

all the rest ; publicity in the engagements made by the members ; and no transfer of territory save by the consent of its inhabitants.

This falls very far short of more ambitious pacifist schemes—universal limitation of armaments, universal arbitration, etc. But it would be the first step to those ends. Without it they will never be achieved. When the defence in one country is, in addition to its own armament, based upon the support of the whole of Christendom, that fear which has been the main operative factor in the increase of armaments in the past, will be attenuated, to say the least. It would in principle transform the armaments of the world into the police force of the world, instead of their being as now a series of police forces pledged, not to the maintenance of order, but to fighting one another.

I am aware, of course, that this means the abandonment of certain Radical doctrines which have been held very tenaciously in the past: non-intervention, no military alliance with foreign countries, etc. But those doctrines, defensible as they were before the war, have, for good or ill, by our act been abandoned. We have become an integral part of the European system, and it is outside the domain of practical politics to go back. We must go forward to a condition which will obviate so far as may be the disadvantages and penalties which the steps already taken have involved.

If even this small development in the right direction is too Utopian, then indeed it is a choice between Utopia and Hell. The adoption of the principle suggested does not involve anything in the nature of non-resistance or a disparagement of the instinct of self-defence and nationality; nor the assumption that men will always