EDITORIAL - SPECIAL ARTICLES
AUTOMOBILES

New York Tribune

EDITORIAL - SPECIAL ARTICLES
AUTOMOBILES

PART III EIGHT PAGES SUNDAY, JUNE 23, 1918 PART III EIGHT PAGES

HEARST'S FRIENDS—AND GERMANY'S

Bolo Met Hearst, and in 1917 Both Conducted 'Defeatist' Campaigns in Their Newspapers

French Traitor on Trial Stated Hearst Was "Germanophile"

AMONG HEARST'S EMPLOYES

ALBERT SANDER—dramatic critic of "Deutsches Journal"—spy master—convicted.

HANS VON STENGEL—writer on "Deutsches Journal"—started German satirical magazines with German money—interned.

THEODORE SUTRO—editor in chief of "Deutsches Journal—official of German-American Alliance and counsel in attempt to prevent annulment of charter.

ALBRECHT DE MONTGELAS—art critic of Chicago "Examiner"—German propagandist and reputed close friend of Hearst—interned.

ARTHUR W. MATEIKAT—writer on "Deutsches Journal"—friend of Sander, whom he aided in notorious attempt to protect Captain Boy-Ed.

WILLIAM BAYARD HALE—writer on New York "American"—secret director of German propaganda.

DEFENDED IN "THE AMERICAN"

JEREMIAH O'LEARY—German propagandist—now on trial after attempt to escape.

"PURELY SOCIAL" ACQUAINTANCE

PAUL BOLO PACHA—paid agent of Germany—convicted of treason and shot.

By Kenneth Macgowan

THERE are two interesting, curious and significant things about William Randolph Hearst.

One is the extent to which his editorials have been quoted in German newspapers as representative of American sentiment against our war with Germany. Elsewhere on this page are a few examples of how Germany has used Hearst and his papers, in the same way that the Allies have used the German Independent Socialists and their press, to show the existence of anti-national, anti-government and anti-war sentiment within the enemy lines.

The other interesting, curious and significant thing about Mr. Hearst is the frequency with which, prior to the declaration of war, he came into intimate contact—both in business and in a "purely social" way—with German spies, dangerous alien enemies now interned, Germans and Americans active in promoting German propaganda or purposes in America, Germans in German pay, an American under arrest for treasonable actions and a Frenchman who has been executed for treason—men like Sander, Stengel, Sutro, Montgelas, Mateikat, Hale, O'Leary and Bolo Pacha.

German Agents on Hearst's Pay Roll

Albert Sander, while dramatic critic of Hearst's "Deutsches Journal," conducted a German spy bureau through which he sent Americans into England, France and Holland to discover British and French military and naval secrets and transmit them to Germany. Through the arrest of one of these spies, George Vaux Bacon, in London, the plot was exposed. Sander was indicted on Bacon's testimony, and sentenced to two years in the Atlanta penitentiary. Sander received over $6,000 from a German paymaster for his work. His salary from Hearst is not known.

Hans von Stengel, interned last December as a dangerous enemy alien, was distinguished by being employed on Hearst's "Deutsches Journal" as a writer when his talents were altogether those of an artist. He had come to America in 1915, with a considerable sum of money—said to be $50,000—which he used for the founding of two German satirical monthlies for which he drew illustrations, "Zeppelin" and later "Eulenspiegel." In this work he had the editorial assistance of Otto Julius Merkel, now also interned.

When the Department of Justice created a vacancy on "Deutsches Journal" by interning von Stengel, Arthur W. Mateikat, a chum of Sander, joined Hearst's staff. It was Mateikat who, with Sander, got into trouble with the authorities three years ago when he tried to secure from Mrs. Richard P. Stegler a repudiation of her testimony against Captain Boy-Ed, then involved in passport frauds.

Theodore Sutro, an American citizen born in Germany, was for two years and a half editor in chief of Hearst's "Deutsches Journal." His duties were representing the paper at German gatherings, as well as doing editorial work. Sutro is best known through his connection with the German-American Alliance and his attempt to save its charter from annulment by Congress. Of Sutro Professor Earl B. Sperry, of Syracuse University, who investigated German propaganda extensively for the Federal government, has said:

"As editor of Hearst's 'Deutsches Journal' he exercised a great influence and he was most active in disseminating German propaganda. He served very well, indeed, the cause of Germany in this country."

