

*Papal dispensation
for murder and mayhem*



Quick overview of the main ideas¹

Which Theosophists and Occultists entertain with regard to the Society of Jesus.

Theosophy and Jesuitism are the two opposite poles: one far above, the other far below even that stagnant marsh. One is the power of Light, the other that of Darkness. Theosophists are slandered and reviled by the Jesuits and their adherents everywhere.

Roman Catholicism is but a name. As a Church it is a phantom of the past and a mask. The Jesuits have practised Black Magic in its worst form, far more than any other body of men; and to it they owe in large measure their power and influence.

The day may come when their wealth will be violently taken from them, and they themselves mercilessly destroyed amidst the general execrations and applause of all nations and peoples. There is a Nemesis-Karma, though often it allows Evil and Sin to go on successfully for ages.



¹ Selected by the Series Editor.

Theosophy or Jesuitism?

. . . choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites. . . .

— *Joshua* xxiv, 15

First published in *Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 10, June 1888, pp. 261-72.

Republished in *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (THEOSOPHY OR JESUITISM?) IX pp. 291-307.

The thirteenth number of *Le Lotus*, the recognised organ of Theosophy, among many articles of undeniable interest, contains one by Madame Blavatsky in reply to the Abbé Roca. The eminent writer, who is certainly the most learned woman of our acquaintance,¹ discusses the following question: “*Has Jesus ever existed?*”² She destroys the Christian legend, in its details, at least, with irrefragable texts which are not usually consulted by religious historians.³

The article is producing a profound sensation in the Catholic and Judeo-Catholic swamp: we are not surprised at this, for the author’s arguments are such as it is difficult to break down, even were one accustomed to the Byzantine disputes of theology.

— *Paris*, evening paper, of May 12th, 1888

The series of articles, one of which is referred to in the above quotation from a well-known French evening paper, was originally called forth by an article in *Le Lotus* by the Abbé Roca, a translation of which was published in the January number of *Lucifer*.⁴

These articles, it would seem, have stirred up many slumbering animosities. They appear, in particular, to have touched the Jesuit party in France somewhat nearly. Several correspondents have written calling attention to the danger incurred by The-

¹ The humble individual of that name renders thanks to the editor of *Paris*: not so much for the flattering opinion expressed as for the rare surprise to find the name of “Blavatsky,” for once, neither preceded nor followed by any of the usual abusive epithets and adjectives which the highly-cultured English and American newspapers and their gentlemanly editors are so fond of coupling with the said cognomen. — *Ed.* [H.P. Blavatsky]

² The question is rather: Did the “historical” Jesus ever exist? — *Ed.* [H.P. Blavatsky]

[See “Jesus Ben Pandira, the historical Christ,” in our *Buddhas and Initiates Series*.]

³ [Note 1 by *Boris de Zirkoff*: This has reference to H.P. Blavatsky’s scholarly essay entitled “Réponse Aux Fausses Conceptions de M. l’Abbé Roca Relatives à mes Observations sur l’Ésotérisme Chrétien.” (Reply to the Mistaken Conceptions of the Abbé Roca Concerning my Observations upon Christian Esotericism) which appeared in *Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. II, No. 13, April, 1888, pp. 3-19. Both the original French text and an English translation thereof will be found in their correct chronological place in the present Series of volumes.]

⁴ [Note 2 by *Boris de Zirkoff*: This refers to the first article of the Abbé Roca entitled “Ésotérisme du Dogme Chrétien — La Création, d’après Moïse et d’après les Mahâtmas” (The Esotericism of Christian Dogma — Creation according to Moses and according to the Mahâtmas) which appeared in *Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. II, No. 9, December, 1887, pp. 149-60. It can be found, together with H.P. Blavatsky’s first Reply, in its regular chronological order, in Volume VIII of the present Series.]

osophists in raising up against themselves such virulent and powerful foes. Some of our friends would have us keep silent on these topics. Such is not, however, the policy of *Lucifer*, nor ever will be. Therefore, the present opportunity is taken to state, once for all, the views which Theosophists and Occultists entertain with regard to the Society of Jesus. At the same time, all those who are pursuing in life's great wilderness of vain evanescent pleasures and empty conventionalities *an ideal worth living for*, are offered the choice between the two now once more rising powers — the Alpha and the Omega at the two opposite ends of the realm of giddy, idle existence — THEOSOPHY and JESUITISM.

For, in the field of religious and intellectual pursuits, these two are the only luminaries — a *good* and an *evil* star, truly — glimmering once more from behind the mists of the Past, and ascending on the horizon of mental activities. They are the only two powers capable in the present day of extricating one thirsty for intellectual life from the clammy slush of the stagnant pool known as Modern Society, so crystallized in its cant,¹ so dreary and monotonous in its squirrel-like motion around the wheel of fashion. Theosophy and Jesuitism are the two opposite poles, one far above, the other far below even that stagnant marsh. Both offer power — one to the spiritual, the other to the psychic and intellectual Ego in man. The former is “the wisdom that is from *above* . . . first pure, then peaceable, gentle . . . full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy,” while the latter is the “wisdom [that] *descendeth not from above*, but is earthly, sensual, DEVILISH.”² One is the power of Light, the other that of Darkness. . . .

A question will surely be asked: “Why should anyone choose between the two? Cannot one remain in the world, a good Christian of whatever church, without gravitating to either of these poles?” Most undeniably, one can do so, for a few more years to come. But the cycle is rapidly approaching the last limit of its turning point. One out of the three great churches of Christendom is split into atomic sects, whose number increases yearly; and a house divided against itself, as is the Protestant Church — MUST FALL.³ The third, the Roman Catholic, the only one that has hitherto succeeded in appearing to retain all its integrity, is rapidly decaying from within. It is honeycombed throughout, and is being devoured by the ravenous microbes begotten by Loyola.

It is no better now than a Dead Sea fruit, fair for some to look at, but full of the rottenness of decay and death within. Roman Catholicism is but a name. As a Church it is a phantom of the Past and a mask. It is absolutely and indissolubly bound up with, and fettered by the Society of Ignatius Loyola; for, as rightly expressed by Lord Robert Montagu, the Roman Catholic Church is now “the largest secret society in the

¹ [Singing in a whining way, from the Latin *cantāre*, to sing. Cant was at first a beggar's whine, hence hypocrisy. Cf. W.W. Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary of English*, 1835–1912. — ED. PHIL.]

² *James' General Epistle*, chapter iii, 15, 17

³ [In 2010, the largest Protestant denominational families were historically Pentecostal denominations (10.8%), Anglican (10.6%), Lutheran (9.7%), Baptist (9%), United and uniting churches (unions of different denominations) (7.2%), Presbyterian or Reformed (7%), Methodist (3.4%), Adventist (2.7%), Congregationalist (0.5%), Brethren (0.5%), The Salvation Army (0.3%) and Moravian (0.1%). Other denominations accounted for 38.2% of Protestants.]

world, beside which Freemasonry is but a pigmy.”¹ Protestantism is slowly, insidiously, but as surely, infected with Latinism — the new ritualistic sects of the High Church, and such men among its clergy as Father Rivington, being undeniable evidence of it. In fifty years more at the present rate of success of Latinism among the “upper ten,”² the English aristocracy will have returned to the faith of King Charles II, and its servile copyist — mixed Society — will have followed suit. And then the Jesuits will begin to reign alone and supreme over the Christian portions of the globe, for they have crept even into the Greek Church.

It is vain to argue and claim a difference between Jesuitism and Roman Catholicism proper, for the latter is now sucked into and inseparably amalgamated with the former. We have public assurance for it in the Pastoral of 1876 by the Bishop of Cambrai. “*Clericalism, Ultramontanism and Jesuitism are one and the same thing — that is to say, Roman Catholicism* — and the distinctions between them have been created by the enemies of religion,” says the “Pastoral.” “There was a time,” adds Monseigneur the Cardinal, “when a certain theological opinion was commonly professed in France concerning the authority of the Pope. . . . It was restricted to our nation, and was of recent origin. The civil power during a century and a half imposed official instruction. Those who professed these opinions were called Gallicans, and those who protested were called Ultramontanes, because they had their doctrinal centre beyond the Alps, at Rome. Today *the distinction between the two schools is no longer admissible*. Theological Gallicanism can no longer exist, since this opinion has ceased to be tolerated by the Church. *It has been solemnly condemned, past all return, by the Oecumenical Council of the Vatican*. ONE CANNOT NOW BE CATHOLIC WITHOUT BEING ULTRAMONTANE — AND JESUIT.”³

A plain statement; and as cool as it is plain.

