



UNIVERSITÄTS-
BIBLIOTHEK
PADERBORN

**The Works Of the late Right Honorable Henry St. John,
Lord Viscount Bolingbroke**

In Five Volumes, complete.

Bolingbroke, Henry St. John

London, 1754

An Answer to the Defence of the Enquiry into the reasons of the Conduct
of Great Britain

[urn:nbn:de:hbz:466:1-60759](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:hbz:466:1-60759)

A N
A N S W E R
T O T H E
D E F E N C E
O F T H E
ENQUIRY into the Reasons of the
Conduct of Great Britain, &c.

In a Letter to CALEB D'ANVERS, Esq;

TO THE
ANSWER

D. E. F. E. N. C. E.

OF THE
ENQUIRY into the Reasons of the
Conduct of Great Britain, &c.

In a Letter to Great D'Avenant, Esq.

A N
A N S W E R

T O T H E

Defence of the Enquiry into the Reasons of
the Conduct of Great Britain, &c.

S I R,

AS soon as I heard that the author of the * Enquiry had condescended to take notice of a Letter which you thought fit to publish in your journal of the fourth of January last, I resolv'd to make my acknowledgments to him for so great an honor, and to desire you to convey them into the world. This duty should have been dif-

* The following was the motto to this Answer to the Defence, &c. viz. " Nor can we conceive a more abject servility of conduct, than for people, so long famed for commerce and bravery, to see their darling good, and their peculiar glory, the pledge of their liberty, and life of all their property, just going to be forcibly and unrighteously torn from them; and tamely to look on without one struggle for so great a blessing, or one hearty effort against the invaders of it. What can we become, if we give our consent to such ruin by our own supine indolence and insensibility, and suffer ourselves to be stript of our boasted strength and ornament at once, but a nation, the most despicable of all nations under heaven; expos'd to the contempt and insults of the world about us here below. and rendered utterly unworthy, by our own conduct, of the care of providence above us?" Enquiry, p. 86.

charged *

charged immediately, if I had not been diverted from it by avocations of a very different nature; and if I had not observed, on a review of the present dispositions, that there was no reason in force to make a very speedy reply necessary. What I am going to say now will, I think, justify me for what I have said already, in the opinion of mankind; and at least in the secret thoughts even of the author and defender of the Enquiry: and as this effect of the little additional trouble I am about to give myself is the principal, nay, the sole good one which I dare expect, we are in time for that; and by consequence I shall not lose my labor by my delay.

THIS author hath thrown several matters in my way, to which it is proper I should say something before I enter into that which is strictly the subject of our present dispute.

HE declares upon this occasion, with all possible seriousness, that "he hath not writ, or dictated, or advanced, or directly or indirectly, had the least part in the writing or publishing any paper, which hath appeared in the world, in any form, from the time of writing the Enquiry, and from some time before that, to the twentieth of January 1728-9." He makes this declaration, "and for that space of time, particularly with a view to papers printed in the London Journal; in all which he hath been utterly unconcerned either directly or indirectly."

FAR be it from me to question the truth of so solemn a declaration. I give entire credit to it; and I freely own that he hath reason to complain of me for insinuating, at least, that he had a hand in the London Journals. The little share I have had in the paper war hath not given me many opportunities of knowing the combatants; and the productions on one side,

gave me little curiosity to enquire after the authors of them. But I found it universally affirmed, and no where contradicted, that this gentleman had a hand in the weekly papers just mentioned. The persons who recommended these papers, countenanced the opinion; and were glad, perhaps, that so considerable a name should give them an authority which might supply whatever else they wanted. Nay, I found amongst those, who were acquainted with this author, and who profess a particular regard for him, some who were angry at him on this very account; some who were sorry for him; but none who doubted the truth of the fact. What may have given occasion to so general a concurrence, he can best tell. I urge these circumstances only to shew, how I was led into an error. It was indeed error, not malice. But still I think myself obliged to take this occasion of asking his pardon; and I do it with all possible seriousness, as he made his declaration, and from the bottom of my heart; because I am as much convinced, that he neither abetted, encouraged, nor paid the authors of these papers, as I am that he was not himself the author of them.

It cannot be imputed to me, that I have any thing to answer for, on account of the personal severities which this author, in a very pathetic manner, complains of. We must acknowledge, and we ought to lament, that our public papers have abounded in scurrility. One would be tempted to imagine, that the Saturnalia were held all the year round in Britain; for those who can do nothing but rail, have had their encouragements to write; and I am persuaded that this gentleman's candor will oblige him to confess, that nothing but a thorough contempt hinders complaints from being made against the writers of his own side, much better grounded and supported by much stronger instances, than he can produce against the writers

ters of the opposite side, in his own, or in any other case. For my part, I should be extremely sorry to have it said of me, with truth, that I had railed at any author, instead of answering, or even in answering his book; and less than any would I be guilty of this crime, for such it is, towards one who defends, with so much uniformity of conduct, the liberty of the press, that corner-stone of public liberty. He who will support what hurts himself, because he thinks it the support of the whole liberty we enjoy, shall meet with nothing from me but that which he deserves from all mankind, the utmost respect, whenever he leaves me the power of shewing it, consistently with the regard I owe to truth, and to my own necessary defence.

He will not, I hope, think it inconsistent with this respect for his person, or with that which I have for some of his writings, if I cannot bring myself up to have the same for his "Enquiry into the reasons of the conduct of Great Britain;" or for his "Defence of this Enquiry." He appears to have a paternal fondness for the first of these treatises, which amounts even to a partiality; the more surprizing, because it is found in one who can boast so numerous and so fair an offspring. I should not have attempted to draw him out of an error, which he seems to indulge with so great a satisfaction, if he had not made it necessary for me. Since he hath done so, I will offer some observations on the Enquiry itself, before I come to the Defence.

THE circumstance upon which he seems to triumph a little, (that the Enquiry was not answered) he will permit me to say is often a very equivocal proof of the merit of a book. The same mouths, it seems, which pronounced the Enquiry to be a mean and despicable performance, "have more than
" once

“ once expressed in print their earnest desire that some able hand would answer it.” From what mouths he took this, I know not. But surely the testimony of those who desired some able hand would answer what they judged to be mean and despicable, is an odd testimony for him to quote; since it could proceed from nothing but a design to ridicule him.

THO the Enquiry was not answered in form, yet I believe that several, perhaps all, the points on which his system leaned, were occasionally examined, and sufficiently refuted by you, Mr. D'ANVERS, and by others. If no more was done I take the reason to have been plainly this. The ministerial air of authority and information, assumed in it, made even those, on whom this air did not impose, judge that it was prudent to wait till time and events should open the scene a little more; and as the scene opened, they perceived that the Enquiry was daily answered, in the most effectual manner, to their hands; so that the author might have waited all his life, perhaps, for something more of this sort, if he had not thought fit to seize an opportunity of defending it, not more worthy his notice, than several others before given him; and if my respect for him, and my desire to stand fair in his opinion had not determined me to make him a reply.

As to the effect of the Enquiry, which he thinks so considerable, that it “ awakened multitudes out of a dull and languid state into life and vigor; and that it was not found “ to procure slumbers either to those who liked it, or to those “ who disliked it;” I, who was most certainly one of those who either liked or disliked it, can affirm with the greatest truth, that if it did not procure me slumbers, it did not keep me awake. Some of the facts advanced in it were strange and surprising; but then they were destitute of any proof,

except the strong affirmations of the author, and collections of circumstances so extremely trivial, that they became burlesque as soon as they were seriously applied. A bare exposition of any real danger from the pretender would have waked multitudes into life and vigor, tho' the Enquiry had never been written. But I apprehend that so many pages spent on WHARTON's rambles, RIPPERDA's chit-chat, hear-says of what one great man writ concerning what another great man said, three Muscovite ships coming to Spain, embarkations which were never made, and armies which were never assembled, could have no other effect than to compose multitudes into perfect tranquility, and to confirm the opinion of their security on this head. Any surmises of an engagement, on the emperor's part, to assist Spain in the recovery of Gibraltar by force, could provoke no indignation, whatever else it might provoke, nor cause any alarm. We knew Gibraltar to be impregnable to the Spaniards, before RIPPERDA declared it to be so; and what assistance the emperor could give them towards reducing this place, unless he had in his service some of Mr. WALLER's winged troops and Pegasean horse, we were not able to discover. As to the emperor's real engagement in this article towards Spain, and as to the engagements of Spain towards the emperor, on the article of trading to the West-Indies, we soon knew what they were; and with this knowledge our alarm ceased. What was said in the long dissertations, about the Ostend company, caused likewise little or no emotion in us. Our interest was plainly not that of principals, till the Dutch had the address to make us so, by their accession to the treaty of Hanover; and the conduct of our own court, who beheld, with so much indifference, the rise and progress of this company, had taught us to be indifferent about it. These considerations, and many others which I omit, hindered the Enquiry from having the effect, which this gentleman's paternal

ternal fondness makes him believe it had. The part, if I may have leave to say so, was over-acted. But still I see no reason that he has to be concerned, because one way or other the end of writing it was answered. The Enquiry was the book of a day, like some little animals on the banks of the river Hypanis, which came to life in the morning, fulfilled all the ends of their creation, and died before night.