Hexamer, president of the German-American Alliance, once addressed Sutro, "dear friend and faithful comrade in arms."

In connection with Sutro's work for the German-American Alliance there should be noted in the report of the Congressional committee hearings on the bill to dissolve the alliance a letter from Hearst written before proposing an international alliance and promising not only to give it the support of his papers, but also to bear all the expenses of sending an American delegation of a dozen members to Berlin in the interests of the project.

Albrecht de Montgelas, who was interned as a dangerous enemy alien in January, 1918, was employed by Hearst on his Chicago "Examiner" as art critic. Montgelas claimed that he was a close personal friend of Hearst and that he always dined and conferred with Hearst when he visited Chicago.

Dr. William Bayard Hale was fully exposed in The Tribune on October 29 and 30, 1917, as a secret director of German propaganda prior to 1917. In this work he conferred twice a week with Dernburg, Albert, Fuehr, Macklenburg, Claussen, Viereck and frequently with Münsterberg and Boy-Ed. While he secretly directed German propaganda, he was at the same time an employe of Hearst. In both employments he condoned the sinking of the Lusitania. On the day following the tragedy he sent to the printer, edited and corrected, the speech defending the sinking made a few hours later by Dr. Dernburg in Cleveland.

Calling Down Wilson for O'Leary

The history of that fugitive from justice Jeremiah O'Leary needs no retelling at this time. It is interesting, however, to recall Hearst's indorsement printed in "The American" in October, 1916, following President Wilson's telegram to O'Leary:

"Your telegram received. I would feel deeply mortified to have you or anybody like you vote for me. Since you have access to many disloyal Americans and I have not, I will ask you to convey this message to them."

Commenting on the message, "The American" said:

"As an American citizen Mr. O'Leary puts loyalty to America above loyalty to England.

"His disloyalty is not to America, but to a foreign government.

"Upon this proposition we are all with Mr. O'Leary.

"It is amazing that any American can be found to take any other view—and those Americans who do take another view are those who are disloyal, Mr. Wilson."

But none of these cases of Hearst's connection with pro-Germans attracted the attention given to the dining and entertaining of the American publisher by Paul Bolo Pacha during his last visit to New York, a visit which ultimately brought the French traitor before a firing squad.

Hearst's Friend Bolo

The evidence presented at the trial of Bolo Pacha and the depositions taken by Captain Bouchardon, who exercised the functions of examining magistrate prior to the trial, do a great deal to clear up the relations between Hearst and the French traitor and German agent. They establish matters far beyond the evident fact that Hearst was eager to use Bolo as a means of camouflaging his anti-Ally record and checking the French government's growing distrust, and that Bolo was equally eager to help him accomplish this. For they show that it was not Hearst who sought out a supposedly loyal Frenchman to ask a rather questionable service, but a traitorous Frenchman who sought out a notorious American publisher—for what reasons and what purposes may be judged by the later actions of both men.

Charles F. Bertelli, Hearst's correspondent in Paris, deposed, on October 5, 1917, that Bolo obtained from a French journalist a letter of introduction to Hearst, and that he (Bertelli) undertook to "accredit" Bolo with Mr. Hearst. For this purpose he travelled to America with the Frenchman, arriving on February 22, 1916, spent twenty-three days with him in New York, and then returned with Bolo to Paris. Bolo initiated the junketing. Hearst unquestionably permitted his principal European correspondent to indulge in it.

In New York three of Bolo's acquaintances stand out. They are Captain Hans Tauscher, who plotted the destruction of the Welland Canal; Adolph Pavenstedt, a financial agent of Bernstorff, and William Randolph Hearst.

With Captain Tauscher Bolo had luncheon.

Pavenstedt saw Bolo on a number of occasions and was the go-between through whom Bolo secured $1,683,000 from Bernstorff for the corruption of the French press.

Hearst invited Bolo to luncheon and showed him his Riverside Drive home. Bolo gave a dinner to Hearst at Sherry's. Finally Hearst returned the compliment with a farewell supper, preceded by a theatre party. Upon these last two functions Hearst has based his claim that he knew Bolo only in a "purely social" way. The exact nature of the first meeting and the absence of other intercourse have not been established.

It has been established, however, and established by Bolo's own statement on the first day of the trial, that Pavenstedt, the German financial agent who made it possible for Bolo to secure his million and a half corruption fund, said to him:

"You must meet Hearst."

