

KIPLING AND THE GREAT WAR PROPAGANDISTS

by David Alan Richards

Newspapers and pamphlets will convey to posterity sufficiently, and even more than sufficiently, the notions and fancies and passions of the moment.

Lord Bryce, Presidential Address to the British Academy, 20 June 1915

Have you ever considered what a diabolical weapon that can be—using all the channels of modern publicity to poison and warp men’s minds?...You can use it cleanly—as I think on the whole we did in the War—but you can also use it to establish the most damnable lies.

Macgillivray in John Buchan’s *The Three Hostages* (London: 1924)

Wellington House

The leading writers of the Edwardian period occupied a pre-eminent position as a specialized elite, and they likewise formed part of a social elite which was unusually cohesive. When the First World War broke out, the prestige of men of letters was set in a context of extraordinary diversity and vitality, ranging from heavyweights like Thomas Hardy, Rudyard Kipling, H. G. Wells, Arthur Conan Doyle, Arnold Bennett, and George Bernard Shaw, through cultured English gentlemen like John Galsworthy, Edmund Gosse, and Arthur Quiller-Couch of the *Oxford Book of English Verse*. The Edwardian literary establishment, ready to enter the public arena as preachers, debaters, and entertainers, had no competition from radio or television, and its representatives enjoyed tremendous prestige throughout the world among both elite and mass audiences. Noting the strength of belief in the educative and civilizing power of classical and English literature, and the vigor of a native tradition of popular education and “self-improvement,” Paul Fussell has argued that Edwardian England exuded “an atmosphere of public respect for literature unique in modern times.”¹

These leading writers were major public figures in a manner missing from our modern culture, except perhaps in terms of the television journalist “expert” of today; they were assumed to possess weighty opinions on a variety of subjects, in a humanist tradition reaching back to Cicero.² They indeed had already played a part in the deterioration and subsequent reshaping of European international relations at the end of the nineteenth century. In particular, the fellow-feeling between Britain and Germany dissolved after the Kaiser sent his provocative telegram in support of the Transvaal in the Boer War (see Kipling’s poem of 1902, “The Rowers,” about “the breed that has shamed us most...the shameless Hun,” in response to

the Kaiser's own evocation of the term in 1900, and Conan Doyle's *The War in South Africa*), to be replaced by the atmosphere which had resulted in L'Entente Cordiale of 1910 (see Kipling's poem of 1913, "France"). These same British authors—again, perhaps most especially Kipling, but including his friends Doyle and H. Rider Haggard and John Buchan—had also played their part in creating the imperial idea which led to increasing strains in international relations, an image taken up by the popular press of Northcliffe and Harmsworth and given mass popularity and appeal.³

When the "guns of August" in 1914 shattered the late summer tranquility of the British people, Prime Minister Herbert Asquith's Liberal administration was (with some exceptions like Churchill) totally unprepared for war. That government soon learned that its German adversary, supplementing its armies sweeping into Belgium, had also prepared for psychological warfare, with a propaganda agency in place in the United States that immediately began to distribute leaflets in many cities, paralleled by the distribution of posters and leaflets in Italy.

David Lloyd George, hearing about this after an August Sunday luncheon at a golf club, realized at once that German actions had to be countered, and that the United States and other neutral nations must be persuaded to share Britain's view of the genesis of the war. He urged the Cabinet on 31 August to establish an organization "to inform and influence public opinion abroad and to confute German mis-statements and sophistries," and turned to his cabinet colleague, an M.P. and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, C. F. G. Masterman, saying "Will you look into it, Charlie, and see what can be done."⁴ Masterman had served as Chairman of the National Insurance Commission, established in 1911 in connection with the National Insurance Act; Lloyd George as Chancellor of the Exchequer was this legislation's greatest sponsor, recruiting the services of a team of lecturers to tour the country explaining the benefits of the Act to employers and workers alike. This rare example of an organized publicity campaign conducted by a government department in peacetime prior to 1914 may have been a precedent Lloyd George had in mind. This Commission's headquarters were in Wellington House in Buckingham Gate, a residential block of flats (since demolished) taken over by the Liberal government before the war.⁵

To begin this task, the placing before the peoples of neutral countries and of the Dominions the British case for entering the war and its justifications for wartime policy decisions, Masterman organized two conferences, the first with prominent literary figures and only thereafter a second with representatives of the British press, in an attempt to establish the principles on which his propaganda campaign would be based and the methods to be adopted. He issued a summons to many of England's major writers to attend a secret meeting on 2 September 1914 "for [in the words of Thomas Hardy's journal] the organization of public

statements of the strength of the British case and principles in the war by well-known men of letters," to be held at Wellington House. Around that conference room table gathered Hardy, Doyle, J. M. Barrie, Arnold Bennett, G. K. Chesterton, John Galsworthy, John Masefield, Gilbert Murray, G. M. Trevelyan, H. G. Wells, R. Hall Caine, and a dozen other prominent authors (Masefield, Trevelyan, and Chesterton had earlier been fellow journalists with Masterson on the *Daily News*); Kipling and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch were unable to attend but sent messages offering their services. No minutes of the meeting have survived, if any were kept (and indeed, most of the records of Wellington House and the successive Department and Ministry of Information were scattered and destroyed at war's end).⁶ Hardy was later to recall in a letter to Anthony Hope Hawkins (the author of *The Prisoner of Zenda*, appointed as Masterman's literary advisor) "that memorable afternoon in September, 1914, the yellow sun shining in upon our confused deliberations in a melancholy manner I shall never forget."⁷

Anticipating a manifesto of support for the attack on Belgium by prominent German academics, artists, and intellectuals, Masterman's initial goal with this highly individualistic crowd was to secure from them a proposed response. This document, drafted by Gilbert Murray, was eventually signed by the summoned writers and several not present at the early September meeting, including Haggard and Jerome K. Jerome. This "Authors' Manifesto" appeared in London in *The Times* and in the *New York Times* on 18 September, signed by fifty-four authors, calling upon Britain and "all the English speaking race" to defend the "ideals of Western Europe against the rule of 'Blood and Iron'..." It was reprinted on a full page of the Sunday supplement of the *New York Times* on 18 October, with the authors' signatures in facsimile, constituting to the watching Americans an impressive and apparently spontaneous demonstration of British authors' solidarity.

The statement began: "The undersigned writers, comprising amongst them men and women of the most divergent political and social views, some of them having been for years ardent champions of good will towards Germany, and many of them extreme advocates of peace, are nevertheless agreed that Great Britain could not without dishonour have refused to take part in the present war." The principal reasons offered were the defence of Belgian neutrality and the prevention of the ruin of France. The declaration concluded: "For these reasons and others the undersigned feel bound to support the cause of the allies with all their strength, with a full conviction of its righteousness, and with a deep sense of its vital import to the future of the world."⁸ No other war in Britain's history has been defined and defended so quickly, and by writers of such stature.

Since the enlistment of the literary establishment was a mode of warfare without precedent, why did the government feel it was necessary? One answer is that the serving administration depended for its continuance on the support of a more literate portion of the

population than ever before: late Victorian legislation had raised the general level of literacy and extended the franchise, so there were more voters in England to be persuaded of the rightness of the nation's cause. And since this was a war to be fought by volunteers—literate volunteers, young clerks and artists, students from Oxbridge and the great public schools, sons of parsons and of peers, men of all classes who shared a common literacy—they too were worthy of and susceptible to persuasion. (Poor Conan Doyle had felt obliged to volunteer for military service in the Boer War at the age of forty because, as he told his mother: "I have perhaps the strongest influence over young men, especially young athletic sporting men, of anyone in England (except Kipling). That being so, it is really important that I give them the lead.")⁹

Moreover, there was the need to counter the anticipated and vast propaganda campaign launched by Germans in neutral countries. (In time arose the necessity of convincing the French and the Russians that, despite Britain's limited contribution to the first two years of the struggle, the British people were not just waiting to pick up the fruits of a victory won by somebody else.) And the paramount concern was the need to keep the United States, even if it remained a non-combatant, sufficiently sympathetic that it would tolerate the interruption of its trade with Britain's enemies and would make its vast manufacturing resources available to the Allies. Thus, the Great War became the most literary and most poetical war in English history, before or since.¹⁰

The Authors' Manifesto signatories were flattered by being asked by the government to lend a hand in the great cause, leaving the isolation of their work-rooms to identify themselves with the war effort of the nation, and presumably many—not least Kipling—felt it was one way to assuage their vague guilt for being too old to serve on the fighting front. Still, patriotic fervor was the chief motivation that caused them to be swept away by the tide of ardor and dedication marking Britain's early war effort. "All the grey complexities and ambiguities of the prewar period fell away," one scholar has observed, "and in the subsequent grand simplification, the Germans became the enemy of whom any barbarism could be believed, the French became the noble saviors of an ancient civilization, and the British and imperial troops became as the knights of old, riding out of the west to the succour of a beleaguered ally....It did not require much effort of imagination on the part of these writers to transform the platitudes of the British imperial idea, the worship of French culture, and the dislike of German militarism into a propaganda rhetoric embodying unconscious prejudices and stereotypes. They were willing to believe the worst about the enemy and accepted that worst unhesitatingly when it came in the form of rumours and reports of atrocities."¹¹

While this historian in his summary was speaking particularly of Edith Wharton, Henry James (who became a British citizen in 1915), Conrad, Bennett, Wells, and Doyle, as well as of

Kipling, those familiar with the latter's work over the prior fifteen years will recognize all of these themes as well-worn ones in his popular poems and tales. Even before the declaration of war on Germany, Wells had characterized that nation's attitudes as "Teutonic Kiplingism,"¹² and as long ago as the Boer War, in *The Struwwelpeter Alphabet* of 1900, Kipling had been paired in a double caricature for the letter "K", entitled "Sword and Pen;" the accompanying poem concluding "When the Empire wants a stitch in her | Send for Kipling and for Kitchener."¹³

The War Propaganda Bureau—or Wellington House, as Masterman's agency came to be generally known within the government, while its operations were kept secret from Parliament, the price of which was the recurring accusation that nothing was being done—was not to engage in propaganda directed against the enemy or in home front propaganda, but instead to concentrate on making the British case in Allied and neutral nations. Masterman believed he was to disseminate neutral facts, even if those were carefully selected and presented to suggest conclusions convenient for the British cause, but fabrication was to be avoided.

