



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. II.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1852.

NO. 23.

THE HISTORY OF THE COMPANY OF JESUS.

A LECTURE BY T. D. M'GEE.
(Concluded.)

As the chief disturbers of States have been their own members, and the chief recusants have been bad churchmen, so the chief enemies of the Jesuits were some of their own degenerate pupils. Jansen, a student of the Jesuits at Louvain, afterwards Bishop of Ypres, early in the year 1638, prepared his comments on Augustine—a book which made a party in the Church, not yet quite extinct. From that book rose the Gallican party—the anti-Jesuit party in France. From that book the estrangement of the Kings of France from Rome—from that book, perhaps, the fall of the Bourbons—the rise of Napoleon—and the European revolutions. The moral order in Europe received a rankling wound from the hands of Cornelius Jansen, and the first to feel the effect was the "body-guard of Rome!" "Ruin the Jesuits, and you ruin Rome," the discovery of Fra Paolo, was not unknown to his Jansenist imitators of recent times.

Yet it took above a hundred years to complete the conspiracy for this purpose. Arnaud and Pascal labored at it, and died; Voltaire, D'Alembert, and Raynal, continued the work more successfully. "Sire," said De Sartine to Louis XV., "the Philosophers are ruining France." "How long will it take them to ruin it, M. De Sartine?" "Twenty years more, Sire." "Well, M. De Sartine," said the Father of Louis XVI., "You will please report them to my successor." The Encyclopedia of the new School of Philosophers appeared in 1755; in 1765 the Jesuits in France were suppressed; in 1775 the Order was suppressed in Rome; in 1793 the King lost his head at Paris. The Philosophers made short work of it after the Jesuits went. The twenty years of the astute De Sartine sufficed to ruin France.

I will not mention all the charges alleged against the Order by the Statesmen, the Bigots, and Philosophers, their adversaries. Every point and its exact opposite, has been equally urged. They were by turns indicted as favoring despotism, and favoring republicanism; as ultra-Catholics and concealed Protestants; of patronising the passions, and being utter enemies to all enjoyment and freedom. In the appeals against them it is impossible to find any two agree—it is impossible to find any one, which stands upon internal evidence of its own truth.

The suppression took place in 1773. It was by much diplomacy and much pressure, that this suppression was obtained. The Pontiff, (popularly best known by his family name, Ganganelli) came slowly and painfully to the decision. He feared a Jesuit and anti-Jesuit party among the European Catholics, and chose "suppression" probably to avert schism. During the short time he survived this act, he labored under deep depression, as to its consequences on his own and after ages. The act was done, but another generation saw it undone.

For forty-five years—till 1814, they were dormant, and could be slandered with impunity. They live again, but have their enemies amputated to return to the old indictment? No, ladies and gentlemen, they have confined themselves to a single, but in our times, a very taking assertion, namely, that the existence of the Society is incompatible with civil liberty. When I have disposed of this assertion, what will remain? Nothing but assertion, unsupported by fact—nothing which reasoning men can take for granted, because uttered by enemies of the Order without proof or authority.

If the Jesuits, as an Order, are enemies of civil liberty, we shall find it in their Organisation, or in the Doctors, whose works are the guides of the Order. Do we so find it in either one or the other? Saint Ignatius legislated only for his own company, and in common with all sacerdotal founders, Christian and Heathen, prescribes authority and obedience, to the Fathers and the subjects. The Pagan Priesthood were so ordered; the Musselman Hierarchy is so ordered; the Christian Priesthood is so ordered. Every sect in the Union has some general congregation, some temporary moderator, some elders, some rectors of colleges, some rules of obedience for novices or students. If those who say the Jesuit Institution is incompatible with liberty, within itself, are consistent, they must equally oppose all authorised clerical orders.

