

endeavour) to gross distortion, a mindless derision, honest and dishonest misrepresentation, falsification, and sheer falsehood.

For many years I have been trying to call attention to the fact that the political philosophy to which the nations have given, and still give, their allegiance must, so far as it is adhered to, inevitably involve conflict between them; that the means by which they have attempted to insure peace (by each of two parties—nations or groups—trying to be stronger than the other) could have in the nature of things, if continued, only one outcome—war.*

This result has been produced, and is accepted as a demonstration that we who predicted it as the natural result of this system were wrong! Those who have argued insistently that armaments could never alone achieve peace are supposed to be entirely routed by the fact that the peace has been broken; while those who urged that peace was to be secured by everybody having as large armaments as possible are believed to be vindicated by the fact of war—the fact that peace has *not* been secured. Some of these latter critics, of course, urge that their advice has not been followed, and that if England had added, by compulsion or otherwise, half a million soldiers to her army ten years ago, peace would in some way have been kept. But can it seriously be argued to-day that Germany (if her intentions were all that we suppose them to be) would not have met that increase? Even if she had doubled her army during the last ten years, she would not have imposed upon her population a blood-tax much

* See, notably, concluding Chapters II. and IV. (Part III.) of "The Great Illusion," and Chapter V. "Foundations of International Policy."