

1921

Limitation of Armaments

Samuel Plantz
Lawrence University

Follow this and additional works at: https://lux.lawrence.edu/addresses_president

 Part of the [Liberal Studies Commons](#)

© Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Recommended Citation

Plantz, Samuel, "Limitation of Armaments" (1921). *Presidential Addresses*. 30.
https://lux.lawrence.edu/addresses_president/30

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of the President at Lux. It has been accepted for inclusion in Presidential Addresses by an authorized administrator of Lux. For more information, please contact colette.brautigam@lawrence.edu.

Limitation of Armaments

President Samuel Plantz

Victor Hugo has said, "Nothing on earth is as powerful as an idea whose hour has come." Has the hour come for a realization of the dream of the prophets who in all ages have been looking forward to a day when swords should be beaten into plow shares and spears into pruning hooks and the nations of the earth learn war no more? During the awful conflict through which we have just passed, and which has left us a shattered if not a ruined world, we held sacred in our hearts the promise, oft repeated and loudly proclaimed, that we were in a war to end war. It would seem as though 10,000,000 dead, 20,000,000 crippled, 350,000,000 ⁰⁰⁰ of the world's wealth destroyed, nations bankrupt, ~~eco-~~ⁱⁿ⁻
~~onomic~~^{dustrial} conditions in chaos, anarchy and starvation stalking over the face of Europe, states staggering under debts that will crush them economically for from 50 to 100 years, would combine to make a picture on a canvas sufficiently extensive to be seen by all the statesmen of the world, and lead to a common and universal demand, that the hammer be taken from the hand of Thor and given to the angel of peace to be cast into the bottom of the sea there to remain forever.

But what are the facts. ^{There have been 20 years of long wars since armistice} France asks for a military alliance with England and the United States; Germany talks of the day when she shall have revenge for the economic burdens which a harsh treaty had put upon her back; Greece is seeking to extend her domain by conquest of the Turks in Th²ace and Cilicia; Poland

and Germany are contending for upper ^{and war in Ireland} Belicia; the Juga
slaves are seeking a portion of Albania; the Soviate
government has developed a large army which has been in
almost continuous action in fighting Poland and in sup-
pressing various revolutions: and above all the United
States, having refused to join the League of Nations,
has started on a military program vaster than any in its
history. In 1909-10 the United States spent for mili-
tary preparedness 279 millions. The estimate for 1921-
22 are 1,379 millions. In August alone our country
spent 95 millions. President Harding said in his
Norfolk speech, "America must have the biggest and most
powerful navy afloat." America is today building
108 war vessels, for which she is to spend \$1,074,931,837
in the next three years. ^(our) This is a "peace" program with
a vengeance. This means that burdened England must
build more ships to maintain her supremacy upon the seas
and Japan must increase her navy to keep up with the
United States. ^{Japan} She has authorized the construction of
41 ships and her naval authorities are ^{preparing} preparing the
building of 68 more. Indeed, when the League of Nations
proposed that its committee act on the limitation of
armaments, Japan quickly said she could not agree ^{to reductions} as
long as the United States was prosecuting an extensive
program of naval and military preparedness. Our general
staff has no notion about the recent war being a war to
end war. Listen to this statement of General Swinton
before the House committee on military appropriations:

President Harding, notwithstanding his call for a disarmament
Conference seems to incline to the Rooseveltian policy to
"speak softly and carry a big stick". He ~~favours the~~ ^{says he}
naval policy favors "partial but not permanent disarmament" and in the next sentence uses the sentence
just quoted to "America must have the biggest & most
powerful navy afloat". We have made appropriations by
which by 1924 the naval strength of U.S. will be
about doubled. "Our present navy is not sufficient," says
"American General Board of the Navy," to give due weight to
the diplomatic requirements of the U.S. in peace. The naval
Board has insisted very effort to halt the program of 1916. It
says: "War has shown that a navy powerful enough to have
control of sea of outbreak of any po. war is a prime
essential of any country situated as the U.S. is, bordering
on 2nd oceans. A navy strong enough to defend our
coasts is not sufficient. Defense from invasion is
only one of the functions of a navy. It must protect
our sea-borne commerce & drive the enemy's sea.
+++ The current war has shown that a navy of size recom-
mended by this Board in previous years confers larger
be considered as adequate to defensive needs of the United
States." When a motion was introduced in the Senate
last January calling upon the Committee on Naval Affairs
to report whether it would be wise & practicable to
suspend building operations for a period of six
months to investigate "what constitutes a modern
fighting navy, a navy with the type of ships and
with the air and submarine weapons that would
be most effective in the strategy and tactics of
future wars upon the sea; and also to the end
that we may avoid ourselves of any possible

"Prepare now * * we must envisage these new forms of warfare, and as far as possible expend energy, time and money in encouraging our inventors and scientists to study the waging of war on a wholesale scale instead of * * * thinking so much about methods which will kill a few individuals only at a time." (over)

