

Do We Really Want
World War III —
*The War That Will End
The World?*

Address of CYRUS EATON
Chairman of the Board
Chesapeake and Ohio Railway

At Meeting of The City Club of Cleveland
Cleveland, Ohio
Saturday, December 13, 1958

*I*N THIS CHRISTMAS SEASON, during which our tradition calls on us to place special stress upon peace on earth and goodwill toward men, I should like to have you consider with me what we can do to check our headlong rush toward World War III.

Day by day, the overwhelming majority of our politicians, our generals and our journalists are relentlessly driving us toward war. This truculent trinity heedlessly fans the flames of blind hatred against the communist world, while blatantly beating the drums for ever bigger expenditures for armaments. Obviously we cannot continue to pursue this belligerent course long without, at the least, bankrupting ourselves or, at the worst, committing nuclear suicide.

Let us face the dreadful facts. Our nation is currently spending some \$50,000,000,000 annually for what is labeled "defense." The cloak of military secrecy hides the exact nature of much of this fantastic expenditure from the eyes of the citizens who must bear the crushing tax burden for it. Nevertheless, there is no concealing the rueful truth that, between the weapons stockpiles of the capitalist world and the communist world, enough hydrogen and atom bombs now exist not only to blow every city off the map, but actually to annihilate all humanity.

A single hydrogen bomb, mind you, possesses sufficient destructive power to wipe out the city of

Cleveland and its inhabitants. What is more, despite the solemn civil defense exercises that were conducted in Cleveland last week, there is no defense, civil or military, against modern nuclear weapons. Civil defense must be labeled, however regretfully, a farce.

The War to End War

Before we permit ourselves to be plunged into the flaming pit of World War III, let us take a long look backward at World Wars I and II, and review the painful lessons we should have learned from them. Few who are alive today recall the causes of World War I, and we need not go into them now. I will remind you, however, that President Woodrow Wilson came here to Cleveland and made a speech, during which I vividly recall him saying that our reason for entering the war was to make the world safe for democracy, and that this was to be the war to end war. I will also remind you that World War I witnessed internecine warfare between the most completely civilized and Christian of nations, who were not divided by differences of ideology, religious, economic, or philosophical. Half a dozen men could have gathered around a table and settled the issues at dispute in a few hours, but we went at each other's throats like dogs instead, in a battle to the death.

The War to End German Military Might

Three decades later, democracy had disappeared from a number of the nations that had formerly embraced it, and the world again went to war. Our entry into World War II was again based on high principle, this time that we intended to make sure that Germany's military might was ended for all time.

If you read the boastful memoirs of the generals and admirals, especially those on our side, in World Wars I and II, you cannot escape a sense of horror at the cold-blooded manner in which military leaders sacrifice men for their own glory. And precious little else is accomplished by armed conflict. Thirty of my relatives took part in World War I, my only brother

among them, and he received the disabilities that later cost his life. Participating in World War II were scores of members of my family, including both of my sons and six of my nephews. Two nephews were killed in action, one on his 65th bombing mission over Germany, just before he was to be furloughed home to Canada. Instead he lies buried in Germany, where his family has elected to leave him as their small personal gesture toward international understanding. In this nuclear age, all of my 13 grandchildren, the four girls and nine boys alike, would no doubt be counted casualties in World War III.

Preparing for the War to End the World

The folly and futility of war are borne in upon us, when we find that the fearful price we pay in lives lost and property destroyed fails to purchase even a fraction of the noble ends for which we fight. We won both World War I and World War II, but we lost the peace. Thirteen years after the world's first two atom bombs put a final end to World War II, we find ourselves rearming Germany at our own expense, and even planning to place deadly nuclear weapons in her hands. Actually, we are insisting on German rearmament, and the West German government is unable to resist the constant and heavy pressure of our government on this score. German business leaders have told me of their alarm over the reawakening of the old military spirit that brought such tragedy in the past.

The rearmament of Germany is but one small facet of our military preparations, however. Getting ready for World War III has become the chief pre-occupation of our government, not just our generals. We are constantly told that this way lies the only solution to our rivalries with the Soviets.

The warlike exhortations from Washington are reported so frequently and prominently on page one that the angry face of our Secretary of State, for one, has become more familiar to the public than the most glamorous countenance of any cover girl. These official

utterances are swiftly followed by inflammatory editorials, reeking of bravado with their dire threats of slaughter to the Soviets. Not only is this constant clamor courting the destruction of our lives and our material achievements, but it is also leading us to the abandonment of our most cherished principles of freedom of thought and freedom of expression. By an ironic twist, the further we depart from our ideals and traditions, the louder Dulles and his editorial claque claim nobility for our people and perfection for our institutions.

