

treaties and international engagements we can no longer be secure. And I want to suggest that the real line of advance is to extend the system we have adopted, render it more effective and more secure; that the older policy of "letting all foreigners go hang" and of each trusting only to his isolated military force, without regard to the possible co-operation of other nations in the work of mutual defence, is not "practical" at all. We have in any case abandoned it, and even the militarists have become internationalist. But the military internationalism so far adopted stops just at the point where from the point of view of the maintenance of peace it becomes self-stultifying. The preceding pages have shown why a "Balance of Power" based on the rivalry of two groups is a moral and physical absurdity. As it is impossible to estimate exactly the real power of the rival groups, and as each naturally wants to give the benefit of the doubt to itself, the system means that really to secure peace by it each must be stronger than the other. Superiority of strength on one side in rival groups of nations must always be unstable. These pages have already shown why we cannot "wipe out" or "destroy" a people of 80 or 100 million souls; why the extreme instability of a Balance of Power based on a shifting and changing system of alliances will always furnish such a people the possibility of forming some new combination which may tilt the balance in their favour. And yet we—each group, that is—must be stronger than the other, because each is everlastingly afraid of the other. This war has been well called the "war of fear." It is fear which has produced the present form of the alliances, and the war which that form of alliances has failed to avert. To give this place