American ships.

Finally, the editor of the Winston-Salem Journal wrote:

Many have thought and publicly declared that this [a declaration of war] should have been done immediately after receipt of the news of the sinking of three American ships by German submarines, but they will not have long to wait and meanwhile some of the many needful things may be done.

On March 21, 1917, President Wilson called a special session of Congress for April 2, 1917. At that time he requested a war resolution against Germany from the jointly assembled Senate and House of Representatives. The Senate passed the resolution on April 3; the House, on April 6. On that same day it was signed by the President.

CONCLUSION

From 1914 to 1917 the newspaper was probably the principal source of information for the general public on the war then raging in Europe. With certain limitations, the newspaper was a potent factor in the formation of public opinion as well as an indicator of the public mood. Hence, it has seemed relevant to examine the leading newspapers in North Carolina during the period to gain some insight into opinions expressed in the state about the war.¹

Nine North Carolina newspapers have been read for editorial comment on the first World War during the period August, 1914, to April, 1917. These include one paper in each of the seven most populous cities as of the 1910 census, three of the cities being located in the eastern portion of the state and four in the western: the Wilmington Morning Star, the Raleigh News and Observer, the Durham Morning Herald, the Greensboro Daily News, the Winston-Salem Journal, the Charlotte

¹In addition to the review of editorial opinion, the Claude Kitchin Papers in the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina Library at Chapel Hill were surveyed for the period April 5 to April 7, 1917. On the evening of April 5-6, 1917, Congressman Kitchin delivered an address before the United States House of Representatives against the war resolution. He was alone among North Carolina Congressmen in his opposition. An examination of his mail from April 5 through April 7 showed 90 percent support for his position, evidence of a strong antiwar sentiment among North Carolinians who were politically active enough to convey their opinions to a Congressman. The material from the Kitchin Papers is contained in Appendix A.

Representative comment from letters written to the editors of the newspapers surveyed is included in Appendix B.

Daily Observer (after April 3, 1916, the Charlotte Observer), and the Asheville Citizen. In addition, a small-town paper, the Graham Alamance Gleaner, and a Republican paper, the Winston-Salem Union Republican, have been consulted. A sampling of the religious press, the North Carolina Christian Advocate and the Biblical Recorder, provides little comment on the war, as does an agricultural journal, the Progressive Farmer.

Although the newspapers have been examined for the entire 34-month period preceding American intervention, particular attention has been given to four major periods: (1) the beginning of hostilities in Europe, July-August, 1914; (2) the Lusitania and Arabic crises, May-September, 1915; (3) the Sussex crisis, April-May, 1916; and (4) the resumption and aftermath of unrestricted submarine warfare by Germany, February-March, 1917.

This study shows that German submarine warfare was by far the most important factor in steering editorial opinion towards an acceptance of United States intervention in the first World War on the side of the Allies. Although newspapers differed widely in editorial reaction to specific incidents in the war from 1914 to 1917, the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare by Germany on January 31, 1917, brought unanimous agreement among the editors that war with Germany was probable. With the exception of the Asheville Citizen, which felt intervention would occur during the Sussex crisis in April, 1916, the papers did not recognize a real war threat until early February, 1917. By March 27, 1917, a full week before President Wilson delivered his war message to Congress, eight of the nine papers had declared the existence of a state

of war with Germany, the one exception being the Winston-Salem Union Republican which waited until April 12 to mention it on the editorial page. Table 1 summarizes this information.

Of interest, too, are the variations in editorial attention to the war. The periods of intense concern were August, 1914; May, 1915; and February-March, 1917. During the fall of 1914 and the winter of 1914-1915 editorial coverage was generally infrequent. However, the Lusitania crisis during the summer of 1915 resulted in frequent editorials which slacked off after the Arabic crisis was settled in September. Throughout 1916 editorial comment on the war was scarce while editors gave their attention to the Mexican Revolution and the presidential campaign.

As stated earlier, the purpose of this study is to find out what some influential North Carolinians thought about the first World War from the beginning of hostilities in July, 1914, until United States intervention in April, 1917. Newspaper editorials have been surveyed because newspaper editors were prominent members of the foreign policy public and did influence public opinion formation and change concerning foreign affairs. Since no means are available to determine the extent of this influence, this study has necessarily been limited to a content analysis of one type of opinion in one particular state. It is not a statement of public opinion in North Carolina before entrance into World War I.

TABLE 1
SURVEY SUMMARY FOR NORTH CAROLINA NEWSPAPERS, 1914-1917

Newspaper	Party Affiliation	War Guilt	Neutrality Status	Declared War A Distinct Possibility	Recognized State Of War
Asheville <u>Citizen</u>	Dem.	Germany	Pro-Ally 7/13/15	4/20/16	3/24/17
Charlotte <u>Observer</u>	Dem.	Russia	Neutral	2/2/17	3/19/17
Durham <u>Morning Herald</u>	Ind.	Austria	Neutral	3/10/17	3/27/17
Graham <u>Alamance Gleaner</u>	Dem.	-	Pro-Ally 5/20/15	2/8/17	3/22/17
Greensboro <u>Daily News</u>	Ind.	Germany	Neutral	2/3/17	3/23/17
Raleigh <u>News and Observer</u>	Dem.	Germany	Pro-Ally 8/6/14	2/1/17	3/19/17
Wilmington <u>Morning Star</u>	Dem.	-	Neutral	2/4/17	3/20/17
Winston-Salem <u>Journal</u>	Dem.	Germany	Pro-Ally 9/1/14	2/2/17	3/27/17
Winston-Salem <u>Union Republican</u>	Rep.	Germany	Neutral	2/8/17	4/12/17

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Newspapers

Asheville Citizen, 1914-1917.

