declared to be carrying contraband; and this without reference to any court of law. Such was—and is—the German doctrine of freedom of the seas.

The American doctrine was simpler, bolder and more honest; and it is fair to say that it has been consistently maintained by American publicists ever since 1783. It was that all private property, whether ships or cargoes, and whether enemy or belligerent, should be exempt from seizure or destruction; but that goods destined for a belligerent government should (if contraband, as such goods practically always are) be liable to seizure and confiscation. How governments are to be prevented from importing goods under the names of individuals, we are not told. This is the American doctrine of freedom of the seas, which has been preached so ardently by President Wilson. It is the doctrine of a highly individualistic people, who draw a sharp distinction between the rights of the individual and the rights of the State, whether in peace or war. If it were established and enforced, the result would be to leave neutral shipping, in certain cases, liable to destruction or confiscation, but also to deprive sea-power, in effect, of its principal offensive weapon, the attack upon enemy commerce. On that ground Germany was willing to accept it (for the time being, at any rate), provided that the weaker naval power were at the same time left in possession of every possible means of doing mischief to enemy and neutral shipping, by confiscating or destroying ships, without judicial decision, on the plea that they were carrying contraband, and by making the sea perilous with mines.

Here, then, three sharply contrasted views of the freedom of the seas were presented, in 1907. They still