The Pastoral made a certain noise in France and in the Catholic world, but was soon forgotten. And as two centuries have rolled away since an *exposé* of the infamous principles of the Jesuits was made (of which we will speak presently), the “Black Militia” of Loyola has had ample time to lie so successfully in denying the just charges, that even now, when the present Pope has brilliantly sanctioned the utterance of the Bishop of Cambrai, the Roman Catholics will hardly confess to such a thing. Strange exhibition of infallibility in the Popes! The “infallible” Pope, Clement XIV (Ganganelli), suppressed the Jesuits on the 21st of July, 1773, and yet they came to life again; the “infallible” Pope, Pius VII, re-established them on the 7th of August, 1814.⁴

¹ [Note 3 by Boris de Zirkoff: In his *Recent Events and a Clue to their Solution*, p. 76. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1886; xxiv, 711pp.]

² [Or “Upper ten thousand,” a phrase coined in 1852 by American poet Nathaniel Parker Willis to describe the upper circles of New York, and hence of other major cities. In 1875, both Adam Bissett Thom and Kelly’s Directory published books entitled *The Upper Ten Thousand*, which listed members of the aristocracy, the gentry, officers in the British Army and Navy, members of Parliament, Colonial administrators, and members of the Church of England. The usage of this term was a response to the broadening of the British ruling class which had been caused by the Industrial Revolution. — Wikipedia]

³ [Note 4 by Boris de Zirkoff: Quoted passages are practically identical with those quoted in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 356. Most likely reference is to René François Régnier, Archbishop of Cambrai, 1850–1881. *Vide* Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. RÉGNIER]

⁴ [Note 5 by Boris de Zirkoff: Up to here, this paragraph is almost identical with a passage in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 356]

The infallible Pope Pius IX,¹ travelled, during the whole of his long Pontificate, between the Scylla and Charybdis of the Jesuit question; his infallibility helping him very little. And now the “infallible” Leo XIII (fatal figures!)² raises the Jesuits again to the highest pinnacle of their sinister and graceless glory.

The recent *Brevet* of the Pope (hardly two years old) dated July 13th (the same fatal figures), 1886, is an event, the importance of which can never be overvalued. It begins with the words *Dolemus inter alia*,³ and reinstalls the Jesuits in all the rights of the Order that had ever been cancelled. It was a *manifesto* and a loud defiant insult to all the Christian nations of the New and the Old worlds. From an article by Louis Lambert in the *Gaulois* (August 18th, 1886) we learn that “In 1750 there were 40,000 Jesuits all over the world. In 1800, *officially* they were reckoned at about 1,000 men, only. In 1886, they numbered between 7 and 8,000.”⁴ This last modest number can well be doubted. For, verily now,

Where you meet a man believing in the salutary nature of falsehoods, or the divine authority of things doubtful, and fancying that to serve the Good Cause he must call the devil to his aid, there is a follower of Unsaint⁵ Ignatius,

says Carlyle, and adds of that black militia of Ignatius that:

They have given a new substantive to modern languages. The word Jesuitism now, in all countries, expresses an idea for which there was in nature no prototype before. Not till these last centuries had the human soul generated that abomination, or needed to name it. Truly they have achieved great things in the world, and a general result that we may call stupendous.⁶

And now since their reinstalment in Germany and elsewhere, they will achieve still grander and more stupendous results. For the future can be best read by the past. Unfortunately in this year of the Pope’s jubilee the civilized portions of humanity — even the Protestant ones — seem to have entirely forgotten that past. Let then those who profess to despise Theosophy, the fair child of early Aryan thought and Alexandrian Neo-Platonism, bow before the monstrous Fiend of the Age, but let them not forget at the same time its history.

¹ [Note 6 by Boris de Zirkoff: Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti), b. at Sinigaglia, May 13th, 1792; Elected Pope June 16th, 1846; d. in Rome, February 7th, 1878]

² [Note 7 by Boris de Zirkoff: Leo XIII (Gioacchino Vincenzo Raffæle Luigi Pecci), b. March 2nd, 1810, d. July 20th, 1903. Elected Pope February 20th, 1878, succeeding Pius IX.]

Ref: *Acta Leonis XIII*, Rome, 1878–1903. 26 vols.; *Sanctissimi Domini N. Leonis XIII allocutiones, epistolæ, etc.*, Bruges and Lille, 1887, etc.; *The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII*, ed. by J.J. Wynne, New York, 1902]

³ [Among other things, we lament.]

⁴ [Note 8 by Boris de Zirkoff: The French original of this passage is as follows: “Ils étaient quarante mille dans le monde entier, en 1750; ils étaient un millier à peine, en 1800, tous sécularisés; ils sont aujourd’hui, de sept à huit mille.”]

[As of 1st January 2013, the total number of Jesuits was 17,287, a net loss of 337 members from 1st January 2012. Cf. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Society_of_Jesus#cite_note-stats2-14]

⁵ [divested of sainthood]

⁶ [Note 9 by Boris de Zirkoff: Carlyle’s quotations unchecked.]

Note by ED. PHIL. Quotation from Carlyle’s Eighth and last of the *Latter-Day Pamphlets* on Jesuitism, published August 1850, checked.]

It is curious to observe, how persistently the Order has assailed everything like Occultism from the earliest times, and Theosophy since the foundation of its last Society, which is ours. The Moors and the Jews of Spain felt the weight of the oppressive hand of Obscurantism no less than did the Kabbalists and Alchemists of the Middle Ages. One would think Esoteric philosophy and especially the Occult Arts, or Magic, were an abomination to those good holy fathers? And so indeed they would have the world believe. But when one studies history and the works of their own authors published with the *imprimatur* of the Order, what does one find? That the *Jesuits have practised not only Occultism, but BLACK MAGIC in its worst form,¹ more than any other body of men; and that to it they owe in large measure their power and influence!*

To refresh the memory of our readers and *all those whom it may concern*, a short summary of the doings and actings of our good friends, may be once more attempted. For those who are inclined to laugh, and deny the subterranean and truly infernal means used by “Ignatius’ black militia,” we may state facts!

In *Isis Unveiled* it was said of the *holy* Fraternity that:

. . . though established only in 1535 to 1540, in 1555 there was already general outcry raised against them.²

And now once more:

. . . that crafty, learned, conscienceless, terrible soul of Jesuitism, within the body of Romanism, is slowly but surely possessing itself of the whole prestige and spiritual power that clings to it. . . . Throughout the whole of antiquity, where, in what land, can we find anything like this Order or anything even approaching it? . . . The cry of an outraged public morality was raised against this Order from its very birth. Barely fifteen years had elapsed after the bull approving its constitution was promulgated, when its members began to be driven away from one place to the other. Portugal and the Low Countries got rid of them, in 1578, France in 1594; Venice in 1606; Naples in 1622. From St. Petersburg they were expelled in 1815, and from all Russia in 1820.³

The writer begs to remark to the readers, that this, which was written in 1875, applies admirably and with still more force in 1888. Also that the statements that follow in quotation marks may be all verified. And thirdly, that the principles (*principiū*) of the Jesuits that are now brought forward, are extracted from authenticated MSS. or folios printed by various members themselves of this very distinguished body. Therefore, they can be checked and verified in the British Museum and Bodleian Library with still more ease than in our works.