It has also been established, by Pavenstedt's own testimony, that Bolo, "shortly after his arrival," told him of his plan to buy an interest in the Paris "Journal" and other papers, and admitted, because of Pavenstedt's German citizenship, that "the object of his buying French newspapers was to bring public opinion in France through the press more around to an early peace."

Pavenstedt, therefore, knew two things which are interestingly related to each other—one, the true nature of Bolo and his purposes, and, two, the true nature of Hearst and his purposes.

It is a matter of court record that Pavenstedt was present at one, at least, of the meetings between Bolo and Hearst. He was among the guests selected by Bolo, after consultation with Bertelli, for the dinner at Sherry's.

Five Hearst Guests Out of Eleven

Of the eleven guests at Bolo's dinner, besides Mr. and Mrs. William Randolph Hearst, were two Hearst employes. Five were connected with the Hearst interests. Pavenstedt was also present.

Having acquired his corruption fund and an acquaintance with Hearst, Bolo returned to Paris, ever with the faithful Bertelli at his side. Before leaving he doubtless received certain instructions or suggestions from Hearst, though certainly not at the two public dinners. The evidence is threefold. Bertelli deposed:

"Before leaving America Bolo addressed this language to me: 'I should like very much to be able to show to my friends, Poincaré and Briand, a document proving that Hearst is pro-French. I have sent Mrs. Hearst some flowers. Suggest to her that she write to me to that effect; coming from a lady, the statement will have more weight."

Upon arriving in Paris, with the assistance of Bertelli, Bolo prepared a puff of Hearst and his "pro-French" sentiments which he caused to be inserted in "Le Journal." He inserted matter of the same kind in other French periodicals which he bought with German money.

Finally, at an interview which Bolo secured with President Poincaré, he attempted to expatiate on Hearst's love of France.

Unfortunately for the desires of Mr. Hearst, the evidence in the trial of Bolo establishes the belief of the French government, of the public men of France, and even of Bolo himself, in the pro-Germanism of Hearst.

Long before the French government excluded the Hearst service from France, "abstaining," according to "Figaro's" extract from the official announcement, "from all relations with the Hearst organization, the connivance of which with the enemy is certain," the Foreign Press Bureau censorship had settled its opinion of Hearst. In regard to the puff printed in "Le Journal," Lieutenant Pruvost, of that bureau, said at the trial, as reported in "La Victoire":

"My attention was more particularly called in 1916 to the personality of Mr. Hearst when an article eulogizing him appeared in 'Le Journal.' At that time Hearst was campaigning to cause the American government to forbid the delivery of war material necessary to us. At the same time he used the cinemas . . . to show pro-German films. It was he who published first, and even before it was delivered, the speech of Dernburg, glorifying the torpedoeing of the Lusitania."

The Foreign Press Bureau interfered with other attempted puffs of Hearst, and later prevented the execution of an arrangement between Hearst and "Le Journal" for an exchange of news.

Poincaré Bans All Talk of Hearst

The episode of Bolo and Poincaré was fully brought out by a number of witnesses.

According to "Le Temps," M. de Lostalot testified that, on Bolo's return from America, he had asked an audience with President Poincaré, who observed: "If he had information of value to the national defence I would give an audience to the devil." Hearst, however, appears unable to meet even that simple moral test, for, as "Le Temps" records de Lostalot's evidence, when Bolo wished to speak of Hearst the President interrupted him, saying: "Enough. I will transmit your words to the President of the Council."

"Le Courrier des Etats-Unis," in its report of Lostalot's testimony, gives the following version of Bolo's visit to Poincaré:

Six of His Employes Were Convicted, Interned or Involved in Intrigue

Hearst Editorials Quoted by Teutons to Encourage People

"M. Poincaré received him, believing that, as Bolo had said, it was in regard to the national defence. Bolo wanted to talk about Hearst. The President stopped him at once, and after that Bolo was subject to a certain surveillance."

Mr. Louis Barthou, ex-Premier, also spoke of Bolo's visit to Poincaré, saying, according to "Le Temps": President Poincaré explained to me under what conditions Bolo had been introduced into his office. He added that the name of Hearst had aroused his suspicions in the conversation he had had with Bolo."

The account of Barthou's testimony in "Le Courrier des Etat-Unis" adds the further words: When his [Poincaré] interlocutor tried to bring the name of Hearst into the conversation, the President ended the visit."

