

## CHAPTER 57 : NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA 1648-1775

Various of the English colonies in North America challenged reformed Protestantism. First, there was Roman Catholic Maryland. The English colony of Maryland was founded by Lord Baltimore, who in 1634, accompanied by a Jesuit priest, led the first settlers into this area which would soon become one of the few dominantly Catholic regions among the English colonies in America. The Maryland toleration act was one of the first laws that explicitly tolerated varieties of religion (as long as it was Christian). It was passed in 1649 by the colonial assembly of Maryland, mandating religious toleration of all Christian denominations. In 1649, Maryland was the most religiously diverse of the English colonies, having been founded as a Catholic haven, and then populated by a large number of Protestants. The toleration act was a way to thwart established Protestantism in the colony. But the effort eventually failed, and Maryland adopted Protestantism and the Anglican Church as the State Church along with the other southern colonies.

Also there was Rhode Island. Rhode Island Colony was founded in 1636 by Roger Williams, after being banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The decree of banishment was grounded on his aggressive and uncompromising hostility to the charter and the theocracy of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. His radical tenets, involving complete separation of church and state and absolute voluntarism in matters of religion, and his refusal to have communion with any who gave countenance or support to the existing order, made his banishment necessary to the theocratic leaders of Massachusetts. He asserted that the magistrate may not punish any sort of "breach of the first table," such as idolatry, Sabbath-breaking, false worship, and blasphemy; and that every individual should be free to follow his own convictions in religious matters. He settled at the tip of Narragansett Bay, calling the site Providence and declaring it as a place of religious freedom for Baptist settlers. It was a proto-secularist state, and presaged a new nation crafted after its tenets.

Finally, there was Quaker Pennsylvania. In 1681, Charles II of England granted a land charter to William Penn for the area that now includes Pennsylvania. Penn then founded a colony there as a place of religious freedom for Quakers. Penn also invited the followers of other heretical sects, like the Amish and Mennonites, to settle in Pennsylvania. Most of these came from the Palatinate region of Germany. Like Rhode Island, Catholics, Mennonites, Quakers, Jews and others came also.

With such a religiously diverse population, Rhode Island and Pennsylvania became havens of toleration and the vanguard of the Enlightenment movement in North America.

Most of the English-speaking colonies during the colonial era, however, enjoyed established Protestantism. New England upheld established congregational Protestantism, the South upheld established Anglican Protestantism, and much of the frontier was dominated by Scot-Irish Presbyterians. But even in these places a spiritual

fatigue had set in by the latter half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. This fatigue only increased in the early decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

First, there was a fatigue with religious war, strife, and persecution. For example, the Thirty Years' War, with its great destruction in the battle pitting Romanists against Protestants, had exhausted Europeans. Also, the English civil wars of the 1640s followed later by the Stuarts' persecutions of Presbyterian and other dissenters made people desirous of peace.

Second, there was a fatigue with the seeming inability of the branches within the reformed churches of the North America and the British Isles to reconcile and unite. The 3 branches were:

- Episcopal (the Anglican Church of England) – adhering to the Thirty-Nine Articles
- Presbyterian- adhering to the Westminster Standards
- Congregational- adhering to the Westminster Standards except where the Cambridge Platform laid out differences

The primary difference among these three concerned the form of church government. In addition, Presbyterianism and congregationalism were more clear and emphatic that the elements of worship be limited to that which is prescribed in scripture, so as to remain pure of corruption and invention (hence the name 'puritan' to describe them).

Since the differences which separated them could not readily be ironed out, the intermediate measure had been to give each certain territory within the United Kingdom to be the established church. England, Wales, Ireland and the southern American colonies were Anglican; Scotland and effectively many colonial frontier settlements were Presbyterian; and New England was Congregational. While this led to a measure of peace, it nevertheless represented a disappointment that reformed Christians and the kingdom could not unite upon a common confession.

Third, there was fatigue with controlling and containing the rising swell of non-reformed factions and sects, including Baptists and Quakers, as well as others. The only way to suppress them seemed to be by civil force, by the use typically of banishment from the territory, but many people were growing fatigued by this method of suppression. This was part of an even broader fatigue with the imposition of authority concerning religion by the state, church and family.