Charlotte Daily Observer (after 1916 changed to Charlotte Observer),
1914-1917.

Durham Morning Herald, 1914-1917.

Graham Alamance Gleaner, 1914-1917.

Greensboro Daily News, 1914-1917.

Raleigh News and Observer, 1914-1917.

Wilmington Morning Star, 1914-1917.

Winston-Salem Journal, 1914-1917.

Winston-Salem Union Republican, 1914-1917.

Periodicals

Biblical Recorder, 1914-1917.

Literary Digest, 1914-1917.

North Carolina Christian Advocate, 1914-1917.

Progressive Farmer, 1914-1917.

Books

Arnett, Alex Mathews. Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies.
Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1937.

N. W. Ayer & Son's American Newspaper Annual and Directory.
Philadelphia: N. W. Ayer & Son, 1916.

Bailey, Thomas A. A Diplomatic History of the American People. 7th ed.
New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

- Burgess, John W. Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law. Vol. I. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1890.
- Cohen, Bernard C. The Press and Foreign Policy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Costrell, Edwin. How Maine Viewed the War, 1914-1917. University of Maine Studies, Second Series, No. 49. Orono: University Press, 1940.
- Crighton, John Clark. Missouri and the World War, 1914-1917: A Study in Public Opinion. The University of Missouri Studies, Vol. XXI, No. 3. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1947.
- Cummins, Cedric C. Indiana Public Opinion and the World War, 1914-1917. Indiana Historical Collections, Vol. XXVIII. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1945.
- Gossett, Thomas F. Race: The History of An Idea in America. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- Graber, Doris A. Public Opinion, The President, and Foreign Policy: Four Case Studies from the Formative Years. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Hero, Alfred O., Jr. The Southerner and World Affairs. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965.
- Link, Arthur S. Wilson. Vol. III: The Struggle for Neutrality, 1914-1915. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- Link, Arthur S. Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era, 1910-1917. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.
- Lippmann, Walter. Public Opinion. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- May, Ernest R., ed. The Coming of War, 1917. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1966.
- May, Ernest R. The World War and American Isolation, 1914-1917. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Nevins, Allan. American Press Opinion Washington to Coolidge: A Documentary Record of Editorial Leadership and Criticism, 1785-1927. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1928.
- Peterson, H. C. Propaganda for War: The Campaign against American Neutrality, 1914-1917. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939.

Rosenau, James N. Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: An Operational Formulation. New York: Random House, 1961.

Salmon, Lucy Maynard. The Newspaper and the Historian. New York: Oxford University Press, 1923.

Articles and Essays

Adler, Kenneth P., and Bobrow, Davis. "Interest and Influence in Foreign Affairs." Public Opinion Quarterly, XX (Spring, 1956), 89-101.

Benson, Lee. "An Approach to the Scientific Study of Past Public Opinion." Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXI (Winter, 1967-1968), 522-67.

Brown, Maynard W. "American Public Opinion and Events Leading to the World War, 1912-1914." Journalism Quarterly, XIV (March, 1937), 23-34.

DeConde, Alexander. "The South and Isolationism." The Journal of Southern History, XXIV (August, 1958), 332-46.

Eaves, Richard Glen. "Pro-Allied Sentiment in Alabama, 1914-1917: A Study of Representative Newspapers." Alabama Review, XXV (January, 1972), 30-55.

Fiske, John. "Manifest Destiny." Harper's New Monthly Magazine, LXX (March, 1885), 578-90.

Foster, H. Schuyler, Jr. "Charting America's News of the World War." Foreign Affairs, XV (January, 1937), 311-19.

Foster, H. Schuyler, Jr. "How America Became Belligerent: A Quantitative Study of War News, 1914-17." American Journal of Sociology, XL (January, 1935), 464-75.

Link, Arthur S. "The Cotton Crisis, the South, and Anglo-American Diplomacy, 1914-1915." Studies in Southern History in Memory of Albert Ray Newsome, 1894-1951. The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. XXXIX. Edited by J. Carlyle Sitterson. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957.

Link, Arthur S. "The Middle West and the Coming of World War I." Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly, LXII (April, 1953), 109-21.

May, Ernest R. "An American Tradition in Foreign Policy: The Role of Public Opinion." Theory and Practice in American Politics. Edited by William H. Nelson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

"Sentiment in the South." Outlook, CXV (March 14, 1917), 446.

Syrett, Harold C. "The Business Press and American Neutrality, 1914-1917." Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXXII (September, 1945), 215-30.

Unpublished Studies

Abrams, Ray H. "Preachers Present Arms: A Study of the War-Time Attitudes and Activities of the Churches and Clergy in the United States, 1914-1918." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1933.

Nafziger, Ralph O. "The American Press and Public Opinion during the World War, 1914 to April 1917." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1936.

Public Document

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913.

Manuscript Collection

Kitchin, Claude, MSS. Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill.

