

## THE JESUITS.

[We are glad to find, after all, that the *Montreal Herald* admits impartially into its pages the defence of the Jesuits, as well as the attack.]

Quicumque bellum vult, quantumvis.  
"Who seeks for war shall have enough."

"Look on this picture and on that."

To the Editor of the MONTREAL HERALD.

Sir.—Since the publication of my last letter I have met with the following Protestant testimony in favour of the Jesuits, which I deem too important to be withheld from the public, and which I will accordingly introduce previously to entering upon an examination of the charge of Regicide, as promised in my last.

In a letter addressed in the year 1825 by M. Kern, Professor in the University of Göttingen, to Doctor Tzschirner, in answer to certain strictures published by the latter against the Jesuits, the writer thus speaks:—

"But who are at this day the enemies of the Jesuits? they are of two classes: those who do not know them, and Atheists Revolutionary Philosophers, but every minded man should admire that which is the object of the hatred of such characters; for we may be assured that then, either religion, or justice, or subordination, is at stake. The re-establishment of this celebrated order, so far from causing us any disquietude, should, on the contrary, be regarded as a happy omen for our times. In its organization and its tendency is to be found the most powerful safeguard against the assaults of the doctrines of impiety and insubordination: and this is constantly allowed even by Protestants themselves. John de Muller goes so far as to say that 'it constitutes a common bulwark of defence for all lawful authority.' The Jesuits attack evil in its very root by educating youth in the fear of God and in obedience. It is true they will not teach Protestantism, but, have we a right to enquire that Catholics should teach other doctrines than those of their own church? Have we seen in times past doctrines issuing from the colleges of the Jesuits similar to those of our modern schools? Have they preached up the sovereignty of the people and all its mournful consequences as is done in the present day in our Protestant universities? Hostility to kingly authority has been imputed to them, but of this charge they have been wholly acquitted by Henry IV., by an assembly of Bishops convened by authority of that Monarch. Experience proves how what rapid progress revolutionary doctrines have made since the suppression of the Jesuits; the English Protestant writer, Dallas, declares that everywhere on the Continent the colleges of the Jesuits are replaced by Philosophical Universities, in which faith and reason have ceased to be united in education. Reason, with all its errors, is preferred as being that which is most noble in man. Faith has been abandoned, and impiously derided as superstitious. In 1773 Clement XIV. suppressed the order of St. Ignatius. In 1793 a King of France was beheaded, and Tem-

ples were opened to deified Reason.—During two centuries the *elite* of the French Noblesse were educated by the Jesuits in their college of Clermont at Paris, in a love of religion, of science, and of country. In a brief space after the dismissal of these skilful masters the same college cast upon society a Robespierre, a Camille, Desmoulins, a Talien, a Noel, a Frenon, a Chenier, with a host of others similarly corrupt. Can it then after all this be a matter of astonishment that the Pope and Catholic Princes should recall men whose services are so much required, and whose high worth has been acknowledged by the great Leibnitz,—by Frederick the Second,—and of whom Bacon has said, 'To discover the best mode of Education the surest way is to consult the Schools of the Jesuits.'

The learned and impartial Groen in his work *"Annals de reb. Belg."* page 194, renders a tribute to the Jesuits which will be best read in the original:—

"Mores inculpati, bonæ artes, magna in vulgum auctoritas ob vite sanctimoniam—Sapienter imperant, fideliter parent. —Novissimi omnium sectas priores famavere, hoc ipso cæteris invidit."

The charge against the Jesuits of holding a "doctrine," that the murder of Kings in certain cases is lawful, put forth by you as the copyist of other and earlier accusers, is one well calculated to excite particular attention. It is above all other crimes imputed to that order, one which, if established against it, would render it not only obnoxious to proscription by all monarchical governments, but deserving of absolute exclusion from all trust and confidence in civilized life.

Happy, however, for the Jesuits as well as for mankind at large, we are living in an age in which the mere advancement of a charge is not sufficient to ensure it public credence. ENQUIRY, Sir, is the order of the day; and to the just anger of that ordeal must be subjected even statements stamped with your authority, all "Sir Oracle" though you are. Upon enquiring, then, into the history of the hateful doctrine of Regicide, we find that about the middle of the sixteenth century, certain writers, prompted, as we are told "by the constant progress towards absolute monarchy which was then observable in the principal Kingdoms of Europe," entered into very free discussion on the nature of Governments, and on the abuses of kingly power. First in the order of publications on these questions was the *Frango Gallia* of Francis Hotoman, one of the most eminent lawyers of that age. The chief aim of this work was, it appears, "to prove the share of the people in Governments, and especially their rights of electing the Kings of the first two races," a competent reviewer has said of it, that "it had the defect of great partiality, and an unaccountable extension of the author's hypothesis." Next came the famed treatise of Hubert Languet,—commonly termed the *"Vindiciæ of Languet,"*—which breathes the stern spirit of Judicial Huguenotism. "Kings," says the author, "that lay waste the Church of God and support idolatry; Kings that trample upon their subjects' privileges, may be depos-

ed by the states of their kingdom, who, indeed, are bound in duty to do so." He also speaks *honourably* of ancient tyrannicides, and remarks, that, as Kings derive their pre-eminence from the will of the people, they may be considered as feudal vassals of their subjects, so that they may forfeit their Crown by felony against them." Hotoman and Languet were both Protestants, and it was not long ere their bold theory was adopted and enlarged by many of their brethren of that Faith. The treatise produced in Scotland by George Buchanan, a scholar, a Protestant, and the subject of a very limited Monarchy, entitled *"De Jure Regni apud Scotos,"* proves most conclusively the Regicidal tone which almost immediately spread over the Protestant mind of Europe. This work is in the form of a dialogue, elegantly written, and designed, "first, to shew the origin of Royal Government from popular Election; then the right of putting tyrannical Kings to death, according to scripture, and the conditional allegiance due to the Crown of Scotland, as proved by the Coronation oath, which implies that it is received in trust from the people." The following is a specimen of Buchanan's reasoning which goes very materially further than Hotoman or Languet had presumed to do.

