

for while this is a convenience to the belligerent, it is a like convenience to the neutral ; as is proved by neutrals availing themselves of the licence given for this purpose. If the antagonist attempts to prevent this, it is the affair of the neutral to determine whether it will pursue the trade under this risk, or abandon it. Thus it appears that the pompous reference to books, to the rules of 1756, to armed neutralities, and to the prior conduct of either of the belligerents, is made upon a false principle. When wars depart from common principles, the true rule to go by is the mode in which one of the belligerents treats the other, where it does not invade the laws of humanity and justice, in points which are paramount even to the rights of man. To make things still more obvious, suppose that I have a pecuniary claim on a shop-keeper, whose trade is necessary to a large tract of country. Will not the law of every nation permit me to seize his goods, and shut up his shop, even if the operation is distressing to all the neighbourhood ? Shall a belligerent then be subject to every possible reproach and inconvenience from a neutral, because the neutral power does not *gain all* she wishes ? If we look at the tables of Mr. Gallatin and Mr. Blodgett, at the increase of the revenue, capital and navigation, and at the low rate of our insurances, we shall see whether, in fact, we have suffered by this war, and whether that nation, which could have easily destroyed our commerce, has done it. It is so far otherwise, that it has been in the mouth of too many of our citizens, that it would be well for the United States, if Europe would always remain at war ! Look at the lead too, which Bonaparte has always taken in restrictions, and the insulting language in which he has always imposed them. Remember, that if he confined himself for a time, to little more than menaces, it was because he had not naval force enough to do as much mischief as he then threatened. His undisguised language however is, that he made the decree in November, 1806 ; and as he knew no limits in favour of neutrals, *when he made it in 1806*, so he knows no limits as to its extension. The persons in France, who had

preten
proper

Let
that h
lences
iated o
He we
goods,
the E
bered,
erwise
the sup
under t
sive pr
forcible
ly, wel
Embarg
When
of the
knew ;
go was
whether
must ha

Our
lect, th
time af
now ass
country
tack its
be add
rule for
found in
united a
an impe
case, wh