

Should AMERICA Disarm?

A DEBATE

IN PRESIDENT COOLIDGE's last message to Congress, he asked the Senate to ratify the Kellogg-Briand Treaty outlawing war as an instrument of national policy, and he urged the same body to pass the bill, already voted by the House, authorizing the government to build fifteen cruisers and one aircraft carrier. To some foreign observers, as well as to many citizens at home, it seemed inconsistent or even hypocritical to profess pacific intentions in one breath and then demand increased armaments in the next. This raises the question — What does America really want? In the accompanying debate, a pacifist and a militarist both insist that they want peace, but they disagree as completely as two men can on the way to attain it.

I

A New National Preparedness

by KIRBY PAGE

EVERY PATRIOTIC CITIZEN believes in preparedness. There are, however, two kinds of preparedness. Some support one, some the other. The position which I shall uphold in this discussion is that armed preparedness — reliance upon the army and navy — is less effective and more dangerous than another kind of preparedness which I shall outline in some detail.

Before we can decide upon the most effective means of national defense, we must find out where our national peril lies. With what dangers are we confronted? What are the causes of invasion and war?

Contrary to a widespread belief, war is not traceable primarily to the fighting instinct. Human nature is pretty much the same in New Jersey as it is in Europe, but the Germans of Hoboken do not wage war on the Frenchmen of Newark. Complete refutation of the idea that the first cause of war is the fighting instinct is found in the fact that modern warfare cannot be waged without conscription and false propaganda. During the World War, voluntary enlistment failed, in every belligerent country, to provide the required number of soldiers. If men are so eager to fight, why do

they have to be filled with hate and then drafted?

Neither can war be attributed primarily to greed. The citizens of New York and Pennsylvania are not less greedy than the people of France and Germany, but there is no probability that the Woolworth Building and the Brooklyn Bridge will be demolished by Philadelphia airmen.

Modern war is caused by the dogmas and emotions of nationalism. It is not pugnacity and greed that make nations engage in systematic annihilation of each other, but the actions of governments in supporting the rival interests of their respective citizens. Let us look for a moment at the nature of these doctrines and emotions.

We cannot possibly make a wise decision concerning the most effective means of national defense until we understand the significance of the dogmas of national interest, national sovereignty, national honor, and national patriotism. The essence of the doctrine of national interest is that the highest duty of a government is to safeguard the interests of its citizens, and that, in doing so, it is justified in making use of any weapons it considers

necessary. If a citizen goes into some distant region to do business and his property is endangered, his government feels obliged to defend him — if necessary, at a cost a thousand times as great as the value of his property. In order to defend its rights on the high seas, a nation will go to war and spend billions of dollars and sacrifice thousands of lives.

The doctrine of national sovereignty maintains that a nation is a final or ultimate political unity, with no power above it, and that it has a right to choose its own policies and determine its own course of action. It is obvious that if each of sixty political divisions is absolutely sovereign, then law and government are impossible. Sovereignty creates lawlessness and anarchy, whether sovereignty resides in tribes, walled cities, feudal baronies, states, or nations.

The doctrine of national honor is very similar to the idea of individual honor which prevailed in the days of the duel. A writer on this subject has listed one hundred and thirty-six types of national dishonor, including insults to the flag, refusal to make apology demanded, disregard of diplomatic customs, etc. No doctrine is more paradoxical than the doctrine of national patriotism; it may prove to be either a blessing or a curse. If patriotism is defined as love of one's countrymen, devotion to the ideals of one's nation, and the willingness to serve and suffer on behalf of one's people and their ideals, it is a glorious thing. But too often patriotism is defined as the duty of a citizen to obey his government at all times, even if it commands him to participate in a duel with a neighboring nation.

These dogmas of nationalism which I have just outlined are now accepted by all the great nations of the world. And what is the result? To uphold these dogmas, every government feels itself obliged to engage in a race of competitive armaments with every other government. But to maintain huge military and naval establishments calls for a steady outpouring of national wealth and man power; and the citizens of a country simply will not bear the crushing burdens of taxation and conscription unless they are afraid of what will happen if they fall behind in armaments. Consequently, it becomes the duty of those who advocate military and naval preparedness to break down the nation's common sense by creating suspicion and fear of other nations.

Thus nationalists are always drawing pictures — of themselves and other peoples. They exaggerate their own virtues and minimize their own faults, while distorting the vices of other countries and underestimating their achievements. When the nationalists of all nations are engaged in this pursuit, the result is a group of caricatures that bear little resemblance to reality. These false pictures generate such emotions as consciousness of difference, suspicion, fear, and hatred. Without these emotions, humanity would not engage in wholesale slaughter.