THERE is a point, on which the author and defender of the Enquiry values himself and his book very much; I mean the strict regard to truth which he assures us he observed in writing. Now, tho I am ready to agree that this author has always a great regard to truth, yet I affirm that I could write a book as big as the Enquiry, filled with nothing but demonstrations of his errors in matters of fact. Too much confidence in the informations he received, too much haste in composing, and above all, that fire which is apt to over-heat the imagination of polemical writers, must have caused these errors. It is impossible to account any other way, how a gentleman of nice honor, remarkable sincerity, and even exemplary piety, instead of making his propositions constantly the result of the evidence he found, upon a thorough examination, true, should, through a whole book, have constantly suited his evidence to a certain set of propositions; and how facts and dates, as stubborn things as they are in the hands of other men, should grow soft as wax under his touch.

BUT it is not my design to enter into a disquisition of this sort. It would shew ill-nature, which I hope I have not; and it would be now of no use whatever. I must however defend myself, as unwilling as I am to offend him; and therefore since he contradicts what I said, viz. that "he had been given up in every material article of the Enquiry;" I think myself

obliged to prove it. "How easy are such words as these," says our author, "but how hard to support them?" Now I do assure him that these words, as far as they may be thought harsh or impolite, will at no time fall easily from my tongue or pen; but he will find that it is easy for me, upon this occasion, to support them. I will confine myself to the four great points of danger, arising from the Vienna treaties, and mentioned already. Let us see whether he has been given up in them or not.

ACCORDING to the Enquiry, we were in danger of losing not only our East and West-India trade, but many other branches of the British trade, by the privileges supposed to be granted to the emperor's subjects, and from the enjoyment of which privileges we are debarred. Nay, it was very strongly insinuated that even the ruin of Britain was involved in this point. If this had been the case, and if the treaty of Vienna had thus settled the matter, there would have been occasion for all the outcries which we meet with in the Enquiry, and for still more. But our most knowing merchants gave up this point, as soon as they read and considered the several clauses; and it is notorious, that the contracting powers declared, as soon as they heard of the objection, that their meaning was not to give these privileges to the imperial subjects above other nations; and that they would explain the text accordingly, if any ambiguity made it necessary. But in truth there was little or no ambiguity in the matter, except what the representations of it occasioned; for without entering any deeper into it, let us observe that the answers which this author gives to the objection, which he was forced, from the notoriety of the thing, to make to himself, are evasive and fallacious; for since the same liberty of entering the Spanish ports in the West-Indies, in case of distress by bad weather,

ther, or for refreshment, is granted to us by the treaty of 1670, as is granted to the imperial subjects by the treaty of Vienna, does it follow that more is granted to them than to us, because the liberty granted to us hath ceased for many years? If we have not made use of the liberty, the fact affirmed is nothing to the purpose. If we have been denied it, such denial is an infraction of the treaty of 1670, and proves that we have had injustice done us by the practice of the Spaniards; but doth not help to prove that we have had any done us by their concessions to the emperor, with whom they may keep this article, perhaps, as little as they have done with us, and who is not likely to have the same means of obliging them to it as we have in our power, whenever we please to employ them.

How the eighth article of the treaty of Utrecht came to be quoted, on this occasion, is to me marvellous. That article is made general to all nations; but was particularly directed against the French, who, even at that time, continued to obtain licences to send ships to trade in the South-Sea, as they had done all the war. But the treaty of Utrecht confirms the treaty of 1670; and the stipulation, that "no licence, or any permission at all, shall at any time be given to the French, or any other nation whatsoever-----to sail, traffic, &c. to the dominions subject to the crown of Spain in America," cannot surely be construed to deprive us of the right of going into those parts, in the cases allowed by the treaty of 1670. This seems so clear, that I may pronounce the gentleman given up, on this head, by the most knowing merchants, and by every man who can read and understand what he reads.

BUT I may go farther; for it appears even from the fifth article of the provisional treaty itself, which is said to secure

us from the dangerous engagements contained in the treaties of Vienna, with relation to trade, that the king of Spain "never understood to grant, by the said treaty, any privileges contrary to the treaties confirmed above; nor to give to his imperial majesty any greater advantages than those enjoyed by other nations in their commerce; his imperial majesty adopting for his subjects the above-mentioned declaration, made in the name of his catholic majesty." And it is very observable that this article seems to be inserted in the treaty, merely upon the surmises of the ministers of France, Great-Britain and Holland, who have pretended, as it is said in the introduction to it, "that in the treaty of commerce, concluded at Vienna on the first of May, 1725---there were divers clauses, which clashed with articles of several treaties of commerce, anterior to the year 1725," &c.

If therefore the natural sense of the Vienna treaty itself, as well as the declaration of their imperial and catholic majesties, as soon as the objection was first started, and their offer to remove any supposed ambiguity in this article of the Vienna treaty, were not sufficient to satisfy us; what farther satisfaction shall we receive by the provisional treaty, in case it should be accepted, which contains only the very same declaration? ---But this hath been sufficiently explained already by your correspondent RALEIGH.

As to the Ostend trade, he thinks that I myself cannot be against him, unless in the degree of the importance of it. Now this is the very point upon which he must be given up, in this case, if he is given up at all. I never heard that any man was wild enough to affirm, that the trade carried on from Ostend, was of no consequence whatever to us. But the question is, whether that trade be of that degree of importance

tance to us, which he represents. He asks, "who of those I oppose hath declared against him in this?" I answer, The very person I quoted in the passage he had before his eyes, when he asked this question. He says, in the Enquiry, "that our East and West-India trade will be ruined by the Ostend company; that they are so already, in some degree; that the contagion will spread to other branches; in short, that this trade will carry riches, strength, and naval power from us to the Spanish Netherlands." What says PUBLICOLA? "The Ostend trade, about which such a noise hath been made," (he must mean by the enquirer, since the enquirer made more noise about it than all the other writers put together) "was more the concern of our neighbors, both by treaty and interest, than our own." I appeal now, in my turn; and I appeal to the enquirer himself. Is not one of these representations directly contrary to the other? Does not PUBLICOLA diminish the consequences of the Ostend trade to us, and treat it even lightly? Does not he magnify it, in the strongest terms, and make our all depend upon the obstruction of it? Does not PUBLICOLA, an author whom I oppose, give him up?

WE are now come to the danger, much insisted upon in the Enquiry *, "of having Gibraltar wrested out of our hands by force, if it be possible, unless we will basely yield it up;" and this danger is grounded on a supposed † mutual engagement between the emperor and king of Spain, contained in a secret offensive treaty. The writer of the Enquiry confesses, "that the imperial resident read to some of our ministers the words, which he said were the contents of the article which his master had entered into, relating to Gibraltar; the which implied, that his master had engaged to use his good offices

* Page 57.

† Page 34, 35.

“for the restitution of Gibraltar.” Now from hence, because this resident read all that related to this point, and did not shew the whole treaty to us, any more than we thought ourselves obliged to shew to the imperial ministers the treaties of 1721, which we made at Madrid with one of the parties between whom we were at that time mediators, in the congress at Cambray; from hence, I say, the writer I am answering concludes that the truth of what he imputes to the emperor stands confirmed: but this offensive alliance hath appeared hitherto no where, except in his writings; and the article relating to Gibraltar, in the defensive alliance between the emperor and king of Spain, is surely as contrary as possible to all that he hath advanced. By that article it appears, that the Spaniards affirmed a promise on our part to restore Gibraltar. In consideration of this promise, the emperor declares he will not oppose this restitution, if it be made amicably; that if it be necessary, he will employ his good offices, and even his mediation, if the parties desire it. Till therefore the enquirer can shew another article between the contracting powers in the Vienna treaties, about Gibraltar, this must be reputed the sole article of that kind, and by consequence a flat contradiction to all that he hath said on this occasion; so that if his own side do not give him up in this case, both they and he will be given up, I fear, in the opinion of every other man in Europe; to which I shall add, since the observation lies fairly in my way, that every man, who knows any thing of the interest of Europe, knows it as much the interest of the emperor, that Britain should keep Gibraltar, as it is the interest of one of our allies, that we should lose the possession of this place; and yet we have been taught, by some profound statesmen, to apprehend the emperor’s efforts to take it from us, and to rely on the assistance of France to preserve it to us.