Fourth, there was fatigue, especially among many intellectuals, with the reformed view of man's incapacity to attain knowledge apart from divine revelation (i.e., scripture) due to man's depraved sinful nature. Some viewed this proposition as a hindrance and not a help to intellectual, societal and cultural development. It was becoming more fashionable to believe only that which could be deduced by reason (the rationalism of Descartes) or by observation in experience (the empiricism of Bacon and Locke), and to abandon a pre-suppositional approach to knowledge according to Augustine's dictum, "I believe in order that I may know."

Fifth, there was fatigue among many, especially the more economically prosperous, with seeking to obey the regimen of the historic reformed faith, as summarized in the Ten Commandments. This fatigue compounded as many Britons enjoyed increasing prosperity with international commerce and colonization. Much of the prosperity which England and its American colonies enjoyed was a fruit of the Protestant work ethic, but this same prosperity tended towards more materialistic concerns and away from religious strictures. It also made time for more worldly entertainments.

Sixth, there was fatigue among many people within reformed churches, especially in the middle and lower class ranks, at a growing prevalence of lukewarm religion in the established reformed churches, especially arising from the spiritual fatigue among the economically prosperous. Many saw people just going through the motions of the reformed religion, but with very little heart for Christ. Even in Puritan New England, Increase Mather observed that “clear, sound conversions are not frequent. Many of the rising generation are profane Drunkards, Swearers, Licentious and Scoffers at the power of Godliness.”

Out of this milieu of fatigue, the Enlightenment, the Great Awakening, and freemasonry arose in North America, as it had in the British Isles. Enlightenment philosophers like John Locke influenced the English-speaking colonies of North America, just as they influenced the Mother Country.

Perhaps the Enlightenment's most prominent patron in North America was the Deist Benjamin Franklin. Franklin fled the Puritan New England of his youth, to reside in Quaker Pennsylvania. He became one of the most prominent colonists, distinguishing himself in science, journalism, and philosophy. He helped form the first secularist college in North America, the University of Pennsylvania, which was not affiliated with any religious denomination. And he founded an American Philosophical Society.

The Great Awakening was another important movement in this time period. The movement took different shapes in different locales.

The movement began in the Mid-Atlantic region in 1720. In that year the Dutch Reformed Church in Holland sent Theodore J. Frelinghuysen to New Jersey. In Holland, because of his left wing pietistic (i.e., an emotional religion with less emphasis on doctrine) views, he was a member of a small isolated group within his church.

Another voice of the new religious awakening in the Mid-Atlantic region was that of Gilbert Tennent, son of William Tennent, a Presbyterian minister who set up a school in his home to train sorely needed Presbyterian clergy. The school came to be known as the "Log College." After 1727, it was located in Tennent's parish of Neshaminy in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Gilbert Tennent became a minister and accepted a call from New Brunswick, New Jersey. Here he came to know Jacob Frelinghuysen, who lived nearby. Tennent, influenced by Frelinghuysen's pietism, led to pietism's becoming an important force in the Presbyterian church.

One of the more famous sermons of Gilbert Tennent, “The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry”, displayed his contempt of those who opposed the Great Awakening. In this same sermon Tennent went on to declare that the anti-revivalists, “being greedy of filthy lucre”, were “guided by the devil.” These men were “moral Negroes” who were white on the outside but black as sin on the inside, said Tennent. These echoed the words of another revivalist preacher, George Whitefield, who had said: “The generality of preachers talk of an unknown, unfelt Christ. The reason why congregations have been so dead is because they had dead men preaching to them.”

A leading figure of the Great Awakening in the southern colonies was Presbyterian minister Samuel Davies.

An early leader and advocate for the Great Awakening in New England was Puritan minister and theologian Jonathan Edwards. His explanation and defense of the movement in its early stages in New England is found most notably in his work, “*A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God.*” Here are excerpts from that work:

---

“...Just after my grandfather's death, it seemed to be a time of extraordinary dullness in religion. Licentiousness for some years prevailed among the youth of the town; there were many of them very much addicted to night-walking, and frequenting the tavern, and lewd practices, wherein some, by their example, exceedingly corrupted others. It was their manner very frequently to get together, in conventions of both sexes for mirth and jollity, which they called frolics; and they would often spend the greater part of the night in them, without regard to any order in the families they belonged to: and indeed family government did too much fail in the town...