Of the manufacture of national bogeys there is no end, and it is not confined to any one country. Japanese militarists, for example, are carrying on propaganda designed to make their people suspicious and afraid of the United States. And in this country, also, a systematic effort is being made with the same object in view toward other peoples. Military and naval campaigns for preparedness tend to inculcate the idea that war is inevitable; they overestimate the degree of security afforded by armaments; they minimize the efficacy of international agencies of justice; they accentuate the more dangerous dogmas of nationalism; and they create suspicion and fear even between nations that are bound together by ancient bonds of good will and coöperation.

Let us look at one or two illustrations. A prominent general recently said: "The United States is as helpless as a chick facing flying wolves." Go through the files of any newspaper that strongly urges more armaments and notice the constant appeal to fear. An extreme but not isolated illustration is found in the Hearst press. Some months ago the various papers in this chain ran a series of articles by General Mitchell, which were described by the editor as follows: "Another step in the aerial war plans of Asiatic powers against the United States is startlingly outlined by General William Mitchell, former Assistant Chief of the U. S. Army Air Service, in the accompanying article. This is the third article of a notable series prepared for the Hearst newspapers, in which General Mitchell, for the information of the American people, is presenting his views on 'The Air Requirements of the United States.' In last Sunday's article General Mitchell revealed secret tactical plans of the Japanese General Staff for a bombing attack upon Los

Angeles and San Francisco by a fleet of planes landed in Lower California immediately after a sudden declaration of war against the United States. In to-day's article General Mitchell tells how an Asiatic aërial assault could be made simultaneously upon Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippines with the object of seizing these American possessions."

On the occasion of a visit of the American fleet to San Francisco a local paper published a scare editorial which contained the following paragraph: "*The next war* — and that war may *not be so very far distant*, if we are to believe reports seeping out of Tokyo and Washington — will be a *sea war*. It will be fought *at sea*, by vessels of the navy. To-day, 145 vessels of *war* lie in the bay, aboard which close to 50,000 men are quartered. *There is a reason why this fleet lies* in San Francisco waters *to-day*. That reason will be forthcoming before so many months pass by. In 1914 another great armada lay in the waters of Portsmouth harbor, Great Britain. One month later the world was embarked on its greatest war-making venture. Citizens of San Francisco and the bay cities *should not fail* to realize that the visit of this monster fleet here bears a *significance* that cannot be too strongly impressed upon them. The months that are to come will reveal just at what this article is driving."

In addition to creating suspicion and fear, the militarists find it necessary to warn the public against reliance upon the agencies of peace. A good illustration of this line of argument can be found in the words of Rear Admiral Rodgers: "The popular suggestion for securing peace is by means of treaties, international conferences, and world courts and other diplomatic and economic agreements, which endeavor to anticipate points of friction and, by some preëxisting code of rules, provide for their decision when they occur. It is hoped that the existing rule will be observed in time of great national emotion when people are so moved that they contemplate war. It is a vain hope. We all know that great collective emotions are only restrained by force, not reason. . . . While international arbitral courts can do much to remove minor causes of international friction, it is almost hopeless for us to look for a Permanent Court of International Justice to bestow peace on the world by judicial procedure." Elsewhere the Admiral says:

"The League is a rope of sand. . . . This country is rich and is the envy of other nations. We want for nothing and wrongly attribute to others the same spirit that actuates us. . . . We cannot maintain our leading position in the world as a great, progressive, democratic nation with a popular government unless our armed strength is kept in prompt readiness to defend our riches."

"When the blood rushes to a nation's head," writes an editor who is devoted to preparedness, "and armies are on the march, pledges made not to fight become scraps of paper. Nothing is more futile." This same note of cynicism is revealed in the following editorial from the *Army and Navy Journal*: "The proposal to outlaw war is one of those projects which appeal specially to a nation seeking an object not revealed on first presentation. To the pacifist and unthinking, it has a pleasant tinkling sound foreannouncing the fruition of that wonderful idea of the Brotherhood of Man of which Tennyson sang so sweetly half a century ago. But to the hard-headed, practical statesman who is unwilling to jeopardize the vital interests of America, who is confronted by the specific declaration of the Constitution reserving the war-making power to Congress, and who is indisposed to permit the United States to be drawn into foreign entanglements, it has a harsh, raucous note which cries 'Danger!' We doubt if the Administration will negotiate any such pacts, and if it does — well, the Senate will dispose of them as it did of the League of Nations."

Rear Admiral Fiske, in addressing a very influential audience, recently said: "International law is not law at all; and incalculable harm has been done to our national security by those jurists and statesmen who have made the people believe that it is. The plain fact is that international law is largely international humbug."

