

The History of the Twentieth Century

Episode 108

“This Isn’t War!”

Transcript

[music: Fanfare]

In April 1915, an international conference of women convened in The Hague as part of a non-governmental women’s initiative to find an end to the Great War.

In a bitter historical irony, even as the hopeful conferees were on their way to their meeting, a terrible new weapon was unleashed, just across the border in Belgium, changing the nature of the Great War, changing the nature of war itself.

Welcome to *The History of the Twentieth Century*.

[music: Opening War Theme]

Episode 108. This Isn’t War!

We’ve talked before on the podcast about the women’s suffrage movement in the United Kingdom and in the United States. But the movement was international in scope. At a conference in Berlin in 1904, the International Women’s Suffrage Alliance was formed, with representatives from many Western countries, including the then 84-year old Susan B. Anthony from the United States. Also from the US was Carrie Chapman Catt, a suffrage movement leader who would be instrumental in the fight for women’s right to vote in the United States and go on to found the League of Women Voters. The British suffragist leader Millicent Fawcett was there, too—we have already met her in this podcast. And there was the German feminist Anita Augspurg, who held a law degree but could not practice law in Germany because women weren’t permitted to become lawyers at that time. Augspurg was famous—maybe I should say notorious—for her advocacy of complete equality between women and men in the German legal system, including a revision of the German Empire’s marriage laws. She condemned the German marriage laws of the time as effectively a form of legal prostitution, a position which certainly raised a lot of eyebrows, as did her long-term and not-very-secret romantic relationship with fellow feminist Lida Gustave Heymann.

There were also representatives from Norway, Australia, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire who participated in the establishment of the Alliance. The Alliance organized a number of international conferences on women’s issues in 1906, 1908,

1909, 1911, and 1913. By the time of the Great War, one of the most prominent international suffrage advocates was a Jewish Hungarian feminist known in the English-speaking world as Rosika Schwimmer. In 1913, she was elected Secretary of the Alliance, which was by then headquartered in London. When the war began in 1914, she found herself isolated in Britain and unable to return home. She became a peace activist and toured the United States in the autumn of 1914, calling on America to sponsor an international conference to end the war.

We've already met the militant British suffragettes Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughter Sylvia, who formed the more radical Women's Social and Political Union, which advocated breaking the law in support of the campaign for voting rights for women. I should note that Emmeline had two other daughters, Christabel and Adela, who were also part of their mother's movement. When the Great War broke out, Emmeline Pankhurst judged winning the war against Germany the highest priority, and the Women's Social and Political Union, which Emmeline ruled with an iron fist, agreed to suspend its campaign of civil disobedience until the war was concluded. Christabel, her eldest daughter, agreed with this decision, but Sylvia and Adela, who had also become socialists and pacifists, broke with their mother and campaigned for an end to the war.

In early 1915, the Germans Anita Augspurg and her lover Lida Heymann, in conjunction with the Jewish-Dutch feminist Aletta Jacobs, who by the way was also the first woman physician in the Netherlands—organized an International Congress of Women, to be held in The Hague beginning on April 28, to discuss ways of achieving a peaceful resolution of the Great War. Prominent feminists and pacifist women were invited from belligerent nations on both sides, as well as neutral nations.

Sylvia and Adela Pankhurst were invited to go, along with 178 other British feminists and peace activists, including peace activist Charlotte Despard who, in a delightful historical irony, was the big sister of Sir John French, currently the commander of the British Expeditionary Force in France. Emmeline Pankhurst was beside herself, telling a journalist, "It is unthinkable that Englishwomen should meet German women to discuss terms of peace while the husbands, sons, and brothers of those women...are murdering our men." The British press dismissed the conference as a "pow-wow with the fraus."

The British Foreign Office would only grant passports to 20 of the 180 British invitees, and even they were turned back at the last minute when it was decided that the North Sea was too dangerous to permit the trip. Three British peace activists did attend the conference, including Emily Hobhouse, whom we have also already met; these three women only managed to attend because they were already out of the country and beyond the reach of the Foreign Office. Two Canadian and five Belgian women rounded out the Allied delegation at the conference. There were 28 German delegates, nine Hungarians, and six Austrian women from the Central Powers, as well as delegates from the Netherlands, the United States, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Italy.