But I understand the objection is not this. It is not with each other they are despots, but with the world without. They have inspired despotic ideas into kings, and opposed the freedom of the human mind at large—this is the favorite charge. This brings us to the Doctors of the Society, the exponents of its doctrines of power, of law, and of duty—and here, indeed, we find them on glorious ground. The modern Doctor, most quoted and relied on by

all Catholics, (Jesuits included,) the expositor who has almost exhausted judgment on all modern questions of this kind, was St. Thomas of Aquin, whose Philosophy and Theology, are to this day, standards which all Catholics obey. The most eminent Jesuit Philosophers, have devoted themselves to illustrate and defend this Doctor, who, for his wonderful perspicacity of mind, was called "The Angelic." Suarez, Bellarmin, Mariana, and other Jesuits, have written many famous books, all grounded on him, as on a rock. Of course, this high debate of the origin of power, of the nature of law, of the duties of governed and governors, occupies a large share of these writings. The books are in every learned library—they speak for themselves, and for the Order of Jesuits. But if the generality have not time or taste to turn over these old latin quartos and folios, there is a modern book—"The Comparative Influence of Catholicity and Protestantism, on Civilisation,"—by Abbe Balme, written in 1840, and published this present year, in English, by Mr. Murphy, of Baltimore, in which the passages, and pages, and the chief extracts are given between page 291 and 311, in that book, and I find this text of St. Thomas on the origin of power:—

"If man," he says, "was intended to live alone, like many animals, he would not require any one to govern him; every man would be his own king, under the supreme command of God; inasmuch as he would govern himself by the light of reason given him by the Creator. But it is the nature of man to be a social and political animal, living in community, differently from all other animals; a thing which is clearly shown by the necessities of his nature. Nature has provided for other animals food; skins for a covering, means of defence,—as teeth, horns, claws,—or at least, speed in flight; but she has not endowed man with any of those qualities; and instead she has given him reason, by which, with the assistance of his hands he can procure what he wants. But to procure this, one man alone is not enough; for he is not in a condition to preserve his own life; it is, therefore, in man's nature to live in society. Moreover, nature has granted to other animals the power of discerning what is useful or injurious to them: thus the sheep has a natural horror of his enemy the wolf. There are also certain animals who know by nature the herbs which are medicinal to them, and other things which are necessary for their preservation. But man has not naturally the knowledge which is requisite for the support of life, except in society; inasmuch as the aid of reason is capable of leading from universal principles to the knowledge of particular things, which are necessary for life. Thus, then, since it is impossible for man alone to obtain all this knowledge, it is necessary that he should live in society, one aiding another; each one applying to his own task; for example, some in medicine; some in one way, and some in another. This is shown with great clearness in that faculty peculiar to man, language—which enables him to communicate his thoughts to others. Indeed, brute animals mutually communicate their feelings; as the dog communicates his anger by barking, and other animals, their passions by various ways. But man, with respect to his fellows, is more communicative than any other animal; even than those who are most inclined to live in union, as cranes, ants, and bees. In this sense, Solomon says, in Ecclesiastes; 'It is better, therefore, that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society.' Thus, if it be natural for man to live in society, it is necessary that some one should direct the multitude; for if many were united, and each one did as he thought proper, they would fall to pieces, unless somebody looked after the public good, as would be the case with the human body; and that of any other animal, if there did not exist a power to watch over the welfare of all the members. Thus Solomon says: 'Thus, where there is no one to govern, the people will be dispersed.' In man himself the soul directs the body; and in the soul, the feeling of anger and concupiscence are governed by the reason. Among the members of the body, there is one principal one, which directs all; as the heart or the head. There ought, then, to be in every multitude some governing power." (St. Thomas, *De Regimine Principum*, lib. i. cap. 1.)

I proceed and I find this comment of Bellarmin, an Italian Jesuit, who died in 1621, and opposed the absolutist theories of James the 1st of England, at a time, when Sancroft, and all the English Bishops, slavishly preached up "passive obedience."

Cardinal Bellarmin expresses himself in these words:—"It is certain that public authority comes from God, from whom alone emanate all things good and lawful, as is proved by St. Augustin throughout almost all the forty-five books of the *City of God*. Indeed, the Wisdom of God, in the Book of Proverbs, chap. viii., cries out, 'It is by Me that kings reign; and further on, 'It is by Me that princes rule.' The prophet Daniel, in the second chapter, 'The God of heaven has given thee the kingdom and the empire; and the same prophet, in the fourth chapter, 'Thy dwelling shall be with cattle and with wild beasts, and thou shalt eat grass as an ox, and shalt be wet with the dew of heaven, and seven years shall pass over thee, till thou know that the Most High ruleth over the kingdom of men, and giveth to whomsoever He will.'" After having proved, by the authority of the Holy Scriptures, this dogma, viz., that the civil power comes from God, the illustrious writer explains