The preferred instrument was the pamphlet. Usually an ephemeral literary form, the pamphlet had its origins in Britain in the sixteenth and seventeenth century controversies between religious sects; customarily published in paper covers, it is cheap to produce and easy to distribute. The volume of Wellington House's print runs is not known, as the government destroyed the records of its various propaganda bureaus after the war, but nearly a thousand titles were commissioned and it is said seven million copies were printed by 1916 (for the German propaganda pamphlets in the United States alone, the smallest edition was twenty-five thousand, and some attained an edition of several hundred thousand).¹⁴

Masterman intended that these pamphlets would be of the highest literary quality, academic in tone and scholarly in content, rather than simple propagandistic diatribes. Conscious of brash German methods that sought to impose an opinion, he further expected Wellington House products to be of a highly factual nature, with the British case argued only very subtly. This meant authoritative accounts written by respected authors on the basis of documentary or otherwise-cited "evidence."

The pamphlets' official nature was to be disguised: bearing no overt indication of their origin, these appeared to be written by private individuals of repute, and printed by private but prominent publishers. The Bureau got commercial houses to print their material in England and paid five guineas for the use of their respective imprints; the government secretly agreed in advance to buy copies, which it then distributed for free. An American scholar who visited the Bureau just before it was dismantled and its materials scattered wrote that "Wellington House put out its own materials, the materials of approved works, authorized and acknowledged

works published by private individuals, and *distributed privately published works which it did not acknowledge...*"¹⁵

Alexander Strahan Watt, whose father's firm A. P. Watt & Son had coincidentally represented Kipling since he came to Britain from India in 1889, was appointed the Bureau's literary agent, bringing his expertise to bear on the thorny problems of copyright and distribution. By the end of 1914, Wellington House had translated more than twenty publications for distribution in neutral countries, and by June 1915 had commissioned and published some 2.5 million booklets. Over its four-year administrative life, Wellington House instigated some 1162 titles, most of them pamphlets.¹⁶

One strain of the rhetoric employed was the evangelical tradition of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* (the British soldier identified with Christian, and the City of Destruction with the ruins of the devastated towns of Flanders), and another was drawn from the school story—the archetype of which was Kipling's *Stalky & Co.* of 1899, about United Services College (a military crammers' school rather than a classic public school)—with its code of school devotion to games and the spirit of sportsmanship. The language in which these pamphlets were written is elevated, formulaic, and clichéd,¹⁷ but many novelists on behalf of the government rushed into print with them on an astonishing number of military and civilian concerns. Arnold Bennett defended their work in a letter to the *New Statesman*: "As war is preeminently an affair of human nature, a triumph of instinct over reason, it seems to me not improper that serious novelists (who are supposed to know a little about human nature and to be able to observe accurately and to write) should be permitted to express themselves concerning the phenomenon of a nation at war..."¹⁸

The success of Masterman's bid to his Wellington House literary set may be measured by a letter from Minister to Great Britain Walter Page to "Dear D.P. & Co.," his friends back at the American publishing house of Doubleday Page (Kipling's American publisher), sent at Christmas, 1915: "As you know, nobody's writing anything but war books—from Kipling to Hall Caine....These writing men and women, by the way, are true blue and as thoroughbred as any other class....Of course, nobody can tell what effect the war will have of the writing of [books], now what sort of new writers may come up. You may be sure that everything is stirred to its profoundest depths and will be disturbed still more."¹⁹

Kipling at the Pamphlet Wars

Even without the Masterman invitation, Kipling would of course have brought his literary guns to bear in what became the Great War. On 2 September, the very day of the Wellington House meeting of his fellow authors, his poem "For All We Have and Are" appeared in *The Times* (which at his request sent £50 to the Belgian Relief Fund in Kipling's name), and

the entire world was soon aware of his call to “stand up...The Hun is at the Gate!” The verses appeared in two New York newspapers on the day of the London publication, and Methuen, the commercial publisher of his poetry (and another of Wellington House’s enablers), produced a one-penny leaflet version in the same month.²⁰ “What stands if Freedom fall?”, he demanded of his many readers. “Who dies if England live?”

This was followed in November by his starkly anti-German poem, “The Outlaws,” produced for *King Albert’s Book*, a volume of many authors’ and artists’ contributions organized by R. Hall Caine which the *Daily Telegraph* commissioned to raise funds for Belgian refugees and produced in trade and deluxe editions in England, Canada, and the United States. To meet the demand, it was produced jointly by thirty-one printers in 400,000 copies. Kipling’s verses attacked an outlaw people who “...set themselves to find | Fresh terrors and undreamed-of fears | To heap upon mankind.”²¹

While Kipling shared the urgency and enthusiasm of his fellow writers for Masterman’s mission, he was not an easy bedfellow for the current government. In 1906 he had become the foremost advocate of General Frederick (“Bobs”) Roberts’s National Defence League, which had as its chief aims a rearmed Britain and a national military service scheme of conscription (and Kipling bought the ground for the shooting range at Rottingdean for the Roberts-sponsored miniature rifle club). From then up to the outbreak of the European war, Kipling had been a caustic critic of the Liberal party’s pacifism, as well as of its imperial and Ulster policies. Under the title “Rudyard Kipling’s Indictment of the Government,” *The Daily Express* had published in penny-priced leaflets his speech at Tunbridge Wells less than three months before Germany’s invasion of Belgium.²²

Just two weeks after the Wellington House writers’ meeting in September 1914, Foreign Secretary Sir Edward Grey heard a rumor that Kipling was going to the United States to lecture as a goodwill ambassador, and wrote to Masterman the same day that the author must not be allowed to make the trip because as a bellicose Tory he would advocate American entry into the war, a posture which was anathema to the Liberal party and would, Grey stated, compel his resignation. Masterman told Grey he agreed that Kipling’s advocacy in this regard was not the kind of propaganda that Wellington House wanted, but he was at a loss to do much, since Kipling was not in the government’s permanent employ and Masterman could hardly “lock [him] up as a danger to the State.”²³

This deflection of Grey’s alarm preserved Masterman’s ability to call on Kipling’s services, and he was not a recalcitrant ally. Kipling’s biographer Charles Carrington asserts that he was repeatedly asked to write propaganda for the government and refused to do so, but as early as 13 September, in a letter to Lord Alfred Milner, Kipling’s urgent interest is evidenced by a comment on the global reach of the German propaganda machine.²⁴ The author wrote

Ladies Home Journal editor Edward Bok on 28 October 1914: "I have given my only son to the Army; I am giving my time and substance to the work that lies before us. It will be a long task..."²⁵ Corresponding with Lord Beaverbrook on 5 March 1918 after Beaverbrook became Minister of Information later in the war, in recommendation of Strahan Watt as literary agent for the new ministry, he recounted that Watt had written to Kipling many times in the past few years "saying that Wellington House wanted to do so and so, and would like to include such and such a bit of my work,"²⁴ and in Mrs. Masterman's biography of her husband, she notes that "certain of [Kipling's] writings were made use of, particularly in France."⁶⁵

He began as an indefatigable speechmaker at recruiting rallies and writer of recruiting pamphlets. When the war was but a month old, and almost certainly without prompting from Wellington House, Kipling wrote the editor of the *Daily Express*, R. D. Blumenfeld, noting that he was about to make a recruiting speech at Brighton, and urged the paper "to publish this speech in leaflet form," while donating the profits to "either the Red Cross or the Belgian Relief Funds."²⁷

"National Bands," a speech delivered at Mansion House on 27 January 1915 made at the Lord Mayor's request, proposed "to provide drums and fifes for every battalion, full bands at depots, and a proportion of battalion bands at half or even one-third establishment;" it was printed as a leaflet by Hodder & Stoughton (another of Wellington House's publishing firms) and distributed in a special "National Bands" edition of Kipling's previously published *A Song of the English*.²⁸ On 21 June, he was the chief speaker at Southport at a rally for Lord Derby's Recruiting Campaign for the West Lancashire Territorial Battalions, and his "A Call to the Nation" was published by *The Daily Express* as a leaflet selling for 1/2d. An Australian edition was published using the government printer by the Federal parliamentary war committee in Melbourne (and a Portuguese edition was to be published in Lisbon in 1918).²⁹

The focus and pace of output soon shifted. Since Allied military leaders at the outset of the war prevented newspaper reporters from visiting the front (despite Masterman's recruitment meeting with them at Wellington House on 7 September, following the authors' gathering) and exercised a powerful censorship of whatever was published about the fighting, the public were starved of news. As a remedy, Wellington House and the War Office organized visits for a few British writers, under close supervision, to the war zones. Among them were Arnold Bennett, Arthur Conan Doyle, and Kipling, who was sent on a tour of the camps of the New Army, rapidly being trained in late 1914 and early 1915 to replace the British Expeditionary Force, the regular army detachment decimated in the early months of the war.