I HAVE

I HAVE reserved to the last the greatest of all those dangers, which are represented in the Enquiry; and that is the danger of the pretender.

IT is there affirmed, * “ that one express article of the alliance between the emperor and Spain, contained an obligation in favor of the pretender, and a stipulation to make the attempt for him in England, before opening the war in any other parts.” Nay, this author was so well informed of all these proceedings, that he gives us the particular engagements which the pretender, in return, took towards the emperor and Spain. All these things are asserted in the strongest manner, as founded on “ positive intelligence; on intelligence from more than one person; on undoubted intelligence, and such as could be entirely depended on.” Now I suspect that the enquirer would think me very impertinent, if I should seem to question the authority of his intelligence; and yet I verily believe, that I have better reasons to do so than he had to depend upon it, when he writ the words I have quoted. But we will wave saying any thing more on a point on which it is proper for neither of us to speak plain. His good opinion of the intelligence communicated to him will not give it the stamp of infallibility; nor will my bad opinion destroy its credit. The world will therefore judge, or rather has judged, of the validity of what he does not explain, by the force or weakness of the other circumstances which he enlarges upon; and by observing whether the course of events hath justified this boasted intelligence or not. I have just mentioned above the chief of these circumstances; and notwithstanding the great respect I have for this author, nothing shall oblige me to treat them more seriously. I will shew him, however, that

• Page 52.

H h 2

the

the course of events hath destroyed all the use he pretended to make of these circumstances, and that it has contradicted, instead of confirming his intelligence. He says, * "that the vigorous resolutions taken, and the preparations and dispositions made by Great Britain, suspended the execution of this design. The Spaniards found themselves obliged to send part of their ships from Cadiz and St. Andero to the West-Indies, and the Muscovite ships returned home."----- Very well! The event does not yet justify the intelligence; but that is accounted for. The execution of the design was suspended for the present. The design went on then; and the preparations for an invasion by consequence. It must have been so; for we find in the Enquiry, † that the design thus suspended was afterwards prevented by the appearance of a British fleet on the Spanish coast. Now let me desire you, Mr. D'ANVERS, to take the trouble of turning to Sir JOHN JENNINGS' letter, dated August 10, 1726, and made public here; in which you will find the Spaniards so little prepared to invade us, that when he came on their coast, they seemed to be in the greatest consternation, that all the troops they could assemble did not exceed three thousand men, and that these were in very bad condition.

I ASK now, is the intelligence of the enquirer, upon this head, supported by any thing but his own affirmation? Is it not contradicted by the whole course of events? Does there appear the least reason to believe that he had a sure foundation to build upon, when he made such bold assertions, and of such a nature? The secret offensive treaty, which he talks so much of, has never appeared, nor any footsteps of it; and many people are apt to believe that it never existed any where

* Page 51.

† Page 97.

but

but in some people's luxuriant fancy. The several treaties made at Vienna in 1725, between the emperor and Spain, have been long public; and when it was observed, some where or other, that nothing was contained in them like what the enquirer had asserted, the enquirer was given up. He was said to be mistaken. The article, in favor of the pretender, was said to be in some other treaty; and afterwards in no formal treaty. It was not a treaty. It was an engagement. This may be called, by some ill-bred people, shuffling: but sure I am that it must pass for a direct giving up of this author; who will find, perhaps, if he pleases to enquire into the particulars of what passed on this occasion, that the person who gave him thus up, had some share in setting him to work.

AFTER this, it is hardly worth notice, that the author of the "Observations on the Conduct of Great-Britain" has given him up likewise; for the utmost which this writer ventures to say, when he comes to speak of this engagement, asserted by the enquirer to be contained in an article of a treaty, is this; "our apprehensions were that there might be engagements in favor of the pretender." Let the enquirer consider again, whether I was in the wrong to advance, that he had been given up, even by his own side.

HAVING justified what I presumed to advance concerning the Enquiry, I come now to the Defence of it.

THE gentleman begins this Defence by stating the case, so he calls it, as he did in the Enquiry; and then he proceeds to take notice of what hath followed since the date of that book; that is to say, he represents the matter in dispute, just as it suits his purpose; leaving out many things necessary to
set

set the whole in a true light; asserting some things, which have been never proved; and others, which I think never can be proved; making what insinuations, drawing what conclusions he thinks fit; and in a word, begging the question in almost every line. It is hard to conceive for what purpose this is done. The reason given, I am sure, is not a good one; since the principal facts and reasonings upon which the strength of all that can be said must be founded, are so far from seeming to be forgot, that they seem to be the only things remembered, or thought of at this time, and are the common topicks of almost every conversation. There must therefore be some other reason for this method of proceeding; and I can guess but one. This method may perhaps be thought proper to catch unwary readers, and to give a particular bias to their minds, with which they are to read and to judge of all that follows. I could make use of the same art; and, without being at much pains, draw up a state of the case very contrary to that which he hath drawn, and at least as plausible. But I think the proceeding too unfair to copy after it. I have indeed no reason to do so; since, very indifferent to all other considerations, I seek nothing in this dispute but the discovery of the truth: and therefore, as I will receive nothing but what is supported by the evidence of fact, and the force of argument, so I will not presume to attempt imposing any thing, void of both, upon others. Besides, this gentleman undertakes to "consider what I have advanced, either against any thing, in which he can be supposed to be concerned; or upon any subject of debate, (of this debate he means) which appears to him to be of importance:" so that if I am able to refute all that he objects to me, in the Defence of this Enquiry, I refute all objections, of any importance, to what I have said in my former letter to you; and then I imagine that his state of the case will do him no great honor, and his cause little good.

THE

THE first point on which I am attacked by the defender of the Enquiry is, on the turn, so he calls it, which I have given to the very beginning of this whole scene. He means the Vienna alliance.

LET us see therefore whether it is he or I, for one of us may, perhaps, have done so, who hath endeavored, in treating this subject, to turn every thing to the service of some other cause than that of truth.

IN the Enquiry, he represented the Vienna alliance, as to the manner, and as to the matter of it, to be one of the most astonishing phaenomena which ever appeared in the political world. What surprize to see two princes, rivals almost from their infancy, "two powers, that could hardly be kept within the bounds of common decency towards one another, privately running into one another's arms," as he expresses himself? What a surprize to see the emperor abandon the mediation of Great Britain and France; to the first of whom he and his family owed so many obligations; and to the last of whom, in conjunction with the first, he owed the acquisition of Sicily, and the other advantages of the quadruple alliance? What a surprize to see Spain abandon this mediation, just in the moment, as my adversary has extremely well observed, when the interests of the duke of PARMA were in agitation; interests which Spain had extremely at heart; and in the supporting which, she had reason to think herself sure of success against the emperor; because the mediators had taken secret engagements with her to favor these interests, by one of the treaties made at Madrid in 1721? What a surprize to see Spain do this, and in doing it, not only forego the advantages which the mediators had procured, and were to procure for her, in many respects; particularly, in that favorite point, the succe-
sion.

sion of Don CARLOS; but make so bad a bargain for herself at Vienna, that the emperor, according to this author, and indeed I think according to the truth, "gained every thing, "and particularly the guaranty of his own succession?"

