

# PACIFIC CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

"GO YE, THEREFORE, TEACH ALL NATIONS."

VOL. XI.

MONMOUTH, OREGON; FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1881.

NO. 9.

## Pacific CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,

Devoted to the cause of Primitive Christianity, and the diffusion of general information.

Price Per Year, in Advance, \$2.50

All business letters should be addressed to T. F. Campbell, Editor, or Mary Stamp, Publisher, Monmouth, Oregon.

Advertisers will find this one of the best mediums on the Pacific Coast for making their business known.

### SALES OF ADVERTISING:

Space	1 W	1 M	3 M	6 M	1 Yr
1 Inch	\$1.00	\$2.50	\$4.00	\$7.00	\$12.00
1/2 Col.	2.50	4.00	7.00	12.00	20.00
1/4 Col.	4.00	7.00	12.00	20.00	35.00
1/2 Col.	7.00	12.00	20.00	35.00	65.00
1 Col.	12.00	20.00	35.00	65.00	120.00

Notices in local columns 10 cents per line for each insertion.  
Yearly advertisements on liberal terms.  
Professional Cards (1 square) \$12 per annum.

Mr. I. G. Davidson is our Advertising Agent in Portland.

Entered at the Post Office at Monmouth as second class matter.

## The French Government and the Jesuits.

BY PRES. CHAS. LOUIS LOOS.

NUMBER ONE.

The attention of the Christian world has been for some time directed, with much interest and with divided sympathy, to the attitude of the French Government towards the Jesuits; first, by the articles of the proposed "Ferry law," which took away from the Jesuits and the other unauthorized teaching "congregations" generally affiliated to them—the right of teaching; and secondly, when the "Ferry law" failed by its rejection in the Senate, by the determination of the Government to revive and execute the old decrees against the Jesuits, which forbid the existence of their institution in France.

The discussion and the action of the German and French Governments in suppressing this Society has excited, is not only every way of great interest and consequence in itself, as involving directly the great question of the right of governments to interfere, for their own protection, with the free activity, and indeed the very existence, of such bodies as the Jesuits; but it is also very opportune, as tending in a very immediate and effectual way to call attention again to the character and workings of this famous Order, in our day; especially at a period when it is extending and developing its activity in an extraordinary manner over the world.

My object at present is not to write as an advocate, in defense of the action of the French Government; but simply to explain this action, by recalling the history of this controversy of France with the Jesuits, and setting forth briefly the grounds that have led the Government of the Republic to execute the old decrees against this Order. I do desire, I confess, to free the French Ministry, which is composed of the liberal and enlightened men in France, from the charge of unreasonable conduct in this case.

It will be impossible, within the limits allowed me, to cite the documentary proofs, historical and otherwise, upon which the statements in this exposition of the case rest. These proofs are abundant and at hand; and when necessary can be brought forth. In my statements I will be as brief as is consistent with the fullness and clearness necessary to enable the reader to come to a correct understanding of the case.

1. The decree against the Jesuits which the French Government is now enforcing did not originate with it,

nor is it of anti-Catholic or republican birth. It is of long standing, had its origin under a Bourbon Catholic monarch, has been once and again confirmed by succeeding monarchs, and has, designedly, never been repealed. It is of first importance to note this fact. The first act of the abolition of the Society of Jesus in France was two-fold. First, the Jesuits were arraigned before the High Courts (*Cours Souveraines*) in the provinces and at Paris, where the Reports (*Comptes Rendus*) and the opinions of the first jurists of the kingdom were heard; and these sovereign judicial authorities pronounced the decrees of abolition. These acts of the French courts were about the year 1760. This brought the matter before the Government; the ministry and the sovereign concurred with the court. Louis XV., by an edict of November, 1764, suppressed the Order, and banished it forever from France. This royal edict was reiterated and confirmed by another of Louis XVI. in May, 1777. These were the acts of Catholic courts and Catholic monarchs; no Protestant, Voltairian, or Republican mind dictated, or hand wrote, these judicial judgments and royal decrees. The University of France, the Old Sorbonne, bishops, and other eminent men of the French clergy, illustrious statesmen and scholars, all royalists and Catholics—vied with the courts and the government in exposing and denouncing this famous and fatal Society.