In a less delightful historical irony, on April 22, 1915, less than a week before the women's conference opened, and less than 100 miles away, at the Belgian town of Ypres, the horrors of the Great War suddenly became even more horrible.

[music: *Four Pieces for Clarinet and Piano*]

I talked about the First Battle of Ypres back in episode 92. Well, hang onto your hats, because the Second Battle of Ypres is coming, but first let me pause to touch on the subject of the name of this town. I mostly used the pronunciation "Iper" back in episode 92. That's the Flemish name for the town, and since Iper lies in the Flemish part of Belgium, that's actually what most of the folks who live there call their home.

I got some pushback on that from a listener who found it annoying, and I have to concede that English speakers usually call the town by its French name, Ypres. That's largely because of the Great War, when the British and French were fighting side-by-side in the trenches. I don't want to confuse anyone into thinking that Iper and Ypres are two different places; they aren't. On the other hand, there's something inside me that rebels at the suggestion that an English speaking person is obligated to call a Flemish town by its French name because...I don't even know why. I don't even call Paris by its French name, and Paris is actually in France, although I do sometimes try to give French place names their proper French pronunciations, with mixed results as you know.

So I've decided on a compromise. When I talk about Iper the town, I'm going to call it Iper. When I talk about the battles of the Great War, I'll say Ypres, because that's what the other English-language histories do. I hope that helps. You know, I could also call it "Wipers," which is the only half-joking name the British Tommies gave it back in the day.

We saw the Germans begin an offensive there in the autumn of 1914, in one last effort to push back the Belgian and British forces near the North Sea coast. That offensive failed, leaving the Allies holding a salient containing the town of Ypres, the only Belgian town of any size still in Allied hands. The Allies are going to pay dearly to retain control of this strip of ground, and the first payment is about to come due.

In the spring of 1915, the Germans began an offensive in the East against the Russians, which we talked about in episode 101. A week before the beginning of that offensive, on April 22, 1915, the Germans began a diversionary offensive in the West to distract the Allies from the coming attack in the East. And since the Germans didn't have enough troops in the West to get a proper offensive going, they again relied on technology to make up for lack of numbers.

So I have to pause here for a moment to talk about Fritz Haber. Fritz Haber was a Jewish German born in 1868 in Breslau in what was then Prussian Silesia, but today would be Poland. In 1891, at the age of 23, he received his doctorate in chemistry. His father Siegfried owned and operated a company that manufactured pigments and dyes and Fritz went to work there for a

time, but he and his old man didn't get on, and so Fritz went into academia. He converted to Lutheranism, probably to improve his chances of getting an academic appointment, and in 1894 he became a professor at the University of Karlsruhe.

In 1901, Fritz Haber married Clara Immerwahr. He was 30 at the time, she 29. Like Fritz, Clara was born into a Jewish German family in Breslau, but converted to Lutheranism. She also earned a doctorate in chemistry; hers came from the University of Breslau, where she was the first woman to earn a doctorate from that institution.

Given how unusual this was for the time, it won't surprise you when I tell you she too was a German feminist. She and Fritz had one child together, a son named Hermann, born in 1902. It was very difficult for a woman to pursue a career in science at this time; recall Marie Curie's struggles that we talked about in episode 9. Clara assisted Fritz in his work, helping him write his papers and translate them into English. She got no credit for this, and by all accounts the marriage soured in a few years. Clara described her husband as "oppressive" and "ruthless."

But it was during his time at the University of Karlsruhe that Fritz Haber made his most enduring contribution to science: an economical method of manufacturing ammonia in large quantities. He did his theoretical work at Karlsruhe, then left in 1911 to further develop the process at the German chemical company BASF along with fellow chemist Carl Bosch. In 1913, just before the war began, BASF began producing ammonia in industrial quantities.

Haber's method, the Haber Process, or sometimes the Haber-Bosch Process, is still in use today, and it would earn Fritz Haber the 1918 Nobel Prize in Chemistry.

The Haber Process uses natural gas, from which the hydrogen atoms are released, and combines these with atmospheric nitrogen to produce ammonia, NH_3 . Previously, ammonia could only be derived from natural sources, or from processes that were much more labor and energy intensive.

