

THE JESUIT UNDER THE X-RAY.

IN REPLY TO THE ARTICLE OF M. DE LADEVEZE.

BY CHARLES MACARTHUR.

IT may be said, without fear of honest contradiction from any source worthy of serious consideration, that the article "The Truth About the Jesuits," which appeared in the January issue of *The Open Court*, was written or inspired by a Jesuit, in spite of the editorial information that the author is a Protestant. The quotations are familiar to all who have ever been engaged in a controversy with them, and are their entire stock in trade. M. Henri de Ladevèze, of Nice, France, though he may nominally be a Protestant, is unquestionably what is known in this country as "a temporal co-adjutor," and in France as "a Jesuit of the short robe." He is indebted to his memory for his jests and to his imagination for his facts. Outside of this, there are but two mistakes, one each of omission and commission, for there was not even the slightest hint about "the chaste womb of the Virgin," without which no Jesuit's inspiration is complete, and then the unlucky plea *tu quoque*. When we hear a street urchin salute a companion with some foul epithet, we naturally expect the retort, "You're another"; but to think that the Jesuits, "that illustrious order of men who have illumined the world by their scientific attainments, their scholarly ability, and their profound learning," to even think that they would attempt to screen themselves behind a *tu quoque*, addressed to the other Orders, who have always filled the second rank only, should be considered rank heresy.

The dragging in of St. Liguori is more indubitable evidence of the source of inspiration. Liguori commenced life as a lawyer. Powerful family influence brought him into prominence before the public. He was uniformly unsuccessful, and in disgust he resigned from the Bar, joined the Church, established the order of Redemp-

torists, and wrote his Moral Theology. This work is mainly an indorsement of those Jesuit teachings from 1580 to 1680, which created so much trouble throughout Christendom, and it contains hardly one proposition original to the author. It is merely a rehash of Jesuit casuistry. I will here repeat a question I have asked a score of times, without any solution. "If a fourth-rate lawyer can become a saint and a theologian, to what position may a first-class lawyer aspire? Moreover Liguori, by his own testimony at least, has enabled the Jesuits to cast odium on Pope Clement XIV. who suppressed the Order, and at the same time, incidentally, to press his own claims for sanctity. The Jesuits claim God informed Clement that he would forgive all his sins except the suppression of their Order. Clement was dying, and at that moment Liguori was saying mass and was at the elevation of the host. Liguori stood in that position for several minutes during which he projected his astral body to Rome, heard the Pope's confession and then returned and finished the mass. Abbé Darras in his history of the Popes says that this visit of Liguori to Clement when "separated by a space of more than forty leagues" is both "incontestable and well authenticated." But Clement, notwithstanding all this evidence, did not revoke his bull, and in consequence several holy Jesuits have been constrained to see him roasting in the very hottest part of hell.

Before going any further, let me place myself on record as being unalterably opposed to Jesuitism, but not to the Jesuit *per se*. One does not hate a man because he has the foul-smelling catarrh, but he hates the catarrh because it has the man. This is my position, after nearly thirty years' study of the teachings and practices of this politico-religious society, and in my various discussions with them and with their friends I have invariably refused to consider their charges against the characters of their opponents. A Jesuit always evades a direct charge made against his Order, and tries to parry the blow by attracting attention to any weakness, supposititious or real, in the personal character of his opponent. I will notice only two instances of this class, in the article under review.

Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609) is called "the greatest scholar of modern times." He became a Protestant, and in those days of controversy he was hotly engaged with the Jesuits. Unable to meet his arguments, the Jesuits engaged a lampooner named Scioppius to do their unsavory work, which resulted in "a quarto volume of more than 400 pages, written with consummate

ability, in the admirable and incisive style, with the entire disregard for truth which Scioppius always displayed, and with all the power of that sarcasm in which he was an accomplished master." (See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. XXI., p. 364, article Scaliger.) Having performed his task, Scioppius demanded his pay, and when the Jesuits refused he lampooned them so severely and told so many truths about their Order that they became the laughing-stock of Europe.