The question that faces the American people today is this: Are we going to keep faith with our dead? Is America which has been known as a peaceful nation, at the close of a war which has almost wrecked civilization, going to be a leader in war preparations which sooner or later will again set the world on fire? Are we in the future going to attempt to develop our golden age by the arts of civilization or by the conquests of brute force and barbaric passion? Gen. Pershing was asked by a congressional committee whether there was any fear across the seas that America "might develop into a military power and become a nation of conquest rather than of peace." He said there was such a thought in the minds of military men of a good many nations. Are we going to permit this fear to be well grounded and the United States instead of being the hope of the world to become the fear of the world? History has shown that there is not room enough on the earth for militarism and peace. One must shove the other off the planet. The question for us to answer is, which shall it be?

Before President Harding was elected he

promised to do what he could to prevent another holocaust of civilization, to try and find some means of chaining the dogs of war so that they will no longer ravish the earth. In harmony with this promise, although in apparent contradiction with his stand for great naval and military appropriations and his statement that America must have the greatest navy on earth, he has called a congress of several nations to consider a first step against militarism, namely a reducing of armaments. This proposition should receive the loyal support of all patriots for the following reasons:

(1). It accords with the general consciousness of the masses of the American people as to the wrong, the waste, the insanity of war as a means of settling the disputes between nations. The folly, the stupidity, the tragedy, the honor of war are axiomatic. From the highest mountain top to the lowest valley comes the call that these massacres of boys, these destructions of human treasure, these carnivals of greed and hate which have long cursed the earth shall cease. ^(over) The American people have no desire to be a fighting nation; but only wish for justice and peace. They know that war is a "monster gorged with blood" with, as some one has expressed it, "the torn limbs of civilization as its trophies." It is barbarism let loose to turn cities and countries into shambles. "Its savage teeth chew up the best results of centuries of culture and of progress." "The program of war is a carnival of desolation. War

It is said there have been but 227 years when no
states and nations were at war in the 3412 years of
recorded history. It has sapped the strength and
virility of the nations; for it is not the weak but the
strong who are slaughtered in war. It is the weak and
vulnerable who are presumed to populate the species. It
did not so much matter in the days of the bow and
arrow and of the spear, but modern warfare with its
wholesale killing is a different matter. It has now reached
the possibility of demolishing whole populations.

makes cruelty its sacrament. It builds up kingdoms by cementing stone upon stone with blood." ^{any} Humanity today, smarting with the awful losses of the last war, demands that the hands of the grim destroyer shall be shackled, and every means employed to banish it from the earth.

(2). Again we should favor disarmament because preparedness is a temptation to conflict. It is claimed that vast military preparations prevent war. We arm for defence not offence, say the junkers. This sounds well, but how does it work? Men come to desire what they have trained themselves to do. A college football team will not consent to practice through a season and play no games. Military training develops a military spirit; and a military spirit, when occasions for irritation arise, as occasionally they will, is quick to sound the call of war and begin the blood letting of mutual slaughter. Thirty years ago a brilliant young professor in the University of Berlin asked me, if I thought he could get a position in an American College or University. "Why do you want to give up your excellent position here," I asked. "We are going to have another war," he replied. "What makes you think so," I inquired. "Nations," said he, "will not be content to spend their time whetting their knives to cut each others throats without sooner or later, getting into the bloody business." He was right. The

Mr. Bruthings son in writing his German tutor gives this excellent description of war, he says; "War is a curtain of dense black fabric across all the hopes and kindnesses of mankind +++ Massacres of boys! That indeed is the essence of modern warfare. The killing off of the young. It is the destruction of the human inheritance, it is the spending of all the life material of the future upon present day hate and greed."

In war reason is supplanted by violence. All values are sent popsy wrong. "Killing becomes a solemn duty ~~lying~~ is holy on the condition that it deceives the enemy to his death. All forms of corruption come with war as its inevitable shadow. Honor is forgotten. Treaties are broken, and ~~facts~~ barbarism, full panoplied, ^{leaps} forth as a giant on the earth." Men are ruined not only physically but morally. Language becomes converted into oaths and obscenity. The worst passions of men's minds are brought to the surface. We say we had the ~~best~~ ^{clearest} army in the world; but that was because of our proclatye treatment & not because of the virtue of our men. There is ~~nothing but~~ ^{nothing} ruin physical & moral in war & there is no excuse for this relic of barbarism to linger among civilized men. Every effort that will tend to terminate it should be enthusiastically welcomed and sustained.

war through which we have just passed should be enough to convince us that all talk of an "armed peace" is a monstrous contradiction in terms. Major General F.B. Maurice of the British General Staff recently said, "I went into the British army believing that if you want peace you must prepare for war. I believe now that if you prepare for war, you get war." "Armaments are ~~electric~~ buttons waiting to be pushed to discharge world destroying explosives to the ruin of civilization." We have just fought a war for the destruction of militarism. Let us not at once go to work to recreate it by a program of competitive armament. Let us rather see to it that blood and iron are never again the masters of men.