¹ Mesmerism or HYPNOTISM is a prominent factor in Occultism. It is *magic*. The Jesuits were acquainted with and practised it ages before Mesmer and Charcot. — *Ed.* [H.P. Blavatsky]

² [Note 10 by Boris de Zirkoff: This footnote, occurring in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 352, runs as follows: “It dates from 1540; and in 1555 a general outcry was raised against them in some parts of Portugal, Spain, and other countries.”]

³ [*Isis Unveiled*, II p. 352]

. . . Many are copied from the large Quarto¹ published by the authority of, and verified and collated by the Commissioners of the French Parliament. The statements therein were collected and presented to the King, in order that, as the *Arrest du Parlement du 5 Mars, 1762* expresses it, “the elder son of the Church might be made aware of the perversity of this doctrine. . . . A doctrine authorizing Theft, Lying, Perjury, Impurity, every Passion and Crime, teaching Homicide, Parricide, and Regicide, overthrowing religion in order to substitute for it superstition, by favouring *Sorcery*, Blasphemy, Irreligion, and Idolatry . . . etc.”² Let us then examine the ideas on *magic* of the Jesuits [that magic which

¹ Extracts from this *Arrest* were compiled into a work in 4 vols., 12mo., which appeared at Paris, in 1762, and was known as *Extraits des Assertions, etc.* In a work entitled *Réponse aux Assertions*, an attempt was made by the Jesuits to throw discredit upon the facts collected by the Commissioners of the French Parliament in 1762, as for the most part malicious fabrications. “To ascertain the validity of this impeachment,” says the author of *The Principles of the Jesuits* [pp. v-vi], “the libraries of the two Universities, of the British Museum and of Sion College have been searched for the authors cited; and in every instance where the volume could be found, the correctness of the citation has been established.” [*Isis Unveiled*, II p. 353, *fn.*]

[*Note 11 by Boris de Zirkoff*: The anonymous work from which H.P. Blavatsky quotes a number of passages, both in *Isis Unveiled* and in the present essay, was written by Rev. Henry Handley Norris. Its full title is: *The Principles of the Jesuits, developed in a Collection of Extracts from their own Authors*: to which are prefixed a brief account of the Origin of the Order, and a sketch of its Institute. London: J.G. and F. Rivington, St. Paul’s Church-Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; H. Wix, 41, New Bridge Street, Blackfriars; J. Leslie, Great Queen Street, 1839. xvi, 277pp. It is a very rare work, not easily obtainable.

As to the *Extraits des Assertions*, from which the above mentioned work has been compiled, it exists in two editions: the one in a single quarto volume, and the other in four volumes, 12°, both published by P.G. Simon, in Paris, 1762. The title-page of this work states that it is a Collection of “dangerous and pernicious” teachings and precepts taught by the Jesuits with the approbation of their Superiors.

All quotations used by H.P. Blavatsky have been checked with the four-volume edition of the *Extraits des Assertions*, and corrected in a few instances, to correspond in every particular with it. The original Latin works which the *Extraits* quote have not been consulted, owing to their scarcity.

The student will find in the Bio-Bibliographical Index at the end of the volume, succinct information regarding as many of the Jesuit writers quoted from as could be traced. Considering the importance of this subject, great pains have been taken to secure all available data concerning the various personalities referred to in the text of the present essay.]

² [*Note 12 by Boris de Zirkoff*: The suppression of the Jesuits in France was connected with the injuries inflicted by the English navy on French commerce in 1755. The Jesuit missionaries held a heavy stake in Martinique. Regular trade was not allowed to them, as they belonged to a religious order; so they sold the products of their mission farms, on which they employed many natives; this was permitted to provide current expenses, and it served to protect the simple, childlike natives from dishonest intermediaries. Père Antoine La Valette, superior of the Martinique mission, engaged in these transactions with considerable success, and went too far along this line. He borrowed money in order to work the vast undeveloped resources of the colony. But on the outbreak of war, ships conveying goods of the estimated value of two million *livres* were captured, and La Valette suddenly became a bankrupt. His creditors were urged to demand payment from the procurator of the Paris province, but he refused to be held responsible for the debts of an independent mission, offering, however, to negotiate a settlement. The creditors went to the courts, and an order was issued in 1760 obliging the Society to pay.

It is then that the Fathers, on the advice of their lawyers, made the mistake of appealing to the *Grand’chambre* of the French *Parlement* at Paris. Not only did the *Parlement* support the lower courts, but once having the case in its hands, the Society’s enemies in that assembly determined to strike a decisive blow at the Order. A number of declared enemies of the Society combined together with this objective. Louis XV was weak and the influence of his Court divided; his very able first minister, the Duc de Choiseul, played into the hands of the *Parlement*, and the royal mistress, Madame de Pompadour, to whom the Jesuits had refused absolution, was their bitter opponent also.

The determination of the *Parlement* of Paris in time wore down all opposition, and a strong attack on the Jesuits was opened by the Abbé Chauvelin, April 17th, 1762, who denounced the Constitutions of the Order as the cause of the alleged defalcations of the Jesuits. This was followed by the *compte-rendu* of the Constitutions, July 3–7th, 1762, and further attacks by Chauvelin. After a long conflict with the Crown, the *Parlement* issued the famous *Extraits des Assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses en tout genre, etc.*, a congeries of passages from Jesuit theologians and canonists, showing them up as having taught all sorts of immoral practices. On the 6th of August, 1762, the final *arrêt* was issued condemning the Society to extinction, but the king’s intervention resulted in an eight months’ delay. A compromise was suggested by the Court. If the French Jesuits would stand apart from the Order, under a French vicar, with French customs, the Crown would still protect them. The Jesuits refused. The King’s intervention hindered the execution of the *arrêt* until April 1st, 1763. At that time, the Jesuits’ colleges were closed, and the Jesuits were required to renounce their vows under pain of banishment. Very few of them accepted these conditions. In November 1764, the King signed an edict dissolving the Society throughout his dominions.]

they are pleased to call *devilish* and *Satanic* when studied by the Theosophists]. Writing on this subject in his secret instructions, Anthony Escobar says:

“It is lawful . . . to make use of the science acquired *through the assistance of the devil*, provided the preservation and use of that knowledge do not depend upon the devil: *for the knowledge is good in itself, and the sin by which it was acquired is gone by.*”¹ Hence why should not a Jesuit cheat the Devil as well as he cheats every layman?

“*Astrologers and soothsayers are either bound, or are not bound, to restore the reward of their divination, if the event does not come to pass.*”

“I own,” remarks the *good* Father Escobar, “that the former opinion does not at all please me; because, when the astrologer or diviner has exerted all the diligence *in the diabolic art* which is essential to his purpose, he has fulfilled his duty, whatever may be the result. As the physician, when he has made use of medicines according to the principles of his professional knowledge, is not bound to restore the fee which he has received if his patient should die; so neither is the astrologer bound to restore his charge and costs to the person who has consulted him, except when he has used no effort, or was ignorant of his diabolic art; because, when he has used his endeavours, he has not deceived.”²

. . . Busembaum and Lacroix, in *Theologia Moralis*,³ say, “Palmistry may be considered lawful, if from the lines and divisions of the hands, it can ascertain

¹ *Theologia moralis*, Lugduni, 1663. Tom. IV, lib. 28, sect. 1, de præcept. 1, cap. 20, n. 184, p. 25

[*Note 13 by Boris de Zirkoff*: Antonio de Escobar y Mendoza (1589–1669), *Liber theologiæ moralis*, viginti quatuor Societatis Jesu Doctoribus reseratus, quem R.P.A. de Escobar et Mendoza in examen confessoriorum digessit, addidit, illustravit. *Lugduni*, 1659. 8vo. (British Museum: 848, c.11) Quoted in *Principles, etc.*, p. 150, from edition of 1663.

Italics in this passage are H.P. Blavatsky’s own.