...But in two or three years after Mr. Stoddard's death, there began to be a sensible amendment to these evils. The young people showed more of a disposition to hearken to counsel, and by degrees left off their frolics; they grew observably more decent in their attendance on the public worship, and there were more who manifested a religious concern than there used to be. At the latter end of the year 1733, there appeared a very unusual flexibleness, and yielding to advice, in our young people. It had been too long their manner to make the evening after the sabbath, [It must be noted, that it has never been our manner, to observe the evening that follows the sabbath, but that which precedes it, as part of the holy time], and after our public lecture, to be especially the times of their mirth, and company-keeping. But a sermon was now preached on the sabbath before the lecture, to show the evil tendency of the practice, and to persuade them to reform it; and it was urged on heads of families that it should be a thing agreed upon among them, to govern their families, and keep their children at home, at these times. It was also more privately moved, that they should meet together the next day, in their several neighborhoods, to know each other's minds; which was accordingly done, and the notion complied with throughout the town. But parents found little or no occasion for the exercise of government in the case. The young people declared themselves convinced by

what they had heard from the pulpit, and were willing of themselves to comply with the counsel that had been given...”

---

It should be said that Jonathan Edward's version was more sound than that of most of the other leaders in the Great Awakening. Indeed, he denounced various abuses associated with the movement.

The Great Awakening reached its peak during the 1740s and 1750s, with George Whitefield as its central figure. George Whitefield was an Anglican minister who engaged in itinerant ministry in Great Britain and North America, which often included open air preaching, instead of at the invitation and in the setting of local churches. Large crowds gathered in cities, towns, and rural areas to hear the stirring sermons of George Whitefield. Whitefield's visit to Williamsburg in 1739 was one stop on a journey through the colonies that ignited a movement that brought about personal religious renewal for many people. His visit helped to mold and redefine a new American culture- a culture which on the positive side stressed personal piety and the need for heart religion, yet on the negative side leaned against the imposition of authority, even where scripture requires it, and tended to undermine principles for maintaining an established church. Indeed, the movement tended to de-emphasize doctrine and emphasize subjective elements of religion.

John Wesley, another Anglican minister with an itinerant ministry, made trips to North America, but focused most of his ministry in England. Yet, unlike Whitefield, Wesley was an Arminian. Whitefield very clearly disapproved of Arminianism, or the view that denies predestination and God's free grace in salvation. But, regrettably, it would seem Whitefield would have given Wesley assurance of salvation and close Christian fellowship even though Wesley unrepentantly promoted this heresy. Presumably Whitefield believed Wesley's "conversion experience" was grounds for assurance. It would also seem Whitefield never called the civil government to suppress Arminian teaching, such as by Wesley, by use of means such as banishment. Although Whitefield was clearly Calvinistic by conviction, by word and deed he diminished the importance of the issues which had caused great controversy in the Protestant churches- issues like the Arminian heresy and the Baptist heresy- while stressing the necessity of a "conversion experience." This is apparently the reason why he was comfortable holding non-denominational crusades that tended to undermine his own denomination, foreshadowing the non-denominational crusades of our own day. As Harvard historian Jon Butler has written: "Whitefield's nondenominational ... revivals thus prefigured another tradition in American revivalism, exemplified in the careers of Charles Grandison Finney, Billy Sunday, Billy Graham, and Robert Schuller. Such evangelists ... stressed their own popularity at the expense of any denominational authority."

Many other examples demonstrate how George Whitefield diminished the importance of doctrine in Christianity and undermined the establishment principle. For instance, on Whitefield's voyage to America he lent his cabin to a Quaker preacher, who held

meetings there. In England he freely collected money for the Lutherans of Georgia and he enjoyed fellowship with the Moravians, though they were not in accord with his Calvinism. On one occasion, preaching from the balcony of the courthouse in Philadelphia, it is said that Whitefield cried out: "Father Abraham, whom have you in Heaven? Any Episcopalians?" "No." "Any Presbyterians?" "No." "Have you any Independents or Seceders?" "No." "Have you any Methodists?" "No!" "no!" "no!!" "Whom have you there?" "We don't know these names here. All who are here are Christians—believers in Christ—men who have overcome by the blood of the Lamb and the word of his testimony." "Oh, is this the case? Then God help us, God help us all, to forget party names, and to become Christians in deed, and in truth. Such statements as these tended to minimize the importance of issues like God's sovereignty in salvation, man's total depravity, and how God should be worshipped. But God is not as unconcerned of these issues as Mr. Whitefield apparently was.