The next item is the claim that the Jesuits were expelled from France owing to Martinique having been taken by the English, and that a scape-goat was necessary. This is absolutely false. In 1743, the Jesuits sent to Martinique as Inspector of Missions one Father Lavalette, who was considered a great financier. He founded a mercantile establishment which, by its connections with large houses in France and Germany, through its agents Lionci Frères of Marseilles, soon controlled the trade of that section. In a few years Lionci Frères found that they had either advanced or had become responsible for about two millions sterling, and they drew a draft on the Order for four hundred thousand pounds. The draft was dishonored, the Jesuits repudiated Father Lavalette and his transactions, although they admitted having received the profits up to date. Lavalette was dismissed from the Society, retired to the Isle of Jersey, outside of French jurisdiction, where he lived on an annuity granted him by the Society. Lionci Frères threatened suit and were begged not to do so for the sake of religion and were assured that the entire Society would pray for them; in fact, that a mass had already been offered. But the mass proved inefficacious, and Lionci Frères went into bankruptcy. A suit followed, and the Jesuits were ordered to redeem the bills of exchange of their Agent. They declined and pleaded their Constitution. This Constitution up to that time had been kept secret; they were forced to produce it, and it became one of the principal articles of the accusation which terminated in 1762 by their being expelled from France. The Official Document reads:

"As persons professing a doctrine whose consequences would tend to destroy natural law, the code of morals God himself has imprinted in the hearts of men, and consequently to break all the ties of civil society by authorising theft, falsehood, perjury, the most criminal impurity, and in general all passions and crimes, by the teaching of occult compensation, equivocations, mental reservations, probabilism and philosophical sin."

Their books were seized and extracts from their Casuists, proving these charges, were appended to the decree of banish-

ment, which was duly signed by his most Catholic majesty, Louis XV. These extracts, which were collected by a commission of Parliament, every member of which was a Catholic, are duly verified, fill four volumes, and are still preserved, not only in the archives, but in many of the public libraries, of France.

A hundred years previous to this, the Jesuits had a like experience in Spain, for their bank at Seville went into bankruptcy in 1646,—liabilities many millions,—exact amount unknown. Investigation proved they had been engaged in many large mercantile transactions, carried under fictitious names. Business secrets had been extorted in the confessional, and the unwilling lips of many a merchant, and the more susceptible ones of his wife, had been opened, and co-partnership affairs of this world had been traded for security in the next. But let Palafox, bishop of Angelopolis, tell the story. In a letter to Pope Innocent X., dated January 8, 1649, he says :

“What other Order, most holy father, from the first of the monks and mendicants, or any other of the Religious, has made a bank of the Church of God? Has lent money at interest and publicly conducted meat markets and other shops in its religious houses? A traffic which is disgraceful and unworthy of religious characters. What other Order has ever become bankrupt? Or to the great surprise and scandal of the laity, has filled almost all the world, by sea and land, with its trade and commercial contracts? Undoubtedly such profane and worldly conduct does not appear to have been dictated by Him who declares in His Gospel that no one can serve God and Mammon. All the great and populous City of Seville is in tears; the widows, orphans, students, virgins, priests and laymen, mingle their lamentations on account of having been miserably deceived by the Jesuits, who, having obtained from them above 400,000 ducats, and spent them all for their own purposes, only paid them by a disgraceful bankruptcy. But having been brought to justice and *convicted*, to the great scandal of all Spain, of acts *which in private individuals would have been capital offences*, they endeavored to withdraw themselves from secular jurisdiction by their claim of spiritual immunity, and named ecclesiastics for their judges. The matter having at length been carried before the Royal Council, it decreed that since the Jesuits pursued the same business that was pursued by laymen, they should be treated like laymen and sent back to the secular power. Thus numberless persons who are reduced to ask charity, are forced to demand from civil tribunals the money they loaned to the Jesuits, which to some is all their substance; to others, all their dowry; to others, all their savings; and in consequence they are loudly declaiming against the perfidy of these Religious and load them with execration. What will English and German Protestants, who boast of preserving such inviolable faith in their engagements, and of such scrupulous honesty in their tradings, say of these things? They certainly must mock at the Roman Catholic faith, at ecclesiastical discipline, at priests, at Regulars, and the holiest professions in the Church, and become only more hardened and obdurate in their errors. Have such proceedings as these, which are absolutely worldly and unlawful, ever been practiced by any religious Order, other than the most holy Society of Jesus?”