APPENDIX A

CLAUDE KITCHIN PAPERS

My attention was directed to the Claude Kitchin Papers at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill by a footnote in Arthur S. Link's biography of Woodrow Wilson.¹ He wrote that although war opponents "were obviously more active in writing to Kitchin than advocates of intervention," the large volume of mail favoring 10 to 1 Kitchin's vote against the war resolution on April 6, 1917, showed "that opposition to war was still very wide and deep."

With one exception, the newspapers in this study recognized a state of war with Germany by March 27, 1917, a week before President Wilson's April 2 request of Congress for a war resolution. Accordingly, the Kitchin Papers were examined for evidence of antiwar opinion in North Carolina.

Claude Kitchin represented the second congressional district of North Carolina in the 65th Congress: Bertie, Edgecombe, Greene, Halifax, Lenoir, Northampton, Warren, and Wilson Counties. The population of the district in 1910 was 199,405 or 9 percent of the population of North Carolina in 1910.²

¹Wilson, Vol. V: Campaign for Progressivism and Peace, 1916-1917 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 429.

²Congressional Directory, January, 1916; U. S. Bureau of the Census, Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913), III, 266.

Kitchin was born March 24, 1869, near Scotland Neck in Halifax County. In June, 1888, he graduated from Wake Forest College, and in 1890 was admitted to the bar. He was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1902, his first public office. In April, 1917, he was Democratic Majority Leader of the House and Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. Thus, on the evening of April 5-6, 1917, he spoke from a position of prominence against the war resolution before the House which had already passed the Senate on April 3. He was the only North Carolina Congressman to oppose the war resolution, and the only one to vote against it. He stated his position thus:

In my judgment, we could keep out of the war with Germany as we kept out of the war with Great Britain, by keeping our ships and our citizens out of the war zone of Germany as we did out of the war zone of Great Britain. And we would sacrifice no more honor, surrender no more rights in the one case than in the other. Or we could resort to armed neutrality, which the President recently urged and for which I voted on March 1.³

Although he was called a pacifist, Kitchin's speech refutes this allegation.⁴

Kitchin's opposition to war with Germany was influenced by his resentment of the British blockade which had severely curtailed North Carolina's cotton and tobacco trade with Europe during the first two

³U. S. Congressional Record, 65th Congress, 1st Session, 1917, LV, Part 1, p. 332.

⁴Alex Mathews Arnett in Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1937), p. 241, apparently disagrees with the pacifist label. He wrote that Kitchin's revenue proposals aroused a greater hostility among manufacturers and the press than his "pacifism" had—the quotes are Arnett's.

years of the war. Almost half of the value of the 1914 cotton crop was lost as a result of the blockade.⁵

Before and after his speech, Kitchin received communications from North Carolinians overwhelmingly favoring his antiwar position. An examination of letters and telegrams dated April 5 through April 7 reveals 219 individuals supporting his position and 24 opposing it, or 90 percent support.⁶ The letters and telegrams came from throughout North Carolina, with 37 items, or 15 percent, coming from the second congressional district. Of these, 34, or 92 percent, supported Kitchin's antiwar position.

The Greensboro Daily News of April 10, 1917, carried a front page news story entitled "Claude Kitchin Gets Many Telegrams and Letters from State," written by Parker R. Anderson, Washington, D. C., and dated April 9, 1917. The article stated that Kitchin's office had opened 1,000 telegrams and letters to date, and 984 "heartily" approved his position while 16 disagreed. According to Mr. Anderson, 100 of these letters and telegrams came from Greensboro and Guilford County. It

⁵Arnett, Claude Kitchin, p. 115; Alexander DeConde, "The South and Isolationism," Journal of Southern History, XXIV (August, 1958), 337-38. Arthur S. Link concludes that "combined with the prevailing rural pacifism, southern resentment at the British maritime system made the South one of the chief centers of resistance to military and naval expansion and to strong diplomacy vis-à-vis Germany between 1915 and 1917." "The Cotton Crisis, the South, and Anglo-American Diplomacy, 1914-1915," Studies in Southern History in Memory of Albert Ray Newsome, 1894-1951, The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. XXXIX, ed. by J. Carlyle Sitterson (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957), p. 138.

⁶These letters and telegrams are in File Boxes 18 and 19, Folders 284-303, Claude Kitchin MSS, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill.

should be noted that the only newspaper in this study which supported Kitchin's position was the Greensboro Daily News. The strong response from Guilford County in support of Kitchin and the editorial support of the Daily News may be an example of the interaction between editorial and community opinion.

In reply to the Greensboro Daily News story, the Charlotte Observer carried an editorial on April 12, 1917, entitled "Mr. Kitchin's Letters." The editorial quoted the Salisbury Post as saying that supporters of Kitchin "would naturally speak to him in commendatory words, and the far greater number who differ would have nothing to say. The latter would speak to some one who represented them; not to one who misrepresented them." The Observer commented that Kitchin's opposition to the Wilson war measures was "a stand contrary to North Carolina sentiment."

