

ment—it is needful 'to show a necessity of self-defence, instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation'. Such a necessity as this the Germans could not show. From whatever point of view we examine the necessity for the attack on Belgium, the evidence of treachery, and complete and callous disregard for international obligations by Germany, is overwhelming.

There is in German law a defence allowed in certain cases which are covered by the term *Notwehr*, a term which I understand cannot be properly translated. It is—according to Article 53 of the German Criminal Code—'such defence as is necessary to avert an immediate unlawful attack on oneself or another'. It is not, strictly speaking, identical with self-defence or self-preservation, but approximates to it. The meaning of the speech of Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg seems to be clearly this: 'We have guaranteed the neutrality and inviolability of these two small States; we find that the observance of the guarantee would inconvenience us in a course of action on which we have decided; it is therefore necessary for us to ignore this word "neutrality", and to disregard this "scrap of paper", for if we do not, France will. Self-preservation stands as the first law of individuals and States; our existence may be irreparably threatened unless we take this step, therefore International Law must on an occasion such as this be broken.' I take, then, the German standpoint for the moment—let us assume the German Chancellor had consulted some English text-book on International Law to see what was said there on the subject of self-preservation. 'The right of self-preservation,' says Hall, 'in some cases justifies the commission of acts of violence against