

"In the first place, the war demonstrated in a striking manner that many of the rules which had been agreed upon by the body of States for the conduct of war were inadequate, illogical or inapplicable to the somewhat peculiar and novel conditions under which they had to be applied during the late war. In the second place, the war brought out the fact that the existing rules did not by any means cover the whole field; that they were wholly silent in regard to the employment of various agencies and instrumentalities for waging war, and that they did not deal at all with certain conditions and circumstances which were unforeseen at the time the rules were formulated. 1/ "

^{1/} Dr. J. de Louter, Professor of International Law in the University of Utrecht, in an article entitled La Crise du Droit International, published in the Revue Generale de Droit Int. Pub. (Jan. - Feb. 1919), observes that the existing body of international law, although by no means destroyed, as well as the old organization of international relations, have proved to be inadequate to prevent war or to curb its violence. It is now passing through a period analogous to a pathological crisis in the case of a sick man and its foundations and content must be reformed. The content of the reformed law of nations should be enlarged so as to embrace within its scope the larger domain of international commerce, communication, finance, instruments of exchange, public health and the like. Among the bases of the new law should be justice, the maintenance of a juridical order among States, respect for the principle of nationality, abolition of the right of conquest, no cession of territory without the consent of the inhabitants thereof, liberty of commerce, freedom of the seas, abolition of secret treaties, etc."