

this sense and for this purpose the formula came into common use on the Continent from 1776 to 1782, at the time of the American War of Independence and the First Armed Neutrality. In this sense and for this purpose Bonaparte at the time of the Second Armed Neutrality, in 1800, adopted it as his own. This combination of neutral and enemy, their resentment at the action of the Power which used her supremacy at sea to interfere with their trading relations, led to her being called the "Tyrant of the Seas," an epithet based solely on the assumption that the use of the sea in peace continues unaltered in war.

Now, in the first place, war upon the sea must interfere with its free use. The quarrels of maritime nations are fought out upon the sea. There will be fighting wherever enemy ships are found (except in neutral territorial waters); and free navigation on the trade routes will be interrupted. Thus indirectly war diminishes the Freedom of the Seas.

War also prejudices it directly; and, quite apart from the familiar questions of blockade and contraband, free commerce is curtailed. This point must at the outset be made clear: that except indirectly, as just indicated, neutral trade with neutral is not interfered with, but remains "free." But it is obvious that neutral commerce alters its character directly an ultimate destination of the cargoes to the enemy is intended, and loses it altogether when it is commerce with the enemy. A new element has been introduced which entitles the belligerent to revise his admission that neutral commerce is free. This is invariably overlooked in all the statements of the case against England; interference with neutral trade with the enemy is treated as being in the same category as interference with purely neutral trade with neutral. The former might be completely destroyed, and yet genuine neutral commerce remain intact. It follows, therefore, that the measure of belligerent interference with the trade of the neutrals is the nature and extent of the