Extraits des Assertions, tome II, pp. 116-18, gives the following Latin text:

“Licitum . . . est ut; scientiâ ope daemonis acquisitâ, modo conservatio ac usus illius scientiæ non pendeat à daemone, quia cognitio seu scientia ex se bona est, & peccatum quo fuit acquisita pertransiit.” (Tom. IV, lib. 28, sect. 1, de præcept. 1, cap. 20, n. 184, p. 25)]

² *ibid.*, sect. 2, de præcept. 1, probl. 113, no. 584, p. 77

[*Note 14 by Boris de Zirkoff*: *Extr. des Ass.*, tome II, p. 118, gives the following Latin text:

“*Astrologi & divinatores tenentur & non tenentur pretium pro divinatione acceptum restituere, si res non evenit.*

“*Tenentur restituere . . .*

“*Non tenentur.*

“*Primam sententiam minimè placere mihi profiteor; quia cùm Astrologus, vel Divinus diligentiam adhibuerit arte Diaboli ad eum effectum necessariam, jam suo muneri quolibet in eventu satisfacit. Quemadmodum Medicus, quando juxta artis præcepta medicamina adhibuit, non tenetur acceptam pecuniam, ægroto pereunte, restituere: haud aliter illi damna & expensas restituere consulenti non tenetur; sed solummodo, quando nullam impendit operam, aut ejus diabolicæ artis erat ignarus, quia quando operam suam impendit, no deceptit.*” (*ibid.*, sect. 2, de præcept. I, problem. 113, n. 584, p. 77)

The English translation is quoted in *Principles, etc.*, pp. 150-51, with H.P. Blavatsky’s own italics, except for the complete sentence concerning Astrologers.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. ESCOBAR.]

³ *Theologia Moralis . . . nunc pluribus partibus aucta à R.P. Claudio Lacroix, Societatis Jesu. Coloniae, 1757. (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1733. Ed. British Museum)*

[*Note 15 by Boris de Zirkoff*: Hermannus Busembaum and Claudius Lacroix, *Theologia Moralis . . . nunc pluribus partibus aucta à R.P. Claudio la Croix, Societatis Jesu.* (Index locupletissimus, secundum ordinem alphabeti digestus à L. Collendal) 9 tom. Coloniae Agrippinae, 1733. 8vo. (British Museum: 850, g. 1)

Quoted in *Principles, etc.*, p. 155.

Extr. des Ass., II, p. 132, using an ed. of 1757 in 2 vols., gives the following Latin text:

the disposition of the body, and conjecture with probability the propensities and affections of the soul. . . . ”¹

This noble fraternity, which many preachers have of late so vehemently denied to have ever been a *secret* one, has been sufficiently proved as such. Their constitutions were translated into Latin by the Jesuit Polancus, and printed in the college of the Society at Rome, in 1558. “They were jealously kept secret, the greater part of the Jesuits themselves knowing only extracts from them. *They were never produced to the light until 1761, when they were published by order of the French Parliament* [in 1761, 1762], in the famous process of Father Lavalette.”² . . . The Jesuits reckon it among the greatest achievements of their Order that Loyola supported, by a special memorial to the Pope, a petition for the reorganization of that abominable and abhorred instrument of wholesale butchery — the infamous tribunal of the Inquisition.

This Order of Jesuits is now all-powerful in Rome. They have been reinstalled in the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, in the Department of the Secretary of State, and in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Pontifical Government was for years previous to Victor Emanuel’s occupation of Rome entirely in their hands. . . . ³

What was the origin of that order? It may be stated in a few words. In the year 1534, on August 16th, an ex-officer and “Knight of the Virgin,” from the Biscayan Provinces, and the proprietor of the magnificent castle of *Casa Solar* — Ignatius Loyola,⁴ became the hero of the following incident. In the subterranean chapel of the Church of Montmartre, surrounded by a few priests and students of theology, he received their pledges to devote their whole lives to the spreading of Roman Catholicism by every and all means, whether good or foul; and he was thus enabled to establish a new Order. Loyola proposed to his six chief companions that their Order should be a *militant* one, in order to fight for the interests of the *Holy* seat of Roman Catholicism. Two means were adopted to make the object answer; the education of youth, and proselytism (*apostolat*). This was during the reign of Pope Paul III, who gave his full sympathy to the new scheme. Hence in 1540 was published the famous papal bull — *Regimini militantis ecclesiae* (the regimen of the warring, or *militant* Church) — after which the Order began increasing rapidly in numbers and power.⁵

“Licita est . . . Chiromancia, si ex lineis & partibus manuum consideret temperiem corporis, imò etiam animi propensiones & affectus probabiliter conjectet. . . .” (Tom. I, lib. 3, part. 1, Tract. 1, cap. 1, dub. 2, resol. 8, p. 183)

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. BUSEMBAUM and LACROIX.]

¹ Tom. II, lib. 3, part. 1, Tract. 1, cap. 1, dub. 2, resol. 8, p. 183. What a pity that the counsel for the defence had not bethought them to cite this orthodox legalization of “cheating by palmistry or otherwise,” at the recent religio-scientific prosecution of the medium Slade, in London.

² G.B. Nicolini: *History of the Jeuits*, p. 30

[Note 16 by Boris de Zirkoff: Italics are H.P. Blavatsky’s own.]

³ *Isis Unveiled*, II pp. 353-55

⁴ Or “St. Inigo the Biscayan,” by his true name.

⁵ [Note 17 by Boris de Zirkoff: Paul III (Alessandro Farnese), b. at Rome or Canino, February 29th, 1468; d. at Rome, November 10th, 1549. Elected Pope October 12th, 1534, to succeed Clement VII. He introduced the Inquisition into Italy, 1542, and established the censorship and the Index, 1543.

At the death of Loyola, the society counted more than one thousand Jesuits, though admission into the ranks was, as alleged, surrounded with extraordinary difficulties. It was another celebrated and unprecedented bull, issued by Pope Julius the III in 1552,¹ that brought the Order of Jesus to such eminence and helped it towards such rapid increase; for it placed the society outside and *beyond* the jurisdiction of local ecclesiastical authority, granted the Order its own laws, and permitted it to recognise but one supreme authority — that of its General, whose residence was then at Rome. The results of such an arrangement proved fatal to the Secular Church. High prelates and Cardinals had very often to tremble before a simple subordinate of the Society of Jesus. Its generals always got the upper hand in Rome, and enjoyed the unlimited confidence of the Popes, who thus frequently became tools in the hands of the Order. Naturally enough, in those days when political power was one of the rights of the “Vicegerants of God” — the strength of the crafty society became simply tremendous. In the name of the Popes, the Jesuits thus granted to themselves unheard-of privileges, which they enjoyed unstintedly up to the year 1773. In that year, Pope Clement XIV published a new bull, *Dominus ac Redemptor* (the Lord and Redeemer), abolishing the famous Order.² But the Popes proved helpless before the new Frank-

Ref: *Literæ Apostolicæ*, Rome, 1606. Bulla I, September 27th, 1540. Also in Cocquelines, *Bullarum, privilegiarum . . . collectio*, IV, 1, pp. 112 *et seq.*, Rome, 1745.]

¹ [Note 18 by Boris de Zirkoff: Julius III (Giammaria Cioocchi del Monte), b. at Rome, September 10th, 1487; d. at Rome, March 23rd, 1555. Elected Pope February 7th, 1550, to succeed Paul III.

Ref: A.M. Cherubini, *Magnum bullarium Romanum*, I, 778 *et seq.*; Turin ed., VI, 401 *et seq.*]

² [Note 19 by Boris de Zirkoff: Pope Clement XIVth, formerly Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli (October 31st, 1705 to September 22nd, 1774), a <Friar Minor> Conventual Franciscan, inherited from his predecessor, Clement XIIIth, a historical stage-setting in which the persecution and expulsion of the Jesuits in several countries was already going on. The Bourbon courts of Naples and Parma followed in this the example of France and Spain. Clement XIVth found himself under strong and ever increasing pressure to abolish the Society of Jesus. Around 1769, the Pope commenced open hostilities against the Order. He refused to see its General, Father Ricci, and gradually removed from his entourage their best friends. A congregation of Cardinals hostile to the Order visited the Roman College and had the Fathers expelled. A widespread system of persecution was extended all over Italy. On July 4th, 1772, there appeared on the scene a new Spanish ambassador, Joseph Moniño, Count of Florida Blanca, who openly threatened the Pope with a schism in Spain and probably in the other Bourbon states. Caught in the Bourbon intrigues, the Pope found himself unable to oppose Moniño. The latter ransacked the archives of Rome and Spain to supply Clement with facts justifying the promised suppression of the Jesuits. Until the end of 1772, the Pope still found some support against the Bourbons in King Charles Emmanuel of Sardinia and in the Empress Maria Theresa of Austria. But Charles died, and Maria Theresa ceased to plead for the maintenance of the Order. At last, in November, 1772, the Pope began the composition of the Brief (*breve*) of abolition, which took seven months to be finished. The Brief known as *Dominus ac Redemptor noster*, signed on June 8th, bears the date of July 21st, 1773, and was made known to the General and his assistants on August 16th. A lengthy trial ensued.