the sense in which it ought to be understood: "But," he says, "it is necessary to make some observations here. In the first place, political power, considered in general, and without descending in particular to monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, emanates immediately from God alone; for being necessarily annexed to the nature of man, it proceeds from Him who has made that nature. Besides, that power is by natural law, since it does not depend upon men's consent, since they must have a government whether they wish it or not, under pain of desiring the destruction of the human race, which is against the inclination of nature. It is thus that the law of nature is divine law, and government is introduced by divine law; and it is particularly this which the Apostle seems to have had in view when he says to the Romans, chap. xiii., 'He who resists authority, resists the ordinance of God.'"

Bellarmin continues: "In the second place, observe, that this power resides immediately, as in its subjects, in all the multitude, for it is by divine right. The divine right has not given this power to any man in particular, for it has given it to the multitude; besides, the positive law being taken away, there is no reason why one should rule rather than another, among a great number of equal men; therefore power belongs to the whole multitude. In fine, society should be a perfect state; it should have the power of self-preservation, and, consequently, that of chastising the disturbers of peace."

But Bellarmin does not stand alone. The great Spanish Jesuit, Suarez, who with Vasquez, Pope Benedict XIV., has called "the sun and moon of theology,"—Suarez in these words explains the origin of power:—

"Herein," he says, "the common opinion seems to be, that God, inasmuch as He is the author of nature, gives the power; so that men are, so to speak, the matter and subject capable of this power; while God gives the form by giving the power." (*De Leg*, lib. iii. c. 3.)

He goes on to develop his doctrine, relying on the reason usually made use of in this matter; and when he comes to draw the conclusion, he explains how society, which according to him, receives the power immediately from God, communicates it to certain persons. He adds: "In the second place, it follows from what has been said, that the civil power, whenever it is found in a man or a prince, has emanated according to usual and legitimate law, from the people and the community, either directly or remotely, and that it cannot otherwise be justly possessed." (*Ibid*, cap. 4.)

Father Mariana, another Spanish Jesuit of the same age, is equally unequivocal in his testimony to the popular sovereignty. In his work entitled *Historia Real Sagrada*, he speaks of the Hebrew revolution, which substituted Saul's kingship for Samuel's judgeship:—

"Such," says he, "is the law which the king whom you wish for will maintain to your regard. The word law is here employed ironically, as if God should say: 'You imagine, without doubt, that this king of yours would govern according to law; on this supposition you asked for him, since you complained that my tribunal did not govern you. Now, the law which this king will exercise towards you will be, to disregard all law; and his law will eventually be tyranny respected.' The politician who, relying upon this passage, should attribute as a right to the monarch a power which is merely pointed out by God to the people as a chastisement, would be an uncivilised being, unworthy of being treated as a rational creature. The Lord, in this instance, does not define what is the best; he does not say what he is giving them; these words are no appreciation of power; he merely declares what would be the case, and what he condemns. Who shall dare to found the origin of tyranny on justice itself? God says, that he whom they desire for a king will be a tyrant—not a tyrant approved of by him, but a tyrant that he reprobates and chastises. And subsequent events clearly shewed it, since there was in Israel wicked kings, by whom the prophecy was fulfilled, and Saints who obtained on the throne the mercy of God. The wicked kings literally accomplished the divine threat, by doing what they were forbidden; the good ones established their dignity upon propriety and justice within prescribed limits."

I might go on and quote many other Catholic divines, for this is not peculiar Jesuit teaching, it is Catholic doctrine—it is a doctrine old as the Catholic Church. But Bellarmin, Suarez, and Mariana will suffice. When the opponents of the order can find three such witnesses on their side, I shall look for the end of the world soon after.

Yet why should I appeal to the past to illustrate the courage, the disinterestedness, and glory of this Order. Have we not in this very congregation, so well and carefully instructed, a plain proof of Jesuit piety? Have we not in our midst, another Father of the Society, illustrious for his virtuous and heroic life—a queller of riots, a brave minister on the battle-fields of Mexico—a laborer in peace in times of peace—the venerable Father McElroy? Have we not had in the College of our Diocese, a Mulledy, a Fenwick, a Ryder, and an Early? Massachusetts, prejudiced as she may be, as she is, against the order, cannot deny that these Fathers were pure, modest, laborious and accomplished men. The citizens of Massachusetts who encountered them, or their suc-

cessors among us, will not soon forget the urbanity, and the power, stamped on every word of their lips. Without trumpet or drum, banner or warning, the Jesuits have entered the heart of the State, and what is more, have entered the hearts of many of the people of the State.