Between 13 October and 24 November, Kipling visited army training camps at Crowborough, Aldershot, Maresfield, Uckfield, Sevenoaks, and Salisbury Plain, as well as Indian Troops in the New Forest. To American magazine editor Bok he wrote about his rounds. "I am

doing a set of newspaper articles about it, though, for obvious reasons, I am not telling more than I can avoid. The Germans have a theory that the New Army is small and contemptible and that the hearts of the English are not in the war. Personally, I do not want to destroy that theory, so I have kept the note of my articles as low and grey as possible.”³⁰

The series of six articles, finished by 2 December, appeared in *The Daily Telegraph* in three-day intervals before Christmas in December 1914. Simultaneously with each’s newspaper appearance, but in an edited version removing colloquialisms unfamiliar to Americans, they were each reprinted by the author’s American publishers Doubleday, Page and Company, in separate pamphlets on infantry, gunners, Canadians, Indian troops, and Territorial battalions, each in an edition of fifty copies. Most of these were then mailed to newspapers and destroyed, being separated into leaves for the convenience of linotype operators.³¹

Doubleday’s publication of the pamphlets both protected American copyright upon valuable literary property, and at the same time aimed to serve the cause of the Allied victory, in a masterstroke for author, publisher—and Wellington House. Their publication and re-use perfectly illustrated what the Bureau’s Sir Gilbert Parker was later to describe frankly (but without naming the War Propaganda Bureau) in an article in *Harper’s Magazine* in March 1918: “I bore responsibility for American publicity. I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged...We established connection with the man in the street...through interviews, articles, pamphlets, etc....we advised and stimulated people to write articles.”³²

Parker, a Canadian novelist, had attended Masterman’s September 1914 meeting with British authors. He was by then a British MP knighted by King Edward in 1902 for services to his dominion’s literature, and agreed without formal title within Wellington House to serve as (unpaid) director of American propaganda. He had first introduced himself to the United States with an editorial in the *New York Times* on 26 September 1914, entitled “A Modest Appeal from Sir Gilbert Parker to read the British Side.” Sir Gilbert, working from London and poring over *Who’s Who* and other sources, over time developed a mailing list of 555 newspapers (actually more, if syndication is factored in), 260,000 influential Americans, and their public libraries, colleges, and clubs.

An exemplary cover letter began: “I am well aware that American enterprise has made available reprints of the official papers relating to the present European war; but the original British prints of these publications may not be accessible to those persons of influence who would study them for a true history of the conflict. I am venturing to send to you under another cover several of these official documents.” In this manner, in the guise of a private citizen and English patriot, he inundated United States readers with writings from Kipling, Wells, Galsworthy, Bennett, and others (sometimes, as a *ruse de guerre*, the enclosure card

apparently came from the authors of the books and pamphlets, such as Viscount Bryce or John Buchan, although they truly came from Wellington House).³³

Although there was to be no American book version of this particular Kipling series, a one-volume paperback edition based on the London newspaper texts was published in Britain by Macmillan & Co. in February 1915, retitled *The New Army in Training*, in an edition of 12,375 copies priced at 6 shillings.³⁴ The Canadians came in for particular praise: “They were all supple, free and intelligent; and they moved with a lift and drive that made one sing for joy.” The Indian troops, although having a grim time in the English winter, were all devoted and disciplined: “It is a war of *our Raj*—‘everybody’s war,’ as they say in the bazaars.”³⁵ In *The New Army*, Kipling wrote of an ideal fighting force: he ignored the real conditions, the inevitable frustrations and annoyances of actual recruits in training, and endowed the men, all brave, disciplined, and loyal, with his own spirit.

Reactions were varied. “Kipling’s little 6d book on the New Armies is very good,” the poet Ivor Gurney observed. But another young poet, Edmund Blunden, later said that it was this pamphlet which permanently turned him off Kipling: “It was so hideous a dismissal of such creatures [as me] into this bottomless pit of war I could never forgive. To him they were the merest cannon fodder.”³⁶

Having thus celebrated British and imperial troops as knights of old, the first major theme of the writers of Wellington House, Kipling’s next reportage embodied the second, France as the noble savior of an ancient civilization, in his collection’s very title. “France at War on the Frontier of Civilization,” a series of six articles appearing in the London *Daily Telegraph* and in the *New York Times* from 6 through 17 September 1915. These were composed in his new capacity as an official war correspondent, on the invitation of General John French who had bidden Kipling out to the front in France, in Carrie Kipling’s diary’s words, to “have a look round” in March 1915. He traversed the lines from Soissons through Rheims, Verdun, Nancy, and Troyes to Belfort in a two-car convoy (for baggage), including a 70 hp Mercedes with two drivers. Upon his return to Paris, he wrote his wife and daughter that “I think I see my way clear to at least three *first* class articles which, if translated into French, will do all you and I desire....Certainly I ought to be able to be useful. [French academic Andrè] Chevillon writes me they will believe me before anyone else.”³⁷

In the event, there were five articles, and The Sun Printing and Publishing Company in New York printed each in a copyright leaflet (the only known copies are in the Library of Congress). The articles were promptly pirated by other American newspapers, which served Wellington House’s purposes exactly, if irritating to Kipling, who transferred his copyright temporarily to the Sun to pursue the infringers. Following the pattern established by *The New Army*, Macmillan published the following month 20,000 copies of a revised text in a London

book edition, *France at War*, priced at sixpence, and introduced by the author's 1913 poem "France." Doubleday, Page published the American version in November 1915, priced at 50 cents, featuring the entwined flags of Great Britain, Russia, and France on the front cover.³⁸

One historian has characterized these articles as "some of the most violent propaganda written by any British writer in the Great War." The author generally uses a stereotypical French soldier or an old woman as his mouthpieces, but the sentiments about the depravity of Germany are unmistakably Kipling's. "'We—you and I,'" declares one soldier, "'England and the rest had begun to doubt the existence of Evil. The Boche is saving us.'" A French woman is said to "tell" him, "This is not war. It is against wild beasts that we fight. There is no arrangement possible with wild beasts." He goes on to discuss the German soldier on the defensive. Reminding the reader of the tales of German atrocities during the advance through Flanders and France, he opined: "The Boche does not at all like meeting men whose womenfolk he has dishonored or mutilated, or used as protection against bullets." The author's tour of the front released, says this historian, "that lust for revenge which was often the mainspring of his worst writing as well of some of his best."

Kipling's denigration of the Germans was harsh ("they stood...outside all humanity"), and he rejoiced when he saw a charred patch on the floor of a dressing station where a wounded German major had burned alive when the building was set afire by shelling. This was matched with hyperbolic exaltation of the French. "France" he asserted, "has discovered the measure of her soul....One sees this not alone in the—it is more than contempt of death—in the godlike preoccupation of her people under arms which makes them put death out of the account, but in the equal passion and fervor with which her people throughout give themselves to the smallest as well as to the greatest tasks that may in any way serve their sword."³⁹

This publication pattern of *The New Army* was replicated in Kipling's third series, "The Fringes of the Fleet." Based on his visits to the headquarters of the east coast naval patrols at Dover and at Harwich in September 1915, these were again commissioned by Wellington House, for publication in British and American newspapers, describing the activities of the smaller units of the Navy employed at its "fringes": submarines, destroyers, and other auxiliary vessels. (Kipling in 1898 had enjoyed great success with *A Fleet in Being: Notes of Two Trips with the Channel Squadron*, published as a one-shilling paperback after appearance as a series of six articles appearing in *The Times* and *The Morning Post* and the *New York World*, which was actually reprinted in Germany only three weeks later!)

The *Fringes* articles, copyrighted in America as six Doubleday pamphlets in print runs of seventy-five copies, appeared in Britain in *The Daily Telegraph*, and in the United States in the Hearst newspapers (*The New York American*, *The Boston American*, *The Los Angeles Examiner*, *The San Francisco Examiner*, *The Atlanta Georgian*, and others in that chain) in the last week of

November and the first week of December 1915. Increasing their notice in the United States, the amalgamated articles were also published by the Hearst newspapers in an octavo-sized illustrated paperback version, entitled “Rudyard Kipling With The British Fleet,” as “Complimentary Reprints” delivered, bearing city-legend front covers, in New York, Boston, Los Angeles and San Francisco, with a distribution covering letter from each paper’s editor to its subscribers describing “ a little book containing six articles and six poems by Rudyard Kipling.”

Thanks to Wellington House and her husband’s fame, these article texts also appeared simultaneously or slightly later, Caroline Kipling noted in her diary, in papers in “the U.S., France, Australia, Greece, Italy, Russia, and French Switzerland.” Macmillan, in the same month in which the last of the series appeared in the newspapers, again produced a London hardback edition of a revised text in 20,000 copies priced at sixpence, and Doubleday once more published a New York hardback edition at 50 cents, advertised on the dustjacket as “A Companion Volume to ‘France at War,’ with a cover design incorporating the British admiralty flag from the English edition as well as its revised text.”⁴⁰

The Fringes of the Fleet painted for the reader a picture of a kind of *Stalky & Co.* navy, the boys sailing around in their little ships playing elaborate jokes on the Germans. The fun only serves to emphasize the superiority of the Royal Navy over the German fleet. “It is no lie that at the present moment we hold all the seas in the hollow of our hands....Nor [wrote this proponent of total war at sea, a policy which would If implemented have ruined relations with the United States while undermining Britain’s high moral position in the war] is it any lie that, had we used the Navy’s bare fist instead of its gloved hand from the beginning, we would in all likelihood have shortened the war.”⁴¹

Ivor Gurney the following September told a correspondent that he had read most of the *Fringes* booklet “in a shell hole, during one of the most annoying times we had. It was during heavy fatigue, and the Boches spotted us and let fly with heavy shrapnel and 5.9s.” As Harry Ricketts has noted, “Kipling would have been pleased to learn that what had proved a vital displacement activity for himself had also helped a private soldier get through part of the Battle of the Somme.”⁴²

Kipling’s output under the guidance of Wellington House was interrupted by a summons from his favorite service, the British Navy, which occupied a cherished place in the hearts of all Britons. People were reluctant to criticize the institution which seemed to hold the empire together, and so there was less pressure upon the navy than upon the army to open its operations to public scrutiny; conversely, the navy did not need to produce propaganda for use against the enemy’s personnel. Still, as it became ever more involved in a war of unprecedented scope and complexity, the navy discovered that it too needed to come to terms

with the new phenomenon of public opinion. The man in charge of this task for the Admiralty was Rear-Admiral (and Chief [Admiralty] Censor) Sir Douglas Brownrigg.⁴³