Kitchin's position against intervention elicited almost unanimous disapproval from the North Carolina editors surveyed in this study, although a few editors expressed admiration for Kitchin's having acted on his convictions. The general opinion was that since war with Germany was unavoidable, Kitchin as House Majority Leader should have kept his opinions to himself for the sake of his country's security and the Democratic Party. The Kinston Daily News of April 7, 1917, carried an editorial stating that it was the only paper in Kitchin's congressional district to support him in the 1916 election.⁷ However, "it is more in a spirit of sorrow than anger that we thus reach the parting of the

⁷Clipping in Claude Kitchin MSS, File Box 46, Folder 763.

ways with our brilliant representative in congress." The editorial went on to say:

There will undoubtedly be crimes committed against the United States that might otherwise not have been attempted, and murder and arson may yet be traceable directly to his desertion of the administration and of the president. We had never thought to be brought so low as to regret that we supported the Honorable Claude Kitchin for congress from the second North Carolina district.

On April 5, 1917, Percy L. Gardner, a lumber dealer of Lakeview, North Carolina, wrote to Kitchin:

Keep us out of war. The great majority, nine-tenths at least, of the people in this section don't want war for so poor a cause as the privilege of the munitionists to continue sending war supplies and death machines to the savage, fighting nations of Europe. . . .

The newspaper hysteria is not deceiving the great solid mass of thinking people. They see the papers are pulled and manipulated by some one behind the scenes. The papers are not representing public opinion, they are hysterically attempting to create public opinion.⁸

Although it may be argued that Kitchin's supporters would be more likely to communicate with him, the letters and telegrams Kitchin received reveal strong antiwar sentiment among North Carolinians who cared enough about the issue to communicate with a congressman.⁹ Kitchin's correspondence, dated April 5 through April 7, 1917, on his

⁸ Claude Kitchin MSS.

⁹ See the article by Lewis Anthony Dexter, "What Do Congressmen Hear: The Mail," Public Opinion Quarterly, XX (Spring, 1956), 16-27, which describes a 1954 study of 903 businessmen's (heads of firms employing over 100 people) attitudes on foreign economic policy and interviews with 50 congressmen. Dexter found that the businessmen and congressmen regarded mail as the primary means of communication. Most of the businessmen believed that writing congressmen was the fundamental political-legislative act.

antiwar position is evidence that the editors, as opinion leaders in the foreign policy public in North Carolina, did not reflect the views of a widely distributed and possibly influential group of North Carolinians.¹⁰

In other words, there was more antiwar opinion evident in North Carolina in April, 1917, than is revealed from reading North Carolina newspaper editorials.

¹⁰ In letters and telegrams sent to Kitchin dated April 5 through April 7, 1917, the occupations of 129 individuals were given. Of the 119 supporters out of the 129, 112 were business and professional men. All 10 of the opposition were business and professional men. According to public opinion research findings, business and professional men are likely to be opinion leaders in their communities if they have been occupationally successful. See Adler and Bobrow, "Interest and Influence in Foreign Affairs," 89-101; James N. Rosenau, Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: An Operational Formulation (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 42-73.

APPENDIX B

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

"Letters to the Editor" columns were not regular features in North Carolina newspapers during the period under consideration. However, the Charlotte Observer and the Winston-Salem Union Republican carried letters to the editor more frequently than the other papers surveyed. Of these, few letters were written about foreign affairs. The following is a sampling of the opinions expressed about the war in letters to the editor:

Why should England be accused of blood-guiltiness and back-stabbing for insisting that Germany desist from her wanton violation of the law of nations by invading a neutral and utterly powerless country [Belgium], for the protection of which England is responsible. . . .

The British Government approached the subject with calm deliberation and a determination to avoid, if possible, unnecessary bloodshed, and prepared to use every effort to bring about a peaceful issue.

Ada M. Byford
Charlotte

Charlotte Daily Observer, August 6, 1914.

The truth of the whole matter is, not that the public is unfair to Germany as much as ignorant of the true state of affairs and the value and worth of German character, culture and genius. . . . A new day will dawn for this country and a better era for the whole world be ushered in when the United States and Germany, the two most virile and less spoiled nations will learn to know, understand and appreciate each other.

F. B. Clausen
Pastor
St. Paul's Lutheran Church

Wilmington Morning Star, September 7, 1914.

One has only to study the statistics of the production of iron. There he will find the key to the Anglo-German conflict. Competition for profit is the cause of the war and until competition for profit is abolished war will continue.

J. A. Lumley
Winston-Salem

Winston-Salem Union Republican, October 15, 1914.

So let the world wait and see if God does not use the awfully wicked European war in setting up His eternal kingdom of peace on the earth. At the same time fearful punishment will be meted out to the war leaders.

S. M. Davis
Caroleen

Charlotte Daily Observer, October 18, 1914.

Three cheers for the anti-war and peace President of the United States. May he live to see the end of the frightful carnage now going on across the sea, and keep this Nation out of it all for the good and lasting welfare of all its people.

E. H. Morris
Mocksville

Charlotte Daily Observer, May 19, 1915.

Four years experience in the Civil War convinced me that any compromise, short of arrant dishonor, is better than war. Hot-headed politicians and newspapers were almost entirely responsible for the ruin and destruction of the South as a result of the Civil War, and those of us who are living and took a part in that cruel and unnecessary war, are largely of the opinion that the position taken by Mr. Bryan is the correct one.

Confederate Soldier
Wadesboro

Charlotte Daily Observer, July 15, 1915.