Is This the Beginning of Our Decline and Fall?

All governments go through periods of folly. But ours has gone to such an extreme that the question arises whether this is but a brief interlude or the beginning of the decline and fall. We need an objective reappraisal of ourselves and of our systems of philosophy and government.

Man, we must remember, is born into the world the most completely ignorant and the most completely helpless of all living creatures. The philosophy he embraces, like the language he speaks, is largely an accident of birth. What one man calls religion, another considers superstition. However different and however strange the beliefs of others, can anyone arrogate to himself the decision to exterminate them with atom and hydrogen bombs? The most extreme systems can exist side by side, I believe, if no attempt is made by violent means for exclusive dominance by any of them.

America has become an economic and military giant, but we are still in our swaddling clothes in diplomacy and international relations. I feel impelled to predict that unless the administration, in the year and a half ahead, adopts a more mature and more productive foreign program than the present game of gigantic bluff, the Republican Party is headed for another 20 years in the wilderness such as followed the financial and economic debacle of the 1930's.

Let us turn now to take a look at Soviet Russia, the modern world's other economic and military giant. I shall mention only briefly my recent visit there, since I have already discoursed at some length on this subject to audiences here and in Washington, Kansas City and Detroit.

Forty Years of Russian Progress

In 40 years under communism, the Soviets have accomplished prodigious feats of industrial and intellectual progress. I, a confirmed capitalist, could never subscribe to their system, but neither can I shut my eyes to the obvious fact that the Russian people are thoroughly and enthusiastically sold on it.

The Soviets have done a good job of making manual work respectable. Their newspapers feature photographs, not of society people, but of healthy and happy working men and women, enjoying their work and rejoicing in it. Every day pictures appear of workers on the farm, in the mine, on the railroad, in the factory, from every part of their vast country.

At the same time, the Soviets have also devoted close attention to cultivation of the intellect of their people. This year of the sputnik has provided the final proof to sceptical critics of the Soviets that Russia now boasts some of the world's most brilliant scientists and mathematicians. I believe she is also bound to produce equally great historians and philosophers who will subject all systems, including their own, to searching analysis.

I found the Russian people friendly and eager for peace, and I do not believe those feelings were feigned for the benefit of visitors. From my meeting with Premier Khrushchev, other government officials and leaders of industry, finance, journalism, science and agriculture, I came away convinced that Russia wants peace, and that it can be attained if there are concessions on both sides.

A Realistic Plan for USA - USSR Understanding

Of the many interesting ideas that Mr. Khrushchev imparted during our 90-minute discussion, one stands out in my mind as the world's brightest hope for peace. If by some means, he said, genuine cooperation and understanding could be created between the Soviet Union and the United States, if these two most powerful nations the world has ever seen could come to work together in harmony, all of the political disturbances in every other part of the world would be adjusted by compromise and peaceful means, instead of becoming the occasion for fomenting renewed bitterness and hatred between the USA and USSR. Both of these giant nations are so extensive geographically and so richly endowed in natural resources that neither needs have much incentive to impose on other countries. If the two giants agree, the rest of the world will pose no major problem. This suggestion, I believe, is realistic and, I repeat, offers promise of a workable peace.

As our statesmen and journalists fulminate against the Russians, so do theirs against us. The presence of our missile and bomber sites on the nearby lands of our NATO allies makes it difficult for the Russians to believe that we harbor no hostility toward the Soviet Union.

Let us remember that Russia has been invaded in every century and by every one of its neighbors, as well as by some who are not its neighbors. In this century, Russia has been invaded by Japan, Germany and Austria, as well as England, France, the United States, Poland and Bulgaria, who all sent in forces after Russia embarked on the revolution. The Russians can be expected to maintain troops in nations at their border as long as we ring them with our bases, and as long as our propaganda seeks to overthrow their government and stir up their neighbors against them.

This propaganda has become a prime weapon of the cold war. In every country, it is now considered

necessary to secure national solidarity and to influence foreign thinking by holding the enemy up to scorn and hatred. To the cruelty and carnage of war, there has been added the blight of subsidized prejudice in times of uneasy peace.

German Rearmament Anathema to Russia

What most terrifies Russia is our rearmament of West Germany. While Russia and Germany were on opposite sides in World Wars I and II, 30,000,000 Russian people were killed and her major cities were devastated. That we should restore the lethal sword to Germany's empty scabbard has shaken the Soviets to their heels. Certainly one of the strongest influences that holds the Russians together in blind support of their government and their system is the threat of attack by other nations.