In the spring of 1916, following the success of *The Fringes of The Fleet*, Brownrigg made available to Kipling for review secret reports to the British Admiralty, from which the author composed three articles, entitled "Tales of 'The Trade'". Doubleday issued its three copyright pamphlets, in 70 copies each, in the last two weeks of June 1916, just preceding Kipling's texts' appearances in *The Times* (London) and other English newspapers on 21, 23, and 28 June. These were distributed to American newspapers in mimeograph form by the Official Press Bureau to subscribing newspapers accompanied by a sheet of instructions requiring notice of Kipling's copyright, which was a condition of the author's cooperation when sending the first of the three articles to Brownrigg for his prior approval. The copyright if made in the Admiralty's name was to revert to Kipling, he wrote Brownrigg, "at the end of a year or at the termination of the war, whichever suits your arrangements best. In the meantime, of course, your people have the exclusive right to use them as articles in newspapers or as pamphlets in propaganda work in all countries." An Italian language edition, *'Il Mestiere', Storie De Sottomarinia Britannici Raccontate*, was printed in London the same year by Darling & Son, Ltd., yet another of Wellington House's publisher fronts.⁴⁴

Kipling objected when his American publisher Doubleday proposed publishing the three articles in a single paperback similar to the 1915 editions of *France at War* and *The Fringes of the Fleet*, preferring that they be combined with other articles "and made into a real book by Doubleday" (a project only realized with the publication of *Sea Warfare* in 1917). In Britain, the littérateur Clement Shorter who liked to print limited editions of work by Hardy and George Meredith and others for distributions to his friends, petitioned the Admiralty (as temporary holder of the copyright, but with Kipling's knowledge and permission) to privately print a limited edition of 25 copies of "The Tales of 'The Trade'" (a dozen copies are still extant). The note of limitation recited that the series was "written by Mr. Rudyard Kipling at the request of the British Admiralty."⁴⁵

This effort had blowback. In referring to submarines in the Sea of Marmara, Kipling had injudiciously written that "one cannot rejoice over dead Mahomedans unless they are Arab." The Foreign Office berated Brownrigg for letting this pass: "The serious part of the matter is just at this moment we are especially anxious not to hurt in any way the susceptibility of our friends in Arabia, and I think Kipling's expression may be unwelcome to the Grand Sheriff...Possibly the wily Boche will not spot the lapse, but he probably will." Brownrigg deflected, commenting that "One can see the Grand Sheriff, or whatever, perusing *The Times*, can't one?," but still asked Kipling to review a prepared statement to "placate the young women at the FO" in the event of a public controversy over the lapse.⁴⁶

Kipling found the work, if time-consuming and requiring his presence in London or abroad, engrossing (he was not at his Sussex home Bateman's when his son John, having turned eighteen, departed for service in France with the Irish Guards). At the Athenaeum Club in mid-July, he had ignored Henry James, and felt the need to apologize in a note: "I have got hold—or rather it's got hold of me—of some work which I can't put aside. It isn't of a literary nature and will be taking all my time for some weeks to come. I should have been at your command."⁴⁷ As young John made his way by cattle truck towards the front, south of St. Omer, he had the odd sensation of reading in the local papers of his father's reception in the French lines.⁴⁸

Although a prize catch for the propaganda officers of Wellington House and the Admiralty, he did not always jump to at their suggestions. In March 1915, perhaps because the job would have been based purely on the accounts of the generals involved, he declined to write the history of the first battle of Ypres. The following September he likewise refused the request of the Committee of Imperial Defence to repeat for the Russian front a series with the approach of the French army articles collected in *France at War* (the head of the Committee's Historical Section told him: "Our Russian experts tell us that you are the only Englishman whom the man in the street will read and you he reads with avidity"). Three months later he declined a proposal from Admiral Edmund Slade to report on the Grand Fleet, this in irritation that, as he claimed, the Navy's failure to blockade Germany had been glossed over in all its official communiques. "The public has been so fogged and fooled over the conduct of the War," he wrote Slade, "that I cannot use my pen to add to their confusion by telling those partial truths which are all that the Government intends them to know." There is some evidence that he planned to visit English munitions factories in March 1918 to write about them, but this came to nothing.⁴⁹

The Battle of Jutland on 31 May 1916, the major naval event of the year and, by most measures, of the entire war (the only battle between two great modern fleets ever fought in European waters, involving 25 admirals, 250 ships, and 100,000 men), deeply challenged Brownrigg's office. With damaged ships beginning to come into ports on Britain's east coast and casualties admitted to hospitals, Brownrigg concluded that an immediate announcement of some sort was essential, and helped craft a brief but completely truthful press communique that admitted heavy British losses. When later reports from sea allowed a revised release showing casualties had not been major, Brownrigg parleyed his public relations victory (the Germans had been forced to alter their own original, vainglorious communique) by inviting Kipling to write a series of articles on the destroyer attacks during the battle.

Although unable to release all the facts to the author, the Chief Censor nevertheless carried a "large dispatch box" of reports to Kipling's Sussex home sometime after 19 August, "and having explained to him what points we wanted left alone," he recalled in his 1920

memoirs *Indiscretions of the Naval Censor*, “he accepted the task, notwithstanding the numbing and withering censorship that had to be imposed on him.” Brownrigg added “in those priceless articles he produced for us, not one word was ever deleted by me or anybody else.”⁵⁰

Kipling himself had been mildly worried at the prospect. In September he wrote Canadian physician Andrew Macphail, then serving in France, that he had “just finished some stuff (I hope the Censor will pass it) about the work of our destroyers at Jutland, on reports of the same destroyers. It was magnificent material to which no one could do justice, but what struck me was the way in which the doing of great deeds cause, as a bye-product, a style of expression that was pure Homeric Greek.”⁵¹ One reader of the final work product in the London papers, Oscar Frewen, a twenty-nine-year-old officer on HMS *Comus*, was astonished to discover passages about the engagement taken from letters home to his family, access having been provided by his father Morton Frewen, Kipling’s neighbor in Sussex.⁵²

“Destroyers at Jutland” appeared in four installments in London in *The Daily Telegraph* and in America on *The New York Times*’s front pages over the last two weeks of October (each, the day after Doubleday produced the 70-copy American copyright pamphlet version), entitled respectively “Stories of the Battle,” “The Night Hunt,” “The Meaning of ‘Joss’,” and “The Minds of Men.” Mimeographed sheets of the articles and their accompanying poems—including “[Have you news of] My Boy Jack” and “The Doorkeepers of Zion”—were again issued to subscribing newspapers by the Official Press Bureau of the Admiralty; Kipling once more ceded his copyright to the navy for the duration of the war. On 1 December, Macmillan for British readers collected between boards the texts of “Destroyers” with “The Fringes of the Fleet” and “Tales of ‘The Trade’” in *Sea Warfare*, and Doubleday did the same for American readers under the same title in late February 1917.⁵³

Both editions of *Sea Warfare* contained one poem not previously appearing, “The Neutral,” which Kipling had copyrighted in America with Doubleday in a pamphlet edition the day before the British edition of *Sea Warfare* was published. In biblical language, he made bold to query the still-neutral United States, asking in the first stanza: “Brethren, how shall it fare with me | When the war is laid aside, | If it be proven that I am he | For whom a world has died?” Sir Edward Grey, still Foreign Minister when the English book edition appeared, was probably furious. (Kipling was to change the title to the less offensive “The Question” at some point after Germany’s use of unrestricted submarine warfare provoked America to join the war in April 1917, causing Doubleday to re-copyright the poem.)⁵⁴ He had earlier turned his fire on neutral nations in his naval story, “The Sea Constables,” in September 1915, in the British *Nash’s Magazine* and the American *Metropolitan Magazine*, telling a tale of the (in the author’s view, justified) refusal of four naval officers to come to the aid of a dying captain of a neutral vessel that had been carrying oil to the enemy.⁵⁵

The branches of the government seeking his literary aid continued to expand. Brigadier G. K. Cockerill, the head of MO5, the “Special Section” of the War Office (also spawning in this war the counter-intelligence services MI5), visited Bateman’s to consult with Kipling about “handling our intelligence to neutrals,” according to Carrie’s diary recording the meeting in the summer of 1916. Emerging from this encounter was the notion that Rudyard write about “his” Indian soldiers serving in the alien terrain of Europe. The four stories which resulted were collected between hard covers in the United States in 1918 under the title *The Eyes of Asia*, and first published in May 1916 in Paris in *La Revue des Deux Monde*, and only the following week in London in *The Morning Post*, and in America in the magazine *The Saturday Evening Post*.

They were compiled largely from letters sent home by Indian troops at the front and obtained for the author through the censorship system by the India Office’s Sir James R. Dunlop Smith, the private secretary to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab during Kipling’s time there (Dunlop Smith had previously sent him an account of the fortitude of the Gurkha guards at the funeral of Edward VII, from which Kipling had composed the story “In the Presence” in 1912).⁵⁶ In transmitting the drafts to Dunlop Smith, Kipling wrote: “You may urge that I’ve taken large liberties with the material? I reply that I certainly have: but an immense amount has been textually lifted from the original documents; and for the rest, I have somewhat amplified the spirit that I thought I saw behind the letters.”⁵⁷

Kipling’s penultimate effort for the British wartime propaganda effort was *The War in the Mountains*, five articles descriptive of his visit to the Italian front with Austria in the Dolomites. They were composed because the British ambassador to Rome, Sir Rennell Rodd, had asked him to write about that front, finding the opinion “prevalent” among the British that “the Italian army is not doing much” (Rodd has previously invited Hillaire Belloc, Arthur Conan Doyle, and H. G. Wells, and all had written of their visits.)⁵⁸ The series first appeared in London in *The Daily Telegraph* and in New York City in *The New York Tribune* on 6, 9, 13, 16, and 20 June 1917. Translated into Italian, they also appeared in that country on the same dates in the periodicals *Lettura* and *Secolo XX*, and were collected in a paperback edition published in Milan this same year entitled *La Guerra nelle montagne*.