The Jesuits did not pay back one cent to these widows and orphans. But we are assured by M. de Ladevèze that the Filipinos do not detest the Jesuits as they do the other monks. This is granted. See Public Document 190 on the report of the Philippine Commission. But why? The Jesuit is exclusive. His training and education make him so. He may be acquainted with the common people, but he associates only with the higher classes. He uses the former as tools; he toadies to the latter. Aguinaldo boasts that he is the son of an "educated Jesuit." The qualifying term may be a libel on the rest of the Order, but may be excused on the score of filial piety.

The Jesuits own the statue of the Virgin of Antipolo, the most celebrated on the Island, and possibly the most remarkable in the world. This statue was in the habit, ever since 1650, of climbing up an Antipolo tree (hence the name) in order to see if there were need of giving assistance to any vessel in the harbor. She climbed up once too often, as a shot from an Oregon volunteer ended the exhibition, and one of the holy fathers carried his arm in a sling for over a month thereafter. Possibly a case of sympathetic affection.

Yes, the Jesuit is *sui generis*. He is exclusive in his loves and unique in his miracles.

The next question is: Have the Jesuits ever given us a first-class man? I may be unusually obtuse; mayhap their mentality is so superior to mine that I have been unable to comprehend their writings, and hence I boldly declare that they have never produced a man worthy of being considered more than second-class. Their very mode of instruction precludes their producing a genius. When a bright man is found among them, he is either squelched or he leaves the Order.

M. Cousin says: "The boasted genius of the Jesuits for education is nothing but the organisation of a vile system of spying into the conduct of the young men, and there never was one manly course of studies in their Institutions. They sacrifice substance to show, and deceive parents by brilliant and frivolous exhibitions."

Says Macaulay: "They appear to have discovered the precise point to which intellectual culture can be carried without risk of intellectual emancipation."

On February 12, 1899, the N. Y. *Times* published from its correspondent in Italy an article on "The Mondragone Controversy." Mondragone is a Jesuit College, and the query was made

why ninety-five per cent. of its graduates failed in the matriculation examination, which by law they must pass before they may enter a university.

Occasionally, we have forcible examples right here. Two of these graduates were candidates for the jury in the Molineaux case. One was asked: "Do you know the meaning of turpitude?" "Oh, yes. Turpitude is a product of turpentine." The other was asked: "Would you understand what was meant by the phrase: 'The existence of malice may be inferred from the perpetration of the deed?'" "Why, certainly. It means that if they are not married they ought to be."

Just one more. The Empress Eugenie was the niece of Father Beckx, General of the Order, and she caused the Public Schools to be placed under their control. These gentlemen of "scientific attainments, scholarly abilities and profound learning" prepared a History of the World, and in the chapter devoted to this country the French youth were informed that, "Catholic Lafayette, assisted by one Washington, secured the independence of the United States." And these are the gentlemen who desire to control our Public Schools.

As far as their founder, Ignatius, is concerned, unless Palanco, his secretary and biographer, falsifies, he was a veritable ignoramus, spoke only one language, and that a mongrel Spanish, and could scarcely read or write. Mosheim says: "Not only Protestants, but also many Roman Catholics, and they men of learning and discrimination, deny that Loyola had learning enough to compose the writings ascribed to him, or genius enough to form such a Society as originated from him. . . . Most of his writings are supposed to have been produced by Jo. de Palanco, his secretary. His spiritual exercises, the Benedictines say, were transcribed from the works of a Spanish Benedictine whose name was Cisneros." Yet Guntherode admits that the Society paid 100,000 gold florins to the Papal Exchequer to have this gentleman canonised.

