preservation and safety, cannot enter into engagements contrary to its indispensable obligations." And he cites, as an illustration, that "in the year 1506 the States-General of the Kingdom of France engaged Louis XII. to break the Treaty he had concluded with the Emperor Maxmillian and the Arch-Duke Philip, his son, because that Treaty was pernicious to the kingdom. They also decided that neither the Treaty, nor the oath that had accompanied it, could be binding on the King, who had no right to alienate the property of the Crown."[29]

But, while these authorities are not entirely concurred with by some English writers, one writer, however, who does not concur, admits that internationally, as no superior coercive power exists, and as enforcement is not always convenient, or practical, to the injured party, the individual State must be allowed in all cases to enforce, or annul, for itself as it may choose.[30]

It was well said by Chief Justice Jay, of the Supreme Court of the United States, that "the contracts of sovereigns are made for the benefit of all their own subjects; and therefore every sovereign is interested in every Act which necessarily limits, impairs, or destroys that benefit. Whatever injuries result to the subjects run back from them to their sovereign." And he further said that a voluntary validity of a Treaty is that validity by which a Treaty that has become voidable by reason of violations, afterwards continues to retain validity by the silent volition and acquiescence of the nations concerned;[31] or, in other words, "during pleasure."

It would seem, therefore, to be reasonable in the international and diplomatic interests of other nation sovereignties that the doctrine which those precedents sanction, and which the United States has heretofore enforced, and has thereby incorporated into its administration of International Law, should be recognized as an authoritative doctrine of general International Law,

[29] Vattel's Law of Nations, p. 194.

[30] Hall's International Law (5th ed.), 352 and 358.

[31] *Jones* v. *Walker*, 2 Paine (U.S.), 688.