During its heyday the Great Awakening encountered strong opposition, even as it generated mass appeal as well. Within New England Congregationalism, it created a rift between "New Lights" and "Old Lights". The revival movement itself died down in New England by the 1750s, but this rift would persist. The "Old Lights", led by Charles Chauncy, a Boston clergyman, opposed the revivalist movement as extravagant and impermanent. The theology of the "New Lights", a slightly modified Calvinism, crystallized into the Edwardian, or New England, theology that became dominant in western New England, whereas the liberal doctrines of the "Old Lights", strong in Boston and the vicinity, would develop into the Universalist or Unitarian positions. The "Old Lights" were thoroughly adopting Enlightenment philosophy as their creed. Puritan theologian Cotton Mather had bewailed the trend away from Calvinism and towards Arminianism at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and by the mid-eighteenth century liberals had taken over Harvard College. Yale College was formed in an effort to preserve conservative congregational Puritanism.

The "New Lights" tended to draw support from within conservative congregational Puritanism. Two prominent New Light clergymen were Jonathan Edwards and David Brainerd. Brainerd achieved some notable success in missions to the Indians, although his work was cut short by an untimely death. Jonathan Edwards served in various ministerial capacities, before his invitation to serve as president of a newly formed Princeton College in New Jersey. Princeton served as a bridge between New England congregational Puritanism and Presbyterians in the Middle Colonies.

Even among the "New Lights" of New England congregationalism, strict (or full) subscriptionism to the church confession was not required of ministers. Strict confessional subscriptionism had died off even before the Great Awakening, perhaps fostered by Congregationalist church government itself.

Within Presbyterianism the Great Awakening brought about a rift between the "New Side"- which supported the Great Awakening- and the "Old Side" - which opposed it. The Presbyterian establishment was centered in Philadelphia and was "Old Side". It was sometimes referred to as the "Old Synod". Old Siders insisted that the call of men to the

ordained gospel ministry must be carried out by the duly constituted officers of the church. They began to challenge the legitimacy of men trained under Tennent's supervision at the so called "Log College" in New Jersey. They were especially wary of Tennent's looser subscriptionism to the Westminster Confession. They were also concerned that the Tennents laid claim to supernatural discernment, which the Presbyterian anti-revivalists regarded as superstitious and pretentious. One likened the Tennents to astrologers and fortunetellers: Could Tennent really ascertain "Men's inward feelings?" If so, "Must not Mr. Tennent have some cunning beyond what is common to man?" In sum, the Old Side critique of the Tennents was that they claimed possession of that which Presbyterian orthodoxy reserved for the work of the Holy Spirit.

On the other hand, the "New Siders" argued that subscription matters were judgments that belonged to the Presbyteries and not the synod, that American Presbyterians needed their own indigenous training school and not one in Scotland, and that, ultimately, Old Siders really opposed the "experiential Calvinism" of the revivalists. The rift led to denominational schism in 1741.

This schism lasted 17 years. The New Side Presbyterians grew substantially during the years of division, while the Old Side fought for survival. From 1741 to 1758, the numbers of New Side ministers increased from 22 to 73, while the ministerial members of the Old Side decreased from 27 to 23. Further, the New Side largely won over the respect and enthusiasm of most American Presbyterians. The congregations of the New Side grew to more than three times the size of the Old Side.

A reunion of the Old Side and New Side eventually took place in 1758, and largely on New Side terms. Among the compromises of the Old Side were an endorsement of the Great Awakening, an affirmation of the necessity of experiential piety of ministers, a looser form of subscription to the Westminster Confession (only requiring agreement with it as a *system* of doctrine, and not in its details), and the power of ordination of presbyteries. But despite this reunion, there remained tensions within the Presbyterian synod for many years.