I have now run hastily over the record of the career of this Society, in its origin so miraculous, in its history so superhuman. Its first foundation was hardly so imposing as its restoration. In 1814, the exiled religious were gathered from the ends of the earth into the Basilica of St. Peter's at Rome. Russia and Prussia, which had sheltered them as remnants of a power, still capable of great achievements, saw them set forth with regret for the Eternal City. Pope Pius the VII., had issued his summons and projected their re-establishment. In his long banishment in France, he had reflected deeply on the cause of the evils then prevailing. He had known the sorrow of Pope Clement—he had seen the death in captivity of his predecessor—he had seen the first continental revolution, which particularly afflicted France, the chief of the anti-Jesuit nations. At the head of the small band of survivors who came to Rome, was Albert of Montalto, who had reached the wonderful age of 126 years, and had been in the Order 108 years! The youngest Father present was nearly four score years old. While the Bull for the restoration was being read, tears streamed down the cheeks of those ancient men, and murmurs of joy filled the immense dome of the cathedral of Christendom. Nearly forty years have gone by since that memorable day, and all the venerable actors in the event, sleep with their sainted brethren. Once more the Jesuits are throughout the earth—once more pulpits and colleges echo to their words—once more the wilderness and the wild man hail their advent. Once more irreverent conspiracy slings its secret fire into the homes of old authority, and nature trembles to think what to-morrow may bring forth. Once more all who have principles to guide them, and all who have none, are angrily arrayed, face to face. On the side of religion, law, and education, on the side of justice, equity, and order, I see the Catholic Church, and conspicuous in that host, I see the Jesuits on the right. As I mark their banner and their numbers, as I hear them invoke the aid of St. Ignatius, their general in Heaven, my heart bows down before them, and bending my head with unfeigned reverence for their virtues and their afflictions, I hail the Order with Gratian's exclamation—*Esto Perpetua, may it endure and flourish for ever!*

LECTURE OF MR. LARKIN AT DUMFRIES, SCOTLAND.

In consequence of certain itinerant orators having recently visited the towns of Scotland declaiming vehemently against the Catholic Church, Mr. Larkin, of Newcastle, was invited to give a lecture in Dumfries in refutation of the harangues of Gavazzi, which that gentleman did on Monday evening, the 8th inst., in the theatre of Dumfries, to a respectable audience of Catholics and Presbyterians.

Mr. Larkin commenced by stating it was the first time he had the honor of addressing the men of Scotland—that he had not come there to vindicate the Catholic religion, which required no vindication from him, but he came there to prove to all those who believed, or pretended to believe, the lies and trash of Gavazzi, that they were either fools or knaves—that if they believed the ridiculous stories Gavazzi told them respecting Catholicity and Catholicity, they were fools; and if they knew better, and still supported such an attack on the religious feelings and characters of their neighbors, they were knaves who were worthy of Gavazzi, and he of them. Of course the Scotch pride did not receive such remarks with complacence. The Free Kirk Ministers, who came to the meeting with a pile of books, and occupied a conspicuous place in the boxes, rose, and wished to interrupt the speaker, but Mr. Larkin would permit no interruption, and being supported by the gods in the gallery, ultimately succeeded in putting down the interruption, which was again renewed on Mr. Larkin telling them that they should pluck the mote out of their own eye before that of their neighbors; that if the practices, or certain practices, of the Catholic Church, seemed to them ridiculous, Presbyterianism was, in the eyes of others, a huge system of blasphemy; that the doctrines they professed were deemed by many as calculated to turn the Creator of Man into an object of abhorrence as connected with their doctrine of election. On Mr. Larkin refusing to answer certain questions put to him by various persons in the meeting, he told them they were mistaken in supposing such questions could not be answered satisfactorily; but that the theatre was now taken to deliver a lecture by himself, and he would not play the game of the enemies of the Catholics, by turning the occasion into one of discussion; that