It is natural that advocates of armed preparedness, believing as they do that war is inevitable, and being cynical concerning international agencies of peace, should make a determined effort to extend military training in the schools and colleges of the country. Most citizens are unaware of the extraordinary growth of militarism in the educational institutions of the United States. In a period of fifteen years, Federal expenses on military training in

civil schools have increased fifteenfold; the number of institutions giving such training has increased fourfold; the army personnel detailed to conduct this training has increased eighteenfold; the number of students enrolled has increased fourfold. In eighty-six colleges and universities, students are required to take military training for two years if they desire to remain in school. Thus the campaign of armed preparedness is rapidly militarizing our educational institutions.

Thus far, I have attempted to show that modern wars arise out of the suspicions, fears, and enmities generated by nationalism and its prevailing dogmas. I have tried to locate the danger against which the nationalist wants to arm us. I have indicated that the greatest danger is to be found, not beyond our borders, but within our gates. To the militarist of every nation who points the finger of suspicion at this or that foreign people, saying, "Behold your enemy and arm against him," my answer is, "Thou art the enemy!" In the face of this peril, what methods of national defense are likely to be most effective?

My platform for preparedness has five planks. First, a nation-wide campaign of education to remove suspicion, fear, and hatred of other peoples and to increase international understanding and good will. We should have a Department of Peace, with a Secretary of Peace, an adequate staff, and a budget of at least one-sixth of the six hundred millions that we are now spending annually on the current expenses of our army and navy. For one hundred million dollars a year our government could provide for the following: a Department of Peace, with a Secretary of Peace and an adequate staff; ten regional offices in the United States, each with ten regional secretaries; forty foreign offices, each with five foreign secretaries; an editor-in-chief of peace publications and an adequate staff; the free circulation of a million copies of a monthly peace magazine; the free circulation of twelve million copies of peace booklets annually; the distribution of a huge quantity of peace posters; the production of twenty peace moving picture films each year; the free distribution of fifty selected books on international problems to 20,000 libraries; the support of 10,000 American students abroad, and 10,000 foreign students in our colleges and universities; the support of



Drawings by Herbert Rolfe

two hundred American professors abroad, and two hundred foreign professors in this country; the maintenance of an International University, including scholarships for 2,000 students; the maintenance of 1,000 professors of international relations in American colleges and 5,000 such teachers in our high schools; the maintenance of one hundred summer camps and the payment of the camp expenses of 40,000 young men and women each year; the promotion of an annual peace day; the conducting of twenty World Friendship Cruises annually; the erection of peace monuments; and the support of numerous international peace projects. All this for one hundred million dollars a year, as compared with the six hundred millions we spend annually on the army and navy!

My second plank calls for hearty coöperation on the part of our government with other countries in creating and strengthening a peace system through which all international controversies may be settled by pacific means. This system includes conciliation, arbitration, the World Court, international conferences, the Pan-American Union, the League of Nations, and the International Labor Office. Fortunately, our government is in process of negotiating conciliation treaties with most of the countries of the world. These treaties provide for a board of conciliation which is em-

powered to make an investigation and report in any time of crisis and provide for a "cooling off" period of one year, or until after the conciliation report is made. Arbitration treaties are also being negotiated with many nations. The only thing that stands in the way of our entrance into the Permanent Court of International Justice is the Senate's insistence upon the right to veto the giving of an advisory opinion by the Court concerning any question in which we claim an interest. The Pan-American Union, the League of Nations, and the International Labor Office are steadily growing in influence and effectiveness. Hearty coöperation with these agencies would greatly strengthen the prospects for world peace.

My third plank calls for the outlawry and renunciation of war. Fortunately, the Kellogg-Briand treaty has been signed by fifteen nations, and some thirty-five other powers have signified their intention of adhering to it. In the first article of this treaty the signatories renounce war as an instrument of national policy, while in the second article they agree to settle all disputes of whatever origin or nature by some pacific means. It is true that this treaty is accompanied by interpretative notes from the respective governments which go a long way toward nullifying its significance. But it is important to remember that the respective nations are not signing and ratifying these accompanying notes, simply the declaration renouncing war and the agreement to settle all disputes peaceably. If the qualifications were withdrawn and the treaty allowed to mean what it says, war would become an illegal method of attempting to settle international controversies. Law and public opinion would then be on the side of peace.

My fourth plank provides for the abandonment of the use of armed force in other countries. Our government should seek to protect the interests of our citizens in other lands by pacific means but not by armaments. Our citizens should be told that if they go abroad, they must take the risks involved and not expect our government to send marines and gunboats every time there is a riot or rebellion. This new policy would certainly result in some

losses for American citizens abroad, but nothing like as much as the expense involved in maintaining armaments.

