

but a rule of convenience? what that of blockade, or contraband, but rules of convenience arising out of a particular state of circumstances?—The whole question is, whether the belligerent has a right to have his convenience consulted. It is conceded that he has this right in the cases of contraband and blockade: why not in the case of a trade interdicted in peace, and opened in war, in order to avoid its pressure?—Are not all three, and all other belligerent rights against neutral interference, founded on the common principle, that it is the duty of a neutral to be impartial, and not to interfere on one side or the other? But it is an interference, and a partial one too, to aid the prosperity and revenue of one belligerent, and to enable him to carry on the war with more vigor and effect. This is the true hinge of the controversy; and to this common principle must every belligerent right and every neutral duty be referred.

Though the author says he “will not concede that America has not a right to import *with a view* to exportation,” (P. 45.)* he at length gives up the controversy; for when speaking of the war of 1756, and the conduct of the British prize-courts then condemning neutral vessels engaged in the colony trade of France, he says, “The

* See P. 47 of this tract.