

12th of May; and the British vessels "Hilja" and "Monmouth" warned off on the same day. Confederate privateers were already at sea. One was captured at the mouth of the Chesapeake River on the 8th of May by the United States' ship "Harriet Lane." On the 15th, the Federal bark "Ocean Eagle" of Rockhead, Maine, was taken by the Confederate privateer "Calhoun" off New Orleans. At the same port Captain Semmes had already received his Commission and was engaged in the outfit of the "Sumter."

Could any explanations which Mr. Adams might have had to offer alter such a state of things as this? Can any other name be given to it than that of civil war?

It is stated that there was no fact of continued and flagrant "hostilities" to justify the action of Great Britain in issuing a proclamation of neutrality.

Mr. Seward, writing at the time, and previously to the Queen's Proclamation (May 4), characterised the proceedings of the Confederates as "open, flagrant, deadly war," and as "civil war" (Congress Papers, 1861, page 165), and in a communication to M. de Tassara, the Spanish Minister, referred to the operations of the Federal blockade as belligerent operations which would be carried on with due respect to the rights of neutrals.

Judge Betts, in the cases of the "Hiawatha," &c., said, "I consider that the outbreak in particular States, as also in the Confederated States, was an open and flagrant civil war."

It was also judicially decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the "Amy Warwick" and other prizes, that "the proclamation of blockade is itself official and conclusive evidence that a state of war existed which demanded and authorized such a measure." Moreover, the joint resolution of Congress in July, 1861, approving and confirming the acts of the President ("North America, No. 1, 1862," page 57), commences, "Whereas, since the adjournment of Congress on the 4th of March last, a formidable insurrection in certain States of this Union has arrayed itself in armed hostility;" and a Resolution of the House of Representatives, of the 22nd of July, 1861, speaks of the "present deplorable civil war," and of "this war."

The date at which the civil war actively commenced has, therefore, been fixed by the published despatches of the Secretary of State, by proceedings in Congress, by the formal judgment of the United States' Prize Courts, as well as by the universal assent of all the neutral Powers concerned; but it is urged that, nevertheless, there was no necessity for Great Britain to take notice of it, as no ship of the insurgents had appeared in British ports, no collision occurred at sea, nor did the nearness of Great Britain to the seat of hostilities compel her to act.

With regard to the latter point, it is difficult to see how one nation can be much nearer to another than England to the United States, seeing that the British dominions touch the United States on two sides, while the British Islands of New Providence, &c., lie immediately in front. As to a collision at sea, it was apparent that British commerce must be interfered with the moment the blockade came into operation, as indeed was the case, several British vessels having been captured before there was time for the intelligence of the Proclamation of Neutrality to reach America. As to the arrival of Confederate ships in British ports, such ships were afloat and might at any time be expected. As Mr. Dana, in the notes to the eighth edition of Wheaton

expresses it (p. 35), "it is not fit that cases should be left to be decided as they may arise, by private citizens, or naval or judicial officers, at home or abroad, by sea or land."

The British Government were compelled to take action of some sort; was that action really unfriendly? was it intended to be unfriendly?

No one who recollects what actually passed, or will consult "Hansard," can suppose that the Proclamation was intended to be unfriendly. On the contrary, as was stated by Mr. Foster in his speech at Bradford, it was absolutely pressed upon the Government by the friends of the Northern States, who were afraid lest Confederate privateers should be fitted out in British ports.

Nor was its immediate result injurious to the Federal States. Far from being so, it legitimized the captures of the blockading squadron, and, in the language of the Prize Court, "estopped" the British merchants, whose vessels were seized, from making reclamation.

While the intelligence of the issue of the Queen's Proclamation was still fresh, and almost immediately after hearing of the French and Spanish Proclamations of Neutrality, the President in his Message of the 4th of July, 1861, stated that he was "happy to say that the sovereignty and rights of the United States are now practically respected by foreign Powers, and a general sympathy with the country is manifested throughout the world."

Does any one really believe that the Queen's Proclamation in the very least influenced the movements of the Confederate armies? All the preparations for war had been made long before, munitions collected, troops levied, and generals appointed. The Proclamation reached America at the end of May, by which time the Confederates had taken up their position in the Upper Potomac, and the Federals had occupied Alexandria in Virginia with a force of 13,000 men (May 24).

The armies on both sides were in motion; skirmishes were daily occurring; engagements took place at Little Bethel on the 10th of June, at Carthage, Missouri, on the 6th of July, and at Centreville on the 18th, followed by the great battle of Manassas Junction on the 21st. Can any one suppose that if the Proclamation had not been issued that battle would not have been fought.

The charge of premature recognition, on examination, reduces itself to this, that the Proclamation ought not to have been issued until Mr. Adams arrived, or until some event called for it. Against this is to be set the fact that the Proclamation was considered by some friends of the Northern States as a step taken in their interests, and that it was further pressed upon the Government by Mr. Dallas's communication of Mr. Seward's circular. Moreover, Confederate privateers were at sea, and British vessels being made prizes by the Federal blockading fleet.

Besides the assertion of the premature recognition of belligerent rights, the despatch states that maritime enterprises in the ports of Great Britain, which would otherwise have been piratical, were, "by virtue of the Proclamation," rendered lawful, "and thus Great Britain became, and to the end continued to be, the arsenal, the navy yard, and the treasury of the insurgent Confederacy."

Mr. Fish, in a preceding passage, admits that national belligerency is "an existing fact," and he might have added that it exists independently of any official proclamations of neutral Powers, as is shown by the records of the American Prize Courts, which continually recognize the