This remarkable document issued by Clement XIVth opens with the statement that it is the Pope's office to secure in the world the unity of mind in the bonds of peace. He must therefore be prepared, for the sake of charity, to uproot and destroy the things most dear to him, whatever pain and bitterness their loss may entail. A long series of precedents are cited for the suppression of religious orders by the Holy See, among them the Templars. After enumerating the principal favours granted to the Society of Jesus by former Popes, he remarks that “the very tenor and terms of the said Apostolic constitutions show that the Society from its earliest days bore the germs of dissensions and jealousies which tore its own members asunder, led them to rise against other religious orders, against the secular clergy and the universities, nay even against the sovereigns who had received them in their states.” Persuaded that the Society of Jesus is no longer able to produce the abundant fruit for which it was instituted, the Pope resolves to “suppress and abolish” the Society, “to annul and abrogate all and each of its offices, functions, and administrations.” The *breve* proceeds to make regulations for the transference of the authority of the Society's officers, and concludes with a prohibition to suspend or impede its execution.

It should be noted that this Brief was not promulgated in the form customary for papal Constitutions intended as laws of the Church; it was not a Bull, but a Brief, *i.e.*, a decree of less binding force and easier of revocation; it was not affixed to the gates of St. Peter's or in the Campo di Fiore; it was not even communicated in legal form to the Jesuits in Rome, the General and his assistants being the only ones to receive the notification of suppression.

After the death of Clement XIVth it was rumoured that he had retracted his famous Brief by a letter of June 29th, 1774. The letter it was said, had been entrusted to his confessor to be given to the next Pope. It was published

enstein, the fiend that one of the “Vicars of God” had evoked. The society continued its existence secretly, notwithstanding the persecutions of both Popes and the lay authorities of every country. In 1801, under the new *alias* of the “Congregation of the *Sacré Coeur de Jésus*,” it had already penetrated into and was tolerated in Russia and Sicily.

In 1814, as already said, a new bull of Pius VII resurrected the Order of Jesus, though its late privileges, even those among the lay clergy, were withheld from it.¹ The lay authorities, in France as elsewhere, have found themselves compelled ever since to tolerate and to count with the Jesuits. All that they could do was to deny them any special privileges and subject the members of that society to the laws of the country, equally with other ecclesiastics. But, gradually and imperceptibly the Jesuits succeeded in obtaining special favours even from the lay authorities. Napoleon III granted them permission to open seven colleges in Paris only, for the education of the young, the only condition exacted being, that these colleges should be under the authority and supervision of local bishops. But the establishments had hardly been opened when the Jesuits broke that rule. The episode with the Archbishop Darboy is well known. Desiring to visit the Jesuit college in the *Rue de la Poste* (Paris), he was refused admittance, and the gates were closed against him by order of the Superior. The Bishop lodged a complaint at the Vatican. But the answer was delayed for such a length of time, that the Jesuits remained virtually masters of the situation and *outside* of every jurisdiction but their own.

for the first time in 1789, at Zürich, in P.Ph. Wolf's *Allgemeine Geschichte der Jesuiten*. Although Pius VI, Clement's successor, never protested against this statement, the authenticity of the document in question is not sufficiently established.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES: *Bullarium Romanum; Clementis XIV epistolæ ac brevia*, ed. A. Theiner, Paris, 1852. — J.J.I. von Döllinger, “Memoirs on the Suppression of the Jesuits,” in *Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Culturgeschichte*, Vienna, 1882. — J. Créteineau-Joly, *Clément XIV et les Jésuites*, Paris, 1847. — Smith, “The Suppression of the Society of Jesus,” in *The Month*, London, 1902–1903, Vols. 99, 100, 101, 102. — A. Theiner, *Geschichte des Pontificats Clemens' XIV*, Leipzig and Paris, 1853, 3 vols. — *Beytrag zu den zufälligen Gedanken . . . über die Bulle Dominus, ac Redemptor noster, etc.*, Strassburg, 1774. — *Breve della Santità di Nostro Signore Papa Clemente XIV*, Rome, 1773. — Delplace, “La Suppression des Jésuites,” in *Études*, Paris, 5–20th July, 1908. — A. de Guignard, Comte de Saint-Priest, *Histoire de la chute des Jésuites*, Paris, 1846. — De Ravignan, *Clément XIII et Clément XIV*, Paris, 1854. — English tr. of the *Dominus ac Redemptor* brief may be found in G.B. Nicolini, *History of Jesuits*, London, 1893, pp. 387–406.]

¹ [Note 20 by Boris de Zirkoff: Far from submitting to the *breve* of Clement XIVth, the ex-Jesuits, after some ineffectual attempts at direct resistance, withdrew into the territories of free-thinking sovereigns, such as Russia and Prussia. They elected three Poles successively as Generals, taking the title of Vicars, till on the 7th of March, 1801, Pius VII (Luigi Barnaba Chiaramonti, 1740–1823), the successor of Clement XIVth, granted them the liberty to reconstitute themselves in north Russia. On the 30th of July, 1804, a similar *breve* restored the Jesuits in the two Sicilies. Finally, in 1814, Pius VIIth, by the Bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, revoked the action of his predecessor and formally restored the Society of Jesus to corporate legal existence. He made no censure, however, of Clement's action, and no vindication of the Jesuits from the heavy charges that had been levelled against them. *Vide* for the Bulls of Pius VII, Barberi, *Bullarii Romani continuatio*, Vols. XI–XV, Rome, 1846–53.

Lucifer, Vol. XI, December, 1892, pp. 266–67, contains rather copious excerpts, in English translation, from the two <in>famous Bulls of Clement XIV and Pius VII.]

And now read what Lord R. Montagu says of their deeds in Protestant England, and judge:

Think of even a part of it — the Jesuit Society — with its Nihilist adherents in Russia, its Socialist allies in Germany, its Fenians and Nationalists in Ireland, its accomplices and its slaves in its power; think of that Society which has not scrupled to stir up the most bloody wars between nations, in order to advance its purposes; and yet can stoop to hunting down a single man because he knows their secret and will not be their slave — hunting him down, discrediting him, and thwarting him at every turn, with the cool calculation that they will either drive him mad or make him put an end to himself, so that the secret may be buried with him. Think of a Society which can devise such a diabolical scheme, and then boast of it; and say whether a desperate energy is not required in us. . . .

If you had been behind the scenes . . . then you would still have before you the labour of unravelling all that is being done by our Government, and of tearing off the tissue of lies by which their acts are concealed. Repeated attempts will have taught you that there is not a public man on whom you can lean. Because, as England is “between the upper and nether millstone”¹ none but adherents or slaves are now advanced; and it stands to reason that the Jesuits, who have got that far, have prepared new millstones, for the time when the present ones shall have passed away; and then, again, younger millstones to come on after, and wield the power of the nation.²

In France the affairs of the sons of Loyola flourished to the day when the ministry of Jules Ferry compelled them to retire from the field of battle. Many are those who still remember the useless strictness of the police measures, and the clever enacting of dramatic scenes by the Jesuits themselves. This only added to their popularity with certain classes. They obtained thereby an aureole of martyrdom, and the sympathy of every pious and foolish woman in the land was secured to them.