My fifth plank calls for disarmament, for the double reason that armaments are not necessary and that they are highly provocative and a chief cause of hostility between nations. I am talking about armies and navies that are maintained for use against other nations. A police force to be used against individual criminals and mobs seems to me to be necessary. It is important, however, to realize the vital distinction between municipal police and a municipal army. It is one thing to maintain policemen to protect society against individual wrongdoers and lawless mobs; it would be an entirely different thing for Boston to send a municipal army against a similar armed body from Portland. Policemen are needed, but there is no corresponding need for municipal soldiers. Moreover, I am strongly convinced that we do not need a national army and navy to safeguard our shores against invasion. Is the strength of the British fleet the reason why we do not invade England? Is the Japanese fleet all that keeps us from seizing Tokyo? Certainly not! Neither is it the American fleet that keeps England or Japan from invading this country. So far as the United States is concerned, the fear of invasion is one of the dangerous delusions created by extreme nationalism.

To summarize my position briefly, there are two kinds of preparedness. I have tried to indicate the inadequacies and perils of the policy of building armaments upon a foundation of suspicion, fear, and cynicism. The programme of preparedness which I have outlined includes disarmament, the outlawry and renunciation of war, the abandonment of armed intervention, a campaign of education to increase international understanding and good will, and the creation and strengthening of an adequate peace system. If our government would devote to this programme even a small fraction of the money and man power now being devoted to armed preparedness, I have no doubt whatever that the American people would be much more likely to maintain security and justice.



The Delusions of Pacifists

by **REAR ADMIRAL BRADLEY A. FISKE**

WE MILITARISTS deplore the evils of war just as much as the pacifists do. We know more than they about the misery, the poverty, the physical and mental torture that war has caused and we are quite as eager to see it prevented in the future. Where we differ with the pacifists is in refusing to believe that disarmament would be a solution. On the contrary, we believe that disarmament as a remedy would be immeasurably worse than the disease.

We base this belief upon the lessons of history. I think I hear the pacifists object: "Oh, we know all about history and the wars of history. You don't need to tell us about them. But history is concerned with the people of distant ages, who were less civilized than we are. The history of ancient times has nothing to do with the present." In other words, the pacifists virtually endorse Henry Ford's famous aphorism, "History is bunk."

The militarists have more respect for history. We hold the past record of mankind to be the only test by which we may predict the probable behavior of mankind in the future. Contrary to the statements of the pacifists, there has been no essential change in the nature of man which could be expected to exempt him from the rules of human conduct that have obtained in the past. History shows that he has not changed, either physically, mentally, morally, or spiritually, since the days of ancient Greece. We doubt, therefore, that he is any more "civilized." Has the twentieth century produced any greater orator than Demosthenes, any greater general, statesman, and lawgiver than Julius Caesar, any greater poet than Homer, any greater sculptor than Praxiteles, any more versatile genius than Leonardo da Vinci? What evidence can the pacifists offer to prove that the intellect and emotions of modern man have reached a higher state than those of past ages?

The fighting instinct was present in the earliest man and in all the stages of his develop-

ment it has not disappeared. The use of armed force has always been a necessary adjunct of property — either for its seizure or its protection. Doubtless as soon as the primitive savages acquired possessions — such as wives, children, food, and shelter — they found that they had to fight to protect them from theft by other savages. Later, when tribes were formed and villages built, each tribe arranged for the coöperative protection of its property as a whole against the inroads of other marauding tribes. Eventually the villages grew into walled cities, protected by soldiers, and then the cities banded together in nations. In every instance an armed force was necessary, for the same reason that a modern bank has to build walls around the money deposited in it.

As long as the nations maintained their armaments, they were able to resist outside attacks and live in security and peace. But as the nations grew wealthy they came to abhor war, and for that reason refused to keep up their armaments. The barbarians were lying in wait for them, and as soon as they saw signs of weakness and neglect, invaded and overthrew them. By means of adequate armament, Egypt maintained her greatness for over four thousand years — a far longer period than any other nation can boast. She rose to wealth and greatness by a combination of industry and intelligence, under armed protection; but with wealth came decadence, inadequate armament, and a terrible ruin. Greece, Carthage, Rome, and Constantinople fell in the same manner.

In more recent history, it has been plain that the nations which have been most careful in keeping up their armaments have nearly always been the ones that have achieved the most in civilization and prosperity. Do I hear some pacifist insisting that the history of Germany is just the reverse — that Germany tried the armament scheme and went down in the dust? Let me point out that Germany could not have been dragged down if she had not first climbed