The testimony as to Hearst's pro-Germanism comes from a varied assortment of men—Senator Humbert, Bolo himself, Monseigneur Bolo (Bolo Pasha's brother) and the government prosecutor, Lieutenant Mornet.

Senator Humbert was brought into the case to state his attitude toward Bolo and Bolo's puff of Hearst, an attitude explained at some length in letters to Bolo published in September:

"I might have said it [the puff] was provoked by you on your return from America and at first written by you in unacceptable form, which would have led 'Le Journal' into the most dangerous path."

Humbert reminded Bolo of his insistence.

"I finished by believing, in your word, in the sincerity of Hearst's change of heart in favor of France and her allies. Events soon taught me that you had deceived me and when a second time you returned to the charge to associate me with the same Hearst in suspicious telegraphic combinations I categorically refused."

Hearst and the Khedive in the Same Leaky Boat

It was Bolo's claim throughout that Hearst had been in fact a pro-German before Bolo's trip to America and that he had worked to convert him. Previous to his trip to America Bolo had visited Switzerland to see his one-time benefactor, the former Khedive of Egypt, and to obtain from him German money for use in France. Bolo lumped the Khedive (deposed by England) and William Randolph Hearst in the same class. In his opening statement at his trial he said:

"I have documents to show that my position in regard to the Khedive was correct, as it was toward Hearst."

Through his wife, Bolo attempted to pose again as the man who had tried to wean away from Germany two of her most stalwart friends. According to "Le Temps," she testified that, on Bolo's return from America, he had said in greeting her:

"My dearest, I am very glad to see you again, for I knew that the Germans had the date of my sailing, which could not be unknown to them, and I was afraid they would torpedo me. If they reproached me before on account of the Khedive, they have against me now another charge, called Hearst."

Monseigneur Bolo, Bolo Pacha's brother, a prominent cleric, took the same attitude toward Hearst's sympathies. According to "Le Temps," he said:

"What did my brother do in Switzerland and America? He worked to bring the Khedive closer to France and England. In America he worked on Hearst with the same end."

In the account of "Le Courrier des Etats-Unis" Monseigneur Bolo is quoted as saying in the course of his defence of his brother:

"In America it was on Hearst that he exercised his influence. He made of Hearst, Germanophile, an Ententophile."

None, however, could go further than the French government's representative in asserting the unqualified pro-Germanism of Hearst.

Hearst Accused by the Prosecutor

On the first day of the trial Lieutenant Mornet interrupted Bolo with an allusion to the "dinner costing $150 to which the Germanophile Hearst was invited." Later, according to "Le Temps," Bertelli took occasion to say:

"It has been said that Mr. Hearst is a notorious pro-German. I want to protest against that accusation. When Mr. Daudet or Mr. Barres (Parisian journalists) say it, it is of no importance. But you, M. le President"——

The President of the court-martial, interrupting: "I have not said it."

Lieutenant Mornet, the prosecutor, "But I, *I* say it."

The logic of this testimony before the court which convicted Bolo Pacha of treason leaves only two lines of thought open—and only one conclusion.

If Bolo Pacha was innocent, he met Hearst because Hearst was a pro-German whom he wished to convert.

If Bolo Pacha was guilty, he met Hearst because Hearst was a pro-German whom he wished to use and to aid.

In any case, Hearst figures as a pro-German. Nothing else is here possible. Quite apart from the evidence of Hearst's newspapers, Bolo's attitude and actions show it. Even though we put aside the verdict of the court and accept the plea of Bolo that he was an innocent man, we must still accept Bolo's consequent estimate of Hearst as a pro-German. On the other hand, if we accept the verdict of guilty, we must accept the further fact that Bolo Pacha, as a conscious traitor in danger of discovery and punishment, would never have associated with a man who he admitted he knew was considered a notorious pro-German unless he needed Hearst's aid and advice in a French "defeatist" campaign and peace drive, such as Hearst himself later made in America, or else wished to aid Hearst in playing Germany's game in America.

All this is before America entered the war. But we may project the visit of Bolo into the days of our belligerence by these incontestable facts:

Bolo met Hearst in 1916.

In 1917 papers owned by Bolo and by Hearst entered upon "defeatist" campaigns in consonance with German peace drives.

How Germany Used Hearst

From the Cologne "Volkszeitung," April 8, 1918.