In the rearmament of Germany, as in most of our other foreign policies, we seem to be asking, almost begging for trouble. This, I am certain, can be mainly blamed on the insane fanaticism of John Foster Dulles who, by default, has been permitted to dictate American policy for an uninterrupted period of six years without let or hindrance from any quarter. In his every decision and declamation, Dulles demonstrates that he so detests communism that he would rather have the human race exterminated than permit communism to continue to exist.

Since Dulles never misses an opportunity to publish his warped opinions, the record is replete with his resounding and irresponsible pronouncements. His repeated verbal efforts to stir the satellites to rebellion, with the promise that we would assist in freeing them from Russian influence, stand as stark hypocrisy. We have never been in a position, nor did we ever intend to provide the satellites with anything but moral support.

Dulles, the Frenetic Fanatic

I invite you to read the speech that Dulles made in San Francisco a week ago. The Secretary still clings

righteously to the threadbare belief that the discredited and corrupt Chiang Kai-shek regime, which we have sustained on Formosa at fantastic cost to the American taxpayer, will ultimately resume the mantle of leadership on the mainland. True, the Secretary no longer prates of unleashing Chiang for a forceable invasion to put down the People's Republic and its 600,000,000 citizens. But listen to these frenetic San Francisco utterances:

"It is certain that diplomatic recognition of the Chinese communist regime would gravely jeopardize the political, the economic and the security interests of the United States." America must be far advanced in its dotage if such a dire fate would overtake us from realistic recognition of the world's most populous nation, which is rapidly emerging as a major industrial power, despite our official disapproval.

"If we were to grant political recognition to the Chinese communist regime, it would be a well-nigh mortal blow to the survival of the non-communist governments in the far east." What, pray, is the largest non-communist government in the far east? None other than India, the world's second most populous nation, which long since has recognized the People's Republic of China. Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma and Indonesia have also accorded their recognition so that little remains of continental Asia to be engulfed by the horrendous devastation that Dulles invisions. Japan, I am sure, would also have granted recognition by now were it not for adamant opposing pressure from Dulles.

India Unintimidated by Dulles

India, incidentally, is one nation that does not hesitate to take exception to the loose loquaciousness of our Secretary. To Dulles' recent remark in London that, far from being indifferent to the threat of communism, India is fighting it, Prime Minister Nehru subsequently rejoined from New Delhi that India is "not fighting against capitalism or communism or any other ism. We adopt any good feature (from any

country) whenever we consider it proper for India."

I was impressed with the Indian diplomats whom I met on my European trip. Ambassador Menon in Moscow must be ranked a great scholar and historian as well as an able diplomat. Equally outstanding is Madame Pandit, Ambassador to the Court of St. James. Both keep in close touch with their diplomatic colleagues from all countries, including communist China. In Moscow and London, I also met the Chinese ambassadors, and I found them exceptionally competent men. To our loss, our ambassadors are not permitted to have contact with the Chinese representatives except, as Dulles confessed in San Francisco, when we consider it "expedient."

In our own naivete, we tend to forget that India's civilization and culture belongs to the ages, and that she has produced many profound philosophers and scholars over the centuries. An Indian savant whom I saw in Austria gave me grounds for sober reflection on American brashness, when he reminded me that, a hundred years ago, we Americans were sending Christian missionaries to India, to try to teach their people that the world was created in the year 4004 B. C. on October 23rd at 9:00 A. M. While the people of India treated our well-meaning if aggressive missionaries with polite tolerance, they did not yield up their conviction that the world has existed for billions of years, a conclusion to which our American scientists have only latterly subscribed. To comprehend the tremendous scientific developments of recent years, let alone understanding all that is going on in the modern world, of course, demands a breadth of knowledge that few can command.

Recognition of Red China Coming

The matter of Chinese recognition will not be downed, despite our Secretary's stubbornness. Canada has been doing business with the People's Republic, but has been withholding recognition largely in deference to Dulles. This week, however, our northern neighbor's

Secretary of State for External Affairs, Sidney Smith, has indicated that Canada will soon follow the example of England and some 30 other nations that have already recognized Red China.

At home, the very ground was almost cut out from under the Secretary's feet three weeks ago, when the World Order Study Conference of his cherished National Council of the Churches of Christ adopted a strong stand for American recognition of the People's Republic of China. To add to the Secretary's chagrin, this action was taken by the Conference in Cleveland, after the Secretary had come here to address the group.

Foreign Policy by Default

Earlier I referred to the disastrous Dulles domination of our foreign policies as the product of default. That default runs right through practically the whole roster of men the American people have elected to federal office, from the President to members of the Senate and the House, Republicans and Democrats alike. The catchword "bi-partisan foreign policy" has led to almost complete bi-partisan default. With a few striking exceptions, the newspapers of the nation have become ensnared in the same trap. And the greatest and most glaring default must, I think, be laid to America's industrial leaders.