Cheap and plentiful ammonia is useful in a number of ways. The most important is that ammonia solutions can be used as a fertilizer, or further processed into nitrates, which are even more useful as fertilizers. Ammonia in water makes a handy cleaning solution and it kills germs, so it can be used as an antimicrobial agent. Ammonia was at this time the principal chemical used as a refrigerant in refrigeration systems, and will be for another fifteen years or so, until it is replaced by chlorofluorocarbons. Ships and railroad cars with refrigerated storage were already revolutionizing food production and distribution, and that revolution is going to continue and accelerate throughout the twentieth century.

But the biggest impact of the sudden availability of cheap and plentiful ammonia was in further processing it into nitrates. Methods for converting ammonia into nitrates were already known, so now, nitrates are also going to become cheap and plentiful. Nitrates make even better fertilizers than ammonia alone, which is important because European agriculture was becoming increasingly intensive and dependent on fertilizers by the early twentieth century.

Previously, only naturally occurring nitrates were economical for use as fertilizer. Among these natural sources of nitrates were guano, which we already talked about in episode 103, and nitrate deposits from the Atacama Desert in northern Chile. Since these nitrates are water soluble, the only places you're likely to find them are places that are very dry. The Atacama Desert region had once been divided between Chile and its neighbor Bolivia, but after the 1879 War of the Pacific, Bolivia lost its coastal region, and Chile gained exclusive control over the only significant nitrate mineral deposits in the world.

Nitrates were a crucial Chilean export in the early twentieth century, which accounts for the interest both Britain and Germany have shown in that country. But thanks to Fritz Haber, industrial quantities of nitrates can now be manufactured anywhere, which is unfortunate for Chile, since it will deprive her of a good source of export revenue, but will be great news for farmers all over the world. The rest of the twentieth century will see dramatically increasing crop yields worldwide, which will in turn allow for a rapid increase in the planet's population.

There's something borderline mystical, even miraculous, in the idea of manufacturing fertilizers that can be used to feed starving multitudes literally out of thin air. The BBC captured the poetry of this in their 2001 radio play on the life of Fritz Haber, titling it *Bread from the Air, Gold from the Sea*. The second part of that title, by the way, refers to the extraction of gold from seawater, which was another area of industrial chemistry Fritz Haber pioneered. And he found a way to do it; unfortunately, it was not economical.

But there's something else nitrates are good for, besides making farms more productive. Do you know what that is? Munitions and explosives. Saltpeter, which is potassium nitrate, is a component of gunpowder, and in the early twentieth century, manufacturers of arms, munitions, and explosives were dependent on natural sources of nitrates like those deposits in Chile, but Fritz Haber had also made it possible to manufacture ammunition out of thin air.

And so, ironically, the Haber Process would lead to the deaths of millions of people, even as it sustains the lives of billions of others. Germany exhausted its stockpiles of nitrates in early 1915 and couldn't get any more of them because of that British blockade. That should have been the end of the war right there. But it wasn't, because the Haber Process provided the German war machine with a new source of munitions, allowing the war to continue for a further three and a half years of death and misery and precipitate a collapse of the existing world order.

That is a pretty big historical irony, that the man who discovered how to make bread out of air also discovered how to keep the bloodshed going for years after it should naturally have ended. But if you like historical ironies, well, keep listening, because Fritz Haber isn't done messing with you yet.

When the war began, Fritz Haber became an ardent German patriot. He was one of 93 German intellectuals to sign a manifesto in October 1914 defending the fatherland against Allied accusations of war crimes in Belgium. By this time, the German Chief of Staff, Erich von

Falkenhayn, was already directing the German war ministry to investigate the feasibility of gas warfare. And the war ministry turned to Germany's most prominent chemist, Fritz Haber.

The German military spent time experimenting with artillery shells designed to deliver poison gas in a targeted way, but the results of these experiments were not promising. You have to deliver a large quantity of gas onto an enemy position to make the attack work—we're talking about quantities in the tons here—and that's not easy. In the early months of the war, both sides experimented with using artillery shells to deliver tear gas into enemy positions, but this method couldn't deliver enough of the gas quickly enough to raise the concentration to a level that would have a military effect. Some of those early experiments were so feeble that the enemy units being shelled didn't even realize that their enemy was trying to gas them.