Our great newspaper men have surely lost their heads in regard to our relations with Germany. They are creating a sentiment for war and claiming it to be the sentiment of the people and such is not the case. Germany is a great nation made of great and thinking people and because a few American pleasure seekers and of a class who love excitement have taken their lives in their hands and gone over on board vessels that were carrying ammunition to kill Germans our leaders and editors are trying their best to pull us into the scrap, after seeing how foolish this thing of war is, all to lose and nothing to gain.

J. A. Walker
Kernersville

Winston-Salem Union Republican, August 26, 1915.

I asked 10 of my men, every one of them reads eagerly the daily paper at night, and at the rest hour at noon, did they believe it would be their duty if we declared war on Germany for sinking an English ship because it had American passengers on it, to enlist in the Army to fight. Every single one of them made the answer: "We do not believe we should be forced to fight any country because it sinks its enemy's boats with the few of our people on them, when they have been notified and know that it is war between Germany and England, and our people have no right to take risks on either an English or a German boat, simply because international law permits it. And because of that, to involve this country in a bloody and cruel war." Every one of these are native born, North Carolina Americans back to their third generation.

S. A. Jones
Waynesville

Charlotte Daily Observer, September 8, 1915.

The German Government holds our form of government and our people in the utmost contempt and why we should attempt to conciliate them in any way is difficult for me to comprehend. I feel very strongly that an American citizen who stands for Germany is an enemy to his country and his people.

W. C. Jones
Asheboro

Charlotte Daily Observer, February 10, 1916.

It is sufficiently obvious that a complete list of the advertised sine qua nous of the ten nations making up the Allied group would not only put the Central Powers in the position of being forced to fight to a finish for their very existence but would also convict the Allied combination of insatiable greed in the eyes of the rest of the world.

E. A. Denham
Pinehurst

Raleigh News and Observer, January 10, 1917.

Germany is entirely justified in her latest move in submarine warfare. The trouble is the United States is not neutral. . . If we fight, it will be for the interests of the Allied Powers and not for independent American interests which in point of fact are not seriously involved. Germany is hemmed against the wall with the British lion tearing at her throat. What wonder she makes a desperate effort for very existence. . . . As a diplomatic move, our President's cause may be a wise step, but as a preliminary to further hostilities it is without sufficient provocation and absolutely without justification.

D. M. Howell
Ellenboro

Charlotte Observer, February 11, 1917.

The German submarine warfare does not threaten our National integrity or independence, nor even our National dignity and honor. It was not aimed primarily at the United States and would not affect the American people. It would strike only those parasite classes that have been making huge profits by manufacturing instruments of death or by taking our food and selling it at exorbitant prices to the fighting armies of Europe.

Edgar Hughes
Pensacola

Winston-Salem Union Republican, April 5, 1917.

My opinion is that we were in a state of war when Germany first attempted to destroy American ships and American lives on the high seas, which is free to all navigation.

W. T. Perdue
Falling Creek

Winston-Salem Union Republican, April 5, 1917.

Joseph Lee Benson is a useful and important article, "An Approach to the Scientific Study of Past Public Opinion," Public Opinion Quarterly, XIII (Winter, 1947-1948), 523-57, defined the historical study of public opinion as the "use of procedures to secure data from documents (usually defined) that the researcher locates and selects but does not create, directly or indirectly" (p. 525). A survey of the historical studies of public opinion as related to foreign policy reveals that the documents selected for such studies were primarily newspapers.

The 24th annual meeting of the American Historical Association in Washington and Richmond, December 28-31, 1909, devoted a session to the historical uses of American newspapers.¹ Jacob Ford Rhodes presented a paper entitled "The Use of Newspapers for the History of the Period from 1850 to 1877" which was later published as "Newspapers as Historical Sources," Atlantic Monthly, CIII (May, 1909), 630-37. Rhodes had used newspapers extensively in writing his History of the United States, and his article was an argument for their use as respectable sources by historians. He found the press to be not only a "repository of facts," but also a "representative and guide of public sentiment" (p. 633).

¹The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Washington and Richmond, American Historical Review, XIV (April, 1909), 429-32.

APPENDIX C

A NOTE ON THE STUDY OF PUBLIC OPINION

Lee Benson in a useful and important article, "An Approach to the Scientific Study of Past Public Opinion," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXI (Winter, 1967-1968), 522-67, defined the historical study of public opinion as the "use of procedures to secure data from documents (broadly defined) that the researcher locates and selects but does not create, directly or indirectly" (p. 525). A survey of the historical studies of public opinion as related to foreign policy reveals that the documents selected for such studies were primarily newspapers.

The 24th annual meeting of the American Historical Association in Washington and Richmond, December 28-31, 1908, devoted a session to the historical uses of American newspapers.¹ James Ford Rhodes presented a paper entitled "The Use of Newspapers for the History of the Period from 1850 to 1877" which was later published as "Newspapers as Historical Sources," Atlantic Monthly, CIII (May, 1909), 650-57. Rhodes had used newspapers extensively in writing his History of the United States, and his article was an argument for their use as respectable sources by historians. He found the press to be not only a "register of facts," but also a "representative and guide of public sentiment" (p. 653).

¹"The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Washington and Richmond," American Historical Review, XIV (April, 1909), 429-52.

At the 12th annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association held May 8-10, 1919, in St. Louis, George M. Stephenson presented a paper on "The Attitudes of Swedish Americans toward the World War," Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, X, Part I (1918-1919), 79-94, which was actually a survey of opinion expressed in the Swedish language press.