ALL this, it must be confessed, appeared wonderful, and excited a strong curiosity to know what were the springs of so great, and, according to these representations, so sudden a revolution of counsels and interests. But here we were dropped. The enquirer spent much time, and took much pains to shew what did not occasion it; but I have not observed, that he pretended to shew what did; unless he meant, that we should take, for causes of it, those terrible designs which he imputes to the emperor and the king of Spain. Our ministers, who seem to have foreseen so little that France and Spain might break, and that the negotiations then on foot might be thrown into confusion, or take some new course, by this rupture, grew it seems prodigiously alert and sagacious afterwards. They did not foresee what happened; but they discovered strange mysteries of iniquity concealed under this transaction, when it had happened; and these mysteries we find pompously unfolded in the Enquiry, with all the improvements and embellishments which the author's luxuriant fancy could bestow upon them. Now supposing these discoveries to have been real, the things so discovered can be looked upon no otherwise than as circumstances of the general measure; the measure, which the emperor and Spain took, of treating by themselves and for themselves; and therefore they wanted to be accounted for as much as the measure itself: but upon this head, I say, the enquirer gave us no satisfaction. Far from explaining to us what might induce Spain to take such a resolution, at that particular point of time, rather than at any other, he did not afford us the least hint to guess, why we should

should take it at all; and yet so strange an effect must have had some very considerable cause; too considerable certainly to be absolutely a secret, and even beyond the reach of conjecture.

THIS remarkable defect was, I believe, felt by every person who read the Enquiry; and therefore in the progress of the dispute, the writers of the same side thought it incumbent upon them to assign some cause, which might appear proportionable to such extraordinary effects; and which, at the same time, might not be inconsistent with what their great master, the enquirer, had advanced. The task was not easy; and indeed they have succeeded accordingly. Some laid the cause of all in that inveterate rancor, which they supposed the court of Spain to have conceived against us, on two accounts; the promise made by lord STANHOPE about Gibraltar, and the defeat of the Spanish fleet in the Mediterranean. When this was exploded, and I think it was so as soon as examined, they had recourse to another system; a very strange one indeed: for it declares that the emperor, France, and Great Britain, the three contracting powers with Spain in the quadruple alliance, acted the most perfidious part imaginable in that whole proceeding; such a part as FERDINAND the catholic, or LEWIS the eleventh would have startled at. The succession of Don CARLOS, was, it seems, * a point, which all the powers of Europe strenuously opposed; which the emperor, who had already obtained his desires in the affair of Sicily, could not be for; to which the French were averse; which Great Britain had reason to oppose and prevent; and which it was plain that the Spaniards could never carry in a congress, where every party was an enemy to their intentions. Surely nothing so extra-

* British Journal, Jan. 4.

vagant, nothing so insolent as this was ever yet advanced! If you, Mr. D'ANVERS, had presumed even to insinuate any thing like it, I believe you would have been prosecuted with all the severity possible; and I am sure you would have been given up by all your friends. Neither can I conceive how the enquirer, who is so zealous an assertor of our honor in the observation of treaties, could pass by such an imputation as this, without darting his thunder at the impious head who devised the slander; unless he thinks it an irremissible sin to account for any thing in contradiction to himself; and a venial fault to accuse Great Britain and France, as well as the emperor, of something worse than a violation of treaties; even of making them with a design to break them; and of obliging a prince, by long negotiations, and by a war, to accept conditions, which they never intended should be made good to him.

AMONGST others, I presumed, at last, to account for this great event upon principles which I believed to be true, notwithstanding all that I read in the Enquiry; and which I still believe to be true, notwithstanding all that is said against them, in the defence of the Enquiry.

THE defender begins with quoting two or three passages, which relate to the sending back the infants, and the point of the sole mediation, out of my letter to you; and then, without disproving the facts, or so much as mentioning the argument grounded upon them, he pretends that the whole is hypothetical; and thinks it would be a full and sufficient reply to me, to "frame a scheme on the other side, and to oppose supposition to supposition, and one arbitrary interpretation of appearances to another." After which he proceeds to frame such a scheme, partly on facts, which he would have us believe true, and partly, as he says himself, from his own invention; and

and this he thinks proper to oppose, in a ludicrous manner, to the account I have given.

Now if it shall appear, on examination, that I have built upon undeniable facts, and have reasoned justly, instead of building on suppositions, and giving arbitrary interpretations to appearances, this author's smartness will turn upon himself, and, instead of shewing that I deserved no answer, he will only have shewn that he was unable to give me a good one.

LET us enter into this examination.

I affirmed, and I do still affirm, that from the death of the duke of ORLEANS, the Spanish ministers were full of fears and jealousies about the completing the infanta's marriage with the king of France. Neither do I find any thing urged in the Defence of the Enquiry, to destroy the credibility of this fact. Indeed, if it was proper to descend into particulars of so delicate a nature, it would not be at all difficult to demonstrate, from a consideration of the change which was made in the French ministry, and of the difference of personal situations, interests and views, that altho there never could have been room for such fears and jealousies as these, while the duke of ORLEANS had lived, yet there was great room for entertaining them, under the administration of his successor. But this is not all. These fears and jealousies increased and strengthened daily, in the minds of the Spanish ministers; and if this author pleases to enquire, I believe he will find, or else his prompters deal very unfairly by him, that the delay and excuses of the court of France, about performing the ceremony of the Fiancials, which Spain expected should have been performed soon after the time at which the duke of ORLEANS died, confirmed, in the highest degree, the suspicions already taken.

The ceremony of the Fiancialles would have secured the marriage. What other effect then could excuses and delays in this affair produce, but that which I have mentioned ?

THE Enquiry * says, " that the resolution of the court of France, relating to the infanta, did not come, no not in " suspicion to Madrid, till March 8. N. S. 1724-5." If he means the particular resolution of sending her back at such a determinate time, that is nothing to the purpose, how much soever the affirmation might impose, when it was made use of at first, and before this matter had been sufficiently canvassed. But if the resolution of sending the infanta back, at some time or other ; in plain terms, the resolution of not completing her marriage with the king of France be meant : then, I say, that I might very justly have set this assertion down in the list of those which are made in the book without a strict regard to truth ; for it is undeniably true, that the Spanish ministers in foreign courts, entertained this suspicion above a year before that time. It is equally true, that several months before that time they spoke of this measure, as a thing they expected ; and I add, that several private persons, at least, writ from Madrid in the same stile, to their correspondents in other countries. Of all this I am as sure, as I am sure I now hold a pen in my hand ; or that a pamphlet, called " A Defence of " the Enquiry," is now lying before me ; and therefore neither the authority of the Enquiry, nor any better authority can persuade me, that the suspicion of a design to send the infanta back from France, did not come to Madrid till March 1724-5 ; because it would be absurd to believe, that the ministers of that court were less informed or less jealous about an affair of this importance, than private persons ; or that the

* Page 15.

repeated

repeated advices, which must have come from the Spanish ministers abroad, made no impression upon those at home.

THIS fact is, I think, pretty well established; and the others I am to mention will occasion no dispute. They are these. The Spaniards* first took the resolution of throwing off the mediation, and of treating at Vienna in November 1724; and RIPPERRDA's full powers were signed, according to the Enquiry, on the 22d of that month; that is, about a year after the death of the duke of Orleans. Soon after this, the negotiation was begun; but the treaties, in which it terminated, were not signed till the last of April and the first of May 1725.

THESE, I presume, are facts, and not suppositions. Let it now be considered how I argue upon them, and whether my reasoning be nothing more than an arbitrary interpretation of appearances, as the author of the Defence hath rashly pronounced, but not ventured to attempt to prove. The sum of my argument is this. Since the Spaniards expected that the infantina would be, a little sooner or a little later, sent back from France, they expected to find themselves, a little sooner, or a little later, obliged in honor to shew a due resentment of this affront, to send back the princesses of the house of Bourbon from Spain, and to break off that correspondence which had subsisted between the two courts, from Spain's accession to the quadruple alliance, and which had been so intimate, during the life of the duke of Orleans. They could not foresee how long this rupture might last, because they could not foresee how soon a change would be made in the French ministry, and satisfaction be given them for this affront; but they could not fail to foresee, that if this event should happen during the

* Enquiry, page 15.

congress of Cambray, something worse than the affront would follow, and they must remain in the most abandoned condition imaginable; broke with one mediator; not sure of the other; the emperor in possession of Sicily; and the reciprocal condition, in favor of Don CARLOS, not effectually secured to them. These things are so intimately and necessarily tied together, that I can as little discover how it is possible to allow the first fact which regards the suspicions and expectations of the Spaniards, and deny the consequences which follow, as I can see how it is possible to contradict, with the least appearance of reason, a fact so publicly known, supported by so many circumstances, and justified by so many consequences as the first is. The probable arguments employed in the Defence, and which, it may be pretended, will serve to prove that tho the fact were true, and the suspicion I have insisted on was entertained by the court of Madrid, yet that it did not produce the effects of throwing Spain into the engagement she took at Vienna, will be considered presently.

