

in might not in right; in force not in reason. That is a very different situation from that with which the world was faced a little while ago. These circumstances have changed the whole position of security so far as the nations of the world are concerned.

The league was in existence at the time of aggression against a league member in Manchuria, and the league was found to be a helpless institution in preventing that aggression. The league was in existence at the time of the Chaco war in South America, and the league did not intervene there though nations which were members of the league were involved. More persons were killed in that war than in the Ethiopian war. The league has been seen to be essentially a European institution. The league was in existence when Italy invaded Ethiopia and an effort was made by the application of sanctions to enforce what the league had felt would be the most effective means of ending aggression and maintaining peace. But what was discovered at that time? It was discovered that economic sanctions if they were to be effective at all would lead inevitably to military sanctions, and that military sanctions meant war. That is a very different condition from what most people had thought was likely to be the case when they were advocating membership in the League of Nations.

The result of all this has been that the attitude of nations generally has changed very materially towards the league viewed as an instrument for maintaining peace. Collective security under some of the league's provisions is none other than a reliance upon force. I am not saying that the League of Nations cannot fulfil a useful purpose and that it is not absolutely necessary; I believe it is. But the league in some of its provisions is based too much on a war mentality. The league, as its covenant is drafted, puts far too much reliance upon what force may be expected to accomplish. At any rate that is so to my way of thinking. There may be others who hold a different view. I believe that the league as an instrument to further peace by peaceful means, by constructive peace policies, by reliance upon conciliation, investigation and the power of public opinion by the formulation of world opinion and methods of that kind can be of very great service to mankind and can be made a universal league and a league which will be effective in bringing injustices to light and having them ultimately remedied. But a league which in the light of the developments of the last few years continues to place its reliance on force is going to be a very different institution from that which most of

us have conceived the League of Nations to be. And those who are going to put their faith in a league which relies upon force as its means of effecting collective security will have to consider anew what force they are going to be prepared to contribute from the country to which they themselves belong. The change in the position of the league, and in the possibility of its being able to serve the ends it was intended to serve, is another factor which has greatly affected world conditions.

But there is something else which has had a far-reaching effect and it is this. The old struggles, which were in the minds of people in the days when the league was formed, were struggles between nations; the league was formed to prevent one nation flying at the throat of another. But what is the nature of the struggle that is going on in Europe at the present time? What we see is a new kind of struggle, a conflict spreading throughout the world, a class struggle which sweeps right across the frontiers of nations without regard to boundaries—a class struggle on a scale scarcely contemplated by the mind of man. We see violent conflicts of classes and social systems, forms of social and political organization; the peoples beginning to fight among themselves—fighting for their social philosophies with a zeal akin to that of the days of the old religious wars. In other words, it is no longer a matter of nation protecting itself against nation; it has come to be a question of conflicting ideologies, to use an expression that covers the ground better than any other, and as to which of the contending forces is to prevail. All this has been accompanied by new and increasingly terrible weapons and methods of warfare, the wider range of aircraft and submarine and the use of deadly bombs and poisonous germs.

On different occasions I have quoted a passage which I should like to quote again because of its evident application to the present world situation. It is a quotation from one who was not a jingo, but a great scientist, a great humanitarian, one of the benefactors of mankind, one who knew a great deal more about human beings and human nature than most men of his own or any other day—the great scientist Louis Pasteur. In 1888 when Pasteur was being honoured by his country in the opening of the great institute which bears his name he was so overcome by the reception accorded him by the statesmen and scholars of France that he was unable to read from the manuscript he had prepared. He handed it to his son who read from its pages the following memorable words: