

naval armament but also by the solution of various other disturbing problems which threatened the peace of the world particularly in the Far East.

"These problems were all inter-related. The willingness of the American Government to surrender its then commanding lead in battleship construction, and to leave its position at Guam and in the Philippines without further fortifications, was predicated upon, among other things, the self-denying covenants contained in the Nine Power Treaty, which assured the Nations of the world not only of an equal opportunity for their Eastern trade but also against the military aggrandisement of any power at the expense of China. One cannot discuss the possibility of modifying or abrogating these provisions of the Nine Power Treaty without considering at the same time the other promises upon which they were really dependent". (Letter: Mr. Stimson)

"The change of attitude on the part of world public opinion toward former customs and doctrines, which is evidenced by these two treaties is so revolutionary that it is not surprising that the progress has outstripped the landmarks and orientation of many observers. The Treaties signalize a revolution in human thought, but they are not the result of impulse or thoughtless sentiment. At bottom they are the growth of necessity, the product of a consciousness that unless some such step were taken modern civilization would be doomed. Under its present organization the world simply could not go on recognizing war, with its constantly growing destructiveness, as one of the normal instrumentalities of human life. Human organization has become too complex, too fragile, to be subjected to the hazards of the new agencies of destruction turned loose under the sanction of international law. So the entire central point from which the problem was viewed was changed. War between nations was renounced by the signatories of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. This means that it has become illegal throughout practically the entire world. It is no longer to be the source and subject of rights. It is no longer to be the principle around which the duties, the conduct, and the rights of nations revolve. It is an illegal thing. Hereafter when two nations engage in armed conflict either one or both of them must be wrongdoers - violators of this general treaty law. We no longer draw a circle about them and treat them with the punctilios of the duelist's code. Instead we denounce them as lawbreakers.

"Another consequence which follows this development of the Kellogg-Briand Treaty, which I have been describing, is that consultation between the signatories of the pact when faced with the threat of its violation becomes inevitable. Any effective invocation of the power of world opinion postulates discussion and consultation."

(Mr. Stimson)

From this it will readily be seen that British and American views on the Far East do not coincide, and in that lies the possibility of a difficult decision for some future Canadian government, and even a menace to Canadian peace and security. For if Great Britain continues to support Japan - even passively - and the United States to oppose her ambitions, it is not inconceivable that Canada will have to decide which side she is on.