These royal decrees were again confirmed by the first Napoleon (Messidor, year 12). No law or decree of reinstatement has been passed by any legislature or government to the present hour. Nor was this because of indifference or, because these judgments or decrees were forgotten, or regarded dead. On the contrary, soon after the restoration of the Bourbons, in 1815, the question of the re-establishment of the Jesuits became a subject of public agitation in France. The partisans of the Jesuits, thinking that this period of general reaction would be very favorable for such a measure, were already moving to ask the Chamber of Deputies to pass a law to restore the order. What gave them, above all, high hopes of success, was the complete rehabilitation of the Order by the Pope, August 7, 1814, that took away one of the potent arguments against the Jesuits with Catholics. For in the bull of their re-establishment, the Pope had, under the most awful penalties, forbidden all "judges" of the earth, "with whatever power they might be clothed" to oppose the restoration of the Jesuits. This, as was everywhere understood, embraced not only courts, but also parliaments, and all governmental power, legislative and executive. The Jesuit party, encouraged and supported thus by the general religious and political reaction, and the mighty power of the Roman Pontiff, felt sure of victory. I desire the reader to note this historical fact; it has a most important weight in deciding the general question before us.

But the very first intimation of a movement to re-establish the Jesuits at once excited a storm of opposition on all sides. I have lying before me some of the pamphlet literature of that day, called forth by this Jesuit movement,—old, faded brochures, but by far the best witnesses of the spirit, the passions and arguments of the hour, testifying of the fierce, tumultu-

ous war instantly aroused in France by this proposal. France had not forgotten the past history of the Jesuits. They knew also that this Order was ever the same for evil. The tremendous experiences of the past twenty-eight years were not lost on the people of France; the lessons and the enjoyment of freedom they had had made them only understand better and hate more this order of men, so deadly to freedom in its hostility and influence. To the surprise of the Jesuit party, men sprang up everywhere advocating with power the justice and necessity of the decrees against Jesuits, and the extreme peril to the liberties of France, and the very monarchy itself, in their restoration. The literature of the last century judgments of courts, decrees of kings, bulls of Popes, the testimonies of Catholic prelates, and of eminent writers and statesmen, were called into life again, and read by the people.

The effort to bring about a legal restoration failed. Neither the government of Louis XVIII., nor of his bigoted brother Charles X., who was largely under the influence of the Jesuits, whose fatal advice finally effected his downfall; nor the government of Louis Philippe, the republic of 1848, or of the Second Empire—desired or ventured, by any act, to re-establish the society. Catholic France, since 1764, had seen no good reason for reversing the judgments and decrees of French courts and French monarchs against this order.

It is therefore unhistorical to attribute the decree against the Jesuits to republican hostility to the Jesuits and the Catholic church. What the republic holds in its hands to-day, is only the legitimate inheritance from a line of Catholic monarchs, a law left intact by all the nine preceding governments, covering a period of more than a hundred years.

2. What were the grounds of the action of the French courts and governments against the Jesuits? This will be seen best by quoting from the language of the reports, the judgments and decrees, of councils, courts, parliaments and cabinets.

The judgments (*arrêts*) were rendered against the Order by the parliaments of Paris—in the presence of all the Chambers; the first, August 6, 1761; the second, August 6, 1762. The decree of the latter filled seven full pages, 4to. I take from it the following passages:

The aforesaid institution (of the Jesuits) can not be tolerated in any well governed State (*etat police*), as being contrary to nature, dangerous to all authority, spiritual and temporal, tending to introduce into the Church and the State, under the veil of a religious institution, a political body whose essence consists in a continual activity to attain, by all sorts of direct and indirect ways secret and public, to an absolute independence, and then gradually to the usurpation of all authority.

In the same decree the order is declared to be "perverse, destructive of every principle of religion and even of rectitude;—injurious to Christian morality; pernicious to civil society; seditious, dangerous to the rights and the nature of the royal power, to the safety even of the sacred persons of kings, and to the obedience of subjects; and finally calculated to excite the greatest disturbances in the States, and to form and keep alive the deepest corruption in the hearts of men."

The French Parliaments of that day knew the Jesuits well. President Rollard, in his Report to the Parliament of Paris, April 2, 1762, demonstrates the existence in France of a

vast multitude of "Jesuits of the short robe," secretly affiliated male and female members of the Order, who escape public notice, "who the invisible army" of the Society, "and invade every path of public and private life."

M. de Salellis, in his Report to the Council of Rousillon, says:

The execrable Jesuit doctrine which aims at the life of kings, comes to the support of the privileges to which the Society is invariably attached both by vows and by interest. The Jesuits regard as their enemy, as a tyrant, every prince who, by placing them on a level with other subjects, would reign over them. To assassinate a prince, with them, is only to make war against him; to hire murderers, is only to take into-pay auxiliary troops.

