

plan, and it is easily seen that its functions would in fact be quasi-judicial, and that it would have to specialize its work by some committee system for this and other purposes. It should be noted that even those schemes which include a formal judicature have not proposed to give it any immediate power of enforcing its awards. So Lord Parker's method is less remote from others than may appear at first sight.

The League, however organized, would guarantee its members against acts of war committed against them by non-members. It would define what should be considered as acts of war. A nation refusing or neglecting to take steps for peaceable settlement of a dispute would be denounced by special resolution of the Council, and, if a member, would forfeit its membership. On an act of war being notified by the Council, the members of the League would be bound to break off diplomatic relations and commercial intercourse with the offending nation. If this does not suffice, military execution is to be undertaken on the Council's requisition by specified members of the League, consisting of the chief military and naval Powers. (Lord Parker seems rather to glide over the military problems involved here. Can the necessary joint action be effectually and promptly taken without preconcerted measures amounting to the establishment of a common General Staff? I doubt it. But that may stand over along with the question of a judicial