And now that Pope Leo XIII has once more restored to the good fathers, the Jesuits, all the privileges and rights that had ever been granted to their predecessors, what can the public at large of Europe and America expect? Judging by the *bull*, the complete mastery, moral and physical, over every land where there are Roman Catholics, is secured to the Black Militia. For in this bull the Pope confesses that of all the religious congregations now existing, *that of the Jesuits is the one dearest to his heart*. He lacks words sufficiently expressive to show the ardent love he (Pope Leo) feels for them, *etc., etc.* Thus they have the certitude of the support of the Vatican in all and everything. And as it is they who guide him, we see his Holiness coquetting and flirting with every great European potentate — from Bismarck down to the crowned heads of Continent and Isle. In view of the ever increasing influence of Leo XIII, moral and political — such a certitude for the Jesuits is of no mean importance.

¹ [Expression from Charles W. Chesnutt's *The Wife of His Youth*, first published July 1898]

² *Recent Events and a Clue to their Solution*, pp. 76-77

For more minute particulars the reader is referred to such well-known authors as Lord Robert Montagu in England; and on the Continent, Edgard Quinet: *l'Ultramontanisme*; Michelet: *Le Prêtre, la Femme et la Famille*; Paul Bert: *La Morale des Jésuites*; Friedrich Nippold: *Handbuch der Neuesten Kirchengeschichte* and *Welche Wege führen nach Rome? etc., etc.*

Meanwhile, let us remember the words of warning we received from one of our late Theosophists, Dr. Kenneth Mackenzie, who, speaking of the Jesuits, says that:

“Their spies are everywhere, of all apparent ranks of society, and they may appear learned and wise, or simple and foolish, as their instructions run. There are Jesuits of both sexes and all ages, and it is a well-known fact that members of the Order, of high family and delicate nurture, are acting as menial servants in Protestant families, and doing other things of a similar nature in aid of the Society’s purposes. We cannot be too much on our guard, for the whole Society, being founded on a law of unhesitating obedience, can bring its force on any given point with unerring and fatal accuracy.”¹

The Jesuits maintain that “the Society of Jesus is not of human invention, *but it proceeded from him whose name it bears*. For Jesus himself described that rule of life which the society follows, *first by his example*, and afterwards by his words.”²

Let, then, all pious Christians listen and acquaint themselves with this alleged “rule of life” and precepts of their God, as exemplified by the Jesuits. Peter Alagona (*S. Thomæ Aquinatis Summæ Theologiæ Compendium*) says: “By the command of God it is lawful to kill an innocent person, to steal, or to commit. . . . (*Ex mandato Dei licet occidere innocentem, furari, fornicari*); because he is the Lord of life and death and all things: *and it is due to him thus to fulfil his command.*” (*Ex prima, Sec. quæst. 94*)³

¹ *Royal Masonic Cyclopaedia*, p. 369

[*Note 21 by Boris de Zirkoff*: Quoted also in *Isis Unveiled*, II p. 355]

² *Imago primi sæculi Societatis Jesu*, Lib. I, cap. 3, p. 64

[*Note 22 by Boris de Zirkoff*: *Extr. des Ass.*, tom. II, pp. 146-48, gives the following Latin text:

“Societas Jesu humanum inventum non est, sed ab illo ipso profectum, cujus nomen gerit. Ipse enim Jesus illam vivendi normam, ad quam se dirigit Societas suo primùm exemplo, deinde etiam verbis expressit.” (*Imago primi sæculi Societatis Jesu, à Provincia Flandro-Belgica ejusdem Societatis repræsentata*. Antuerpiæ, ann. Societ. sæculari, 1640. Lib. I, cap. 3, p. 64) Copy of this work is in the holdings of the Bodleian Library, at Oxford.

Quoted in *Principles*, etc., p. 157. Italics are H.P. Blavatsky’s own.]

³ *Note 23 by Boris de Zirkoff*: *Extr. des Ass.*, tom. II, p. 146, gives the following Latin text:

“Ex mandato Dei licet occidere innocentem, furari, fornicari; quia est Dominus vitæ & mortis, & omnium: & sic facere ejus mandatum est debitum.” (*Sancti Thomæ Aquinatis Summæ Theologiæ Compendium*. Auctore Petro Alagona, Theologo Societatis Jesus. *Lutetiæ*, 1620. *Rothomagi*, 1635) The ref. given is: *Ex primâ, Sec. quæst. 94*, edit. 1620, p. 244; edit. 1635, p. 230

Quoted in *Principles* etc., p. 157.

The British Museum lists this work as part of the *Thesaurus Theologicum*, etc., Tom. 13, 1762, etc. 4to (3553 c.) Italics are evidently by H.P. Blavatsky.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. ALAGONA.]

“A man of a religious order, who for a short time lays aside his habit *for a sinful purpose*, is free from heinous sin, and does not incur the penalty of excommunication. . . .” (Tom. I, lib. 3, sect. 2, probl. 44, n. 212, p. 99)^{1, 2}

John Baptist Taberna (*Synopsis Theologiæ Practicæ*) propounds the following question: “Is a judge bound to restore the bribe which he has received for passing sentence?” *Answer*: “. . . *If he has received the bribe for passing an unjust sentence, it is probable that he may keep it. . . . This opinion is maintained and defended fifty-eight doctors*” (Jesuits).³

We must abstain at present from proceeding further. So disgustingly licentious, hypocritical, and demoralizing are nearly all of these precepts, that it was found impossible to put many of them in print, except in the Latin language.^{4, 5}

But what are we to think of the future of Society if it is to be controlled in word and deed by this villainous Body! What are we to expect from a public, which, knowing of the existence of the above-mentioned charges, and that they are not exaggerated *but pertain to historical fact*, still tolerates, when it does not reverence, the Jesuits on meeting them, while it is ever ready to point the finger of contempt at Theosophists and Occultists? Theosophy is persecuted with unmerited slander and ridicule at the instigation of these same Jesuits, and many are those who hardly dare to confess their belief in the philosophy of Arhatship. Yet no Theosophical Society has ever threatened the public with moral decay and the full and free exercise of the seven capital sins under the mask of holiness and the guidance of Jesus! Nor are their

¹ [Note 24 by Boris de Zirkoff: *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome II, p. 160, gives the following Latin text for this portion of the quotation from Escobar’s work:

“Religiosus dimittens habitum ex causâ turpi ad breve tempus, a gravi culpa excusatur, & excommunicationem non subit, quia . . .” (*Theologia Moralis*, Tom. I, lib. 3, sect. 2, de Peccatis, probl. 44, p. 99, n. 212)

In *Principles, etc.*, p. 159, this passage, however, is ascribed to Escobar’s work entitled *Universæ theologiæ moralis receptiores absque lite sententiæ*, to be found in the Library of the University of Cambridge.]

² Anthony Escobar: *Universæ Theologiæ Moralis receptiores absque lite sententiæ, etc.* Tomus I. Lugduni, 1652 (Ed. Bibl. Acad. Cant.):

“Idem sentio, & breve illud tempus ad unius horæ spatium traho. Religiosus itaque habitum dimittens assignato hoc temporis interstitio, non incurrit excommunicationem, *etiamsi dimittat non solum ex causâ turpi, scilicet fornicandi aut clam aliquid abripiendi, sed etiam ut incognitus ineat lupanar.*” — Probl. 44, n. 213.

[Note 25 by Boris de Zirkoff: The English rendering of this Latin sentence, quoted in *Extr. des Ass.*, II, 160, is given in *Principles, etc.*, p. 159, as follows:

“I am of this opinion, and I extend that short time to the space of one hour. A man of a religious order therefore, who puts off his habit for this assigned space of time, does not incur the penalty of excommunication, *although he should lay it aside, not only for a sinful purpose, as to commit fornication, or to thieve, but even that he may enter unknown into a brothel.*” (*ibid.*, n. 213)]

³ Part. 2, tr. 2, cap. 31, p. 286

[Note 26 by Boris de Zirkoff: *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome III, p. 244, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“Quæres 5°. An Judex teneatur restituere pretium acceptum pro ferenda sententia?