A far more comprehensive study of public opinion was published in 1923. Clara Eve Schieber used a variety of source materials for her book The Transformation of American Sentiment Toward Germany, 1870-1914 (Boston: The Cornhill Publishing Company, 1923). She believed newspapers either shaped or reflected prevailing public opinion. However, an investigator of public opinion should not rely on newspapers alone. Therefore, she used biographies, autobiographies, magazines, newspapers, histories, diplomatic correspondence, and the results of a survey which she had conducted. A questionnaire was distributed to university and college presidents, teachers, ministers, doctors, lawyers, businessmen, government officials, diplomats, and newspaper editors and writers at the end of World War I to which she received 173 replies.

In 1923 Oxford University Press in New York published two large volumes by Lucy Maynard Salmon: The Newspaper and Authority and The Newspaper and the Historian. Miss Salmon had planned the contents of both books to comprise a single volume, the first effort in a multi-volume work on historical source materials. Her unfortunate death in 1926 limited this undertaking to the two books on newspapers. In the second book, The Newspaper and the Historian, she cautioned her readers to evaluate editorials used in public opinion studies. She pointed out

that only the personal views of the editor could be presumed to appear in an editorial, but that there was no guarantee that these same views were widely held.

In December, 1925, the American Historical Association held its annual meeting in Ann Arbor, Michigan, at the same time that the American Political Science Association was meeting in New York. In Ann Arbor Paul N. Garber presented a paper on "Public Opinion in the United States and the Panama Congress" based on a study of newspapers, correspondence, and speeches.² During the American Political Science Association meeting in New York, a Round Table Conference was held for the first time on public opinion. The following topics were discussed at the conference: "Agencies and Methods of Propaganda," "Analysis of Election Results," "Analysis of Leaders and Official Representatives," and "Analysis of the Opinions of Individuals and their Sources."³

At the 41st annual meeting of the American Historical Association held in Rochester, New York, December 28-30, 1926, F. M. Anderson read a paper calling for increased attention by diplomatic historians to public opinion found in newspapers and reviews to supplement their studies of diplomatic correspondence.⁴ It is interesting to note here that in 1962

²J. Franklin Jameson, "The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Ann Arbor," American Historical Review, XXXI (April, 1926), 430-31.

³"Reports of Round Table Conferences Held in Connection with Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association at New York, December 28-30, 1925," American Political Science Review, XX (May, 1926), 404-07.

⁴J. Franklin Jameson, "The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Rochester," American Historical Review, XXXII (April, 1927), 440-41.

Ernest R. May, "An American Tradition in Foreign Policy: The Role of Public Opinion," Theory and Practice in American Politics, ed. by William H. Nelson (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 101-22, pointed out that American historians working in European diplomatic history were still neglecting public opinion, whereas those working in the diplomatic history of the United States were preoccupied with public opinion.

John Gerow Gazley, American Opinion of German Unification, 1848-1871 (New York: Columbia University, 1926), relied primarily on newspaper editorials and gave secondary attention to biographies, autobiographies, speeches, diaries, and letters of "makers of public opinion," i.e., statesmen, journalists, authors, educators, and clergymen (pp. 14-15). His final chapter, "The Sources of American Opinion in the Mid-Nineteenth Century," pp. 524-64, attempted to classify the sources of public opinion, describe each class, and determine the importance of each class as a source of public opinion.

Diplomatic historian E. Malcolm Carroll made extensive use of newspapers in attempting to ascertain public opinion in nineteenth century Europe in "French Public Opinion on War with Prussia in 1870," American Historical Review, XXXI (July, 1926), 679-700. Carroll wanted to correct what he considered a serious deficiency in previous historical accounts of events leading up to the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. Using the contemporary French press he found far less public support for war than had previously been assumed; the French government had, in fact, created opinion rather than followed it. In a later study, French Public Opinion and Foreign Affairs, 1870-1914 (New York: The

Century Company, 1931), Carroll commented that the study of the relationship between public opinion and foreign policy required an historical approach. He believed that the investigator of opinion should find out about its formation, expression, and influence rather than try to formulate a theory of public opinion. Carroll felt that the newspaper was the most effective agent for influencing public opinion as well as the primary means for the expression of public opinion. He recognized that public opinion for the historian would have to be the opinions of influential individuals, and it was the goal of the historian to discover who these leaders were and how effective they were in translating their ideas into policy. Later Carroll published another study on the relation between public opinion and foreign policy, Germany and the Great Powers, 1866-1914: A Study in Public Opinion and Foreign Policy (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1938).

In another monograph published in 1931, Donaldson Jordan and Edwin J. Pratt studied opinion in England, France, and Spain about the United States Civil War, Europe and the American Civil War (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931). Believing as they did that in the mid-nineteenth century journalists were of primary importance in the formation of public opinion, Jordan and Pratt relied almost exclusively on newspapers and magazines for opinion in the countries studied.