(4). We must favor a reduction of armaments, because to build up great military machines in the present bankrupt condition of the nations would be a crime and tragedy combined in one. Human imagination cannot compass the economic waste of the last war. Its direct cost has been computed to be between 240 and 250 billions. Its indirect loss is figured from 100 to 150 billions more. A total of at least 350 billions of additional burden has been laid on the backs of the tax ridden peoples of Europe and America. The national debt of Great Britian has risen from 3½ to 39 billions of dollars: of France from 6½ to 46 billions: of the United States from 1 to nearly 25 billions. It is not necessary to speak of Germany and the rest of Europe. The total

*If Adam came on the sands when Bishop Ussher
chronology says he did, he would have had to
earn \$252,000 a day or \$175 a minute
working day & night to have earned what
the war cost.*

1440
 365
 7200
 8640
 43.2.0
 525.600
 4000
 2,102,400,000

war through which we have just passed should convince us that all talk of an "armed peace" is monstrous contradiction in terms. Major General Maurice of the British General Staff recently said: "I went into the British army believing that you want peace you must prepare for war. I believe now that if you prepare for war, you get war." "Armaments are electric buttons waiting to be pushed to discharge world destroying explosives to the ruin of civilization." We have just fought a war for the destruction of militarism. Let us not at once go to work to recreate it by a program of competitive armament. Let us rather see to it that blood and iron are never again the masters of men.

(5) We must favor a reduction of armaments, because to build up great military machines in the present bankrupt condition of the nations would be a crime and tragedy combined in one. Human imagination cannot compare the economic waste of the last war. Its direct cost has been computed to be between 240 and 250 billions. The indirect loss is figured from 100 to 150 billions more. A total of at least 350 billions of additional burden has been laid on the backs of the tax ridden peoples of Europe and America. The national debt of Great Britain has risen from 3 1/2 to 38 billions of dollars; of France from 8 1/2 to 48 billions; of the United States from 1 to nearly 25 billions. It is not necessary to speak of Germany and the rest of Europe. The total

national wealth of France, land, cities, factories, mines, all kinds of property was estimated in 1920 to be 92½ billions of dollars, and her debt is 46 billions, or half her total wealth. Great Britian's wealth is 120 billions and her debt nearly 40 billions. Japan's finances as is well known are in a most critical condition, as are those of Italy, Austria and the Balkan states. In Russia, Poland, China and other parts of the world men, women and children are starving by the millions. ^{over} Yet, in such a wrecked and ruined world, the United States is spending 93% of its total income for war purposes; Japan is appropriating 48½% for the same object; and if we ~~persist~~ ^{persist} in our announced policy to have the greatest navy in the world, Great Britian will be forced into a naval program that will make her war bill about two thirds of her national income, although her war taxes like those of France are up to nearly 40%. How long can civilization stand up under such a financial strain as this? The people will not bear the burden of taxation that the present program of military preparedness will require; but we shall have a Bolshevik revolution in Europe and America as well as in Russia. As Dr. Henry Fosdick has said: "The people of the world are very patient. The more one knows of the facts, the more he wonders, not at their revolutionary spirit but at their incredible patience. But they will not forever patiently endure the insufferable burdens of modern war. They will rise

All belligerent nations are staggering under ~~debt~~ taxation that
is hampering all the processes of national & individual life.
"For first time in history a nation, dismembered Austria
has gone into the hands of a receiver. Moreover, eleven
out of twelve European states, even with tremendous taxation
on spending far beyond their income, & 3 out of 4
countries in world are unable to raise taxes to meet their
running expenses. The U.S., widely heralded as the
richest nation in world, this year shows an estimated
Treasury deficit of \$2,005,037,000, and in 1922 of
\$1,478,381,000, taking into account as part of expenditures
refunding operations of the fiscal periods. In Europe the
situation is so bad that any nation which can even approach
normal conditions of solvency regards it as a triumphal
accomplishment. Italy, for instance after a herculean effort at
paring down national expenses proudly announces that this
year's deficit has been cut from 14,000,000,000 to 6,000,000,000
lire & cabinet got a vote of confidence as the result.
"There is no money in world so rich in it can afford to put into
a military program money which should be devoted to reconstruction
of a ruined world." The festal war burden nations are carrying
carrying absolutely necessitates an immediate relief. With the
expenses brought by the war if it is said the yearly cost to the
nations is between 8 & 10 billions. At 5% it would require 160
billions of the world's wealth to be set aside to take care of war
budgets. This burden the nations cannot carry & survive econ-
omically." The burden, moreover, is not of short duration. "U.S. is
still paying for civil war of 60 years ago. F. 1870 & 1914
we have been spending 20% of national income for part of
present war purposes. Says Cobb: Spending money on competing
armaments at this time under protest of providing for national defence is
like drawing blood from a patient who is suffering from pernicious anaemia.
The disease may not be fatal if they but remedy is sure to be. It is a
question whether Europe can recover from war which has been in & to have
another war in life time of this generation on scale of last would
be collapse of civilization. Hence money spent in competitive arma-
ments is largely if not all wasted. The nations are now on a grand
march toward economic exhaustion. The collapse is inevitable if the
impaired resources of world are to be depleted by competition of armaments."

up in their fury and blow this so-called civilization to bits first. For we can have war or civilization ; but we cannot have both long."