Fritz Haber suggested that chlorine gas might make a good weapon. The production of chlorine gas in industrial quantities had been possible since 1892, more than twenty years ago, by electrolysis of ordinary salt, which is sodium chloride. Salt is available practically anywhere, so if you have access to electricity, you have access to chlorine gas. Commercially, chlorine was and is used for bleaching, cleaning, and as a disinfectant.

Haber proposed, rather than attempt to deliver chlorine gas by artillery shells, that a large number of cylinders of chlorine gas be carried to the front, and then their valves opened at a time when the wind was blowing toward the enemy trenches.

The German Army tried this for the first time on April 22, at what will come to be known as the Second Battle of Ypres. Over five thousand gas cylinders were carried or dragged to the front lines by the soldiers themselves, in secret, and over 170 tons of chlorine gas were released.

Over on the other side of no-man's land were two French divisions. One was a colonial unit from Algeria; the other was a Territorial unit. These soldiers were not the cream of the French Army in terms of training or equipment or experience. They looked over the tops of their parapets and saw a strange cloud of gray-green mist wafting toward them. The wind favored the Germans that day and it blew the gas directly into the Allied line. The soldiers there noticed first, a stinging in the eyes and nose, then in the throat, and then a burning sensation in the chest.

Chlorine gas dissolves in water, forming acidic compounds, including hydrochloric acid. So when the gas came in contact with wet human tissue, it formed acids that ate away at soldiers' eyes and lungs. Chlorine is heavier than air, so it tended to pour down into the trenches, doing the most harm to soldiers sitting or lying down inside them, especially the wounded. Soldiers who stood up, or climbed out of the trenches, could avoid the worst of the gas, but of course this exposed them to conventional weapon fire.

For these soldiers, on this particular day, the world's first large-scale gas attack was a nameless and mysterious terror. They could not know what was happening to them. They knew only the sudden agony in the delicate tissues of their eyes and noses, the burning sensation in their chests

as chemicals ate at them from within, and at last, the coughing up of blood and fluid and the frothing, until they resembled rabid animals.

Many of the soldiers broke and fled. They could not know it, but that was a terrible mistake. The chlorine cloud blew past the trench and on to the west; those who fled were merely keeping themselves inside the densest part of the cloud, exposing themselves all over again.

The gas attack of April 22 blew open a mile-wide gap in the Allied line. Here was the opportunity Falkenhayn had been looking for since he took command of the German Army last September. But he couldn't take advantage of it. The German armies in the west were short on men, artillery, and ammunition. Everything had been directed east for the offensive against the Russians. In fact, the success of the gas attack was almost as big a surprise to the Germans as it was to the French. A properly prepared offensive right here, right now, might have broken the Allied line. But the Germans weren't ready.

Immediately to the right of the opening in the line was the newly-arrived First Canadian Division. They and the British Second Army, under the command of General Horace Smith-Dorrien were able to hold the line, albeit with heavy casualties. What we now call the Second Battle of Ypres would go on for another four weeks. The Germans would succeed in pushing the Allied line back a couple of miles, reducing the size of the salient and capturing ridges overlooking the town. German soldiers never would march into Ypres—not in this war, anyway—but from the positions they captured in this battle, they would be able to pound the town with artillery until it was virtually obliterated. If you want to go to the podcast Twitter page, @History20th, I'm currently using a panoramic photograph of the town of Ypres during the Great War for the banner. You can see for yourself what German artillery did to the town.

German casualties in the Second Battle of Ypres amounted to about 35,000. Allied casualties were over 60,000. This figure includes casualties from the gas as well as casualties from BEF Commander Sir John French's ill-advised attempts to counterattack against the Germans. Whether the rubble of what used to be Ypres was worth so much sacrifice was a fair question, but when General Smith-Dorrien recommended withdrawing from the salient and abandoning the town, he was sacked by Sir John French for his cheek.

[music: *Four Pieces for Clarinet and Piano*]

The use of poison gas in warfare shocked the Allies and shocked the world. The British War Minister, Lord Kitchener heard the news of the attack and exclaimed, "This isn't war!" Poisonous chemicals had been banned at the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, though that wouldn't stop both sides from continuing to use poison gas for the rest of the war, though it would never again be as dramatic or effective as it was at that first attack on April 22. In that attack, it was the shock and confusion; the not knowing what was happening, and the consequent panic, that made the gas so effective. But soldiers learn quickly. Chlorine gas is visible, and it

has a distinctive odor. Once the troops knew what to look for, they could anticipate the arrival of the gas.

