

## Book Reviews.

*The New Code of International Law.* By JEROME INTERNOSCIA, of Montreal, member of the Bar of Quebec. The International Code Company of New York, Publishers. 1910.

This is a remarkable work and from its title and from the fact that it is published in parallel columns in three different languages, English, French and Italian, it necessarily forms a very bulky volume of over one thousand pages, the size being 9 x 11½.

The object of the author is to aid in the praiseworthy effort of putting an end not only to war, but to something which he thinks it is almost as bad, ruinous peace. By this Code he desires to educate the public in a science not well known and at present of limited application, and which he claims must be thoroughly explained, both scientifically and theoretically, before any approach to the desired end could be expected.

There comes with the book, as tending to explain its origin, a pamphlet entitled "A World Treaty of Arbitration" by James L. Tryon, Ph.D., Assistant Secretary of the American Peace Society. This paper gives a sketch of what has been done at the Hague Conference and by various nations in reference to world arbitration for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

This writer points out that as a result of the movement for arbitration of late years an attempt was made at the first Hague Conference to establish a universal system of obligatory arbitration. This was, however, resisted by Germany, and arbitration, though approved of as a theory, was left on a voluntary basis. Since then a number of the nations have agreed among themselves by treaties to refer all their disputes to arbitration, but these separate treaties, made by them in pairs, would not be of much practical use in the desired direction, nor would they accomplish what might be expected from a single world treaty including all the nations. If this latter were possible, a great step would have been gained; but so long as human nature remains as it is, even that would not put an end to war, or do away with armed peace; for, as seems to be generally admitted, nothing more could be expected than that it should be left optional with the signatory powers to decide for themselves whether a given dispute involved their vital interests, honour or independence and could legally be excepted from obligatory arbitration.