

a war, and when it is carried on by some species of organized government or authority, in full possession of the territory where it claims to exercise authority, neutral States may then recognize such revolted government as a belligerent." Tested by the requirements of this doctrine, the situation in Cuba affords no justification or excuse for the proposed action of the government of the United States. Not only have the rebels not set up any "species of organized government or authority" in the island, but we think there is much to be said against dignifying the sporadic and desultory engagements between the loyal troops and the tatterdemalion cohorts of Gomez with the title of War, even as it is understood in inter-tropical climes. True, the insurrection has been of long standing; but we know of no principle of prescription in International Law which gives irresponsible insurgents a right to recognition as belligerents after the expiry of any fixed period of persistence in revolt. The Cuban case presents no such features as that of the Southern States of America when Great Britain recognized their belligerency in 1861. In the latter case there was not only a de facto government "in full possession of the territory where it claimed to exercise authority," but also an organized army and navy, prepared to vindicate the sovereign rights and dignity of that government *a l'outrance*.

If it were any other nation than our chivalrous, lofty-minded, and unselfish cousins across the border, which was making the welkin ring with windy declamation about the international duty of interference in behalf of the disaffected Cubans, one would be inclined to exclaim with Sir Toby Belch:—

"Excellent ! I smell a device."

CHARLES MORSE.