This proved to be the most lyrical of his war propaganda works, particularly about the look and hazards of the terrain, but also about the men. He found the Italian soldiers to have, because of their steel helmets, “at a distance a look of Roman Legionnaires on a frieze of triumph.” The weather conditions were bitter: “Whole companies can be frostbitten and crippled even while they lie taking cover in the pauses of a rush, and the wandering mountain gusts take sentries from under the lee of their rock as they stand up to be relieved, and flick them into space.” The corps’ recruits “wear a smash hat adorned with one eagle feather (worn down to an honorable stump, now); the nails upon their boots resemble, and are kept as sharp as the

fangs of wolves; their eyes are like our airman's eyes; their walk on their own ground suggests the sea; and a more cheery set of hard-bitten, clean-skinned, steely-eyed young devils I have never yet had the honour to see....No one is hurried or over-pressed, and the 'excitable Latin' of the Boche legend does not appear."

Having been unpleasantly surprised with the criticism of the Arabs in *Tales of 'The Trade'*, the Foreign Office was now vetting Kipling's drafts more closely, and one passage, respecting the attitudes of the Roman upper classes, was suppressed at the FO's direction because of possible wounded feelings among this elite. This passage's attack on the "young civils [men] in such elegant costumes...with the beautiful ladies at lunch and tea" had an artistic purpose perhaps unperceived by the FO mandarins: Rome was still the corrupt city of all ages, but up in the mountains might be found light and nobleness of purpose. In the text which passed muster, he writes lyrically about the common Italian soldiers' road-building efforts, and their devotion to service, skill, and humor in the face of immense difficulties caused by the spring thaw.⁵⁹ Unforeseen was the defeat of the Italian forces in this region six months later, laconically described by Ernest Hemingway in his account of the retreat from Caporetto in *A Farewell to Arms*, published in 1929: the roads built for attack which Kipling celebrated were vital to the Italians in retreat from the German attack of October 1917.

The Canadian press lord Max Aitken, the owner of the London *Daily Express*, had by 1915 become unofficially the *de facto* military representative of Canada to the British authorities, and became close to Lloyd George, appointed Secretary for War in July 1916. Five months later, Lloyd George was Prime Minister, and he created a new Department of Information in February 1917 (of which Wellington House became a subdivision), putting in charge first John Buchan (author of *The Battle of the Somme*, published in 1916 and early 1917, of which it has been said "he managed to win the battle single-handed, for certainly no other Englishman came anywhere near doing so") and then in February 1918 Aitken, now Lord Beaverbrook, as chief of a new Ministry of Information (the word "propaganda" disappearing), which absorbed all existing propaganda governmental subdivisions, extinguishing Wellington House.

The direction of British propaganda for allied and neutral countries changed, literary efforts de-emphasized in favor of the press and film. Kipling was Beaverbrook's first intimate friend in England, and had sent him a memorandum of advice on "Morale of Civilians and the Censorships" upon his appointment; one of the new Minister's first actions was to invite Kipling to join his staff. Although the author refused to accept office, he wrote profusely to the minister about ways to conduct propaganda, and even drafted messages purporting to come *from* the troops at the minister's request. Beaverbrook later told Rudyard's biographer, "I adopted everything [Kipling] recommended." Kipling welcomed the notion of bringing to factories documentary films (sketching for Beaverbrook scenarios for half a dozen) so workers could see

the wonderful results of the weapons they produced. The British workman “has a great respect for the gift of the gab,” he advised. “...Almost as important as the cinema is the lecturer who accompanies [it]....The munitions workers listen best to a person they consider of their own class.”⁶⁰

The writer’s bitterness toward the Germans did not abate with time. The “Teutons” and “Boches” and “Huns” of 1914 became “germs” or the plague (“Pestis teutonicus”) by 1916.⁶¹ When a sensational but unsubstantiated story circulated in the newspapers about the discovery of a factory in Liège, a German “corpse exploitation establishment” rendering human fat into lubricating oils and pig food, John Buchan initially refused to exploit it, but Wellington House did later use it in a short pamphlet, *A Corpse Conversion Factory* (1917). Kipling, noting “the latest about cannon-fodder being turned into pig food,” composed and sent in letters to his friends a quatrain (rewriting the concluding stanza of Thackeray’s “The Sorrows of Werther” of 1853) which read: “Charlotte when she what Hermann | Yielded after he was dead | Like a well-conducted German | Spread him thickly on her bread.” He called these lines “the last verse of my otherwise unprintable set of verses dealing with the subject,” and of course never published them.⁶²

Kipling’s speeches supporting recruitment in particular and the war effort generally continued throughout the conflict, and his remarks at Folkestone on 15 February 1918 were published the next day in *The Times* and other English newspapers, and in American papers on the day after. Despite the current scarcity of paper in Great Britain, Beaverbrook, with Kipling’s active cooperation, encouraged the news vendor W. H. Smith & Son to publish the speech, entitled “Kipling’s Message,” as a sixteen-page pamphlet, priced at a penny. Perhaps also encouraged by Beaverbrook, the speech was reprinted in Paris under the same title by the American Y.M.C.A. (Young Men’s Christian Association), and in the United States, in unauthorized, shortened and garbled form, by the Simmons Hardware Company of St. Louis, Missouri, in its series of advertising “war bulletins.” This edition, entitled “Every Ounce In Us” from a phrase near the speech’s end, was unknown to Kipling, although he had hoped the text might “go to America” (this pamphlet today is known to exist in only one copy).⁶³

Although hardly needed to encourage Americans who were now at last in the war, the English branch of the American Y.M.C.A. also printed another speech of Kipling’s in September 1918, in 50,000 copies for distribution to the troops. This little five-by-three inch pamphlet, *To Fighting Americans*, contained two of his speeches delivered on 20 July on the occasion of the opening of an Officers’ Inn at Winnall Down, near the American Rest Camp at Winchester operated by the Y.M.C.A. The first text was comprised of impromptu remarks to an open-air meeting of 7,000 American non-commissioned officers and men, and the second was a planned address to commissioned officers and nurses at the Inn; both were reported in *The Times* for 22

July. Afterward Kipling wrote Morton Frewen: "If you'd been to Winchester and seen the boys pouring in and out, and heard 'em and watched 'em, it would have sent you home singing and dancing until the Police locked you up. They are marvelous simple and modest, and they say, quite sincerely, that their desire is to 'kill Germans.' Now [in Britain] we've been at war four years and it isn't good form to say that yet. By which you may judge essential differences."⁶⁴

The Aftermath

The First World War saw propaganda become an indispensable part of the armory of the modern state at war. The emergence of propaganda as the chief instrument of control over public opinion, in the evolution through 1918 of those British bureaus in charge of it, was the inevitable consequence of "total" war into which civilians were fully swept, as voters and victims. If it was an extra arm of home defense, abroad it provided another means of combating the enemy in a struggle for the sympathy of neutrals, and for launching a psychological offensive against the enemy himself. It has been said that "most of the principles and many of the techniques of modern propaganda were worked out in such detail [by Wellington House] that subsequent practitioners would do little more than elaborate on them."⁶⁵

The fact that Kipling and the other pamphleteers were seemingly afforded freedom in their compositions—they were not required to follow the government line in all particulars, as long as they ended up by firmly endorsing the British cause—certainly helped to create the appearance that they had managed to retain their personal liberty to express themselves in wartime conditions. However, while appearing to be functioning as private, patriotic individuals, they were effectively employed by the British government, mobilized in the service of their country's propaganda campaign at home and abroad. While it was not the only effect of that campaign, a major cumulative effect was the creation of a national stereotype of the "Hun," capable of the worst crimes imaginable to civilization, employing practices of war which were barbaric and inhumane.⁶⁶ Worse, a delayed effect of British atrocity propaganda during the First World War and the failure to substantiate the stories in the years that followed led to a general disinclination in the nineteen-thirties and the nineteen-forties to believe atrocity stories about the Nazi treatment of the Jews.⁶⁷

If the British were encouraged to believe that Germans crushed the skulls of Belgian and French babies with their jackboots, that the Kaiser was personally involved in torturing three-year-olds in satanic rituals, and that corpses were recycled in Germany to produce fats and pig fodder, the Germans were told that Gurkha and Sikh troops crept across no man's land at night, slipped into German trenches, slit German throats, and then drank the blood of their victims, and that the Senegalese fighting with the French were cannibals. In Britain, the press led the propaganda effort, but churchmen, educators, artists, musicians, and Masterman's authors all

buttressed it, in the creation of myths and the distortion of reality. And for many in the Allied camp, as for the Germans, the struggle became a war to attain utopia, not a war to preserve achievement.⁶⁸

At the peace treaty negotiations at Versailles, Lloyd George and Clemenceau, it has been said, “were prisoners of four and a half years of the greatest political propaganda barrage history had seen: the xenophobic torrent to which Buchan, Kipling, and so many others, along with their counterparts in France, had contributed. All this forged a public that demanded Germany be punished—and punished painfully.” Diplomatic historian George Kennan concluded that the resulting treaty had “the tragedies of the future written into it as by the devil’s own hand.”⁶⁹

By the dexterous intermingling of private endeavor with the output of the official organizations in the production of British propaganda, making much of their literature seem spontaneous, and by diversifying the apparent sources of origin, Wellington House and its successors achieved an important result. The Germans were to berate themselves after the war, claiming that their propaganda effort had been far inferior to that of the Allies (Hitler is himself on record in *Mein Kampf* as stating that his own use of propaganda in the Nazi system stemmed largely from his admiration of Great Britain’s Great War propaganda), but the truth of the matter was that the Allies had have more substance behind their claims against the Germans than the Germans did against their enemies. German propagandists’ appeal to “openness,” “honesty,” and “truthfulness” had the ring of romanticism and idealism, and was an appeal to internal, private virtues.