They quickly learned to cover their noses and mouths with a wet cloth, since chlorine is water-soluble. This works even better if sodium bicarbonate is mixed in with the water, since it reacts with the hydrochloric acid, reducing it to simple sodium chloride—salt. In a pinch, you can use a cloth soaked in urine, since chlorine gas also reacts with urea, but I'd rather not, if it's all the same to you.

Over time, the psychological impact of gas attacks diminished while soldiers were equipped with ever more effective technologies to resist the gas. Wet cloth gave way to flannel hoods which gave way to full gas masks. Gas would continue to maim and kill for the rest of the war, but it would never have a decisive impact.

But the world would not soon forget the shock and the horror of that first gas attack. Two weeks later, *Lusitania* would be sunk by a German U-boat, and shortly after that, the British government would release the Bryce Report, detailing German war crimes in Belgium.

The bottom line here is that in the spring of 1915, eight months into the Great War, a combination of events seemed to mark Germany as an outlaw nation, a country willing to breach the bounds of civilized behavior and trample the principles of Western civilization in its furious pursuit of victory at any cost.

I've raised this point a couple of times before, but I want to emphasize it, because I think it's important in understanding the Great War. We're seeing here a turning point in what the war is about. It's not about Serbia supporting terrorists or Russian pan-Slavism anymore. The war is increasingly being framed in the Allied countries as a crusade against German barbarism.

There was a joke going around in the spring of 1915. It went something like this: "Did you hear the news? They found Archduke Ferdinand! It turns out he's alive and well and the whole thing was just a big misunderstanding." The joke was a wry commentary on the fact that by this time, less than a year into the Great War, it was already obvious that the bloodshed and destruction of the war was out of all proportion to the crime that had triggered it.

And as someone who assumed the role of teacher and explainer of the Great War, I have to tell you that I struggle with this myself, in the here-and-now of the 21st century. You emphasize to your audience what an important event the Great War is, and how severe its repercussions were. Empires fell. Western civilization itself was in peril. In some sense, pre-war Western civilization is in fact going to fall, and the post-war world will see a new and different Western civilization replacing it. A chastened civilization. A civilization whose moral and philosophical underpinnings no longer go unquestioned.

But then, once you've hooked your audience with an explanation of the enormous stakes of the Great War, then you have to explain how it began and why it was fought, and that explanation seems so feeble and fatuous compared with the terrible significance of the war itself.

This was a problem for the governments of the warring powers even at the time, because even then, the question "Why are we fighting this war?" was a hard one, a question that presidents and prime ministers, emperors and kings, struggled with. As the costs of the war, both human and economic, mounted, it was getting increasingly difficult to come up with an answer that justified the price. The Great War was demanding that the full resources of the combatant nations be devoted to the conflict, but as the war ground on, the ordinary citizens of those nations found it harder and harder to believe that the goals of the war, such as they were, were worth the sacrifices being asked of them. Low morale, among the millions in the trenches or among the tens of millions of civilians supporting the war effort, was a constant worry for the governments of the time. If the people stopped believing in the war, defeat was inevitable. Perhaps even revolution would come, just as Jan Bloch had foretold all the way back in episode 29.

When these stories became public—the Rape of Belgium, the gas attacks at Ypres, the sinking of *Lusitania*, and you can add in the Armenian genocide—when these stories became public, it became possible for Allied governments to stitch them together into a narrative recasting the Great War as a conflict between the principled and the unprincipled, between those who would build a better future and those who would return the world to a more savage past.

This was a handy propaganda tool for the Allies, and a devastating one for the Germans. Germany cannot claim to be a beacon of freedom or democracy, not when the societies of France and Britain are freer and more democratic. But she could, and did, claim to be a font of culture: of music and philosophy, of education and science, of industry, technology and innovation. But her conduct of the war turned her best defense against her. How can you claim to be a paragon of learning and philosophy after Louvain? How can you boast of your technology, when it gives the world U-boats, the silent killers of the seas, or of your industry, when it produces poison gas by the ton?

The world of the early twentieth century was enjoying the benefits of a hundred years of tremendous progress. I talked about the stunning accomplishments of the 19th century all the way back in episode 1. But the Great War revealed the dark side of progress. Now the world was seeing a whole new kind of war, and the world didn't like what it saw.