In the aftermath of the Great Awakening the denominations which stressed a "religious experience" started to grow rapidly, at the expense of the established churches. There was significant growth of New Side Presbyterians, Baptists, and Arminian Methodists in the decades immediately preceding the American Revolution. From 1740 to 1760 the number of Presbyterian ministers in American Colonies had increased from 45 to over 100. Especially on the frontier of the colonies, Baptists and Arminian Methodists grew faster than New Side Presbyterians. In New England alone the Baptist churches increased from 21 to 79 between 1740 and 1760. One of the things that made the Baptists so popular with the masses was their novel type of preaching, appealing primarily to the emotions. And one eyewitness Methodist recorded of the Methodist revivals: "In almost every assembly might be seen signal instances of divine power; more especially in the meetings of the classes . . . Many who had long neglected the means of grace now flocked to hear . . . This outpouring of the spirit extended itself more or less, through most of the circuits, which takes in a circumference of between four and five

hundred miles.” The results of the Methodist movement are reflected in the statistics of the Virginia and North Carolina circuits. In 1774 there were only two circuits in the region, with a combined membership of 291; in 1776 the number of circuits had increased tremendously, with one circuit alone reporting 1,611 members. The following year there were six circuits with a combined membership of 4,379.

Another movement which characterized the times, especially as America approached the era of Revolution, was freemasonry. Freemasonry was a widespread secret fraternal order dedicated to furthering goals of the Enlightenment like secularism and religious "toleration". It sought to create a brotherhood of man, not based upon unity in scriptural truth, but rather in Masonic allegiance. Such a brotherhood would cross denominational and religious lines. Members engaged in various secret rites in Masonic temples. Famous American freemasons included Benjamin Franklin (Grand Mason of Pennsylvania Freemasonry), George Washington, Daniel Carroll (a Roman Catholic freemason), Patrick Henry, John Paul Jones, Francis Scott Key, John Marshall, Paul Revere, Ethan Allen, Henry Knox, Dr. Benjamin Rush, James Otis, and John Hancock. Famous freemasons at the time who were not American- but who were influential in early American history - included Voltaire, Frederick II (the Great) of Prussia, Marquis de Lafayette, and Baron Von Steuben.

Freemasonry, the Great Awakening, theological liberalism, and the Enlightenment had the effect of eroding historic Protestant confessionalism and established Protestant government. They sought unity and brotherhood apart from subscription to Biblical truth. To varying extents they undermined the doctrine of the total depravity of man. As these movements had their effect on the psychology of the English-speaking colonists of North America, historic Protestantism declined, replaced by increasing secular humanist and subjectivist tendencies. Nevertheless, throughout this colonial era the English-speaking colonies were professedly Protestant under a Protestant Crown.

Meanwhile, to the north and west of the predominantly Protestant English-speaking colonies of North America lay Roman Catholic territory controlled by the French. It stretched from Louisiana at the mouth of the Mississippi River to Quebec and Nova Scotia (then called Acadia) in the north, and was called New France. For the first few decades of Quebec's existence, there were only a few dozen settlers there, while the English colonies to the south were much more populous and wealthy, owing to God's blessing upon the Protestants.

Cardinal Richelieu, advisor to King Louis XIII, wished to make New France as significant as the English colonies. In 1627 Richelieu founded the Company of 100 Associates to invest in New France, promising land parcels to hundreds of new settlers and to turn Quebec into a mercantile colony. Champlain was named Governor of New France, and Richelieu forbade non-Roman Catholics from living there. The Roman Catholic Church, and missionaries such as the Recollets and the Jesuits, became firmly established in the territory. Richelieu also introduced the seigneurial system, a semi-feudal system of farming that remained a characteristic feature of the St. Lawrence valley until the 19th century

The Church, which after Champlain's death was the most dominant force in New France, wanted to establish a utopian Christian community in the colony. In 1642, they sponsored a group of settlers led by Paul Chomedey de Maisonneuve who founded Ville-Marie, precursor to present-day Montreal, further up the St. Lawrence. Throughout the 1640s, Jesuit missionaries penetrated the Great Lakes region and converted many of the Huron natives, but they also came into conflict with the Iroquois, who also frequently attacked Montreal. By 1649 both the Jesuit mission and Huron society in general were almost completely destroyed by Iroquois invasions.