The Allies’ appeal in which Kipling joined (for all his harshness and occasional economy with the whole truth) was a social, ethical, and historical one, to external, public values of “civilization.” The evidence as it stands shows overwhelmingly that the Germans systematically denied international standards, out of what they saw as necessity, viewing these standards—correctly— as injurious to their immediate success, but also in large part because the Germans were not disposed to abide by rules they considered alien and historic and hence not applicable either to themselves or to the colossal significance of the moment. The effect of all this propaganda activity on the people of Great Britain was to keep their enthusiasm for the war fairly well alive until its end. And while there will never be any agreement on the percentage of influence which British propaganda had in bringing about America’s decision on 6 April 1917—it was not *the* cause for the United States’s entrance into World War One—it was certainly *a* cause, and a powerful one.⁷⁰

Masterman, in assembling his stable of star authors in Wellington House in 1914, made one crucial mistake: almost all of his chosen writers were too old for military service. The eldest, Hardy, was seventy-four, and Masfield, the youngest, was thirty-six; the average age

was just over fifty (Kipling was then forty-eight). These were old men, from a soldier's point of view, and as the war dragged on without resolution, they would seem less and less to have the right to make moral statements about it. "The concept of the Old Men, as the makers of the war and enemies of the young, had many origins; but one was certainly that meeting at Wellington House in September 1914, when those middle-aged and old writers gathered to support a war in which they would not fight." Even during the war, Wilfred Owen wrote how "the scribes on all the people shove | and brawl allegiance to the state."⁷¹

These Old Men, to their eternal credit, were involved in one way or another beyond their writing: Henry James helped Belgian refugees; John Galsworthy raised funds for War Relief; E. M. Forster was a fire-watcher and cataloguer in the National Gallery, and Edmund Gosse, always a great scrounger of manuscripts from his literary friends, turned his acquisitiveness to patriotic ends by begging books, manuscripts, and autographs from the same writers, for sale at Red Cross charity bazaars (there were three auctions for the Red Cross at Christie's between April 1915 and April 1918, and a presentation copy of *Plain Tales from the Hills* from Rudyard's father Lockwood, and Rudyard's copy of Montaigne's *Essays*, itself a presentation copy from James Russell Lowell to Charles Eliot Norton, who gifted it to Kipling, were auctioned at Christie's in London in April 1917 to benefit The British Red Cross and the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England).⁷² The hyperactive Kipling visited the wounded in hospitals around southern England, making scrapbooks to amuse them (inspiring others nationally to do so); worked organizing the Lord Mayor's Recruiting Bands called for in his "National Bands" speech; billeted soldiers on furlough at his house Bateman's; and was patron with Lords Grey and Milner of The Club of the Maple Leaf in London for Canadian troops on leave.

And of course, many wrote fiction and poetry without the prodding of the administration's propagandists: Hardy's "Men Who March Away" was composed three days after the Wellington House meeting, and some of the poets in the anthologies of war poetry which appeared with astonishing rapidity—three in September 1914, another in November, twelve in 1915, six more in 1916—were in Masterman's assemblage, with Poet Laureate Robert Bridges, Hardy, Chesterton, and Kipling all appearing in the first and succeeding waves.

For Rudyard, these included *Songs and Sonnets for England in Wartime* (September 1914, the first book edition of "For All We Have and Are"), *Poems of the Great War Published on Behalf of the Prince of Wales's National Relief Fund* (December 1914, reprinting "Hymn Before Action" of 1896, a poem reprinted in penny leaflet form by Methuen in September 1914), *Pro Patria et Rege* (January 1915, the first book edition of "Lord Roberts," written on the occasion of Roberts's death in November 1914 and bemoaning the loss of "the war wise" patriot who "pleaded [the cause of national defense] in the marketplace...and was not heard!"), *The Book of France* (July

1915, "France"), and *A Treasury of War Poetry* (October 1917, the first book edition of "The Choice," formerly "A Hymn of the Free Peoples").⁷³

Discussion and analysis of Kipling's strictly literary output of fiction during the war years—such as the short stories "Sea Constables: A Tale of '15" (which concludes with the toast "Damnation to all neutrals"), "Swept and Garnished" (a Berlin *hausfrau* disturbed by the ghosts of five children clearly killed by Germans in Belgium), "On the Gate: A Tale of '16" (in which fighting sinners are admitted to heaven by St. Peter, but not Germans), and "Mary Postgate" (mentioning the Germans' amputation of the right hands of Belgian boys)—are beyond the scope of this study, and have in any event been extensively analyzed by literary critics.⁷⁴ Indeed, although he wrote poetry and fiction during the war, he almost did not see such work in that time as his primary vocation: about "Sea Constables" and "On the Gate," he had written to his old American friend Edmonia Hill in August 1915: "I've been too busy to write much but I've got a couple of stories coming out next month—one in the *Century* and one in the *Metropolitan* which my interest you."⁷⁵

The writers originally summoned by Masterman who wore the proffered mask of the propagandist suffered a psychic toll, and perhaps of all the men of his generation, Rudyard Kipling was the one undergoing the deepest and subtlest change. The loss of his son John at the Battle of Loos in September 1915, leading many to think that "My Boy Jack" printed with *Destroyers at Jutland* was really about his son, and the failure to find the boy's body through months of doubt of his ultimate fate, led the father to accept the commission to write *The Irish Guards in the Great War*, published in 1923. Remarkably, he told his secretary Dorothy Ponton, "This will be my great work."⁷⁶

He threw himself into a project of more than 600 pages which would take him five and a half years to complete, working from countless interviews, official documents, and officers' diaries sometimes spotted with blood or mud. Quite unlike his other war writing, the text is sober and restrained, painstakingly recounting skirmish upon skirmish, battle upon battle, medals won, promotions, generals' congratulatory messages, and the sad, long list of officers and men killed, all written in the methodical manner of histories destined to be read mainly by those mentioned in them. "In most instances, the compiler has let the mere facts suffice; since, to his mind, it did not seem fit to heap words on the doom."⁷⁷

He found another outlet for his grief and powers of commemoration in joining the Imperial War Graves Commissioners, a post he held for the last eighteen years of his life, and for which he wrote most of the inscriptions for the Commission's overseas cemeteries for the war dead, including the most famous one, "Their Name Liveth For Evermore," the words cut into the Stone of Sacrifice in each cemetery.⁷⁸ Other "Epitaphs of War" did not appear on those headstones, but expressed the author's mounting and increasingly less hidden disillusion

with his country's leadership. In "Common Form," he wrote: "If any question why we died | Tell them, because our fathers lied."⁷⁹

This Kipling epitaph is somewhat ambiguous, but only on the page. He had perhaps done more than anyone to glamorize the brutality and waste of war for those now in the War Graves Commission's cemeteries, and he was *not* repenting or recanting here. Rather, his anger was for the politicians who had left Britain unprepared, not heeding the early alarms which many had raised (in Kipling's case, from the turn of the new century, with "The Islanders" of 1902, charging "Ye stopped your ears to the warning—ye would neither look nor heed"), anger for the union leaders who had opposed conscription, and anger for all those other members of the establishment and a jaded populace whose complacency and cowardice led to the too-early deaths of John Kipling and so many others.⁸⁰

Kipling would in fact devote much of the rest of his life to his vocation as the nation's chief civilian spokesman for preparedness. In a 1935 address entitled "An Undefeated Island," delivered less than a year before his death as the threat of German rearmament was becoming increasingly apparent, he railed against "State-defended defencelessness" and warned of "the attack of the future" that threatened to render the British just another of "those submerged race of history."⁸¹ The Hun was again at the gate. As he had written Colonel Feilden on the day the First World War began for England, 4 August 1914, "Yes, I feel like Jonah, or whoever it was who went about saying: — 'I told you so.'"⁸² Wellington House may have needed Rudyard Kipling to amplify its message in wartime, but he never needed a government agency, before or after, to call forth his strident sense of alarm and concomitant powers of ceaseless exhortation, stifled only by his death in 1936.

1. Fussell, Paul, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (New York, 1975), p. 157; Gross, John, *The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters* (London: 1969), chapter 8, "Edwardians," pp. 211-232.
2. Wright, D.G., "The Great War, Government Propaganda and English 'Men of Letters' 1914-1916," *Literature & History*, No. 7, Spring 1978, pp. 70-71.
3. Buitenhuis, Peter, *The Great War of Words: British, American, and Canadian Propaganda and Fiction, 1914-1933* (Vancouver, 1987), p. 1. For a detailed discussion of the origin and use of the term "Hun" by Kipling and others, see Matin, A. Michael, "'The Hun Is At The Gate!': Historicizing Kipling's Militaristic Rhetoric, From the Imperial Periphery to the National Center: Part Two: The French, Russian, and German Threats to Great Britain," *Studies in the Novel*, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Winter 1999), pp. 432-433.
4. Mesinger, Gary S., *British Propaganda and the state in the First World War* (Manchester and New York: 1992), p. 35; Rowland, Peter, *David Lloyd George: A Biography* (New York: 1975), p. 289; Masterman, Lucy, *C. F. G. Masterman: A Biography* (London, 1939), p. 277. The Masterman appointment is credited to Asquith or Grey in Squires, James Duane, *British Propaganda at Home and in The United States From 1914 to 1917* (Cambridge, MA: 1935), p. 26, but this now seems incorrect, although he quotes George S. Viereck, *Spreading Germs of Hate* (London: 1930), p. 129, as saying Sir Gilbert Parker told Viereck personally that Foreign Minister Gray was responsible for Masterman's appointment, and Mrs. Masterman's version is also challenged in Ross, Stewart Halsey, *Propaganda for War: How the United States Was Conditioned to Fight the Great War of 1914-1918* (Jefferson, NC, and London: 1996), p. 286, note 8. Wellington House was, of course, primarily an adjunct of the Foreign Office, and Masterman was, despite his close friendship with Lloyd George, responsible to Grey and Asquith (Squires, p. 32).
5. Sanders, M. L., and Philip M. Taylor, *British Propaganda during the First World War, 1914-18* (London, 1982), p. 39; Mesinger, *op. cit.*, p. 38.
6. Masterman, *op. cit.*, p. 272; Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 30; Hardy's journal, quoted in Florence Emily Hardy, *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy* (London: 1930), p. 16; on no surviving minutes, Buitenhuis, *op. cit.*, p. 14-15, but there seems to be a copy in the Dorset County Museum, noted in Millgate, Michael, *Thomas Hardy: A Biography* (New York: 1982), pp. 502, 613.
7. Hardy letter quoted in Mallett, Charles, *Anthony Hope and His Books* (London: 1930), p. 243; see also F. E. Hardy, *The Life of Thomas Hardy 1840-1928* (London: 1962 ed.), p. 366. Arnold Bennett was to complain that the conference had given him "a fearful headache." Flower, Neman, ed., *The Journals of Arnold Bennett, 1911-1921* (London: 1932), p. 104.

