

been objects
it to alledge
s are taught
that the ge-
seems to be a
Jacobinism is
d all govern-
t against it,
uch doctrines
e introduced
ardedly, suspi-
an outward
alty may be
r designs de-
ndeed at the
onal, as the
er that, ex-
lawful oaths
ok is occu-
iples, which
ons to point
ut with the
f Mr. *Burke*
t an evil as
en so earnest
ights of the
Government,
s sovereign,"
such arts to
hich ought
Royal per-
ed His Ma-
vels in his
crown

crown, his ecclesiastical supremacy? Would he have totally counteracted his injunctions to submit to the powers that are, by rendering all civil powers insecure, and dependant upon the pleasure of the people? Establish but once in the minds of men this divine, indefeasible *ministry of the people*, and the rest of his book is totally useless. Impress them once with a firm conviction that all lawful power is derived from them, and stop them from exerting their sovereign authority if you can, by the sentiments of prudence, and duty, at the beginning of the pamphlet. It is like setting a house on fire at all ends, and throwing a bucket of water upon it. It all comes to this short point, if Mr. *Burke* was sincere in his wishes to promote subordination, *he could not* have introduced any doctrines of a directly opposite nature; but if his designs were to promote Jacobinism, he could not have found a more judicious, and effectual mode of doing it than by using a cloak of a different colour. Jacobinism is irreconcilable with loyalty, but loyal pretences are not inconsistent with Jacobinism. Loyalty could require no mixture of Jacobinism to make it palatable, but perhaps a draught of pure Jacobinism would never have been readily swallowed, unless the edge of the cup had been a little flavoured with more wholesome principles.

But it is not merely a question of *intention*; such doctrines he *has actually taught*, and they are too flattering to human pride not to make