“Resp. teneri, si illud acceperit pro sententia justa & debita, quando scilicet habet justum salarium; quia jus naturale dicit non posse alteri vendi, quod jam ante ei debitum est ex justitia. *Si autem pro injusta sententia pretium acceperit*, probabiliter retineri protest . . . Hanc sententiam tenent & defendunt quinquaginta-octo Doctores.” (*Synopsis theologiæ practicæ*, Part. 2, tr. 2, cap. 31, p. 286)

Quoted in *Principles, etc.*, p. 196, where the answer is italicized. The edition used there is the one of *Coloniæ*, 1736.]

⁴ See *The Principles of the Jesuits, developed in a Collection of Extracts from their own Authors, etc.*, London, 1839.

⁵ [*Isis Unveiled*, II pp. 355-56]

rules *secret*, but open to all, for they live in the broad daylight of truth and sincerity. And how about the Jesuits in this respect?

Jesuits who belong to the highest category [says again Louis Lambert] have full and absolute liberty of action — even to murder and arson. On the other hand, those Jesuits who are found guilty of the slightest attempt to endanger or compromise the Society of Jesus — *are punished mercilessly*. They are allowed to write the most heretical books, provided they do not *expose* the secrets of the Order.¹

And these “secrets” are undeniably of the most terrible and dangerous nature. Compare a few of these *Christian precepts* and rules for entering this Society of “*divine origin*,” as claimed for it, with the laws that regulated admission to the secret societies (temple mysteries) of the Pagans.

“A brother Jesuit *has the right to kill anyone that may prove dangerous to Jesuitism.*”²

“Christian and Catholic sons,” says Stephen Fagundez, “may accuse their fathers of the crime of heresy if they wish to turn them from the faith, although they may know that their parents will be burned with fire, and put to death for it, as Tolet teaches. . . . And not only may they refuse them food, if they attempt to turn them from the Catholic faith, *but they may also justly kill them.* . . .”³

It is well known that Nero, the Emperor, *had never dared* seek initiation into the pagan Mysteries on account of the murder of Agrippina!

Under Section XIV of *The Principles of the Jesuits*, we find on *Homicide* the following Christian principles inculcated by Father Henry Henriquez, in *Summæ Theologiæ Moralis* Tomus I, Venetiis, 1600 (Ed. Coll. Sion): “If an adulterer, even although he should be an ecclesiastic, reflecting upon the danger, has entered the house of an adulteress, and being attacked by her husband, kills his aggressor in the necessary defence of his life or limbs, *he is not considered irregular (non videtur irregularis).*” (Tom. I, lib. 14, de Irregularitate, cap. 10, n. 3, p. 869)⁴

¹ [Note 27 by Boris de Zirkoff: This passage has not been found in Louis Lambert’s article in the *Gaulois* of August 18th, 1886.]

² [Note 28 by Boris de Zirkoff: Quotation marks in this sentence may be a typographical error; the sentence itself looks more like H.P. Blavatsky’s own statement regarding the quoted passages which follow it.]

³ *In præcepta Decalogi* (Ed. of Sion Library), Tom. I, lib. 4, cap. 2, n. 7, 8, p. 501

[Note 29 by Boris de Zirkoff: *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome III, p. 426, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

Filii Christiani & Catholici possunt accusare patres de crimine heeresis, si eos à fide velint avertere, etiamsi sciant parentes ob id esse igne cremandos & occidendos, ut docet Toletus . . . nec solùm eis poterunt alimenta negare, si eos à fide catholica avertere conentur, sed etiam eos *poterunt justè occidere* cum moderamine inculpatæ tutelæ, si filios ad deferendam fidem vi compellant.” (*In præcepta Decalogi*, Tom. I, lib. 4, cap. 2, n. 7, 8, p. 501) At the College of Sion, France.

Quoted in *Principles, etc.*, p. 207, where the edition is given as *Lugduni*, 1640.]

⁴ [Note 30 by Boris de Zirkoff: *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome III, pp. 398-400, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“Si adulter, etiam Clericus, advertens periculum intravit domum adulteræ, & invasus à marito illius, *occidat invasorem pro necessaria vitæ aut membrorum defensione: non videtur irregularis.*” (*Summæ theologiæ moralis*, Tom. I, lib. 14, de Irregularitate, cap. 10, n. 3, p. 869)

“ . . . If a father were obnoxious to the state [being in banishment] and to society at large, and there were no other means of averting such an injury, *then I should approve the opinion of the aforesaid authors*” (for a son to kill his father), says Sec. XV, *on Parricide and Homicide*.¹

“It will be lawful for an ecclesiastic, or one of a religious order *to kill a calumniator* who threatens to spread atrocious accusations against himself or his religion . . . ,”² is the rule set forth by the Jesuit Francis Amicus.³

One of the most unconquerable obstacles to initiation, with the Egyptians as with the Greeks, was any degree of murder [or even of simple unchastity].⁴

It is these “enemies of the Human Race,” as they are called, that have once more obtained their old privileges of working in the dark, and inveigling and destroying every obstacle they find in their way — with absolute impunity. But — “forewarned, forearmed.” Students of Occultism should know that, while the Jesuits have, by their devices, contrived to make the world in general, and Englishmen in particular, think there is no such thing as MAGIC, these astute and wily schemers themselves hold magnetic circles, and form magnetic chains by the concentration of their collective will, when they have any special object to effect, or any particular and important person to influence. Again, they use their riches lavishly to help them in any project. Their wealth is enormous. When recently expelled from France, they brought so much money with them, some part of which they converted into English Funds, that immediately the latter were raised to par, which the *Daily Telegraph* pointed out at the time.

They have succeeded. The Church is henceforth an inert tool, and the Pope a poor weak instrument in the hands of this Order. But for how long? The day may come when their wealth will be violently taken from them, and they themselves mercilessly destroyed amidst the general execrations and applause of all nations and peoples.

Quoted in *Principles, etc.*, p. 206, where the last sentence appears in italics. The work can be found in the College of Sion, and the British Museum.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. HENRIQUEZ.]

¹ Opinion of John de Dicastillo, *De Justitia et Jure, etc.*

[Note 31 by Boris de Zirkoff: *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome IV, p. 56, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“ . . . si Pater esset noxius Reipublicæ & communitati, neque aliud esset remedium avertendi tale damnum, tunc approbarem sententiam prædictorum auctorum.” (*De justitia & jure cæterisque virtutibus cardinalibus*, lib. II, Tract. 1, Disp. 10, Dub. 1, n. 15, p. 290)

Quoted in *Principles, etc.*, p. 210, where the last sentence is italicized. The edition used therein is the one of *Antuerpiæ*, 1641.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. DICASTILLO.]

² *Cursus Theologicæ, etc.*, Duaci, 1642. Tom. V, Disp. 36, sect. 5, n. 118, p. 544

³ [Note 32 by Boris de Zirkoff: *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome III, p. 446, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“Unde licebit Clerico vel Religioso *calumniatorem* gravia crimina de se vel de sua Religione spargere minantem *occidere*, quando alius defendendi modus non suppetat. . . .” (*Cursus Theologicæ, etc.*, Duaci, 1642, Tom. V, Disp. 36, sect. 5, n. 118, p. 544)

Quoted in *Principles, etc.*, p. 209.

Vide Bio-Bibliographical Index, s.v. AMICUS.]

⁴ [*Isis Unveiled*, II p. 363

Note 33 by Boris de Zirkoff: The last sentence, without the bracketed portion, which seems to be a later addition by H.P. Blavatsky herself, occurs also in *Isis Unveiled*, II p. 363, but precedes the passages just quoted, instead of following them.]

