

It may be that thanks to newspapers and half-education we have advanced already to a point where Parliamentary Government has ceased to be useful, but we can never substitute democratic government in the sense of government by the whole democracy. If a parliamentary body is not good we must find some other kind of body where discussion is possible. The political theory of internationalism is one which if carried to its logical conclusions must be opposed to nationalism and so to that higher side of nationalism which we call patriotism. The ethical value of internationalism must be touched on separately.

(IV) The ethical aspect.

With the greatest deference to the writers of the memorandum it seems by no means certain that their views of the ethical aspect of war and of the responsibility of the church with relation thereto would be generally acceptable. They differentiate in the first place between war and international police action, following upon the jurisdiction of some international court. The theory that internationalism is right is nothing more or less than the theory that the majority is necessarily right or that a judicial tribunal is necessarily right. It is a truism that majorities are often wrong and an international court is no more immune from error than any other court. When it comes to a test by facts we had at the Amritsar Riots an example of national police action and at the Shanghai Riots an example of international police action. Both of course were on a small scale; both were wrong or both were right. In neither case however was there time for any judgment by any competent tribunal, and it is doubtful whether in the case of an appeal to force on a large scale there will be any more time.

The report proceeds to lay stress on the moral judgment of the world. Who is to be responsible for framing that moral judgment? What for example would be the judgment of a Frenchman who held that America, Japan and Japan were likely to go to war over the Philippines. It is almost