(4). I have time only to maintain one more reason why we must have limitation of armaments and this is, the fearful destructiveness which will attend another war. The business of killing, like everything else in our modern world, has been transformed by our recent scientific progress. The older wars were bad enough, but they were football games compared with modern warfare. The geniuses of human learning and invention have been concentrated in making killing as effective as possible. Nothing in history equals in barbaric methods and ferocity, the war which recently shook the world. From the beginning the code of civilized warfare was abrogated. Germany began at once with her submarines to sink merchant ships without warning. With her air ships she dropped bombs on the heads of women and children. She seized citizens of conquered cities as hostages and shot them down if any citizens of the community offered resistance,- a usage long discontinued by civilized nations. On April 22, 1915, for the first time in history she rolled across the trench line at Ypres a cloud of iridescent gas which burned the lungs of hundreds to a crisp and made thousands roll on the earth in agony. Enough gas that day would have won the war. Then came liquid fire, big Bertha guns that dropped shells on cities 60 and 70 miles away, and finally there

II. THE TERRORS OF WAR

The world has just been through a war, a World War, widely and officially called impossible before it happened. A next war will start in where that one left off, plus the advantages of military experience in the interval. To depict that next conflict,¹ if or when it comes, is a fascinating temptation to a vivid imagination. To him who yields to that temptation, only one thing is certain: he will fall short of the mark.

To summarize this past war is a sufficient forecast of these conflicts of the "absolute" type, to use the phrase of Clausewitz, the standard school master of military theory. General Tasker H. Bliss, who was the American member of the Supreme Military Council directing the operations of all Allied armies and then a member of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, summarizes the situation thus:

"First. It is a world war, such as we have just passed through, which is necessarily one involving the great civilized powers that constitutes a menace to our existing civilization.

"Second. Such a war depends upon a few so-called powers.

"Third. A war between any two of them, which formerly created relatively only a ripple on the surface of the great deep, now has an irresistible tendency to draw them all into the roaring maelstrom.

"Fourth. To meet this, these few nations must stagger under an increasing burden during years of armed peace solely to train what, if we can find some other method satisfactory for our purpose, is an unnecessary number of men in purely destructive arts; and to accumulate enormous quantities of costly material which does not add a penny to our permanent wealth, and which when used for the only purpose for which it can be used is finally represented by an atmosphere of stinking gas and by the destruction of every form of real and otherwise permanent wealth.

¹"The Next War" by Will Irwin is announced for immediate publication by E. P. Dutton Company.

"Fifth. Such wars, resulting in the application of every ounce of accumulated energy on both sides, must result in the practical destruction of one by the other, even if both are not ruined.

"Sixth. Such wars, necessarily characterized by an intensity of national passions heretofore unknown, come to be regarded by each side as wars for life or death, in which each, to save his life, and destroy his adversary, will use every agency of destruction available to him; and, therefore, such agencies as the absolute blockade to starve people who heretofore were regarded as noncombatants, noxious and toxic gases, night and day bombing of cities from airplanes, the submarine, have come to stay until replaced by more destructive agencies.

"Seventh. Various causes will operate to draw neutrals into the struggle.

"Eighth. When such war comes it will be without warning and everyone must be ready.

"Ninth. All of this is due to the acceptance by a few governments of the military doctrine of the nation in arms; to their belief that no way can be found to guarantee their rights except universal preparedness, no guaranty against a general war except a general preparation for it.

"And lastly, with all that staring us in the face, the fact that after the last ounce of strength has been accumulated and the last combination of the powers has been made, one side or the other must strike or forfeit every dollar and every hope bound up in its preparation."¹

In such a war there will be no "first hundred thousand." General Pershing furnishes this testimony as to numbers: "It is evident that a force of about 1,000,000 is the smallest unit which in modern war will be a complete, well-balanced and independent fighting organization."²

¹Hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, 66th Congress, 3rd sess., 553.

²Letter of July 11, 1917, covering general organization project for American Expeditionary Forces, Final Report of General John J. Pershing, 8.