8. German manifesto of October 1914, Ferguson, Naill, *The Pity of War: Explaining World War I* (New York: 1998), p. 228, and Eksteins, Morris, *Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age* (London and New York: 1989), pp. 159-160; Buitenhaus, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19, including facsimile of *New York Times* appearance on 18 October 1914.
9. Doyle quoted in Howarth, Patrick, *Play Up and Play the Game* (London: 1971), pp. 108-109. Doyle volunteered again at age fifty-five for World War One, and when rejected, served for the rest of the war in a volunteer defense force which he himself helped to organize. Buitenhaus, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-23.
10. Wilson, Trevor, *The Myriad Faces of War: Britain and the Great War, 1914-1918* (Cambridge: 1986), p. 733; Hynes, Samuel, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (New York: 1991), pp. 27-28.
11. Buitenhaus, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
12. *New York Times*, 5 August 1914, 3:1. In his autobiography years later, Wells wrote of Kipling, whom he had never met: "He is the most incomprehensible to me of my contemporaries, with phases of real largeness and splendour and lapses to the quality of those mucky little sadists, Stalky and Co....He has an immense vogue in the British middle-class and upper-class home; he is the patron saint of cadet corps masters, an inexhaustive fount of sham manly sentiment, and one of the most potent forces in the shriveling of the British political imagination during the past third of a century." Wells, H. G., *Experiment in Autobiography* (London, 1934), Vol. II, p. 760.
13. Drawing by F. Carruthers Gould, in Harold Begbie's *The Struwwelpeter Alphabet* (London, 1900), reproduced in John Gross's *Rudyard Kipling and His World* (London, 1982), between pp. 84-85.
14. Viereck, George Sylvester, *Spreading Germs of Hate* (New York: 1930), p. 82; Wilson, *op. cit.* p. 734.
15. Sanders and Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-109, 143; Hochschild, Adam, *To End All Wars: A Story of Loyalty and Rebellion, 1914-1918* (Boston and New York: 2011), p. 148; quotation, Adams, E. D., *An Analysis of the Hoover War Library* (Stanford, CA: 1921), pp. 68-69, published in large part as No. 126 in W. H. Cooke and E. P. Stickney, *Readings in European International Relations* (New York: 1931), pp. 558-561. Italics by the present writer.
16. Nicholson, Ivor, "An Aspect of British Official Wartime Propaganda," *Cornhill Magazine*, 70: 593-595, 603-604, May 1931; Buitenhaus, *op. cit.*, pp. 15, 21-22; Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 233. A checklist of some Wellington House documents is contained in Squires, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-104, including official documents published by the British government and other publications

sponsored by Wellington House, but it does not identify very many titles by Masterman's band of authors, and is not the confidential *Schedule of Wellington House Literature*, the only copy of which is in the Imperial War Museum, London, according to Buitenhuis, and is there catalogued as "Schedule of Wellington House Literature," copy no. 79/492, shelf mark 91.9(41):49. Even this Schedule contains only one Kipling title, *Kipling's Message* of 1918 (Richards A303), which came out under Beaverbrook's administration, although André Chevrillo's *England and the War*, published in New York in 1917 by Doubleday, Page & Co. with a preface by Kipling, is listed (no. 771, Richards Bp8).

17. Fussell, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-29.

18. Hepburn, James, ed., *The Letters of Arnold Bennett* (London: 1968), 2: 349.

19. Hendrick, Burton, *The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*, Vol. II (Garden City, NY: 1926), pp. 110-116. In this same letter he writes of his efforts to help Kipling find his missing son. In a letter to André Chevrillon, 7 August 1916 (Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 391), Kipling notes that it is "curious that the U.S.A. Ambassador to England should be junior partner of my firm in America."

20. Richards, David, *Rudyard Kipling: A Bibliography* (New Castle, DE and London, 2010), A270, p. 222; on Methuen, Buitenhuis, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

21. *Ibid.*, B55, pp. 394-395. This volume was the first book edition of poems on Belgium by Thomas Hardy and Austin Dobson and contained a sketch by G. K. Chesterton, all writers in Masterman's assemblage.

22. *Idem*, A267, p. 220

23. Masterman, *op. cit.*, p. 277; Lycett, Andrew, *Rudyard Kipling* (London: 1999), p. 449.

24. Carrington, Charles E., *Rudyard Kipling: His Life and Work* (London: 1955), p. 429, Penguin ed., Harmondsworth: 1970, p. 499; Lycett, *op. cit.*, quoting RK to Milner, 13 September 1914, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. Further evidence of Kipling's close attention to the course and tone of German propaganda may be found in his letter to Edward Bok of 5 December 1914, Pinney, Thomas, *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling Vol. 4 1911-1919* (Iowa City, IA: 1990), p. 279.

25. Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

26. Copy of holograph letter to Beaverbrook, Lord Beaverbrook Papers, House of Lords Records Office, File c/199; use in France, Masterman, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

27. Kipling to Blumenfeld, 5 September 1914, Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 253. The speech, given twice that day, was reported under the title "As They Tested Our Fathers" in the *Daily Express*, *The Times*, and other London newspapers on 8 September 1914 and in the *New York Times Current*

History of the European War for 12 December 1914 [Richards, *op. cit.*, C161, p. 555], but no separate publication is known. It was never collected by Kipling, but is reprinted in Pinney, Thomas, ed., *Rudyard Kipling's Uncollected Speeches: A Second Book of Words* (Greensboro, NC: 2008).

28. Richards, *op. cit.*, A227, pp. 225-226. The speech was reprinted in America as "The Music of War" in *New York Times Current History*, for April 1915. Hodder & Stoughton also published the English translation of André Chevrillon's *L'Angleterre et la Guerre* (Paris, 1916), as *Britain and the War* (in England) and *England and the War* (in America) [Richards, *op. cit.*, Bp7 and Bp8, pp. 454-455], and paid Kipling for his preface, which payment Kipling donated to the French Red Cross, Kipling to Chevrillon, 22 July 1916, Pinney, *op. cit.*, pp. 387-388.

29. *Ibid.*, A278, p. 226. Kipling began his speechmaking, "trying to get men for K[it]chener's new army within the first few weeks after Britain's declaration of war: see Kipling to H. A. Gwynne, 189 August 1914, Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

30. Kipling to Bok, 5 December 1914, Pinney, *op. cit.*, pp. 273-275.

31. Richards, *op. cit.*, A275, pp. 224-225, and Caroline Kipling diaries for 13 October, 13, 16, 21, 23, 24 November, and 2 December.

32. Parker, Sir Gilbert, "The United States and the War," *Harper's Magazine*, 136: 521-531, March 1918, p. 522.

33. Adams, John Coldwell, *Seated With the Mighty: A Biography of Sir Gilbert Parker* (Ottawa: 1979), pp. 162-166, 221; Squires, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-57; Viereck, *op. cit.*, pp. 127-129; Millis, Walter, *Road to War: America 1914-1917* (Boston and New York: 1935), p. 63; Parker mailing list development and addressees, and letter from Parker, 16 March 1915, Box 3, Great Britain, Foreign Office, Willington House, Hoover Archives, HIWPR, Stanford, California, quoted in Sanders and Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 169, and reproduced in Peterson, H. C., *Propaganda for War* (1939: repr., Port Washington, NY, 1968), pp. 52-53.

34. Richards, *op. cit.*, A275, A276, pp. 224-225; on Hodder & Stoughton, Buitenhuis, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

35. Kipling, *The New Army in Training* (Garden City, NY: 1914), "Canadians in Camp," p. 11; "Indian Troops," p. 7.

36. Thornton, R. K., ed., *Ivor Gurney: Collected Letters* (Manchester: 1991), p. 13; Webb, Barry, *Edmund Blunden: A Biography* (New Haven, CT: 1990), p. 45.

