

it preaches the absolute domination of the State over the soul as well as the body and exalts the State as the embodiment of Force.

But more important than this is the ^{mis-}conception which, to my mind, underlies your question (p.162) "Can we honestly claim to be supporting Collective Security while taking vigorous measures to render ourselves independent of it?" I venture to refer to a speech which I made in the House of Commons some little time ago in which I divided wars into two classes; the accidental and the deliberate. For the former I see in the League even in its present embryonic state, a sufficient remedy. Against the latter there is no defence except the certainty that deliberate aggression will be met with such overwhelming force as to destroy any prospect of its success. It seems to me that the view generally taken of disarmament is wrong. I believe that the influence of disarmament on the maintenance of peace is very much exaggerated, and that the importance of effecting a reduction in ~~them~~ ^{armaments} is economic rather than political. If I be right, the limitation of arms is not less desirable, but it is desirable on other grounds than those usually alleged. ^{But} what is important is to reach a point where all the world will know that there will be massed against the aggressor overwhelming force, and in considering what force is overwhelming it must always be remembered that, numbers being equal, an alliance is weaker than a single power. Remember Sarail's remark to Clemenceau when he

* No single state possesses such overwhelming force unless it be Germany in the near future. Only collective action will justify it; but collective action requires adequate armaments in the member states.

returned from commanding the Allied Forces at Salonica.

"Since I have been the General of ^{a coalition} ~~an Alliance~~ I have lost something of my admiration for Napoleon." It is certain, as Sam Hoare said the other day, ^{that} "the aggressor will always be prepared." We shall not find safety for ourselves or the world by remaining unprepared in face of that certainty.

There are some other passages which I noted as I read, but this letter has already become longer and more critical than I should have wished it to be. You must please accept the criticism as a mark of the respect which I feel for ~~the~~ author *of the article*

Yrs. sincerely

Arthur Chamberlain