Their trump-card, Bellarmine, who was created Cardinal, in order, as the General said, "to preserve the credit of our Society," never gave us a new idea. He was noted for his inhuman treatment of heretics, but we are assured he had a tender spot in his heart, at least for insects. He persistently refused to kill or even remove the vermin that infested his clothing and took a holy delight in their bites, saying with a heavenly smile: "We shall have Heaven to reward us for our sufferings, but these poor creatures have nothing but the enjoyments of this present life."

The similarity between the Jesuits and the Mohammedan Societies, the Kadyras and the Kadelyas, in their teachings and discipline has already been fully described in these columns, so I will now turn to their Casuists or Holy Doctors.

Let us get indubitable Catholic testimony first. Speaking of Stephen Banny, Jesuit Professor of Humanities and Moral Theology, Abbé Bouilliot says: "He could permit our consciences to impute crimes to our enemies without calumniating them; allow us to kill them without being a murderer; betray truth without lying; appropriate the property of others without stealing; yield to all the refinements of voluptuousness and taste all the sweetness of sin, and still keep the precept of continence; and teach us a thousand ways of gaining Heaven, while we are doing everything possible to effect our damnation."

Banny's work, *Summary of Sins* according to Jesuit custom, was duly examined and approved by four theologians of the Society, and every Provincial in whose province it was published gave it his official sanction. According to the rules of the Society, no member may publish a book or even a newspaper article except "*con permissio superiorum.*" They have had about 200 Casuists, and about 166 of these are prominent. If space would permit, equally good Catholic testimony could be brought against every one of them.

The ingenuity of the Jesuit casuist is taxed to its limit to find an excuse for every imaginable crime. It is his duty to examine every subject, to conjure up peculiar situations between inconceivably brutal human beings, whom he places in almost impossible positions, and then he gives full play to his imaginings, which are manifested by a love of unclean details far exceeding any work ever suppressed by Anthony Comstock. He looks with suspicion on every movement; the meeting of the betrothed; the kiss of a sister and a brother, father and daughter, and even the caress a mother bestows to the infant in her arms. In one word, the Jesuit Casuist knows nothing of love and its sacredness; to him, everything is contaminated with sin, and his illustrations are drawn with that one point in view.¹

¹The footnote mark at the end of the above sentence indicates the omission from the present article of fifteen closely written MS. pages, full of details and quotations from Jesuit authorities. Similar accusations from the same pen have appeared in the *Brooklyn Daily Times* and are thus not inaccessible to readers interested in the subject. Though we deem it but just to the critic of M. Ladevèze's article to allow him to present his case and to substantiate it, it is not our intention to enter into certain details which are far from pleasant reading and which, even if only half true, exhibit an unfathomable abyss of depravity and immorality.—*Editor.*

During April and May, 1901, I published two letters in the *Brooklyn Daily Times*, in answer to Father Patrick F. O'Hare, who claimed that all of my quotations taken from the Jesuits were false. I take this extract from the last letter :

"Now, my proposition is this : I will place my two volumes of Gury, in Latin, and Marottes Catechism in French, in the hands of the Editor of the *Brooklyn Daily Times* and request him to select five competent gentlemen to act, two of whom must belong to the Italian (Catholic) Church. I will present the points I have made, and if there should be the slightest doubt in regard to the genuineness of my copies, I feel safe to say that I can procure the identical books from which Senator Paul Bert quoted, which caused the expulsion of your friends, the Jesuits, from French territory twenty years ago. I will see that the reasonable expenses of the committee are paid, and all that I ask is that *you* act on the committee ; I will agree in advance to accept the decision, which is to determine whether you or I lie."

O'Hare remained as mum as the proverbial clam. This proposition has been open for twenty years. It still remains open, and will remain so till the end. Our country is filled with Societies for "Propagation of the Faith," "Truth of Catholic History," etc., etc. In Washington there is an immense Institution, the centre of Jesuitism. Large sums of money have been, are being, and no doubt will be, donated for carrying it on. So, to these professors I send my greeting. The above proposition, gentlemen, is open to you. Are my quotations correct?¹

I should much prefer to have their claims disproved, and I will be the first to lift my hat and cry out : *Hoch die Jesuiten !*

¹The bulk of these quotations has been omitted from the present article, at the place above referred to.—*Ed.*