In the late 1920's and during the 1930's a number of diplomatic historians believed the press directly influenced foreign policy formation. In particular, the "revisionist" accounts of the causes of World War I were extensively concerned with the role of the press directly influencing foreign policy formation. Sidney Bradshaw Fay

began in the mid-1920's to publish various articles on the causes of World War I, which were to culminate in The Origins of the World War (2 vols.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930). In it he referred to the "poisoning of public opinion" by the press of the European belligerents as one of the major causes of the war (I: 47). In 1927 Jonathan French Scott, Five Weeks: The Surge of Public Opinion on the Eve of the Great War (New York: The John Day Company, 1927), reached essentially the same conclusion after studying the newspapers of Austria-Hungary, Germany, Russia, France, and Great Britain for the summer of 1914. In fact, he believed public opinion, i.e., press opinion, was the chief factor in starting the war. C. Hartley Grattan, working with events in the United States prior to intervention in World War I in Why We Fought (New York: The Vanguard Press, 1929), felt that Allied propaganda manipulated the American mind after mid-August, 1914, toward intervention due to British control of the trans-Atlantic cables, the employment of British newspapermen on American papers, and the practice by American papers of buying dispatches from British newspapers. H. C. Peterson fully developed this theme in Propaganda for War: The Campaign against American Neutrality, 1914-1917 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939).

Oron J. Hale, Germany and the Diplomatic Revolution: A Study in Diplomacy and the Press, 1904-1906 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931), concluded that the press directly influenced the direction of foreign policy in France, Great Britain, and Germany in the years prior to World War I. He suggested that newspapers should be investigated as agencies directly influencing foreign relations. Hale

echoed the plea of Anderson and Carroll for diplomatic historians to pay greater attention to news and editorial columns in determining the intellectual and social forces which influenced foreign policy formation.

In 1934 Joseph E. Wisan's book The Cuban Crisis as Reflected in the New York Press (1895-1898) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), appeared. An examination of 10 New York newspapers convinced Wisan that the press was primarily responsible for United States involvement in the Spanish-American War of 1898. He argued that the New York press created a climate of opinion which maneuvered McKinley and Congress into war with Spain. According to Wisan's interpretation, the New York newspapers studied created public opinion rather than reflected it.

In 1931 Jonathan French Scott, "The Press and Foreign Policy," Journal of Modern History, III (March-December, 1931), 627-38, reviewed seven monographs which had appeared from 1928 to 1931: E. Malcolm Carroll, French Public Opinion and Foreign Affairs, 1870-1914 (1931); Oron J. Hale, Germany and the Diplomatic Revolution: A Study in Diplomacy and the Press, 1904-1906 (1931); and five volumes by German historians. Some of these described the attitudes of a portion of the press on certain questions of foreign policy, and some attempted to show the influence of the press in foreign policy. Scott concluded that in trying to determine how much public opinion influenced foreign policy, diplomatic correspondence, documents, memoirs, and diaries were more useful sources than newspapers. However, he felt that editorial opinion furnished assistance in discerning the climate of opinion in which policy was made.

A 1937 study by Eleanor Tupper and George E. McReynolds, Japan in American Public Opinion (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937), relied on official documents, personal records, public addresses, newspapers, and periodicals to ascertain public opinion. However, Tupper and McReynolds neglected to clearly define the limitations of their study, which has been an important defect in public opinion studies done by historians.

Lynn M. Case, ed., French Opinion on the United States and Mexico, 1860-1867: Extracts from the Reports of the Procureurs Généraux (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1936), contained a warning to diplomatic historians who were involved with public opinion studies. Case cited several monographs whose authors had a tendency to regard press opinion as synonymous with public opinion: E. M. Carroll, French Public Opinion and Foreign Affairs, 1870-1914 (1931); W. R. West, Contemporary French Opinion of the American Civil War (1924); O. J. Hale, Germany and the Diplomatic Revolution (1931); and D. Jordan and E. J. Pratt, Europe and the American Civil War (1931). Case believed newspapers expressed the views of publishers and advertisers rather than those of the general public. However, he felt that press opinion sometimes could create public opinion.

Parallel to, and undoubtedly influencing, the changes in methodology of historians in dealing with public opinion were changes in the ways political scientists dealt with public opinion. In the early 1930's political scientists dealt with public opinion in broad historical, theoretical, and philosophical terms. However, by the 1950's the study of public opinion had become quantitative, untheoretical, and

technical. The Roper-Fortune and Gallup-American Institute for Public Opinion polls were established in 1935, and the Public Opinion Quarterly first appeared in 1937. These were milestones in the quantification of public opinion research.

W. Brooke Graves, ed., Readings in Public Opinion: Its Formation and Control (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1928), listed several ways in which the press influenced public opinion:

First, by presenting facts upon the basis of which judgments may be made; second, by giving such a version or interpretation of the facts as will lead the reader to accept the view which the publisher desires him to have; third, by ignoring the facts and publishing nothing whatever about the incident; fourth, by editorial comment upon the facts (pp. 297-98).

However, another political scientist, Peter Odegard, The American Public Mind (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), had decided that newspapers had declined as organs and molders of public opinion since their publishers were primarily interested in making money. Furthermore, he felt that the influence of newspapers was limited because the basic attitudes of their readers were formed before they read newspapers.

A political scientist, H. Schuyler Foster, Jr., carried out a content analysis of 11,000 news items which appeared in the New York Times and the Chicago press for the period June, 1914, to April, 1917, concerning the first World War. The results appeared in "How America Became Belligerent: A Quantitative Study of War News, 1914-17," American Journal of Sociology, XL (January, 1935), 464-75; and "Charting America's News of the World War," Foreign Affairs, XV (January, 1937), 311-19.

