

rather than saviours. This not only makes them afraid to disarm but it renders them obdurate in the matter of the revision of frontiers. Certain modifications in existing boundaries are probably desirable, but revision except through the League and its Court or commissions would cause pandemonium in Europe. Until the new nations whose frontiers may be open to criticism, are convinced that the League has not only influence but also authority and power, they will never consent to putting Article 19 of the Covenant into operation. Article 19 provides for the revision of treaties, but if we can explain away Article 10, the new States can close their eyes to Article 19. Last week Mr. Thomas W. Lamont advised Germany that France would be found not unreasonable concerning any revision that might be justified, provided it came through "orderly processes"; but these orderly processes can be guaranteed only by a League grown strong through the unequivocal promise of its Members to stand together against any lawbreaker, any violator of the Covenant, any headlong aggressor unwilling to abide by the moderate decisions of the League's courts or tribunals. Time and time again during the last twelve years, the insecure nations have pleaded for a League with authority and power, whose unanimous Council could call upon States-Members for a demonstration of immediate and effective solidarity. In 1924, in the Protocol of Geneva, Messrs. Ramsay MacDonald, Herriot, Benes and Politis realized an all-embracing synthesis of opposing theses. Whereas