NO ESCAPE FOR ANYONE

War is not only colossal in scale and scope henceforth, but it is three-dimensional, whether you view it as military or naval, or take the point of view of the civilian. On land, war is already conducted on, above and under the ground. At sea it is on, above and under the water. Back home, the sons go to the front, civilians turn their industries over to war purposes, and everybody bends every effort to fight the enemy with literally all weapons from dollars to bread crumbs. The noncombatant has been abolished, and war projects itself in time of peace into every nook and cranny of the industrial world in preparation for the next outbreak of hostilities.¹

The next war will not confine itself to trenches in devastated France. Its impact will not be only on those within range of the guns, even though that range has risen to scores of miles. For every man on the firing line there are four at home furnishing equipment of all kinds to him. But even if that were not true and the distinction between combatant and noncombatant therefore as valid as it used to be, the mobility of warlike operations has so increased that military objectives have completely changed. Aircraft, traveling under ordinary conditions above 100 miles an hour on tracks of their own choice, are responsible for the expansion of warfare to include potentially every human being in the countries at war.

“Gas bombs,” said Brig. Gen. William Mitchell, before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, “were not used in

¹The duties of the Council of National Defense, established by act of August 29, 1916, and intended to function permanently, are:

“To supervise and direct investigations and make recommendations to the President and heads of executive departments as to the location of railroads with reference to the frontier of the United States, so as to render possible expeditions, concentration of troops, and supplies to points of defense; the co-ordination of military, industrial and commercial purposes in the location of extensive highways and branch lines of railroad; the utilization of waterways; the mobilization of military and naval resources for defense; the increase of domestic production of articles and materials essential to the support of armies and of the people during the interruption of foreign commerce; the development of sea-going transportation; data as to amounts, location, method and means of production and availability of military supplies; the giving of information to producers and manufacturers as to the class of supplies needed by the military and other services of the Government, the requirements relating thereto, and the creation of relations which will render possible in time of need the immediate concentration and utilization of the resources of the Nation.”

Europe, because if one side had started it the other side would have started it and the loss of life among women and children in the back areas would have been terrific. However, that is contemplated as a possible use of the airplane in the future, and we find . . . that we can use certain amounts of certain gases for covering areas and that the gas will continue to be effective for a period of time. If we want to cover an area of ten miles by ten miles such as New York is—New York is a very easy target—we may use about two tons of crying gas once in every eight days. If you want to use mustard gas you would use about 70 tons once in every eight days; if you want to use phosgene gas, 200 tons. This, of course, is very deadly.”

WHAT THE NEW GAS DOES

And this is the latest, the quotation being from D. B. Bradner, chief of the Chemical Research and Development Division, United States Chemical Warfare Service:

“The Chemical Warfare Service has discovered a liquid approximately three drops of which, when applied to any part of the skin, will cause a man’s death . . . One plane carrying two tons of the liquid could cover an area 100 feet wide by seven miles long in one trip and could deposit material to kill every man in that area by action on his skin. If the men were not protected by gas masks, which would be the case if the attack were made on a city, the fatal area would be several times as great. . . . The only limit to the quantity of this liquid which could be made is the amount of available electric power, as nearly every nation has practically an unlimited supply of the necessary raw materials. It would be entirely possible for this country to manufacture several thousand tons per day, provided the necessary plants had been built. . . . During the Argonne offensive in the past war the entire first American army of a million and a quarter men occupied an area of 40 kilometers long by 20 kilometers wide. If Germany had had 4000 tons of this material and three or four hundred planes equipped for its distribution the entire first army would have been annihilated in ten to twelve hours. . . . During the past

war, gas produced over 30 per cent of our casualties. In the future the percentage will be far higher. New methods of defense will be devised to meet this particular new development."

In another passage, he speaks of the possibility of providing protective clothing "which will entirely cover the wearer and be impervious to this liquid, still allowing water vapor to pass through; . . . but the problem is an extremely difficult one and it is probable that several years will be required to develop such a material, if it is possible to do so at all."¹

WHAT SCIENCE WILL DO

The gas referred to was invented by W. Lee Lewis, head of the chemistry department of Northwestern University, in a series of experiments costing \$250,000 and conducted during the war by direction of the President. Speaking at West Point on April 20, Professor Lewis is reported as saying:

"We face the possibility in the naval warfare of the future of armor-piercing, toxic and tear shells, smoke screens, toxic smoke clouds and invisible toxic fumes. We also may consider in this connection parallel defensive measures, such as a gas mask for a whole battleship. Gas weapons are capable of a much finer adaptation to purpose than explosive weapons and the future will see worked out a great degree of scientific refinement in the development of gas weapons for all types of military operations. Future battles will not be to the strong, but to the superior in intelligence. Warfare will become less a matter of brute strength and relative man power, and more and more a matter of scientific acumen."

It is considering such probabilities as that which leads General Pershing to say:

"It would appear that recent experiences should be enough to convince everybody of the danger of a renewal of this competition. But one nation can not reduce armaments unless all do. It is time that enlightened people everywhere should undertake to reach some rational agreement which would not only relieve the world of its heavy financial burden, but which in itself would go far toward the prevention of war. We are not a warlike people.

