International Law Studies—Volume 36

International Law Solutions

said that it was "important for the maintenance of pacific relations that hostilities should not commence without previous warning." In the arguments in support of this Convention it was urged that without such a Convention the effects of the war would be thrown back upon the time of peace, and uncertainty as to the time when war commences would again disturb relations and introduce the uncertainty that had existed for two hundred years before.

It was also maintained by the United States that the rights and obligations of the neutrals should be those generally accepted under international law in August 1914. The statement as to many of these was embodied in the neutrality proclamation of the United States of August 4, 1914.

The Joint Resolutions of August 31, 1935, together with the extensions and amendments of February 29, 1936, placed upon the United States obligations beyond those of international law in regard to the control of the sale and export of war material, financial transactions, submarines, travel of nationals, etc.

CONCLUSION

From August 4, 1914, to April 6, 1917, the United States, as a neutral state, followed its long-established neutrality policy which was in general accord with accepted international law.

The Joint Resolution of February 29, 1936, embodied a nationalistic policy in many respects divergent from the prior policy of the United States and from the generally accepted doctrines of international law.

The change in 1935–36 to a doctrine for the most part nationalistic has placed nationals of the United States under restrictions beyond those imposed by international law.