There is a Nemesis — KARMA, though often it allows Evil and Sin to go on successfully for ages. It is also a vain attempt on their part to threaten the Theosophists — their implacable enemies. For the latter are, perhaps, *the only body* in the whole world who need not fear them. They may try, and perhaps succeed, in crushing individual members. They would vainly try their hand, strong and powerful as it may be, in an attack on the Society. Theosophists are as well-protected, and better, than themselves. To the man of modern science, to all those who know nothing, and who do not believe what they hear of WHITE and BLACK magic, the above will read like nonsense. Let it be, though Europe will very soon experience, and is already so experiencing, the heavy hand of the latter.

Theosophists are slandered and reviled by the Jesuits and their adherents everywhere. They are charged with idolatry and superstition; and yet we read in the same *Principles* of the Father Jesuits:

“The more true opinion is, *that all inanimate and irrational things may be legitimately worshipped,*” says Father Gabriel Vasquez, treating of Idolatry. “If the doctrine which we have established be rightly understood, not only may a painted image, and every holy thing set forth by public authority for the worship of God, be properly adored with God as the image of himself; but also any other thing of this world, whether it be inanimate and irrational, or in its nature rational and devoid of danger.”¹

¹ *De cultu adorationis libri tres*, lib. 3, disp. 1, cap. 2, pp. 393-94

[Note 34 by Boris de Zirkoff: *Extr. des Ass.*, Tome II, p. 258, gives the following Latin text for this passage:

“Verior sententia est, res omnes inanimas & irracionales rectè adorari posse. Perspectâ benè doctrinâ à nobis traditâ 2. lib. disp. 8 & 9. non solum imago depicta, & res sacra autoritate publicâ in cultum Dei exposita, *sed queevis etiam alia res mundi, sive inanimis & irrationalis, sive rationalis ex natura rei, & seculo periculo . . . ritè cum Deo, sicut imago ipsius adorari potest.*” (*De cultu adorationis libri tres*, Moguntia, 1614, lib. 3, disp. 1, cap. 2, pp. 393-94) Copy in the College of Sion, France.

Quoted in *Principles, etc.*, pp. 168-69; italics are H.P. Blavatsky's own.

The official publication which comprises all the regulations of the Society of Jesus, its *codex legum*, is the *Institutum Societatis Jesu* the latest edition of which was issued at Rome and Florence in 1869-91. The *Institute* contains among other items of importance to the Order, the special Bulls and other pontifical documents approving the Society and canonically determining its various functions; the *Examen Generale* and *Constitutions*; and the Book of the *Spiritual Exercises*, as well as the *Directorium*. The *Constitutions*, drafted by Loyola towards the close of his life, and adopted finally by the first General Congregation after his death, in 1558, have never been altered. There exists a *facsimile* edition of the Spanish text, with Loyola handwritten annotations and corrections, published at Rome in 1908. One of the most valuable works in this connection is an octavo volume entitled *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, being a scrupulously accurate reprint of the original edition of 1558, together with a collation with the edition printed by the Society at Antwerp in 1702, and a translation; to this is added the text of the three important Papal Bulls of Paul III, Clement XIV and Pius VII. It was published in 1839 by J.C. and F. Rivington, in London. Another valuable work, *The Religious State*, by Humphrey, London, 1889, carefully outlines the structure of the Jesuit order.

The more important MS sources for the early history of the Order have all been critically edited by the Collegio Imperial de la Compañia de Jesús at Madrid in the Series *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* (Rome, 1894-1921, 59 Vols.). These include a very complete edition of the letters of Loyola, and of documents emanating from nearly all the companions of the Founder. Another important collection is that of O. Braunsberger, *Petri Canisii epistolæ et acta*, Freiburg, 189ff.

On the general history of the Jesuits, the following works may be consulted for many-sided information: J. Burmichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France*, 1814-1914, Paris, 1914-1922, 4 vols. — T.J. Campbell, *The Jesuits*, 1534-1921, New York, 1921 (Catholic). — Thos. Carlyle, *Jesuitism*, in *Works*, II, 259-485, Boston, 1885. — W.C. Cartwright, *The Jesuits; their Constitution and Teachings*, London, 1876. — Father Chiniqy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*; 1st ed., 1885; upward of sixty editions; most recent one, 1953, from Christ Mission Book Dept., Sea Cliff, Long Island, N.Y. — J. Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire religieuse, politique et littéraire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1851 and 1859, 6 vols. — J.M.S. Daurignac, *History of the Society of Jesus*, Cincinnati, 1865, 2 vols. — P.H. Fouqueray, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France des origines à la suppression* (1528-1762), Paris, 1910-1913, 5 vols. — T. Griesinger, *The Jesuits*, London, 1885. — Graf Kajus von Hoensbroech, *Vierzehn Jahre Jesuit*, Leipzig, 1910. — J. Hochstetter, *Monita Secreta: die geheimen Instructionen des Jesuiten*, Barmen, 1901. — J. Huber, *Les Jésuites*, Paris, 1875, 2 vols. — J. Michelet and E. Quinet, *Étude*

This is Roman Catholicism, identical and *henceforth one* with Jesuitism — as shown by the pastoral of the Cardinal Bishop of Cambrai, and Pope Leo. A precept this, which, whether or not doing honour to the Christian Church, may at least be profitably quoted by any Hindu, Japanese, or any other “heathen” Theosophist, who has not yet given up the belief of his childhood.

But we must close. There is a prophecy in the heathen East about the Christian West, which, when rendered into comprehensible English, reads thus: “When the conquerors of all the ancient nations are in their turn conquered *by an army of black dragons begotten by their sins and born of decay*, then the hour of liberation for the former will strike.” Easy to see who are the “black dragons.” And these will in their turn see their power arrested and forcibly put to an end by the liberated legions. Then, perhaps, there will be a new invasion of an Attila from the far East. One day the millions of China and Mongolia, heathen and Mussulman, furnished with every murderous weapon invented by civilization, and forced upon the *Celestial* of the East, by the *infernal* spirit of trade and love of lucre of the West, drilled, moreover, to perfection by Christian man-slayers — will pour into and invade decaying Europe like an irresistible torrent. This will be the result of the work of the Jesuits, who will be its first victims, let us hope.



Endnote by Boris de Zirkoff

In connection with H.P. Blavatsky’s essay on “Theosophy or Jesuitism?” mention should be made of the direct and outspoken article written by Annie Besant under the title of “Theosophy and the Society of Jesus.” This article refers to H.P. Blavatsky’s own essay, and deals with the subject in a very unique manner. It may be found in *The Theosophist*, Vol. XIV, December, 1892, pp. 147-51, and would repay careful perusal.

sur les Jésuites, Paris, 1900. — H. Müller, *Les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus; Ignace et Lainez*, Paris, 1898. — B. Neave, *The Jesuits, their Foundation and History*, London, 1879, 2 vols. This work is rather uncritical and too eulogistic. — G.B. Nicolini, *History of the Jesuits*, London, 1854, 1879; not as trustworthy as may be expected. — F. Nippold, *Der Jesuitenorden von seiner Wiederherstellung bis zur Gegenwart*, Mannheim, 1867. — C. Paroissen, *Principles of the Jesuits*, London, 1860. — Blaise Pascal, *Provinciales* (Provincial Letters), many editions. — F.H. Reusch, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens*, Munich, 1894. — Edwin A. Sherman, 32^d (Compl. and Transl.), *The Engineer Corps of Hell; or Rome’s Sappers and Miners* (cont. secret Manual of Jesuits), San Francisco, 1883. 320 pp. Very scarce. — C. Souvestre, *Monita Privata*, Paris, 1880. — E.L. Taunton, *The History of the Jesuits in England, 1580-1773*, London, 1901. — A. Theiner, *Histoire des institutions chrétiennes d’éducation ecclésiastiques*, Paris, 1840.

For general bibliographical purposes, mention should be made of Auguste Carayon, *Bibliographie historique de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1864; and the ten volumes of C. Sommervogel and A. de Backer, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1890-1909, which not only contains an enumeration of all the books and editions published by the Jesuits, but also, in Vol. X, an elaborate classification of subjects.

On the subject of Papal Bulls, consult under BARBERI, BULLARIUM, CHERUBINI, COCQUELINES, MAINARDI, and TOMASETTI, in the General Bibliography of the present Volume.]