¹Hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, 711-712.

We do not wish to expand at the expense of any other nation, and we have no designs on anybody. If other people feel the same toward us and toward each other, it seems unreasonable that they should be unwilling to consent in principle to some limitation of armaments, to be carried out when certain nations succeed in establishing stable governments, and are willing to recognize the wisdom of such a course. **Otherwise, may we not seriously ask ourselves whether civilization is a failure, and whether we are to regard war as a normal and unavoidable scourge that mankind must suffer?**¹

¹Hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, 601.

was the letting loose of the germs of disease and pestilence. "These barbarous methods of warfare turned many first class minds away from scientific investigations in the lines of industry and pure science to find new and deadlier means of destruction," and the result has been the discovery of new agencies of killing so terrible in their possibilities that if another war occurs civilization will be staggered, if it does not collapse. The gas used at Ypres is mere smelling salts to what chemists have later produced. At Northwestern University at Evanston, Prof. Lewis developed a new gas known as Lewisite. This gas is so deadly that it does not have to be breathed to kill. "Let it settle on the skin, merely touch any part of the body and it is certain death." Gas masks are of no effect against it. Furthermore it has 55 times the capacity for diffusion or "spread" of any gas used in the war. Mr. Will Irwin says: "An expert has said that a dozen Lewisite air bombs of the greatest size in use during 1918 might with a favorable wind have eliminated the population of Berlin." And now we are told of the discovery of another gas more deadly than Lewisite, a mere capsule of which will produce acres of death. A few airoplanes with bombs filled with these gasses can in a few hours destroy millions of men. Gen. Bradwin said at a recent Congressional hearing: "If Germany had had 300 or 400 airoplanes equipped with Lewisite gas bombs the entire American army of occupation

would have been annihilated in ten to twelve hours.

General Gwinton tells us of another barbarism. He says:

"The final form of human strife, as I regard it, is germ warfare. I think it will come to that: and so far as I can see there is no reason why it should not, if you mean to fight." Says Irwin: "Among the possibilities of the next war is a general, blighting epidemic - like the Black Plagues of the Middle Ages -

* an indiscriminating rush of death which will destroy whole populations. The conclusion is as clear as sunlight. The only way to save what centuries of effort have built up, the only way to keep the head of civilization on its shoulders, is for the nations to agree to stop this competition in equipment for human slaughter, and reestablish their broken and abandoned codes.

x
Our president has called a conference on disarmament. The hour has come for the people to speak. Let there be a ringing demand from every city and hamlet the country over that this organized madness to develop still further the agencies of destruction shall cease. Let us be true to the men who died in Flanders' field and who thought they were serving humanity in a war to end war. Agitation is the need of the hour. Let notice be served on statesmen and rulers, on unscrupulous politicians and capitalistic profiteers, that the disarmament conference must not fail; that "the dance of the dollars" for war purposes must not continue to go on. Especially, let the voice of the people in tones like

Neverberating claps of thunder be heard in Washington, demanding that the United States shall not lead in war preparations which means another carnival of death.

While limitation of armaments will not necessarily do away with war, while it would be far more effective if accompanied with agreements between nations backed by an economic and if necessary a military compulsion to keep the peace, such as the League of Nations provides, since President Harding will not join the League but has joined the Elks, a conference such as is called at Washington is the best hope we have in the emergency. The fear is that it will be another Hague conference, a conflict with no power to enforce its advices, and they will all prove "waste paper" when nations have differences and military leaders want to fight: but anything is better than nothing and every encouragement should be given to make the coming conference as effective and binding as possible. Again we say, let the people speak in authoritative tones in behalf of a limitation of armaments.

Samuel Plautz

Our president has called a Conference for disarmament, ~~representatives~~ ^{the delegates} of which are now in Washington. This is in harmony with suggestions which have been before the U. S. for some time. As far back as 1916 U. S. took its stand by making ~~the~~ the following provisions a part of the appropriation bill authorizing the naval building program. The U. S. looks on apprehension & disfavor upon a general increase of armament throughout the world, but it realizes that no single nation can disarm & that a common agreement upon subject every considerable power must maintain a relative standing in military strength.