The 98 heads of our largest corporations exercise as potent influence in the economic sphere as do the 98 Senators on the political scene. Were these business leaders to urge an accommodation with the communist world, our government would have but small choice to change its intransigent policy. Far from raising our voices in protest, most of us capitalists, on the contrary, have remained conspicuously silent and allowed the world to believe that we condone preparations for World War III in favor of profits from defense contracts. I suggest that the time has come for the capitalists to speak up, and for the leaders of labor and agriculture to add strong voices to the chorus.

Encouraging Signs on the International Scene

Against the gloomy picture I have felt obliged to paint, a few encouraging glimmers can be observed on the international scene. In contrast to our official policy of regarding Soviet Russia and Red China as almost completely barbarous and backward countries, for instance, some North Americans are beginning to get at least an inkling of the substantial achievements and the immense potentialities of these two top communist countries.

Three important delegations of specialists who have recently visited the Soviets have come home to issue thoughtful reports of Russian industrial and intellectual advances. I only wish each member of my audience would obtain and study copies of the printed papers published by the electric power group, of which Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company's Elmer Lindseth was a member; the educational delegation, in which participated Keith Glennan, now on leave from Case Institute of Technology to head the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and the iron and steel group, of which Earle Smith of Republic Steel Corporation and Irwin Such of Steel Magazine were delegates.

Prominent Americans Get Firsthand View of Soviets

Other prominent Americans who have lately gone to Russia to get a firsthand view, have included Senator Hubert Humphrey, Adlai Stevenson and Eleanor Roosevelt, Democrats all, it may be noted. Unfortunately, no one of any authority representing the Republican administration has deigned to make the trip. Secretary of Agriculture Benson had been slated to go, but backed out on second thought. This absence of administration visitors, along with the lack of real authority and influence of the American Embassy in Moscow, leaves a regrettable gap in the chain of understanding between the USA and the USSR.

We citizens of the United States are proscribed by our Secretary of State from traveling to the People's Republic of China. We have reliable and up-to-date testimony of the tremendous advances there, however, in the written reports of such eminent and reliable Canadians as James Muir, head of the Royal Bank of Canada, and Dr. J. T. Wilson, president of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics.

Pugwash Scientists Set Pattern for International Agreement

Another hopeful sign can be detected in the ability of scientists, almost alone of all segments of society, to come together amicably from both sides of the iron and bamboo curtains, and to reach an agreement on the need for an accommodation between east and west. I am proud to have had some small part in the three Pugwash Conferences of Nuclear Scientists, the latest of which brought together 80 top brains from 22 eastern and western countries in Austria in September. Because many of these men have played key roles in the nuclear revolution, they well realize that the nuclear arms race must be regarded as the greatest evil of history. They are striving to make their fellow men and their governments realize, as Bertrand Russell has so dramatically phrased it, that the only possibilities before mankind are peace by agreement or peace by universal death.

At San Francisco last week, Dulles embroidered again on the old theme that we must have vast retaliatory power and the will to use it. He also exhibited his perennial wishful hankering for communism to crumble from its own supposed inner weaknesses.

In this advanced nuclear age, I submit, the concept of massive retaliation has become massive nonsense. If the arms race continues, and if both we and the Russians persist in our present military strategy, sooner or later total war with mutual annihilation will result, probably over some issue of no vital importance to either side.

Peace Requires U. S. Acknowledgement of Soviet and Chinese Progress

As for the prospect of communism toppling from its own inherent flaws, this is a delusion to which some subscribed at the inception of the Russian revolution forty years ago, but communism has flourished increasingly the while. If there is to be peace, we must adjust ourselves to the economic, scientific and military success of the Soviet Union and to the immense progress of the People's Republic of China. Whether we like it or not, both nations exercise substantial influence in the world.

The paramount issue of our times is war or peace. The longer we delay an accommodation with the communists, the greater the likelihood of war, and if war is miraculously averted, the more costly and painful the eventual settlement will be. In any case, compromises will have to be made on both sides, and although the settlement reached will not be entirely satisfactory to either side, it will be preferable to the complete extinction of mankind and all his works.

Martyrdom of Man vs. the Golden Age

To the question I have raised, do we really want World War III, I feel sure that everyone who truly loves the earth and the fullness thereof will join me in answering with an emphatic no. Modern science, the highest product of man's genius, holds out the possibility alike of degradation of the human species or of the Golden Age, in which all material wants can be satisfied. I hope that my fellow industrialists, along with the leaders of labor and agriculture, the intellectuals and the moralists, will all join in an insistent crusade to avert the unnecessary martyrdom of man and to lead him instead to the lofty heights of which he is capable at his finest and best.