A French priest, the Abbe Chauvelin, in his Second Report made in full Parliament, July 9, 1861, uses this language:

Since the year 1578 the Jesuits have been conspiring in Portugal to take away the regency from the Queen; in Germany their plots date from 1589; in Paris they held in their College in 1589 the meetings of the League; they attempted the life of Henry II., by the plot of Barriere, and a year afterwards by the hand of John Chastel. Notice that this last attempt was followed by their expulsion from France, by the decree of December 29, 1594; and this expulsion is confirmed by an edict of Henry IV., dated January 7, 1595. In England plots of all kinds were hatched by distinguished Jesuits who overran that kingdom from 1580 to 1586. They entered into new conspiracies in 1593, 1594, 1597 and 1603; and finally in 1605 was discovered the famous Powder Plot. Other conspiracies or projects of revolution were exposed in Holland against the Prince of Orange, the work of Jesuit intrigues and maneuvers, in 1498 and 1590; and still others in Bavaria, Poland, Styria, Corinthia and Carniola.

M. de Montclar, an eminent nobleman, in his Report, draws this portrait of the Jesuits:

Political corrupters of every government; flatterers of the great and their passions; promoters of despotism in order to stifle reason and to seize power; enemies of kings who oppose their perverse designs; calumniators of all those who sincerely love the prince and the State, they put a scepter of iron into the hand of kings, and a dagger into those of their subjects; they counsel tyranny, and teach tyrannicide; they unite, as it suits their interests, the most cruel intolerance with the most scandalous indifference to true religion and morality; they forbid controversies about words, etc.

The University of Paris and the Sorbonne expressed themselves at the same time in the same tenor. The King of Portugal, in his decree of the banishment of the Jesuits, September 3, 1759, declares them to be "notorious rebels, traitors, real enemies and aggressors, as much by their past as by their present, against his royal person, his States, the public peace, his kingdoms and lordships, and the common welfare of his subjects."

The decrees of Louis XV. and Louis XVI., based on the grounds set forth in the judgments of the Courts and of Parliaments, both declared that the suppression and expulsion of the Order was "perpetual and irrevocable." And in 1777, when a Councilor of State declared before the Parliament that the Jesuits were again trying covertly to re-establish themselves, in order to calm the fears of the people, the government and the magistrates, the king issued a new decree, in which he declared that "the Society being abolished everywhere, it was so without hope of restoration, and its re-establishment is henceforth impossible." In this decree he calls the edict of Louis XV. "a wise precaution for the extinction of the Society in the kingdom."

What has been cited is sufficient to show what grounds the French Catholic monarchs of last century had for suppressing the Jesuits, and the later governments for confirming their decrees, or refusing to revoke them.—*Christian Standard.*

## Evangelizing in the State.

Editor Messenger:

Please state through your paper that the Missionary Board desire to procure the labors of brethren in different parts of the State, so far as practicable, with the limited means at command. It is hoped that assistance can be rendered in a more permanent establishment of the cause by bringing into requisition one more united strength, enlisting all the faithful, whether in pulpit, in Sunday school, or privately from house to house. To this end it is urgently requested that the various congregations and brethren in different neighborhoods where no congregations exist will correspond with the Chairman or Secretary of the Board as early as convenient, stating needs and resources, circumstances and what assurance of seconding the efforts of any one who will visit them with the above objects in view. Please note that it is not worth while spending time and means unless there is a determination on the part of the resident brotherhood, not only to assist immediately but to continue, perseveringly the work to ultimate success. This is a general call and it is desirous to enlist the brotherhood throughout the State. The Board do not feel warranted in pledging the full support of anyone for holding meetings in the various localities, but we guarantee for the present one-half of the compensation, providing the brethren will pledge the remainder.

Our religious interests in this State are of prime importance at the present time and will ever and everywhere be dear to the people of God. Correspondence is solicited.

In Christian love, &c.,

J. W. COWLES,  
Chairman.

—When your minister prays, pray with him. Don't stare at him as if he was a stone image. No good ever came of that. No good ever came of that. No good ever came of that. Have it all in your hearts, that it may have free course and be glorified in the word he is to preach. Pray with him and sing. It is worth one hundred more people in a big church every Sunday, to have folks fairly hoiler, if you can do no better.

Oh! I have such a longing to get folks to sing. It does seem to be so good to have them make a joyful noise unto the Lord, if it be nothing but a noise. If they don't get the tune it don't make any difference—not to some—but sing. It is a grand thing, and does so help the preacher and the sermon. Seldom find any fault with your minister, but when you do, don't tell him on Monday, then he feels blue; don't tell him on Tuesday, he is just pulling out; don't tell him on Wednesday, he is getting ready for his sermon; don't tell him on Thursday, he is writing it; don't tell him on Friday, he is finishing his sermon; don't tell him on Saturday, because he is getting rested for Sunday; and if you don't tell him before Saturday night you never will tell him.—*Rev. Robert Collyer at Installation of Rev. G. C. Miln.*

—A very plain minister once said that some folks talked like Christians at Church, and like devils at home.

—Of a miserly man somebody wrote: "His head gave way, but his hand never did. His brain softened, but his heart couldn't."