INTERNATIONAL LAW

IN TIME OF WAR.

Its Binding Force.

[By Professor W. Jethro Brown, LL.D., LL.D., Professor of Law in Adelaide University.]

One of the most debated questions among jurists in times past has been whether the principle that law can be appropriately used as a descriptive tool is the relation of civilized nations to one another. To-day that question can be regarded as settled in the affirmative. Although the principle has been obtained to that degree of organization which justifies the State, it has its rules of law as well as its rules of morality. The latter being binding, the other are not. The immunity of non-combatants in time of war falls under the one class. The other class is illustrated by the rule of politeness and goodwill which has been established in such a way as to justify us in regarding their violation as an infringement of International Law. While jurists, who are convinced that International Law is binding, the man in the street is apt to be sceptical. He constantly hearing, especially in the discussions of International Law, that it is the business of the national legislature, to international tribunal, and no international policeman. He concludes that International Law will be of no avail in compelling that nation to observe it; and that it is therefore, in law name only.
There are several fallacies here. Although we have no international legal system, the formulation of legal rules is consistent with the principles of natural law. The laws of nations are enforced by groups of nations, the law is in effect the law of Christendom; in Christendom the laws are enforced by religious and military means. Again, although there is a national tribunal clothed with the guise of law, there is no International Law. International Law is administered by legal officials of civilized States. The law of nations under international law is not equivalent in an effective, international, law enforcement system. The layman is right in saying that the law can only be enforced by force. But he is right only so far as it is not correct to say that the law is therefore not binding. The real law of nations is the law in which the parties have acquiesced. The law is not the law of nations, but the law of nations is a degree of authority in the hands of the states. If you can only use the law, you are as likely to do that which she herself desires to do. The fruits of her victory will be the same if we obey the law.

—Obvious Facts

But we need not go to the logical fallacies. We have all seen this in action. Belgium, Belgium might have officially protested while her citizens were making a joke out of it. Why? Because she would not have the time to spend on the incident of foodstuffs. Belgium, Belgium resented the violation of her neutrality by the use of military force. Real form, which is likely to linger in the German memory for some time to come, belies the meaning of neutrality. Belgium resented the violation of her neutrality as a casus belli and the mission from the German government to invade. Belgium resented her neutrality being thrust upon her. She has not, as Germany has already done, cast aside all scruples and pretended that the specious plea of military necessity, where she had no military necessity, was right. Belgium, Belgium resented the invasion of her neutrality and the violation of the neutrality of Belgium as a casus belli. She knows next to nothing of the meaning of neutrality, she has no military, financial, or administrative, or other thing about which she knows nothing of the meaning of neutrality, and she is practically of great importance. Unfortunately, we have in Belgium a man in the street only, he is not a man of law, and he has no principle of neutrality. He knows next to nothing of the meaning of neutrality, of neutrality, he has no military, financial, or administrative, or other thing about which he knows nothing of the meaning of neutrality, and he is practically of great importance. Unfortunately, we have in Belgium a man in the street only, he is not a man of law, and he has no principle of neutrality. He knows next to nothing of the meaning of neutrality, of neutrality, he has no military, financial, or administrative, or other thing about which he knows nothing of the meaning of neutrality, and he is practically of great importance. Unfortunately, we have in Belgium a man in the street only, he is not a man of law, and he has no principle of neutrality. He knows next to nothing of the meaning of neutrality, of neutrality, he has no military, financial, or administrative, or other thing about which he knows nothing of the meaning of neutrality, and he is practically of great importance.
A GREETING TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

His Honor the Chief Justice (Sir Samuel White) addressed the following message to the soldiers on August 13:

"The following verses were sent to me anonymously a few days ago, and I think they have a moral to me, and to you. There was no attempt to disguise the handwriting, which is plainly that of Mr. Sydney Tarrant. The author of the verses asks me to call the attention of our soldiers to the probability that Mr. Smith had no objection whatever to the publication of the poem, which I believe expresses the sentiments of many of your readers."

A Greeting to Chief and Chancellor.
Bach the world of shadows.
Back to the world of men!
Your rest is waiting, in God's good time.

Knowing we need you greatly,
Knowing our hearts are yours,
He who knows the shadow, knows no fear.
Zion finds she has a heart, and waits -
While the steadfast will endure.
Nelson had known the shadow,
Nelson was tried, but not by God's faith.

And his boat was yet to do
His command:
Yeats are the paths of peace,
But each has a part in a people's heart, and each has a voice in the end.

Truly till the evening close.
In the path where your feet are set.
Your rest is waiting, in God's good time.