37. Kipling to Caroline and Elsie Kipling, 28 August 1915, Pinney, *op. cit.*, pp. 333-334.

38. Richards, *op. cit.*, A279, A280, A281, pp. 226-227; Caroline Kipling to Mrs. Balestier, 28 March 1915, ALS, Dunham Papers.
39. Buitenhuis, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-83; Kipling, Rudyard, *France at War on the Frontier of Civilization* (London: 2015), pp. 29, 32, 49, 51, 68.
40. Richards, *op. cit.*, A117, A282, A283, A284, E1-100, pp. 112-113, 228-230, 639-640. The *New York American* variant copy in the A. P. Watt & Son Archive at Yale is accompanied by a letter from that newspaper's Bradford Merrill dated 16 April 1916, in response to a complaint by F. N. Doubleday charging breach of copyright, stating that only a very few copies were given away to friends of the paper, and that this edition "is now withdrawn and out of print. Not a single copy of it was ever sold."
41. Kipling, Rudyard, *Fringes of the Fleet* (London: 1915), pp. 68-69.
42. Gurney, *Collected Letters, op. cit.*, p. 146; Ricketts, Harry, *The Unforgiving Minute: A Life of Rudyard Kipling* (London: 1999), p. 328.
43. Mesinger, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
44. Richards, *op. cit.*, A285, p. 231; RK to Brownrigg, 24 April 1916, in Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 363. The printers Darling and Son are identified in Squires, *op. cit.*, p. 51, and Buitenhuis, *op. cit.*, p. 16, as a publisher used by Wellington House for other titles.
45. Richards, *op. cit.*, A285, A286, pp. 231-232.
46. Quoted in Lycett, *op. cit.*, p. 464-465, from Brownrigg to RK, 29 June 1916, Sussex University.
47. Kipling to Henry James, 22 July 1915, in Pinney, *op. cit.*, pp. 308-309.
48. Lycett, *op. cit.*, p. 455.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 464, quoting Julian Corbett to RK, 6 September 1915, Sussex University; Kipling to Slade, 9 December 1915, Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 350; munitions factory visit, Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 432.
50. Brownrigg, Rear Admiral Sir Douglas, *Indiscretions of the Naval Censor* (London and New York: 1920), p. 58; Mesinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-117.
51. Kipling to Andrew Macphail, 11-13 September 1916, Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 397.
52. Lycett, *op. cit.*, p. 465.
53. Richards, *op. cit.*, A287, A289, pp. 232-235, 293; *New York Times* coverage, Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

54. *Ibid.*, A288, pp. 233-234. See, for Kipling's extended argument, his long letter to Frank N. Doubleday of 30 May 1916, in Pinney, *op. cit.*, pp. 370-374.

55. *Idem.*, C880, p. 556.

56. Richards, *op. cit.*, A290, A313, pp. 235, 248; Lycett, *op. cit.*, p. 465. Kipling had first been asked to write a foreword to a book about "our Indian troops' work" and declined, but began seeing their letters from Dunlop Smith before June 1916: Kipling to Dunlop Smith, 9 June 1916, Pinney, *op. cit.*, pp. 374-375.

57. Kipling to Dunlop Smith, 13 July 1916, ALS, Tyler Collection, Yale, quoted in Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 386, note 2. Kipling insisted at war's end that fallen Indian soldiers have their own memorial at Neuve-Chappelle. Nothing in Kipling's work, of course, ever hinted at the degree of official anxiety over the growth of Indian nationalism. While all armies censor mail coming from soldiers at the front, the British had a special postal unit of Urdu-speakers censoring mail going to Indian soldiers, to screen out letters of pamphlets supporting independence. Hochschild, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-150.

58. Rodd to Kipling, 15 May 1916, ALS Sussex, quoted in Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 446.

59. Buitenhaus, *op. cit.*, p. 84; Richards, *op. cit.*, A297, p. 240. The suppressed text was printed from the manuscript in *The Reader's Guide to Rudyard Kipling*, Section 5 (Canterbury, Kent: 1970), pp. 2314-2319. The Foreign Office's letter to Watt, dated 6 June 1917, in the Kipling Papers at Sussex University, KP 24/69, asks for the cut to be made to "one passage on page 7 of the fifth article," as "we think it might be misunderstood in Italy, and in view of the importance that will naturally be attached in that country to anything that Mr. Kipling writes we think it is desirable to avoid any risk of offending so sensitive a people."

60. Mesinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-126; Buitenhaus, *op. cit.*, pp. xvii and (on Buchan) 94 and (on Beaverbrook) 136-137; Squires, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-39; Kipling memorandum to Beaverbrook, February 1915, Pinney, *op. cit.*, pp. 287-289; Beaverbrook on Kipling's advice, copy of a letter by Beaverbrook to Carrington, 8 December 1954, Beaverbrook Papers, House of Lords, General Correspondence, quoted by Buitenhaus, p. 136; close friendship, Taylor, A. J. P., *Beaverbrook* (New York: 1972), p. 44; Kipling on documentary films, MUN 5/48/267/3, quoted in Hochschild, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

61. Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 431.

62. First published in Kipling's secretary Dorothy Ponton's memoir, *Rudyard Kipling at Home and at Work* (Poole: 1953), p. 26 [Richards, *op. cit.*, B106, p. 433], and to be found in letters to Andrew Macphail (21-22 April 1917, Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 441), and C. R. J. Fletcher (29 April 1917, *ibid.*, p.

444). On *A Corpse Conversion Factory*, Buitenhuis, *op. cit.*, p. 133, and Nicholson, *op. cit.*, p. 606; later it was shown that some of the material from which *The Times* had taken the story was faked. Smith, Jane Adam, *John Buchan: A Biography* (London: 1965), p. 201. See the extended discussion of the matter in Haste, Cate, *Keep the Home Fires Burning: Propaganda in the First World War* (London: 1977), pp. 91-93.

63. Richards, *op. cit.*, A303, A304, A305, pp. 243-244. See also footnote 16.

64. *Ibid.*, A310, pp. 246-247, RK to Frewen, 24 July 1918, Syracuse University.

65. Messinger, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

66. Sanders and Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

67. *Ibid.*, p. 244; Laqueur, Walter, "Hitler's Holocaust: Who Knew What, When and How," *Encounter*, 60 (1981), 1, 6-25; McLaine, I., *Ministry of Morale* (London, 1978), p. 168. As noted in Lord Birkenhead's biography *Rudyard Kipling* (New York: 1978), p. 273: "In the Second World War concentration camp victims were processed to make soap, and the skin of tattooed prisoners tanned and made into lampshades for the wife of the Commandant of Buchenwald."

68. Ecksteins, *op. cit.*, p. 235-236.

69. Hochschild, *op. cit.*, p. 357; Kennan, George, *American Diplomacy* (Chicago: 1985), p. 69.

70. Ecksteins, pp. 160-161; Hitler, Adolf, *My Battle* (trans., Boston: 1933), pp. 76-77; Squires, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-82. Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 743-747, contests the view that British propaganda was a triumph, and concludes: "To treat propaganda as a significant element in the achievement of victories, rather than victories as a major element in the success of propaganda, is to engage in a serious reversal of cause and effect."

71. Hynes, *op. cit.*, p. 26; Owen, "At a Calvary near the Ancre," *The Collected Poems of Wilfred Owen* (New York: 1965), p. 82. On 12 August 1915 Owen received from his mother a copy of *War Poems from The Times*, a supplement published by the newspaper two days before, containing, *inter alia*, Kipling's "For All We Have and Are," and poems by Hardy, Bridges, Newbolt, and de la Mare (and he thought he saw Kipling the previous April at a meeting at the Guildhall organized by the Central Committee for National Patriotic Organizations). Stallworthy, John, *Wilfred Owen: A Biography* (London: 1974), pp. 119, 125.

72. *ibid.*, p. 25; Richards, *op. cit.*, p. xxxvi.

73. *Idem.*, p. 28; Richards, *op. cit.*, B53, B56, B58, B63, pp. 373, 396, 397, 401. The cloth and paper-covered editions of *A Treasury of War Poetry* shows up on the Schedule of Wellington House Literature as items 1139 and 1140. Kipling and Galsworthy resigned from the Society of

Authors in January 1917 in protest against its policy that required its members not to contribute to any charity books which had not previously been approved by the Society: Kipling to the Secretary, Society of Authors. 29 January 1917, Pinney, *op. cit.*, pp. 423-424.

74. *E.g.*, Buitenhuis, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-109, and Bilsing, Tracy E., "The Process of Manufacture: Rudyard Kipling's Private Propaganda," *War, Literature & the Arts* (Colorado Springs, CO), Volume 12, Number 1, Spring/Summer 2000, pp. 83-97.

75. Kipling to Hill, 4 August 1915, Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 311. For a collection of key excerpts from the range of Kipling's wartime writings, propaganda, poetry, and fiction, see Lycett, Andrew, *Kipling on War: From 'Tommy' to 'My Boy Jack'* (London and New York, 2015), pp. 171-226.

76. Richards, *op. cit.*, A340, p. 268.

77. Hochschild, *op. cit.*, p. 338; Kipling, *The Irish Guards in the Great War* (London: 1923), Vol. I, introduction.

78. Longworth, Philip, *The Unending Vigil: The History of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission* (Barnsley, South Yorkshire: 1985 revision), *passim*; Crane, David, *Empires of the Dead* (London: 2013), *passim*; Richards, *op. cit.*, *The Graves of the Fallen* (1919), A319, pp. 251-252.

79. Pinney, Thomas, ed. *The Cambridge Edition of the Poems of Rudyard Kipling, Volume II* (Cambridge, 2013), p. 1144.

80. Crane, *op. cit.*, p. 224. In Tonie and Valmai Holt's *My Boy Jack? The Search for Kipling's Only Son* (Barnsley, South Yorkshire, 1998), p. 103, the authors note that: "The accepted meaning of 'fathers' is in the general, Establishment Government sense of the mismanagement of the conduct of the war. If Kipling did indeed feel that he had, at the least, been economical with the truth about the seriousness of John's myopia, and thus eventually was responsible for his death, this could be a public admission of guilt." Hochschild too (*op. cit.*, p. 338) wonders whether Kipling was saying that "prewar politicians lied in claiming that Britain was adequately prepared for a major conflict? Or was he speaking of a lie that went deeper? Perhaps the writer himself did not know." The possibility of self-accusation is also discussed in Bilsing, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

81. Kipling, Rudyard, "The Undefended Island," *A Book of Words*, Sussex Edition, Vol. XXV (London: 1938), and *The Times*, 7 May 1935, p. 9.

82. Pinney, *op. cit.*, p. 248.