

the states which basely submitted, became provinces and slaves to *Rome*. Had the united provinces acted in 1672 upon the author's principle, the house of *Austria* would indeed not have assisted them after, nor an *English* parliament have compelled the treacherous and poultry pensioner of *France* to re-assume the roll and policy of an *English* King. But these were events improbable at the first outset, and by consequence do not justify it. And altho' a state despairing of itself "ever be deserted by its neighbours and friends, yet better it is that it should be so forlorn, lest it should otherwise "have more than one army to maintain."

Had *France* poured in forces to support the last rebellion in *Scotland*, superior to the strength of the loyal Clanns in that part of the united kingdom; or had *Constantinople* landed his troops in *Ireland*, *England* should not have sent a man to their assistance. And the nearer and dearer these parts of ourself are to us, than a foreign territory, the stronger this principle should act, even in proportion as our tenderness for them should be greater.

This excellent argument, in its application to *Hanover* receives infinite strength, and becomes absolutely conclusive from the author's analytical discussion, beginning in p.