In 1663 New France finally became more secure against Iroquois attacks when Louis XIV made it a province of France and sent a French garrison to Quebec. During this time, the English had been extending their territory to the north of New France. In 1670 the Hudson's Bay Company was established, controlling the fur trade in all the land that drained into Hudson Bay. This ended the French monopoly on the Canadian fur trade. To compensate, the French extended their territory to the south, and to the west of the American colonies. In 1682, René Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle explored the Ohio and Mississippi valleys, and claimed the entire territory for France as far south as the Gulf of Mexico. He named this territory Louisiana.

By the beginning of the French and Indian War in 1755, New France now had over 50,000 inhabitants, a vast increase from earlier in the century, but the English American colonies greatly outnumbered them with over one million people. It was much easier for the English colonists to organize attacks on New France than it was for the French to attack the English. God blessed the Protestants in this war, as He had blessed their early colonization of North America. They experienced some early defeats in the French and Indian War, but ended triumphant.

Great Britain acquired all Canada by the Treaty of Paris (1763), concluding the French and Indian War. By the British Royal Proclamation of 1763, Canada (part of New France) was renamed the Province of Quebec. In 1774, the British Parliament passed the Quebec Act that allowed Quebec to maintain the French Civil Code as its judicial system and sanctioned the freedom of religious choice, allowing the Roman Catholic Church to remain. But France maintained control of its Louisiana territory in the Mississippi River basin.

Roman Catholic Spain and Portugal controlled most of the rest of North and South America, preventing by force Protestantism from spreading into the region. During much of this period the Jesuits had considerable power in the Roman Catholic regions. By 1700, for example, and reflecting a larger transformation of the Portuguese empire, the Jesuits had decisively shifted from the East Indies to Brazil. There they established their famous Indian missions and became the largest corporate owner of black African slaves, the latter being crucial to the working of the sugar plantations which were just one of the many enterprises in which the Jesuits were engaged there and in Portugal itself. Jesuits also acted as middlemen, lent (to nobles and others) and in the early eighteenth century invested substantially in government annuities. The Jesuits' economic activities were not

always successful, but did leave them open to the criticism that they worshipped Mammon, and less able to resist Pombal in the 1750s.

Having secured the territory of Paraguay, a Portuguese possession in South America, the Jesuits founded a kingdom there, and became its sovereigns. They treated the natives at first with kindness, and taught them several useful arts, but by-and-by they changed their policy, and, reducing them to slavery, compelled them to labor for their benefit. Dealing out to the Paraguayan peasant from the produce of his own toil as much as would suffice to feed and clothe him, the Fathers laid up the rest in large storehouses, which they had erected for the purpose. They kept carefully concealed from the knowledge of Europe this seemingly exhaustless source of wealth, that no one else might share its sweets. They continued all the while to draw from it those vast sums wherewith they carried on their machinations in the Old World. With the gold wrung from the Paraguayan peasants' toil they hired spies, bribed courtiers, opened new missions, and maintained that pomp and splendor of their establishments by which the populace were dazzled.

Their establishments in Brazil formed the basis of a great and enriching trade, of which Santa Fe and Buenos Ayres were the chief depots. But the most noted episode of this kind in their history is that of Father Lavalette (1756). He was Visitor-General and Apostolic Prefect of their Missions in the West Indies. "He organized offices in St. Domingo, Granada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, and other islands, and drew bills of exchange on Paris, London, Bordeaux, Nantes, Lyons, Cadiz, Leghorn, and Amsterdam." His vessels, loaded with riches, comprising, besides colonial produce, negro slaves, "crossed the sea continually." Trading on credit, they professed to give the property of the society as security. Their methods of business were abnormal. Treaties obeyed by other merchants they disregarded.

Neutrality laws were nothing to them. They hired ships which were used as traders or privateers, as suited them, and sailed under whatever flag was convenient. At last, however, came trouble to these Fathers, who were making, as the phrase is, "the best of both worlds." The Brothers Lioncy and Gouffre, of Marseilles, had accepted their bills for a million and a half of livres, to cover which two vessels had been dispatched for Martinique with merchandise to the value of two millions, unfortunately for the Fathers, the ships were captured at sea by the English.

