

The last five chapters here constitute a large part of the book so criticized, and the reader may judge for himself how far that criticism is just. Whatever the motive that lay behind these gibes, the effect of them is to obscure a truth without the recognition of which it will be impossible to approach the problem of international relations, to establish an international society with any hope of permanent and stable success. That truth is that the desire of the nations for the welfare of their people, in the largest sense of the term, must be taken into consideration in dealing with the problem of their relationships. It is simply untrue (as the reader can readily prove for himself), it is in fact the exact contrary of the truth, to say that this study ignores the rôle of the moral factor in the larger sense of the term—national ideals, good and bad, passion, pride. But without food, "wealth," in its simpler form at least, there can be no human life or society or morals. "Economics" must therefore have their part in the problems of war, as in all problems of human society, but more particularly because it has been an age-long delusion of men that in some way war was bound up with "the struggle for life." Anyone even pretending to deal with this problem had to meet that point fairly, to show in what manner this assumed inevitability of struggle between societies for sustenance was a misconception. It was the nature of such misconceptions that "The Great Illusion" tried to make plain, and in the opinion, apparently, of even its bitterest critics did make plain; it tried to show that war cannot promote the struggle of peoples for life and its sustenance. Some at least of the selfsame critics, who had themselves for years been attempting to prove that the motive behind the German challenge was the desire for colonies, wealth,

trad
the
decl
upo
T
pha
mat
first
read
part
indi
inte
nar
writ
amb
resp
will
othe
crec
V
the
we
add
by
rule
I
Gre
can
Sta
We
life
*
year
Polit