

## III THE CASE FOR SECURITY

First of all we must reread the Covenant -- this Shorter Catechism of the new dispensation -- and especially Article 8, paragraph I. Around this article has turned the whole controversy of these last twelve years between the safe countries on the one side and the exposed and anxious populations on the other. The representatives of the nations which count themselves secure and therefore especially peaceful, have invariably read the first few words of Article 8 and then come to a dead stop:-- "The Members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments." However, there is no stop there at all. The delegates of the threatened or exposed States insist upon reading further, and in emphatic tones: "to the lowest point consistent with national safety, and the enforcement by common action of international obligations". It is upon the words "common action" that they lay all the stress -- security or safety through common or united action. This is the kernel of the so-called "French thesis", which is no more French than it is Belgian or Polish or Czech or Rumanian or Jugoslav or Persian or (today at least) Chinese or probably, at bottom, even Japanese. I am explaining it rather than advocating it. It is the point of view of all the nations who for one reason or another fear aggression. It is the pivotal point of the