The house of Lioncy and Gouffre asked the superior of the Jesuits in Marseilles for four thousand livres, as part payment of their debt, to save them from bankruptcy. The Father replied that the society was not answerable, but he offered the Brothers Lioncy and Gouffre the aid of their prayers, fortified by the masses which they were about to say for them. The masses would not fill the coffers which the Jesuits had emptied, and accordingly the merchants appealed to Parliament craving a decree for payment of the debt. The appeal was allowed, and the Jesuits were condemned to honor the bills drawn by their agent. At this critical moment the General of the society died: delay was inevitable: the new General sent all the funds he could raise; but before these supplies could reach Marseilles, Lioncy and Gouffre had become bankrupt, involving in their misfortune their connections in all parts of France.

Now that the ruin had come and publicity was inevitable, the Jesuits refused to pay the debt, pleading that they were protected from the claims of their creditors by their Constitutions. The cause now came to a public hearing. After several pleas had been advanced and abandoned, the Jesuits took their final stand on the argument which, in an evil hour for themselves, they had put forth at first in their defense. Their rules, they said, forbade them to trade; and the fault of individual members could not be punished upon the Order: they were shielded by their Constitutions. The Parliament ordered these documents to be produced. They had been kept secret till now. They were laid before Parliament on the 16th of April, 1761. The result was disastrous for the Jesuits. They lost their cause, and became much more odious than before. The disclosure revealed Jesuitism to men as an organization based on the most iniquitous maxims, and armed with the most terrible weapons for the accomplishment of their object, which was to plant their own supremacy on the ruin of society. The Constitutions were one of the principal grounds of the decree for the extinction of the Jesuit Order in France, in 1762.

That political kingdoms and civil communities should feel the Order a burden too heavy to be borne, is not to be wondered at when we reflect that even the Popes, of whose throne it was the pillar, have repeatedly decreed its extinction. Strange as it may seem, the first bolt in later times that fell on the Jesuits was launched by the hand of Rome. Benedict IV, by a bull issued in 1741, prohibited them from engaging in trade and making slaves of the Indians. In 1759, Portugal, finding itself on the brink of ruin by their intrigues, shook them off. This example was soon followed in France, as we have already narrated. Even in Spain, with all its devotion to the Papal See, all the Jesuit establishments were surrounded, one night in 1767, with troops, and the whole fraternity, amounting to 7,000, were caught and shipped off to Italy. Immediately thereafter a similar expulsion befell them in South America. Naples, Malta, and Parma were the next to drive them from their soil. The severest blow was yet to come. Clement XIII, hitherto their firm friend, yielding at last to the unanimous demands of all the Roman Catholic courts, summoned a secret conclave for the suppression of the Order: "a step necessary," said the brief of his successor, "in order to prevent Christians rising one against another, and massacring one another in the very bosom of our common mother the Holy Church." Clement died suddenly the very evening before the day appointed for the conclave. Lorenzo Ganganelli was elevated to the vacant chair under the title of Clement XIV. On the 21st of July, 1773, he issued the famous bull, "Dominus ac Redemptor noster," by which he "dissolved and for ever annihilated the Order as a corporate body," at a moment when it counted 22,000 members.

The bull justifies itself by a long and formidable list of charges against the Jesuits. Had this accusation proceeded from a Protestant pen it might have been regarded as not free from exaggeration, but coming from the Papal chair it must be accepted as the sober truth. The bull of Clement charged them with raising various insurrections and rebellions, with plotting against bishops, undermining the regular monastic orders, and invading pious foundations and corporations of every sort, not only in Europe, but in Asia and America, to the danger of souls and the astonishment of all nations. It charged them with engaging in trade, and that, instead of seeking to convert the heathen, they had shown themselves intent only on gathering gold and silver and precious jewels. They had

interpolated pagan rites and manners with Christian beliefs and worship: they had set aside the ordinances of the Church, and substituted opinions which the apostolic chair had pronounced fundamentally erroneous and evidently subversive of good morals. Tumults, disturbances, violences, had followed them in all countries. In fine, they had broken the peace of the Church, and so incurably that the Pontificates of his predecessors, Urban VIII, Clements IX, X, XI, and XII, Alexanders VII and VIII, Innocents X, XI, XII, and XIII, and Benedict XIV, had been passed in abortive attempts to re-establish the harmony and concord which they had destroyed. It was now seen that the peace of the Church would never be restored while the Order existed, and hence the necessity of the bull which dispossessed the Jesuits of "every office, service, and administration;" took away from them "their houses, schools, hospitals, estates;" withdrew "all their statutes, usages, decrees, customs, and ordinances;" and pronounced "all the power of the General, Provincial, Visitors, and every other head of the same Order, whether spiritual or secular, to be for ever annulled and suppressed." "The present ordinance," said the bull, in conclusion, "shall remain in full force and operation from henceforth and for ever."