THUS far then, as we have a deduction of facts, not of suppositions; so we have a thread of consequential arguments, not a rhapsody of arbitrary interpretations of appearances. The case is fairly stated, and no imaginary scheme is offered to be imposed for truth. The probability, which results from this state, is confirmed, and I think turned into certainty by the event. By the state above-mentioned, it was probable that Spain would take measures, in time, against the distress to which she must foresee that she stood exposed. Accordingly, the Spaniards began to treat at Vienna before the infanta was sent from France, which is a fact allowed on all hands, that they might prepare for the worst; and when I add, that they delayed concluding their treaty, or that the conclusion of their treaty was delayed till what they feared happened, what do I affirm

affirm more than what my adversary allows? He had said, at first, that the "treaty of peace was signed at Vienna, before what Spain feared from France was known there." He has corrected that assertion, and has said, "that as the treaty of peace was agreed to at Vienna before what Spain feared from France was known at Vienna to have happened; so it was signed before the refusal of Britain could be known there;" that is, the refusal of the sole mediation. The first point then is yielded to me. The Spaniards did not actually sign at Vienna, till the news came thither, of the infant's being actually sent from France; tho they had settled and agreed their terms with the imperialists, on the knowledge that she would be sent away. On the second point, all that I urged, as fact or argument, stands in the same force it did before; for I desire this author may not be indulged in a liberty I shall never take with him nor any one else, the liberty of carrying my affirmations, by strained constructions, farther than the plain and natural import of the terms I employ.

IN opposition to PUBLICOLA, I shewed that the manner in which he affirmed the treaty of Vienna to have been signed before the refusal of the mediation was known there, did not refute RALEIGH, on account of some possible circumstances there mentioned. Now this author has been forced to leave the proof, drawn from those possible circumstances, just as he found it. "There is no proof," says he, "but the bare possibility here insisted on." I say no more. The argument is as strong against him, as against PUBLICOLA; for even after the advantages taken over PUBLICOLA, for not expressing himself clearly, this author has, for reasons easy to be guessed, expressed himself in a manner liable to the same objection. "The peace was signed," he says, "before the refusal of Britain could be known." What! before it could be known by certain
and

and direct intelligence, or before it could be known in form, after the tedious round which this resolution was to take? That is not explained; and yet that was the single point on which any thing could be said to the purpose. In short, we pursued, with great steadiness, our wise maxims of neglecting Spain, and of adhering closely to France; insomuch that those who wished us no good, were perhaps heard, when they insinuated that, far from contributing to ward off a blow so much apprehended by Spain, we privately abetted France, in her design of breaking the match, and imagined by that measure, to establish an irreconcilable quarrel between the two courts. The Spaniards, as well as the imperialists, had reason to believe, from our whole conduct, that we should not accept the sole mediation, which had been offered to us; and was it then strange that the former, neglected by us, provoked by France, should press the signing this treaty, without waiting long for our answer; or that the emperor, who got so much by the bargain, should consent to it?

HAVING been thus led to the affair of the sole mediation, which I had hitherto omitted to speak of, in order to avoid confusion, I shall consider it here, as far as this author has made it necessary for me. In my letter to you, Mr. D'ANVERS, I dwelt a good deal upon it. I placed it in every light, and debated all the merits of the cause, as well as I was able. Now, if what I urged was absurd and nothing to the purpose, this author should have shewn, in general, that it did not deserve a more particular answer. If what I urged was clear and strong, as some people imagine it was, this author, who declares himself, in every point, of a contrary opinion, should have had the goodness to examine and refute my arguments. How it happens I know not; but this great master of polemical writing hath, in every instance, upon this occasion, avoided
to

to enter into the argument. He hath dwelt on the outside of things, and hath generally cavilled at circumstances.

I HAVE just now given a strong instance of this; and I lay hold of the opportunity to tell this gentleman, that I am no apologist for Spain, tho he endeavors to fix that character upon me by an innuendo, so very fine, that I was for some time at a loss to find out his meaning. I neither sounded to arms against the Spaniards, two years ago; nor am, at present, an advocate for bearing their delays and their insults. I neither aggravated, two years ago, the depredations and hostilities committed in the West-Indies by the Spaniards; * “and those violences, by which the whole commerce of Jamaica hath been well nigh destroyed, and the trade of that island reduced to a miserable condition;” nor do I now soften in their favor, and call these outrages and losses by the gentle name of † “inconveniencies attending a state of uncertainty.”

BUT to return. Having given an instance of this author's cavilling at circumstances not material in the dispute, I shall now give some instances of his affirming over again, by way of answer, what had been refuted before; and when I have done this, I shall have taken notice of all that he says upon the subject of the sole mediation.

FIRST then he says, that the knowledge of the negotiations going on at Vienna was a just reason to decline this offer, which he supposes to have been a mere piece of mockery. But he does not so much as pretend to say a word, in answer to what I insisted upon, as an advantage in accepting this mediation, even supposing it offered to us without any design that we should

* Enquiry, page 60.

† Defence, page 13.

concern ourselves in it. He does not pretend so much as to controvert what I urged, to prove that the worse opinion we had of the designs carried on at Vienna, the more reason there was to catch at this offer of the mediation.

SECONDLY, he insists, that we could not accept this mediation, with a due regard to our alliance with France; and he supposes, that this reason will be thought just by "all those who do not think the breach of faith, and the violation of treaties, matters of no concern." Here again is another charitable inuendo. But let it pass. It would be easy to strengthen all that was said on this subject, in my Letter to you, by shewing the difference between such a stipulation as this of a joint mediation, and the covenants which princes and states enter into with one another, about their mutual interests. But there is no need of it, since this author, who thinks fit to insist on this point, hath not thought fit to answer any one of the arguments urged by me, to prove that France could not have complained of us, if we had accepted this mediation; and yet there were some dilemma's laid down, which seemed to deserve a solution.

LASTLY, he pretends that I affirmed, against the most public facts, and the plainest appearances, what I said to shew that our acceptance of the mediation must have been agreeable to France: and yet what I said was founded on public facts, and the plainest appearances; which he has not touched, because he durst not deny them. It is really very strange, that so considerable an author should continue to write, when he can neither find out new arguments, nor answer the objections made to old ones.

HAVING

HAVING now dispatched the point of the sole mediation, it remains that I say something to those probable arguments, if they deserve that name, which I have civilly given them, by which this gentleman pretends to destroy what is, I think, established on the solid foundation of fact and reason, concerning the measure taken in France after the death of the late duke of ORLEANS, to break the match with the infanta, and the consequence of that measure, the throwing Spain into the hands of the emperor.

Now the first of these arguments is, that the court of Spain did not mention this affront from France, as any inducement to the transaction at Vienna; and that any such mention would have been inconsistent with other declarations made to Mr. STANHOPE at Madrid. Very well. It is then an established rule, that we are not to believe a court has motives for their conduct, which motives they do not own, altho we have the strongest reasons imaginable to believe such motives true. Another rule, which this author would do well to establish at the same time, and which is founded on as much reason as the former, is this; that we are to believe all the motives which a court thinks fit to give out, to account for their conduct, altho we have the plainest proofs imaginable that these motives are false. Such logic as this was never introduced into politics, I believe, before; and I am persuaded that you, Mr. D'ANVERS, will excuse me, if I spend no time in answering it. Let me desire you however, before I leave this argument, to turn to the thirteenth and fourteenth pages of the Enquiry, where you will find that the enquirer says, the imperial ministers at Cambray, at London and at Paris, talked the very language, which the defender of the Enquiry says the Spaniards were always ashamed to make use of*. Nay, the en-

* Page 19.

quirer adds, that “ upon the first public news of the Vienna treaty at Madrid, the discourses of many were taught to run that way, and to dwell upon that same popular topic.”

