

calling, and his profits, like those of the trader, were enhanced by other peoples' wars. He also resorted to formulas to protect and develop those profits; but in justice it must be said that it was long before he turned them into assertions of rights. He achieved his end by the more legitimate method of barter, offering something in exchange for the privilege he sought to acquire; more often than not, an alliance.

In 1752 the dispute developed dangerous symptoms. Without offering the same consideration, the trader claimed the carrier's privileges as his own rights; then in process of time vendor and carrier merged into one person, the "neutral," who surrounded himself with a barrier of formulas.

Finally, the enemy adopted for his own benefit all the formulas, together with all the privileges and rights they represented. They exactly fitted the necessities of his case; and the analogy of a legal principle stood him in good stead. He was purchaser of the commodities, consignee of the cargoes; the rights of vendor and carrier, once established, enured to his benefit. There was thus established the most powerful weapon a belligerent can possess—the sympathy of the neutral trader, springing from community of interest.

It is very necessary to appreciate one feature of the discussion which has already been hinted at. The rights were asserted as belonging to neutral *nations*, and were thus lifted from the plane of mere profit. But the privileges and the rights, if they existed, were to be enjoyed by *individuals*. Undoubtedly the resultant mass of profit benefited the individual's Government, since the prosperity of the subject reacts beneficially on its fiscal departments. But a clear insight into the problems raised can only be obtained by remembering that the actual questions in dispute were not national. To endow them with that quality is to eliminate the element of the human trader with which every phase of the subject abounds. At one