

If such doctrines be admitted, where is the security for smaller states? and must not all sink necessarily into the gulph of universal monarchy?

The historian's animadversion upon those states *p. 4*, which did not unite against *Rome*, is just and incontrovertible: His reflection is meant upon them. But our Author turns the censure of the annalist, upon those who fought singly against *Rome*. There should have been such a congress as he describes in *p. 107*, before a single buckler was raised against the *Roman* eagle. But no such august assembly attended the leaders of any of those states when invaded by armies infinitely superior to theirs; they should then have submitted without resistance, knowing that "all resistance was useless, and that they had nothing to do but submit." They should have waited until the *Romans* had rendered themselves *universally odious*, and then the world would have united against them. But altho' *Rome* "grew to a degree of strength, much greater than that of any other power," yet the states of the world did not mutually assist each other when they were attacked by her. *P. 4*. "This universal maxim of politicks" did not operate during many ages. Some nations who ventured to depart from it, asserted their freedom against those tyrants of mankind; and