

necessary in explaining the policy pursued by Great Britain towards the cruisers. And the general principles thus laid down in the British Case concerning neutral duties as they affect the claims under arbitration, though not so concisely expressed as they might be, are nevertheless so well conceived that we are induced to quote them:—

'1. It is the duty of a neutral Government in all matters relating to the war to act impartially towards the belligerent powers, to concede to one what it concedes to the other; to refuse to one what it refuses to the other.

'2. This duty, inasmuch as it flows directly from the conception of neutrality, attends the relation of neutrality wherever it exists, and is not affected by considerations arising from the political relation which before the war the belligerents may have sustained to one another.

'3. Maritime war being carried on by hostilities on the high seas, and through the instrumentality (ordinarily) of vessels commissioned by public authority, a neutral power is bound to recognise, in matters relating to the war commissions issued by each belligerent, and captures made by each, to the same extent, and under the same conditions as it recognises commissions issued and captures made by the other.

'4. Where either belligerent is a community or body of persons not recognised by the neutral power as constituting a sovereign state, commissions issued by such belligerents are recognised as acts emanating, not, indeed, from a sovereign Government, but from a person or persons exercising *de facto* in relation to the war, the powers of a sovereign Government.'

With this exordium the British Case proceeds to record the leading facts of the great Southern struggle for independence. When the American Case deals with history, much circumlocution is employed to keep up the theory that from first to last the people of the Confederacy were 'insurgents;' that the war throughout was an 'insurrection;' that the members of the Southern Government were 'persons calling themselves' by this or that official title. In the British Case, on the other hand, transactions are described by their right names. The historical narrative, for instance, opens with the statement:—'In the year 1861 a civil war broke out in the United States.' It is astonishing how different an aspect is at once imparted to the policy of Great Britain by the use in this manner of honest phraseology in describing events, from that which it is made to wear when examined under the false light thrown upon it by the distorted language of the American writers.

As soon as the war began, the Southern leaders, finding their own ports blockaded by a naval force with which they were quite unable to cope, sought abroad for the means of creating a navy. The identity of their own language with ours, and commercial ties, naturally attracted their agents to this country. The