"In the daily press the numerous Hearst papers of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco and other cities were auxiliaries for us of valued influence. Readers of 'The New York American' or 'The Evening Journal' were not wholly immune, indeed, to the poison of the British cable, but Hearst carried with him an effective antitoxin. In the first place, he has his own cable service, and was therefore rather independent, although he made now and then regrettable concessions to sensation. Nevertheless, how far Hearst's International News Service got upon the nerves of the London atrocity manufacturers is shown by the cable embargo which London finally placed upon the Hearst service, thereby cutting his European life nerve.

"More valuable, however, than the news were the editorials of the Hearst newspapers. They were unexcelled models of popular style and arresting composition; they made the most complicated legal questions attractive to the simplest minds. . . .

"Hearst last year took the sting out of one of the worst pests of the American press when he had his editor in chief of 'The Evening Journal'—Arthur Brisbane, with his salary of $75,000, the highest paid newspaper man of America and probaply of the world—to buy 'The Washington Times' and conduct it in a line with his other papers."

From Berlin "Hilfe," September —, 1917.

"A great movement toward peace has broken out in the United States, and this is being furthered and nourished by the Hearst newspapers.

"The 'defeatist' editorial from 'The New York American' of July 28, 1917, entitled 'The Attitude of the Hearst Newspapers Is Vindicated in a Striking Manner by the Report of Our Army Officers Who Have Just Come From France,' appeared under the following dates in pro-German papers: The Spanish 'A. B. C.,' August 15, 1917; Vienna 'Frembenblatt,' August 25; Hamburg 'Fremdenblatt,' August 26;' 'The Continental Times,' September 3; Cologne 'Volkszeitung,' September 17; Frankfurter 'Zeitung,' September 21; Kreigh 'Zeitung,' September 21; Hamburg 'Fremdenblatt' (second reprint), September 21; Berlin 'Tageblatt,' October 23. This is typical of the extensive use made of Hearst editorials in Germany."

The following editorials from Hearst's "New York American" were reprinted in the papers named:

Hamburger Nachrichten.

"That is the general impression, isn't it—that Germany cannot win and is slowly being beaten and starved into defeat?

"Well, the facts are these: . . . unless America can perform the twin miracles of rescuing England from the submarine and of putting enough troops in France to beat off the offensive which the Germans are now beginning to develop. . . .

"We tell you plainly that in a military, naval and economic way the Germans have the Allies whipped, and that without our intervention there was not a doubt that Germany would have victoriously dictated peace before this year was gone. . . .

"And we have been plunged into war without preparation with the most powerful single nation in the world, equipped to the last shoelace with every possible necessity of warfare, filling the seas with her submarine navy, covering half a continent with her veteran armies, and everywhere winning her way with blood and iron against her foes!"

—N. Y. "American," May 3, 1917.

Cologne Volkszeitung.

"Our part in this war, for months to come, is to pay the bill—to finance and feed hungry and bankrupt England, hungry and bankrupt France, hungry and bankrupt Italy. . . .

"If the result of war is to be that we will be hopelessly outclassed by England as a naval power and hopelessly beaten by England at the start in competition for the world's trade, then it would seem to be prudent to keep enough of our own money to build our industries. . . .

"Our money, like our armies and our fleets, should be concentrated at its home bases and not dispersed abroad."

N. Y. "American," May 17, 1917.

"It is plain enough that the bond issue is not being eagerly taken, to say the least. The banks have gone in to the limit with commendable alacrity, but the people are not buying the bonds. The government will doubtless eventually dispose of the two-billion issue, but who can say as much of the next issue?"

N. Y. "American," May 21, 1917.

Berlin Lokal-Anzeiger.

"'The reports of our own officers say that the Allies will lose the war unless we send enough war materials, men and ships to help them win. . . . Surely we must send four million men, or twice as many as that as aid to the Entente.

"'Granted that we could train and equip all these men and that the U-boats will not destroy the ships of the Entente quicker than we can build them, and that we could change all our trading vessels and coasting vessels for military purposes, we would still need five years to send all the men necessary to France. In the mean time the U-boats are unfortunately not lying still; they destroy a million tons a month, much more than all the yards of the whole world could build.

"'As long as the U-boat danger is not put out of the way, any question of shipping men across and also materials is in the air. Things being such, would it not be better to end the war honorably? Shall we send troops to destroy Germany, which, perhaps, may be necessary for the defence of our own country?'"

N. Y. "American," May 16, 1917.