What about in our time? How do the great moral challenges of the Great War look in our day? I've said before that the world of a hundred years ago was in many ways more callous than our own: more indifferent to human misery, more tolerant of violence. Yet at the same time, the people of the early twentieth century surprise us in their sense of moral outrage when civilians die in war. The Great War was the first time the world saw whole societies mobilized for war, front lines that extended for hundreds of miles, and battles that lasted not hours or for days, but

for weeks and months. War is more expansive now, and civilians are more likely to get caught up in it, as we saw in the sinking of *Lusitania*. War crimes in Belgium—and in occupied France and in many other places—were shocking a hundred years ago and remain shocking today. Still, these were not new. Surely this was not the first war in which soldiers killed civilians wantonly, but it is perhaps the first war in which modern communication allowed for near-realtime news bulletins to go out, detailing the crimes.

But what of the gas attacks? The use of poison gas as a weapon of warfare shocked consciences in 1915 and shocks them today. But the near-unanimous revulsion that the use of poison gas elicits raises a difficult question: why? Pain, injury, and death are terrible things, of course, but there are a few people, including Fritz Haber, who are willing to argue that to be killed or injured by poison gas is no more terrible than to have one's flesh riddled with machine gun fire or shattered by an artillery explosion. And yet these weapons don't shock the conscience in the same way. Perhaps it is because gas attacks us at our ultimate vulnerability: we all have to breathe to survive. One can imagine hiding from gunfire or fleeing from artillery shells, but poison gas hits us where we live, so to speak.

This is in spite of the fact that the use of gas would not prove decisive in the Great War. It didn't even kill all that many soldiers, in the grand scheme of things. Certainly not as many as artillery and machine guns did. What it did do, though, was leave behind over a million otherwise healthy young men who suffered from painful and debilitating lung diseases, vision impairments and blindness and disfigurements that went on long after the war ended. Perhaps that's the reason we still regard it with horror, even in our time.

As for Fritz Haber, he seems to have made his peace with his work on gas warfare. That the same scientist who harvested bread from the air might devote himself to such weapons seems ironic, but Haber didn't think so. He is quoted as having said, "During peacetime, a scientist belongs to the world, but during wartime, he belongs to his country."

On May 2, 1915, just ten days after the first gas attack at Ypres, Clara Haber had an argument with her husband. She took his service revolver, went into the garden, and shot herself in the chest. Many speculate that her suicide had something to do with her husband's involvement in gas warfare, but no one really knows. Sadly, their only child, 12-year old Hermann heard the shot and went to the garden to investigate. He held his mother in his arms as she died. A few days later, Fritz Haber left for the Eastern front, to oversee a gas attack against the Russian Army.

We'll have to stop there for today. Thanks to Jonathan for making a donation, and thank you Juan Pablo for becoming a patron of the podcast. If you have a few bucks burning a hole in your pocket, I'll invite you to visit the website, historyofthetwentiethcentury.com and click on the PayPal button to make a one-time donation to the podcast, or the Patreon button to become a patron. And as always, thank you for being a listener.

And I hope you'll join me next week on *The History of the Twentieth Century* as we examine the British attempt to outflank Germany by striking at the Ottoman Empire. The Gallipoli campaign, next week, on *The History of the Twentieth Century*.

Oh, and one more thing. Fritz Haber would marry a second time, in 1917. His second wife, Charlotte, like both Fritz and Clara, had been born Jewish and converted to Lutheranism. They would have two children, a son and a daughter, before divorcing in 1927. Haber continued to work on poison gases at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Physical Chemistry after the war, including developing the insecticide known as Zyklon A. The rise of National Socialism in Germany led to Haber being forced out of the institute, due to his Jewish heritage. Haber was astonished by this turn of events; he had believed that his well-known contributions to the defense of the Fatherland would protect him.

In 1933, he and his ex-wife and their two children moved to Britain. There the Jewish-British biochemist and Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann offered Haber a position as Director of what was then known as the Daniel Sieff Research Institute in Rehovot, in British Palestine. Haber accepted the offer, but he was by this time in poor health, and he died in Switzerland on his way to his new position. He was 65 years old.

[music: Closing War Theme]