Nothing but the most tremendous necessity could have made Clement XIV issue this bull. He knew well how unforgiving was the pride and how deadly the vengeance of the Society, and he did not conceal from himself the penalty he should have to pay for decreeing its suppression. On laying down his pen, after having put his name to the bull, he said to those around him that he had subscribed his death-warrant. The Pope was at that time in robust health, and his vigorous constitution and temperate habits promised a long life. But now dark rumors began to be whispered in Italy that the Pontiff would die soon. In April of the following year he began to decline without any apparent cause: his illness increased: no medicine was of any avail: and after lingering in torture for months, he died, September 22nd, 1774. "Several days before his death," says Caraccioli, "his bones were exfoliated and withered like a tree which, attacked at its roots, withers away and throws off its bark. The scientific men who were called in to embalm his body found the features livid, the lips black, the abdomen inflated, the limbs emaciated, and covered with violet spots. The size of the head was diminished, and all the muscles were shrunk up, and the spine was decomposed. They filled the body with perfumed and aromatic substances, but nothing could dispel the mephitic effluvia." The suppression with which Clement XIV smote the Society of Jesus was eternal; but the "forever" of the bull lasted only in actual deed during the brief interval that elapsed between 1773 and 1814.

Although suppressed in the Roman Catholic world, and unable to enjoy their profits from lucrative trade in Latin America, ironically the Jesuits were not suppressed in important sectors of the non-Roman Catholic world between 1773 and 1814. We have noted in a previous chapter their protection in Prussia and Russia. In the next chapter we shall outline their protection in America. Indeed, we shall see how the Jesuits used the American Revolution to their great strategic advantage. So long as America was under the Protestant Crown of England, Roman Catholicism in America was greatly disadvantaged. Roman Catholics could not even vote there. And until the end of the colonial era, the established Protestant churches (Congregational, Anglican, and Presbyterian) dominated religious life in the the colonies. As late as 1775 the religious breakdown of the population in the English colonies was Congregationalists (32 percent),

Anglicans (28 percent), Presbyterians (23 percent), German churches (11 percent), Dutch Reformed (4 percent), Baptists and Catholics (1 percent each), and Methodists and Jewish (each less than 1 percent). But all of that was to change under a new secularist state called the United States of America.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### CHAPTER 57 : NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA 1648-1775

This second volume in a two-part series on church history is primarily an edited version of the following works on church history and Biblical interpretation:

James A. Wylie, *The History of Protestantism* (Cassell & Company, Limited: London, Paris & New York. 1878). (see electronic version at <http://www.whatsaiththescripture.com/Fellowship/James.A.Wylie.html> )

Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (Logos Research Systems, Inc.: Oak Harbor, WA, 1997). (see electronic version at <http://www.ccel.org/s/schaff/history/About.htm> )

J. Parnell McCarter, *Sabbath Bible Survey Tests and Assignments* (PHSC: Grand Rapids, MI, 2003). (see electronic version at <http://www.puritans.net/curriculum/> )

J. Parnell McCarter, *Let My People Go* (PHSC: Grand Rapids, MI, 2003). (see electronic version at <http://www.puritans.net/curriculum/> )

The on-line resources of Historicism Research Foundation at <http://www.historicism.net/> also proved invaluable for my understanding of Biblical prophecy. Biblical prophecy concerning Christian church history, especially as revealed in the book of Revelation, serves as the foundation upon which all church histories should be based.

Other references especially consulted for this chapter include:

<http://www.vernonjohns.org/vernjohns/sthpurtm.html>

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New\\_France](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_France)

<http://www.chesf.gov.br/relatorio/english/eng-ctudo-cap2-00.html>  
<http://www.chesf.gov.br/relatorio/english/eng-ctudo-cap2-00.html>

[http://www.findarticles.com/cf\\_dls/m0293/n453\\_v113/21226657/p1/article.jhtml](http://www.findarticles.com/cf_dls/m0293/n453_v113/21226657/p1/article.jhtml)