In view of these premises, President is authorized & requested to invite, at an appropriate time, not later than close of war in Europe, all great governments of world to send representatives to a conference who shall be charged with duty of formulating a plan for a court of arbitration, or other tribunal of which disputed questions between nations shall be referred to adjudication & peaceful settlement, & to consider the question of disarmament & submit their recommendations to their respective governments for approval. Now was this first declaration of this policy, for Congress had taken the same stand in a joint resolution of June 25, 1916. In a hearing before Com. on Naval Affairs in 3rd session of the 66 Congress, General Bliss proposed that a conference of the leading nations be held in Washington

to determine to what extent armaments are necessary. He later says, if such a conference were held he believes that the common people of the nations represented would not permit that conference to adjourn until at least ~~some~~ ^{one} definite step had toward a general limitation of armaments had been taken. At the same time ^{John} Secretary Daniels advocated such a conference. He gave several reasons why he believed the nations would respond to a call for such a conference, the first was all ~~but~~ the nations but Japan ratified the Bryan treaties compelling a year's delay before going to war, second because at the Peace Conference they all agreed to article 8 of the League of Nations providing for a limitation of armaments, third because all the nations in League declared their desire at ~~the first~~ ^{the first} conference at Geneva to secure a reduction of armaments by international agreement & asked the U. S. Government to send a representative ~~de~~ facto & sit in on the hearings. Smith he says the financial situation of the nations would make them respond to a call of Pres. for a conference on reduction of armaments. He then goes on to argue that because of the military program we are prosecuting, "if we do not make some practical and earnest and early effort to reduce armaments, the world will lay the blame of large military expenditures upon our

shoulder & we cannot relieve our conscience of the
 responsibility. If we invite this conference, it
 will give the nations an opportunity to come
 to a better understanding than they have ever
 had before & we would cannot say the American
 was deaf to the appeal for disarmament.
 In January, these opinions the Senate in
 March, 1921 four days before Pres. Harding
 was inaugurated passed following measure:
 "The Pres. is authorized & requested, if not in-
 compatible with the public interest, to invite the
 governments of Brit. B. & Japan to send
 representatives to a conference which shall be
 charged with the duty of promptly entering into
 an ^{understanding on} agreement by which naval building
 program of each of said governments, shall be
 substantially reduced during next 5 years & if
 later on May 7 Senator Borah introduced a resolu-
 tion authorizing Pres. to appoint a commission of
 5 members to consider expediency of limiting
 armaments by international agreement & thus
 lessening probability of war. In January with
 all these suggestions & the requirement of
 Senate Pres. has called the present conference
 on reduction of armaments.

It must be realized that this conference
 will face tremendous difficulties & most perplex-
 ing international problems. It will be

12
It must be realized that this conference will face tremendous difficulties
& most perplexing international problems. It will be
confronted largely with the same questions wh. so
perplexed perplexed the delegates & the peace conference
at Versailles. The question of disarmament depends
upon other fundamental problems of international
politics wh. must be settled, before a limitation
of armaments can be taken up. These problems
are the most delicate possible and affect the
future welfare & survival of the greatest of the
nations. They are not mere questions of trade
rivalries, or imperialistic ambitions, but rather
matters wh. affect the very existence of the nations.
Take for example the problem of supremacy on
the seas. England has felt that she must have
3 times navy of any other nation. Why? Because
she is a small island nation with 90
colonies far distant. She cannot feed herself. Her
people must live on what is brought by ships
& her harbors. She is a manufacturing nation, &
she must sell abroad the fruits of her labor, & with
proceeds purchase food & some her raw materials.
If her navy could be destroyed, & her commerce
on the seas ruined by some enemy, she could be
starved to death in a few months. The question
of limitation of ~~her~~ her navy is therefore a question
of her life. On land France. She lies on the
border of Germany who now hates her & a terrible
hated & looks for the day of vengeance. Germany
though defeated in war has twice the population

16
of France, her factories are in tact, she can soon
get on her feet. She intends to take back what
France has taken in last war. France is in
mental dread of Germany & day of her retaliation.
She feels th. before she can disarm, she must
have ~~some~~ agreements with other strong nations,
esp. 1st. Pr. & U. S. th. they will support her
by a military alliance against a future attack of
a recovered Germany. Then there is Japan. Japan
has an eastern policy. She has a very limited
territory for a large & growing population. She
needs more land for an overflow of her population.
She also needs certain natural products which
are nec. to her industrial development. These she
can get in China & Siberia. She wants certain
spheres of influence in East, & certain concessions
for China. But U. S. stands e. China against
these aggressions of Japan & demands Hay's policy
of open door. There are but a few of them there
is question of the rehabilitation of Europe, how
the bankrupt nations are going to get on their
feet again, and there is the question of the
war debts, & how U. S. is to be paid its
post loans. These are but a few of the very
delicate problems involving not simply welfare
but existence of nations which will come
before Conference & wh. will affect the question
of disarmament. There is very chance for