THE second of these arguments is this. If the news of sending back the infanta from France, and of Great Britain’s refusing the sole mediation, had both come to Madrid before RIPPERDA was sent from thence; even this “ could not have really been, and would not have been pretended to have been the motive of what was afterwards done at Vienna.” And why, pray? Because when the news of our refusing the sole mediation did come, the court of Spain acknowledged it to be a reasonable proceeding. This, you see, is built on the principles laid down in the last article, and deserves no farther notice. But on the news coming to Madrid, that the infanta was sent home, he confesses that the “ court of Spain might, by such circumstances, be induced to try what honorable terms the emperor would come to.” This concession goes farther than he is aware of; for I desire to know if it is reasonable to believe that Spain would have treated with the emperor, when the case had happened, why it is unreasonable to believe that Spain did begin to treat with him on almost a certain prospect that the case would happen; which is the great point we have been contending about? Ay, but Spain would not have treated with the emperor to hurt Holland and Britain, because Spain had been hurt by France; nor would the emperor have entered into a treaty to hurt them, who had no part in the affront to Spain and never injured the emperor. Again; much less would the king of Spain send a minister to Vienna to enter into and finish treaties, which should hurt other nations, upon a suspicion that France would hereafter affront him. I could make several reflections on some of the expressions in this place; and on the turn, which the author

2 takes,

takes, of putting some very odd arguments into my mouth; and, what is still more, into the mouths of the emperor and the king of Spain. But I forbear; and content myself with saying two things, which will effectually blunt the point of all the wit employed in this paragraph, and fully answer the whole of what is said farther upon this subject, in the Defence of the Enquiry.

FIRST then; as far as I am from being, or pretending to be, a master in politics, which degree this writer seems to have taken long ago, I never imagined that the affront, considered merely as an affront, precipitated Spain into all the engagements she took with the emperor; tho, by the way, he mistakes very much, if he thinks, as he says, that he may deny new fresh resentments to determine the conduct of princes, exactly upon the same grounds, as I have denied that old stale resentments have this effect. What I imagined, what I said, and what I proved was, that this affront, considered as a necessary breach with France, at least for a time, would throw Spain into such circumstances of distress, as she was to prevent by all possible means; and that therefore reason of state determined in this case; tho no doubt the affront, at the same time, provoked the Spaniards. Thus I am consistent with myself; and the author might have spared himself the trouble of writing this elaborate paragraph, if he had adverted to my sense, instead of playing with my words.

SECONDLY; as to the emperor, our author is guilty of begging the question; for the emperor will insist, as he has insisted, that his engagements were not engagements to injure any body; that he entered into no offensive alliance; and that, when he exacted from Spain the guaranty of the Ostend trade, and of his succession, he exacted the guaranty of no-
thing

thing but of that, which he judges he has an independent right to establish and secure. As to Spain, it will be likewise said, that when his catholic majesty treated with the emperor, he never meant to hurt other nations, but to secure his own interests; that if his guaranty of the Ostend trade hurts the Dutch or us, he is sorry for it; but could no more avoid that engagement than he could several others extremely disadvantageous to himself, and into which he was however obliged to enter, because he was obliged to purchase the emperor's alliance at any rate: that therefore we must not blame him, who opposed the establishment of the Ostend company, whilst he could do it, without any support from us; who never gave his guaranty to it, till he was forced to do so, by the necessity of his affairs; into which necessity he was falling for above a year together, without seeing the hand of Britain once stretched forth to hinder it. Such answers as these would certainly be given; and, in the mouths of the imperialists and the Spaniards, they would be just.

IF, after all that has been said, this gentleman is unable, upon my notions, to account for the king of Spain's resolute flying from the mediatorship of France, I am sure it is not my fault. A few sacrifices did indeed help to pacify Spain, and to reconcile her to France; and a few sacrifices might, for aught I know, have reconciled our quarrels; or, which is better, have prevented them. But as no one can foresee now when such sacrifices will be made here; so neither could Spain, at the time when she sent to Vienna, foresee when such sacrifices would be made in France.

UPON the whole matter, and to conclude this tedious article; if the way in which I have endeavored to account for the resolution taken by Spain to abandon the mediation of
Cambray,

Cambray, and to treat at Vienna, be not right, I should be glad to know what the right way is. No other, which this gentleman, or any reasonable man will venture to support, has been yet pointed out. But I apprehend the account I have given to be a just one; because it is built on fact and reason; because the event hath, in every respect, confirmed it; and because it shews not only why Spain broke with France, and applied to the emperor; but why Spain entered into these new measures, after the death of the duke of ORLEANS, which it cannot be pretended she ever thought of doing, while that prince was alive. If now this account be a just one, many melancholy but useful truths result from it.

BUT I need not point out these things. The world will discover them, without any help of mine, and will judge how well the Enquiry hath been vindicated, by the author and defender of it upon this head.

THE next point, upon which my reasonings and imputations are to be tried at his tribunal, is that of Gibraltar; and here he sets out, by accusing me, not in terms indeed, but in a manner almost as plain, of lying, of direct, premeditated lying. I will keep my temper, tho a field large enough is opened to me, and tho the provocation is not a little aggravated by the solemn air with which this accusation is brought, by the pretences to patience and meekness and candor, and by all the appeals to God with which my accuser hath, in several parts of this treatise, endeavored to captivate the good opinion of mankind, and to establish his own reputation, that he might make sure of ruining that of others. He calls to my mind the character of MOPSUS in TASSO'S Aminta.

---di

-----di quel MOPSO

Ch' a ne la lingua melate parole,
 E ne le labra un' amichevol ghigno,
 - - - - - e il rasoio

Tien sotto il manto.

I WILL have the decency not to translate the verses into english.

It is not necessary that I should say much about the jealousies which this author seems to complain arose at one time, lest Gibraltar would be given up or artfully betrayed into the Spaniards hands; nor about the vigorous defence of it, which was made afterwards. Thus much however I will say, that when Sir JOHN JENNINGS was called home, with all the troops embarked on board his squadron, just before the siege, and even from the neighborhood of Gibraltar; when the Spaniards were suffered, under Sir CHARLES WAGER's eyes, to transport by sea many things necessary for the attack of the place; and when it was known that the town wanted almost every thing necessary for the defence of it, people stood a-gaze, and not without reason. The cries of the nation precipitated at last the supplies, and the vigor of the garrison made a glorious use of them.

I COME now to the accusation brought against me by this writer. I said, in my Letter to you, that the Spaniards ground their present claim to the restitution of Gibraltar, on a "private article in a treaty made with them in 1721, stipulating the contents of a letter to be written by the late king, and on the letter written in pursuance of this article." This is the fact. The accusation is, that there is no such article in the treaty;

treaty ; and many words are employed to cut off all pretences of excuse, and to pin the lie upon me. Now I desire it may be observed, in the first place, how very exact and knowing a critic this gentleman is ; who, after pronouncing with so much emphasis, that " he hath read the treaty himself, and finds no " one article belonging to it, which hath the least relation to " this subject," proceeds to mention the treaty, and quotes a wrong one. No man would have imagined that such a stipulation could have been supposed to be in the defensive alliance between Great Britain, France and Spain, of the thirteenth of June, 1721, who had known that there was a distinct private treaty, of the same date, between Great Britain and Spain. But this, it seems, was a secret to my accuser ; tho' the treaty had appeared printed in the fourth volume of Rousset's collection, when he committed this mistake. It was of this treaty I meant to speak ; and the reason why I expressed myself in that manner was this. I have had some years by me an extract of this very treaty, which was long kept a great secret, and for the keeping of which secret there is an express provision in the sixth article of it. When the treaty became public, I found that my extract of the several articles was exact ; and therefore I gave the more credit to the separate article, mentioned in the same extract, as belonging to this treaty, and stipulating the contents of a letter to be written by the late king. The letter I never saw ; but the account I have had of it by those who have read it, agrees with my extract. All this induced me to think, that there was such a separate and more private article, belonging to this private treaty ; nor was I at all surpris'd to see the treaty come abroad without this article ; knowing full well that treaties often appear, when the secret articles belonging to them do not ---- This is a true state of the case ; and will, I believe, sufficiently justify me for what I writ. But I have not yet done with my accuser.

Let it be, that no such private article, as I was led to suppose, does exist, or was ever executed. Will he venture to say that no such article was drawn up, as he expresses himself, about the treaty of pacification? Will he venture to deny that if our ministers were afraid to sign such an article, and therefore did not sign it, the reason on which the Spaniards were induced to recede from this point, was that something equivalent should be done; and that this something was his late majesty's letter to the king of Spain? I appeal, in my turn, to the lowest observer, as well as the highest, who hath gone about to deceive mankind, this author or I; this author, who conceals from the world what he knows, or might know, with all the means of information which he has in his power; and what sets the matter in quite another light than he hath represented it: or I, who, having not the same means of information, fell into an undesigned mistake; which does not alter the state of the case in favor of my argument, since, if the Spaniards accepted this letter, which was writ in lieu of the article which was not signed, their pretensions, and nothing but their pretensions are under consideration here, will be still the same.

