

not be obtained by pacific means, and war would simply rivet new and perhaps more terrible evils on Europe. In any case, given the ideal of national self-determination which at present holds Europe in thrall, no redrawing of boundaries could eliminate the minority problem or make state territory coincide with state economic need. Whatever Europe wants, what it needs is a liberal application of internationalism, not another dose of the poison of nationalism. A reinforced League of Nations seems to be its only hope, a League able to secure observance of minority obligations and to promote real economic co-operation between Europe's impoverished peoples. Neither of these objectives is at present attainable because the League is without the necessary moral force, largely because it is losing ground before the rising tide of militarism. No more practical step could perhaps be taken to revive faith in the League than progress at the Disarmament Conference, and particularly so if it were accompanied by drastic reductions in reparations. Such steps would tend to cut the ground from under the feet of Hitler and other chauvinists, and bring new hope to the defeated peoples, not so much for its immediate material effects, but as an earnest of the future. But the removal of the injustices of the peace is at best a long process.

"The problem of disarmament is not the problem of disarmament", says a distinguished student of the subject. "It really is the problem of the organization of the World Community."¹ Progress in disarmament at the coming conference seems to depend primarily upon two factors, the contributions Great Britain and the United States, but particularly Great Britain, are prepared to make to the building of the world-community, and the willingness of France to forego a policy which threatens to bring the half-completed structure tumbling down about our ears.

1. de Madariaga: *Disarmament*, p. 56.