

civilians - there is no weapon that can be used to weaken the morale of the other side that will not be used, that is just as important in modern warfare as destroying armies. In the old days war was not so bad, when you could put an army of one country against an army of another and they fought it ~~xxx~~ out in a hand to hand struggle until they killed each other - that was not so bad, it was not even a bad thing from an economic point of view if a nation was a little over-populated to destroy a few of them in that way, in the old times war was rather a fine thing, there was a certain amount of chivalry about it, about a hand to hand struggle, the best man won, it was a matter of his own personal courage and initiative, and in those days, too, a man could be kind to his foes sometimes; but ~~the~~ war now is rid of all that sort of thing, nations now are just using all the arts they ever knew and all the science they have mastered to destroy, and will continue to do it, it is no use saying in future that you must not use poison gas - they WILL use it; or you must not spread disease germs - they WILL. The stakes are so high. And I do not blame them. It may sound a terribly cruel thing and may be wrong and maybe one should not say it, but it is just this: if you are going to have war you cannot circumscribe the conditions under which war is going to be fought, it is no use saying you must not have civilians killed, you must not have submarine warfare, you must not destroy hospital ships or ~~bomb~~ hospitals. They WILL. You can't say bombs must not be dropped on undefended towns; they WILL be dropped, and the people who live in the back of countries are going to be killed just the same as those near the war zone. (paint a horrible picture of what the next war will be like.

5. The nations have agreed not to use war as an instrument of national policy. But how honest are they? Just how well are they keeping their agreement? That's another matter; but if they are at all honest, if they are not a lot of hypocrites (and if they ARE hypocrites there is not much hope for anything and they might as well have done with it and destroy the race, because it is not worth preserving) But if they are not hypocrites let them be honest. IF WE ARE NOT GOING TO USE WAR AS AN INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY WHY DO WE WANT TO ARM?

7. Perhaps you can't disarm entirely, it may be you can't disarm at all at the present time with war going on in Manchuria and certain nations of Europe on the verge of revolution and the situation not clear even on this continent, -but at least there ought to be some possibility of reducing arms and this horrible drain of money spent on armament each year. At least we would have some relief from the burden of taxation that is responsible for the unhappiness and worry and distress. It is hard to estimate the effect on the English people when they know that out of every pound they have to pay the biggest part of the pound in taxation