As to the letter itself, what I affirm about it is, that the Spaniards pretend it is a positive engagement to restore Gibraltar to them. That this should be allowed them, I am as far from agreeing as this author can possibly be; but that the letter is sufficient to keep up their pretensions, I affirm: and that in fact they do keep up their pretensions on this foundation, is notorious. Was this gentleman to dispute the point with the Spaniards, he might comment as much, and distinguish as subtly as he pleased, on the terms of the letter: the others would insist, that it was given them as an engagement; that if they had not received it as such, they would
not

not have departed from the article; and I doubt they would be apt to insinuate, that we could not have found a more proper casuist than himself, to distinguish us out of our obligations, amongst their own schoolmen, or amongst all the sons of LOYOLA.

To speak seriously; it were to be wished extremely, that the Spaniards had not had this color for persisting in their demand of Gibraltar, or that it had been by an express and clear stipulation taken from them; since it is certain, that the right and possession of Gibraltar is nothing less than ascertained to Great Britain by the preliminaries, as they stand; "and consequently, that all claim of Spain to it again is not extinguished."

I contradict him in his own words, tho none of the properest; and I will prove, in what I am going to say, either that he does not at all understand the matter he talks so magisterially about, or that he attempts, in this instance, to deceive the world, by giving wrong interpretations to some things, and by concealing others.

IF then, altho the letter of the late king hath given the Spaniards a pretence to claim Gibraltar, this claim is effectually barred, and even extinguished by the first general words of the second article of the preliminaries; how comes it to pass that Gibraltar was not specifically mentioned, in order to prevent any future chicane? It will be said, I know, that as the king of Spain's accession to the quadruple alliance vacated any promise which my lord STANHOPE might have made; so the king of Spain, by consenting to these preliminaries, has vacated any engagement of this kind, which the letter may be supposed to contain; and I, perhaps, shall be quoted again as

L 1 2

" one,

“one, who must necessarily see the force of this argument.” But this author must not judge of my eye-sight by his own; for I see a manifest difference between the two cases. My lord STANHOPE’s promise is said to have been conditional; all allow that it was verbal; and I think it is allowed likewise, that the late king never confirmed it. The simple accession of the king of Spain to the quadruple alliance, might therefore be thought very justly sufficient to put the matter, at that time, out of all dispute, for the reasons given by me, and quoted by this author. But when the preliminaries were to be settled, the king of Spain’s claim to the restitution of Gibraltar rested on an engagement, or what he took for an engagement, entered into by the late king, and under his majesty’s own hand. Besides, this engagement, or promise, whether valid or not valid, had been insisted upon as valid, in a formal treaty, and had been made the foundation of the second article in the defensive alliance between the emperor and the king of Spain, which relates to Gibraltar. It required therefore something more to put an end to a claim founded in this manner, than to a claim founded on any promise that my lord STANHOPE could make. These considerations could never escape the penetration of that most able minister, who negotiated the preliminaries; and therefore I conclude, first, that the Spaniards would not consent that Gibraltar should be mentioned specifically in the second article; and, in the next place, that they could refuse to consent to it on no reason whatever, but this one, that their pretensions to Gibraltar would be kept alive, if it was not mentioned specifically, notwithstanding the general words so much insisted upon by this writer. He has not therefore answered my demand; nor shewn “in the preliminaries an article, which is indeed as express and effectual a confirmation of our right to Gibraltar, as if the word Gibraltar had been put into it.” But he goes on, and observes,

observes, "that the latter part of this second article greatly
 "strengthens the former; because it is there stipulated, that
 "if any thing shall have been altered with respect to rights
 "and possessions, or not have been put in execution, the alte-
 "ration made, or the thing not executed, is to be discussed
 "in the congress, and decided according to the tenor of the
 "said treaties and conventions;" that is, in his sense, accord-
 "ing to the tenor of the treaty of Utrecht, and of the quadru-
 "ple alliance; for he mentions no other, except that of Baden,
 "which hath nothing to do here. Now, says he, "nothing,
 "either as to the right of Great Britain to Gibraltar, or to the
 "possession of it, hath been at all altered; nor hath there
 "been any non-execution, &c." From whence he infers, that
 "our right to Gibraltar is not included in this description of
 "points left to be discussed in the congress. But how could he
 "avoid seeing that he assumes for granted the very thing dis-
 "puted? No alteration hath been made in "our right to
 "Gibraltar, says he; therefore this right cannot be discussed."
 "An alteration hath been made in this right, say the Spaniards,
 "by a private engagement taken with us in 1721; therefore
 "this alteration is to be discussed at the congress. Who doth
 "not see, that whether this right shall be found to have been
 "altered, and what the alteration imports, are by this prelimi-
 "nary to be discussed and decided at the congress?"

I THINK, I have now shewn what I undertook, and what
 this gentleman challenges me to shew; that is, I have shewn
 those general words in the preliminaries, upon which the Spa-
 niards may found a pretence for reviving their demand of Gi-
 braltar; or, to speak more properly, since they have never
 ceased to make it, for continuing this demand. But I have
 undertaken something more; and therefore will proceed to
 shew

shew what this gentleman was ignorant of, or what he concealed very unfairly, because it is decisive against him.

I THINK he could hardly be ignorant that the second article of the preliminaries, not only recalls the treaties of Utrecht and Baden, and the quadruple alliance, as he quotes the article, but likewise all treaties and conventions which preceded the year 1725; which latter words he does not quote. Perhaps, he judged them unnecessary. If he did so, he was much mistaken; for by the fifth article of the treaty of 1721, between Great Britain and Spain, it is declared, "that all the pretensions of both sides, touching affairs not exposed in the present treaty, and which pretensions are not comprehended in the second article of it," shall be treated of in the future congress; which was at that time the congress at Cambray. Now let it be observed, that the affair of Gibraltar is not one of the affairs exposed in this treaty. Let it be observed also, that the pretension of the Spaniards to Gibraltar, is not one of the pretensions comprehended in the second article of it; and then let any man deny, if he can, that, in the intention of Spain, these words were relative to the pretension, which she acquired by the private engagement taken in the letter so often quoted. If the letter gave her a right, as she insists, it gave her a pretension certainly to claim that right, and this pretension is carefully preserved by the treaty of 1721. I do not say among other pretensions; for I think I may venture to say, that all other pretensions are specified in the treaty; even that relating to the free exercise of the Roman catholic religion in Minorca: and therefore these words seem to have been singly applied to the pretensions of Spain on Gibraltar. Will not the Spaniards now insist, upon these foundations, that they enjoyed in 1721, a right to demand the restitu-

restitution of Gibraltar, by virtue of conventions then made; and that the second article of the preliminaries preserves entire, to all the contracting parties, whatever rights, as well as possessions, they had by virtue of any treaty or conventions, antecedent to the year 1725; and that therefore the first general words of the second preliminary preserve to them the right of demanding the restitution of Gibraltar, as a right acquired by conventions made before the year 1725; whilst the last general words of the same preliminary article preserve this right as an alteration made in the treaty of Utrecht, and in the quadruple alliance?

How little weight soever the defender of the Enquiry may allow to these observations, which would I doubt have some in a congress, yet he must allow that they ought not to have escaped him, or to have been concealed by him; since they do certainly affect the merits of the cause on which he has so positively pronounced judgment, without any regard to them. But I am almost ready to ask your pardon, Mr. D'ANVERS, for saying so much on this point, when there is another more clear, and more decisive still behind. Is it possible our author should never have heard of a certain public instrument, containing a declaration explanatory of the preliminaries made by the French minister at the Pardo, on the fourth of March 1728, and accepted and confirmed by himself, and by the Imperial, British, Spanish, and Dutch ministers on the sixth of the same month? If this instrument hath ever fallen into his hands, and it is in every body's else, did he never read these words in it, "that all pretensions, on all sides, shall be produced, debated, and decided in the same congress?" The disputes about contrabands, and other complaints made by the Spaniards concerning the ship prince FREDERIC, and the disputes about the restitution of prizes, which articles are taken
notice

notice of in the introduction to this instrument, are, by particular clauses in it, referred to the discussion and decision of the congress. To what purpose then were these general words inserted? To what purpose was it stipulated that all pretensions whatsoever (among which the pretension of the Spaniards to the restitution of Gibraltar must necessarily be included; since, whether ill or well founded, it is still a pretension on their side) shall likewise be referred to the congress; and that his "Britannic majesty shall be obliged to stand to what shall be decided upon the whole?" But I forbear to press this matter any farther upon the gentleman; since it would be, in some sort, like stabbing him on the ground.

