

to the doors of their monastery, shouting: "Vivent les Peres!" This circumstance was taken advantage of by their enemies, D'Choiseul in Paris, Pombal in Lisbon, and D'Aranda, the unbelieving Prime Minister, who hated the Jesuits on account of their popularity. The King received advice from Paris, stating: "It was not difficult for the Jesuits to quell the riot, which they had themselves excited."

D'Aranda (whom the Protestant historian Schoell represents as transported with the praises which Infidel Paris lavished on him) and his colleague, the Duke of Alba (convicted afterwards of having forged letters attributed to the Jesuits), were the bitterest enemies of the Fathers. Even Ranke, Protestant historian (*History of the Papacy*, iv. 494), says: "They persuaded Charles III. that the Jesuits wished to put his brother Don Luiz in his place. Choiseul had forged documents, circulated all over Spain, to the effect that the King was the illegitimate child of Elizabeth Farnese and King Philip, and therefore should be dethroned. These letters were attributed to the Jesuits." The Protestant historian, Sizmondi (*Hist. of the French*, xxix. 370), says: "The plots and counterplots, slanderous accusations, forged letters, intended to be intercepted, and which were, in short, determined the resolution of the King."

The Jesuits were condemned without a hearing. In a single day all the Jesuits in Spain, to the number of 6,000, were arrested, and all their papers and effects seized. They themselves were thrown into the holds of ships unseaworthy and leaking, and cast upon the shores of foreign lands. They were not given a fair trial or asked to defend themselves. The Pigotts and the Houstons were, in those days, allowed to triumph in their rascality. There was no Sir Charles Russell permitted to unmask the conspiracy and save saintly and honorable men from the imputation of high treason and the punishment of confiscation, exile and death.

Is the Ven. Dean going to approve of all this? It would appear so from his wholesale condemnation of the Fathers as "one of the chief curses that ever visited earth."

The next argument adduced in favor of the condemnation of the Jesuits is the Bull of Suppression by Clement XIV. It must be admitted that in 1773 there existed neither railroads nor telegraphic communication. It took a long time for truth to travel across continents and over seas and mountains, especially when very few travelled, except those commissioned by kings or their prime ministers. It was a very easy matter in those days to misrepresent facts and events, and to calumniate religious bodies, whose pure evangelizing teachings were opposed to the Infidel tendencies and the immoral practices of the corrupt and effete Bourbon Courts of France, Spain and Portugal, Sicily, and even Austria. It might be understood how the united influence of all such wicked counsellors and archplotters, through their ambassadors, could disturb the mind of a young, innocent Pope, who, as Ranke tells us, "was one of the mildest and most moderate of men, who lived in retirement from the world, and hated quarrels of any kind." It was represented to His Holiness that the Jesuits were giving trouble to the courts and governments of Europe. And for peace sake he signed, not the Bull, but the Brief—which is quite a different thing—in which he says, not what the Ven. Dean writes, but what the historian Ranke says:

"Inspired by the Divine Spirit, as we trust, urged by the duty of restoring concord to the Church, convinced that the Society of Jesus can no longer effect those purposes for which it was founded, and moved by other motives of prudence and wise government, which we keep locked in our own breast, we abolish and annul the Society of Jesus, its offices, houses and institutions."

All may see how hesitatingly this Brief is worded, and how reluctantly it must have been wrung from him by the fears of greater evils than the suppression of the Jesuits. "Never, perhaps, in modern times,"