Journalists also were involved in studies of the press and public opinion with regard to foreign policy. During the 1930's three of these studies were initiated in the School of Journalism at the University of Wisconsin. The first of these was Marcus M. Wilkerson, Public Opinion and the Spanish-American War: A Study in War Propaganda, published in 1932 but reprinted in 1967 by Russell & Russell, New York. In it, Wilkerson condemned the activities of the "war-mongering press" which acted in accord to foster "international hatred and distrust" and was largely responsible for the Spanish-American War of 1898 (p. 2). The "jingo" press accomplished this feat by playing up the Maine explosion and by bombarding the American public with "half-truths, misstatement of facts, rumors, and faked dispatches" (p. 132). Obviously, Wilkerson believed the press could and did exert a decisive role in public opinion and foreign policy formation.

In 1936 Ralph O. Nafziger completed a doctoral dissertation for the School of Journalism at the University of Wisconsin entitled "The American Press and Public Opinion during the World War, 1914 to April 1917." He surveyed 16 national newspapers, and concluded that newspapers reflected public opinion rather than created it. On the other hand, Nafziger pointed out that an individual usually read the paper he agreed with, and therefore the news published by a paper was "a general measure of attitudes" (p. 6).

Maynard W. Brown also completed his doctoral dissertation in 1936 at the University of Wisconsin School of Journalism, from which he developed an article, "American Public Opinion and Events Leading to the World War, 1912-1914," Journalism Quarterly, XIV (March, 1937), 23-34.

Brown surveyed nine American newspapers and three British papers for the period January 1, 1912, to July 1, 1914, and studied the news treatment of three press associations. Major emphasis was placed on the press as an agent in the formation of public opinion.

In 1940 the first of the state studies appeared on press opinion prior to United States intervention in World War I. Edwin Costrell attempted to ascertain public opinion from newspaper files in How Maine Viewed the War, 1914-1917, University of Maine Studies, Second Series, No. 49 (Orono: University Press, 1940). He assumed that newspapers reflected public opinion. Costrell measured news columns and compared the lengths of various items dealing with the war in Europe in six Maine newspapers. He was familiar with H. Schuyler Foster, Jr.'s methodology, but he did not attempt more sophisticated qualitative analysis.

The next state study to appear was Cedric C. Cummins, Indiana Public Opinion and the World War, 1914-1917, Indiana Historical Collection, Vol. XXVIII (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1945). Cummins also assumed that newspaper editorials reflected public opinion. Throughout he equated newspaper editorials with public opinion.

The third state study, and the most comprehensive, was John Clark Crighton, Missouri and the World War, 1914-1917: A Study in Public Opinion, The University of Missouri Studies, Vol. XXI, No. 3 (Columbia: University of Missouri, 1947). Crighton relied primarily on Missouri newspapers to study Middle Western opinion about the war from 1914 to 1917, and he, too, derived public opinion from press opinion. However, he was careful to delineate press opinion and state when he was inferring

public opinion from it. In addition, Crighton made extensive use of other sources than the press in making his study.

Two other state studies have been made in addition to the three discussed above: Robert P. Wilkins, "North Dakota and the European War, 1914-1917: A Study in Public Opinion" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of West Virginia, 1954); and Richard Glen Eaves, "Pro-Allied Sentiment in Alabama, 1914-1917: A Study of Representative Newspapers," Alabama Review, XXV (January, 1927), 30-55.

Another significant paper appeared in 1945, Harold C. Syrett, "The Business Press and American Neutrality, 1914-1917," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXXII (September, 1945), 215-30. However, Syrett, too, assumed that public opinion and press opinion were synonymous.

Thomas A. Bailey, The Man in the Street: The Impact of American Public Opinion on Foreign Policy (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948), was the first study by an historian, in this case, a diplomatic historian, to use public opinion polls as sources. Bailey worked with all published polls dealing with foreign affairs during the period 1935 to June, 1947. He acknowledged the limitations of polling techniques, but believed polls were an enormous improvement over newspaper editorials as sources for attempts to determine public opinion.

The most comprehensive historical treatment of public opinion and foreign policy was undertaken by diplomatic historian Ernest R. May in American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay (New York: Atheneum, 1968). This study was published in different form earlier in Ernest R. May, "American Imperialism: A Reinterpretation," Perspectives in American History, I (1967), 123-283. May applied the latest public opinion

research and concepts of sociologists, political scientists, and psychologists in attempting to identify the probable foreign policy opinion leaders in several metropolitan areas in the United States during an 18-month period in 1898 and 1899 when the United States became a colonial power. His sources were newspapers, biographies, and biographical registers. After identifying the opinion leaders from newspaper accounts, he examined their public and private writings to try to determine what influences may have shaped their opinions. The essential assumption of his study was "that the sampling of opinion leaders discoverable in the press somehow represents the larger and more varied leadership group whose members played their parts and passed away" (p. 39).

The concepts held by historians regarding public opinion have changed with advances in public opinion research by social scientists. And while newspapers will remain an important source for historians dealing with public opinion, particularly in the periods before sophisticated polling techniques were used, data from the press will have to be treated with regard to the findings of contemporary public opinion research. Historians, if their work is to be valid, must take account of the insights of other social scientists studying public opinion.