I proceed to the article of blocking up the galleons; which is the last upon which I am attacked in the Defence of the Enquiry. And here I must observe again, that he is very far from entering into a refutation of the arguments advanced by me to prove, that seizing the galleons was a measure liable to no objection, and in every respect preferable to that of blocking them up. He observes indeed, upon Mr. HOSIER's letter, that the treasure had been taken from on board the galleons, when our squadron arrived before Porto Bello. Now, without making any reflections on the intelligence brought from on shore to the admiral, and taking it for granted, that all this treasure was in time removed out of his reach; it will still be true, that this circumstance proves nothing in defence of the measure taken to block up the galleons, and not to seize them; since whether they would have the riches on board them or not, when Mr. HOSIER should arrive, could not be known when his instructions were drawn. If all these riches had been actually at Porto Bello, when he came thither, he would have had, in effect, nothing more to say to the Spaniards, than what the orders they had received

ten days before from old Spain imported; which was, that they should secure the money in the country.

THE single point, insisted upon to justify this measure, and which the writer pronounces to be sufficient, is that the contrary measure, that of seizing the galleons in port, with all their treasure on board, if it had been practicable, would "have put Europe into a flame, by putting all the proprietors of those riches, whether French, Dutch or Spanish, into the greatest uneasiness." At the same time, he allows that taking these ships, if they "had attempted, by force or stealth, to come out, had been reasonable." Sure I am it is enough to say in reply to this, that as to the uneasiness which such a seizure might have given the Spanish proprietors, it deserved no consideration; that the French and Dutch proprietors would have believed, or ought to have believed, their effects as secure in our hands, as in the hands of Spain; especially in a point of time, when they were, by treaty at least, engaged on our side in opposition to Spain; and lastly, that the distinction between seizing the galleons at sea, or blocking them up in port, as if one was, and the other was not an hostility, is very manifestly a distinction without a difference; to prove which, I dare appeal to every man in Britain, whether he would not esteem the hostility as great, and the insult greater, if a Spanish squadron should block up Portsmouth, than if it should cruise in the channel, and take our ships at sea. The gentleman cuts the dispute short, by referring us to the observations on the conduct of Great Britain; and I shall readily join issue with him, by referring, on my side, to the Craftsman Extraordinary, in which these observations are fully answered, and treated as they deserved to be.

HAVING mentioned the galleons, our author could not avoid taking some notice of a question I asked, in answering PUBLICOLA, and which he allows to be very material. His answers to it deserve a short reflection or two. "Since the galleons are coming home, hath Spain renounced those designs, which our fleet was sent to the West-Indies to prevent?" Thus he states the question; and his answer is, "Truly I can't tell; nor can any one in the world, who is not in the secrets of the court of Spain." A little afterwards he asks the same question; "Has the king of Spain renounced his projects?" that is, those designs which our fleet was sent to the West-Indies to prevent? His answer is, "Yes undoubtedly, as far as articles ratified by him can bind; and as far as any contracting powers can be bound by treaty to one another." Let us see what is urged between the first and the second asking of the same question, to produce such a wide difference in the answers. The king of Spain hath ratified the preliminaries, in consequence of which the siege of Gibraltar is raised. Orders are sent to restore the South-sea ship; and he has promised, that the effects of the galleons shall be delivered. He hath therefore renounced his projects by treaty; but whether he hath renounced them in his heart; "whether he will go on to act an open and honest part," that is more than our author can tell. It is more likewise than any one will desire, that he or those, for whom he is an apologist, should pretend to tell, or be answerable for. But let us see what they are answerable for; what has been really done by treaty; what we have obtained to make us some amends for the rotting of our ships; for the loss of so many thousand lives, and for the depredations and hostilities which this author sounded so high formerly; and which were carried on with redoubled vigor, during the pacific blockade of the galleons.--The effects of the galleons are to be delivered. I congratulate the Dutch and the

the French upon it; but especially the latter, who have such immense wealth on board them. Our share is, I fear, a small one; too small to bear any proportion to the expence we have been at, or the losses we have sustained.---Orders are sent to restore the South-Sea ship; but the claims of the Spaniards either on that ship, or on any account, are preserved to them, and referred to a congress, by whose decision we must abide; and nothing is stipulated, which may secure to our merchants a just recompence for the numberless seizures and captures of their effects and ships.---The siege of Gibraltar is raised; but the right to the possession of that place hath not been effectually put beyond dispute. The obstinacy and the chicane of the Spaniards have prevailed so far, that they preserve, even by the preliminaries, a pretence for bringing this right to be decided in the congress; and I shall be glad to hear what ally we have there, on whose good offices we can depend for securing to us the right of possessing, and the possession of this important place.---Upon the whole, I am extremely sorry to find, that I was so much in the right, when I advanced that no man could say, with truth, that the main things in dispute between us and Spain, were yielded to us before the return of the galleons; unless he reckoned our keeping Gibraltar, and I might have added the procuring satisfaction to our merchants, not among the main things in dispute, but among those of less importance.---I say very sincerely, that I had much rather have been refuted.

It appears, I think, from what hath been said, that the author and defender of the Enquiry, has not only been given up by his own side, but even by himself, in several particulars; and several other points, which were insisted upon in the Enquiry, and have been disputed in other writings, are

either not mentioned at all in the Defence, or in such a flight manner as plainly shews the author's consciousness that he cannot support them, tho he is very unwilling to give them entirely up: so that the author gave a very partial title to his last production, which can be justly called, at best, a Defence only of some points in the Enquiry, and is, more properly speaking, a "Recantation of it, with a few particular exceptions."

BUT now, Mr. D'ANVERS, what shall I say to you in excuse for so many and such long letters? The best thing I can say, is to assure you, and I do it very solemnly, that I will trouble you with no more of them. The gentleman, to whom I have now replied, may enquire and defend, as much as he pleases, without any farther molestation from me. When I began to write on this subject, I meant nothing less than the silly ambition of having the last word in a dispute. I saw, like every other man, the public distress. I thought I discerned the true and original cause of it. The affectation, which I observed to turn us off from this scent, fortified me in my opinions, and determined me to examine what was alledged against them. I have done so; and if in doing it, I have contributed in any degree to open the eyes of my countrymen, on their true, and on their mistaken interests, I have obtained the sole end which I have proposed to myself. I love and I hate; I esteem and I despise; but in a case of this moment, I should abhor myself, if any regard to persons, any consideration, except that of truth, had guided my hand in writing.

I BEGAN by asking pardon of this author for an injustice which I have done him through error, not malice; and I shall conclude with assuring him, that upon whatever principle he
may

may have treated me, as I think I did not deserve, I lay down my resentment with my pen, and remain in christian charity with him.

I RETURN to the business of my low profession in life; and if I was worthy to advise him, I would advise him to return to that of his high calling; to feed the flock committed to his charge. That I may the more effectually persuade him to take a resolution so much for his own honor, and for the advantage of the church, I will exhort him to it, in the words of the apostolical constitutions, with some very little variation, in order to render the passage more applicable.

Sit autem episcopus turpis
lucris non quaesitor, praesertim
de Gentilibus; malitque detri-
mentum capere, quam inferre.
Non sit avarus; non maledi-
cus, non falsus testis, non ira-
cundus, non contentiosus, non
negotiis, litibusque secularibus
implicatus; non pro alio spon-
sor, aut in causis pecuniariis
advocatus. Non ambitiosus,
non duplicis sententiae, non
bilinguis; calumniae & male-
dicentiae non cupidus auditor;
non hypocrita, fallacis vanis
non utens. Quia haec omnia

Deo

“ Let a bishop then not be
“ fond of making his court
“ for gain, and especially to
“ the Gentiles. Let him ra-
“ ther receive than do an in-
“ jury. Let him not be given
“ to evil speaking, nor to bear
“ false witness. Let him not
“ be wrathful nor contentious.
“ Let him not be engaged in
“ the business and disputes of
“ the world. Let him not be
“ ready to answer for others.
“ Let him not be the advo-
“ cate of private interest in
“ public causes. Let him not
“ be ambitious, nor double-
“ minded, nor double-tongued.
“ Let him use neither simula-
“ tion nor dissimulation in his
“ con-

Deo sunt inimica, daemonibus "conduct; nor vain and fal-
grata. "lacious sophisms in his dis-

Confit. Apostolic. lib. ii. "course. For all these things
cap. 6. "are hateful to God, and
"pleasing to the devil.

I am,

Mr. D'ANVERS, &c.

JOHN TROT.