

complied with every ship would, at the conclusion of the general peace, be restored to her 'in the same condition and state of equipment as when received under the British flag'. Denmark, acting within her undoubted right, treated the British demand as a hostile act, and only after the bombardment of Copenhagen did the Danes decide to surrender their fleet. This high-handed proceeding of Great Britain against a small State has naturally been severely criticized, and is condemned by many continental writers. I am unable myself to join in this condemnation. I agree with Hall that the occurrence is a matter for extreme regret, but that 'the emergency was one which gave good reason for the general line of conduct of the English Government'. That being so, I have to ask whether the action of Germany can be justified for similar reasons.

In 1807, Great Britain had been at war with France for more than ten years. Napoleon had overthrown Austria, crushed Prussia, and for the moment obtained the alliance of Russia. His methods were severe and unscrupulous. It was known that he would be deterred by nothing which stood in the way of the achievement of the object dearest to his heart—the overthrow of Great Britain. It is now held that Canning acted on imperfect evidence, but the information he received was well in accord with the plans which Napoleon might have been expected to form, and Canning took a step which to the other neutral Powers seemed a violation of the principles of neutrality, which it must be remembered were not so well established then as now. But even so, England's proceeding was at the time 'regarded as little better than piratical', and the attack on Denmark was followed by a loss