17
national interests to defeat the ~~plan~~ of disarmament
wh. all really desire. Then there is that worst
thing of all, the fear of the nations, the suspicion
& apprehension wh. they entertain towards each other,
and in addition to this there is the military class,
the men who want wars, the profilers in armaments
& munitions who will do all possible to see that
their interests are not seriously intified with. But
besides this is a problem of how to effect an agreement
wh. will amount to anything, if occasions for
difference between nations arise. Kant said more
than 100 years ago we can never have
universal peace until 'wild is politically organized
but as Am. opposition to League of Nations has
shown, it is exceedingly difficult to get the nations
to agree to any extra authority wh. shall in
anything control their activities. The League of a
super gov. or a superstate sets men wild, even
if it only be an organization for common safety.
The danger is th. a conference will be a matter
of verbal agreements, but th. there will be no
agency constituted to enforce them in case of
differences. You have seen the futility of men
conferences & agreements in the Hague conferences.
Before the war we met at Hague & nations
agreed to many things wh. would lessen the
honors of war. But what did they amount to
when war came. They were ropes of sand, but

is one of them receive any attention. Every article
of the code was broken, & nothing was
neglected wh. gave any promise of successful
killing. If U. S. had joined League of Nations,
there would have been a good chance of doing
away c. excessive armaments, & of causing war
& cease, for constitution of ~~the~~ League wisely
provided not only for the arbitration of disputes,
but it provided an element of compulsion by
economic boycott, & if th. was not sufficient
military pressure wh. would have made
agreements effective. The danger is th. the
disarmament conference at Washington will be a
talk fest wh. will end in verbal agreements
but no authority to enforce them, & result will
be as in present war th. when some nation
sets out on a career of conquest, the agreements
will be cast aside as waste paper. Even if
~~some~~ limitation of armaments is agreed to in
conference, it will not make peace certain, for
it will only equalize the war strength of the
nations, & in case of a quarrel, the nation
will be as well prepared for a war relatively
as if the military policy of preparedness had
gone on.

But while this is all true, nevertheless
the conference holds out a possibility of success,
& of relief from taxation burdens wh. all

15 persons should appreciate, with the result
that, everything should be done to make the
Conference a success. Much depends on
America. We have the whip end of the
Conference. The nations that come to us are under
moral, & much more under financial obligations
to us. They will be much influenced by American
public opinion. Because of this a tremendous
appeal should be made by the people from
every part of the land. The voice of the people should
be heard like reverberating claps of thunder. The
diplomats should feel that the people are speaking
& must be heard &c.

21
4 agreements between naval powers providing for a reduction of armaments," the committee reported on Feb. 9 that in its opinion "it is not practicable is not a sound policy to suspend the naval construction program of the U. S. now in progress for a period of 6 months, now at all." This is a "peace program" with a vengeance. ~~What does it mean?~~

What does it mean? In the first place if forces England, notwithstanding her debt of 40 billion, as a result of the recent war to begin a program of naval construction. England because of her vast colonial possessions and the fact that her national existence depends on keeping open the highways of trade as she cannot like the U. S. produce what is necessary to feed & care for her people, cannot allow any other nation to surpass or equal her in naval power. Her past policy has been to be 3 times as powerful as any other nation. Recently she decided that to be twice as strong would be sufficient. But the ~~making~~ naval program of the U. S. will make her not more than equal or inferior. This she cannot permit, notwithstanding her good will towards America and her sense of security concerning a war with us. The result is the Board of Admiralty recognizing the ~~gr~~ nec. of economy, and hoping for an agreement with other nations wh. will make vast expenditures unnecessary, is still planning to see that her naval supremacy is sustained.

The influence of our program is naturally now acute in Japan; for our jingo press has long been ~~is~~ trying to create trouble between U. S. and the island empire. It has loudly proclaimed that a war between the two countries is inevitable. It

21
written extensively about the "yellow peril". It is said
that Japan is building armaments to fight us, and
the chief reason for our new naval program is
the fear that has been awakened concerning the
military purposes of Japan. The fact is th. this is
largely jingoism. Japan does not want to fight the
U. S. and has no reason for doing so. Japan is
exceedingly oppressed financially and has not the econ-
omic background to fight a war successfully with
this country. But much more than that Japanese industries
are very dependent on American trade. For example one of her
most profitable industries is the production of silk. In
1919 her total exports of raw silk amounted to over \$310,000,000
of wh. U. S. bought more than \$299,000,000, or 96% of the
whole. Again Japan produces no cotton, & she must have
it. Where does she get it. In 1919 we sold Japan over
\$142,000,000 of raw cotton. In same way Japan has to
get abroad iron, steel, engines and machinery. Where
does she get these? Three fourths of all of comes from the
U. S. Japan is economically so dependent on U. S. th.
she does not want a war w. America & will not have it
unless we force it upon her. These facts & the burden of
taxation under wh. Japan is staggering, has made Japan
respond readily to any suggestions about a reduction of
armaments. Thus Viscount Ishii says: "Japan is ready to
support any Am. suggestion aiming at securing the peace
of world, and, to quote a specific instance, we should
be glad to be associated in any practical scheme
wh. may be started in order to promote practical dis-
armament". However, if we are going on with our naval
program there is nothing left for Japan to do than strengthen
in ^{her} navy. When the League of Nations etc. see page 2