"Is there then," says one of the interlocutors, "a natural compact between the King and the people? Thus it seems. Does not he who first violates the compact, and does anything against his own stipulations, break his agreement? He does. If then, the bond which attached the King to the people is broken, all rights to be derived from the people are forfeited? They are forfeited. And he who was mutually bound becomes as free as before the agreement? He has the same rights and the same freedom as before. But if a King should do things tending to the dissolution of human society, for the preservation of which he has been made, what name will we give him? We should call him a tyrant. But a tyrant not only possesses unjust authority over his people, but is their enemy? He is surely their enemy? Is there not a just cause of war against an enemy who has inflicted heavy and intolerable injuries upon us? There is. What is the nature of a war against the enemy of all mankind, that is, a tyrant? None can be more just. Is it not lawful in a war just commenced, not only for the whole people but for any single person to kill an enemy? It must be confessed. What then shall we say of a tyrant, a public enemy, with whom all good men are in eternal warfare?—May not any one of all mankind inflict on him every penalty of war? I observe that all nations have been of that opinion; for Theba is extolled for having killed her husband, and Timoleon for his brother's, and Cassius for his son's death."

Another work appeared at this time written by Poynt, Bishop of Winchester, under Edward VI., professing to be an answer to seven questions respecting kingly authority, the sixth of which question is: "Is it lawful to depose an evil Governor and kill a tyrant?" Hallam tells us that this question with all the others "are determined upon principles adverse to kingly power, and that the author contends in the 11th chapter, that 'the manifold and continual examples that have been, from time to time, of the deposing of Kings and killing of tyrants, do most certainly confirm it to be most true, just and consonant to God's judgment.' This work first appeared in 1553, and was reprinted in 1642 'to serve' says Strype 'the turn of those times.' The doctrine of Regicide thus broached and extended by Protestants, was of course warmly opposed by the equally unreasonable advocates of the preposterous doctrine of the 'Right Divine,' and it was during this fierce contest that the book

from which you have so triumphantly quoted 'De Rege et Regis Institutione' by the Jesuit Mariana, appeared, in which the views of the Reformers were certainly espoused; but in so guarded and indeed metaphysical a manner, that Philip III., the then absolute monarch of Spain, actually permitted the work to be dedicated to him. And Hallam in speaking of it in his chapter on Political Philosophy, says—"The whole work, even in its reprehensible exaggerations, breathes a spirit of liberty and regard to the common good." Nor does Mariana, continues this discreet reviewer, though a Jesuit, lay any stress on the papal power to depose princes, which I believe he has never once intimated through the whole volume. It is absolutely on political principles that he reasons, unless we except that he considers impiety as one of the vices which constitute a tyrant."

Hallam, however, conceives it proper to quote some strong passages from Mariana, but with that justice which so prominently distinguishes his work, he immediately adds; "This language whatever indignation it might excite against Mariana and his order, is merely what we have seen in Buchanan." Comparatively unexceptionable however, as were the views of Mariana for the age in which they were published, still did the brethren of his order condemn them as anti-Christian. Already had the Holy Catholic Church by the general council of Constance unequivocally and *in toto* condemned such views, and it was not for the Jesuits who were her divinely chosen champions to tolerate them: nor did they. Promptly was censure called for, and as promptly was the Censure pronounced by the General of the order, Aquaviva, whose solemn decree I will here give in full length as I find it in the original French.

"Nous enjoignons," dit-il, "par ce present decret, en Vertu de la sainte obeissance, sous peine d'excommunication et inhabile a tous offices, et de suspension a diriger, et autres peines arbitraires a nous reservees, qu'aucun religieux de notre compagnie, soit en public, soit en particulier, lisant ou donnant avis, et beaucoup plus, mettant quelques œuvres en lumiere, n'entre prenne de soutenir qu'il soit loisible a qui que ce soit, et sous quelconque pretexte de tyrannie, de tuer les rois ou princes, ou d'attenter sur leurs personnes; afin que telle doctrine n'ouvre le chemin a la ruine des princes, et trouble la paix, ou revoque en doute la sùreté de ceux lesquels, selon l'ordonnance de Dieu, nous devons honorer et respecter comme personnes sacrees et etablies de Dieu, pour heureusement regir et gouverner son peuple. Pourtant, nous voulons que les provinciaux qui auront eula connoissance d'aucune des susdites choses, et n'auront corrigé les delinquans, ou n'auront pourvu a tels inconveniens, et procure l'exacte observation de ce decret, non-seulement encourrent les susdites peines, ainsimême soient prives de leurs charges et offices; a ce que chacun sache quel est la jugement de la compagnie en tel cas: et que la faute d'un particulier ne rende a tous les autres, et les rende suspects; jucoit que devant tout homme de bon jugement, il est notoire que la faute d'un membre ne doit pas etre attribuee a tout le corps. En outre, nous voulons que tous ces provinciaux nous rendent compte de la reception du present decret, et qu'ils le fassent savoir et annoncer par toutes leurs provinces, puis inserer es archives de chaque maison et collegé, afin que la memoire et observation en demeure inviolable a perpetuite. CLAUDE AQUAVIVA."

A Rome, le 6 Juillet, 1610.

Notwithstanding this disclaimer,—clear and uncompromising as language could render it, there were still to be found Protestants who would impugn the integrity of the Jesuits *globally*; but, these accusers were of a class, at