


[The Secret History of the Jesuits – by Edmond Paris](#)



Webmaster's Introduction

This book was introduced to me by Christian J. Pinto of the [Noise of Thunder Radio Show](#). My wife and I love to listen to him because Mr. Pinto is one of the few Christians we know of who sees the power of the Roman Catholic Church behind politics.

I was searching for the roots of antisemitism. My friend in Australia introduced me to a website "The Jewish Agenda to Destroy the White Race" that was filled from quotes supposedly from Jews including the head of the Anti-Defamation League, Abraham Foxman, saying how the White Race must be exterminated. I told him, "I can hardly believe Jews are saying such things! It doesn't make sense. If we say that so and so Jewish man said the Jewish plan is to kill off the White race, we're immediately labeled as antisemitic conspiracy theorists! Why would Jews add more fuel to antisemitism?"

It's my personal conviction that the true source of antisemitism is from the Roman Catholic church. The Church of Rome has a long history of persecuting Jews. I believe I was led by the Lord to post this book because I think the author, Edmond Paris, proves over and over that the Catholic Church is the main source of antisemitism. Paris puts as much blame on Pope Pius XII for the murder of Jews as the world does on Hitler. Why would the Church of Rome continue to spread lies about the Jews? To use them as a scapegoat for what *they themselves* are doing!

Publisher's Introduction

There is no other person more qualified to introduce Edmond Paris' book, "The Secret History of the Jesuits," than Dr. Alberto Rivera, a former Jesuit

priest under the extreme oath and induction, who was trained in the Vatican and briefed on the history of the Jesuits.

The information in this book is factual and fully documented, and it should be read by every Bible-believing Christian in the United States and Canada. The Bible says, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." (Hosea 4:6)

J.T. C

Dr. Rivera's Introduction

The most dangerous of men are those who appear very religious, especially when they are organized and in a position of authority. They have the deep respect of the people who are ignorant of their ungodly push for power behind the scenes.

These religious men, who pretend to love God, will resort to murder, incite revolution and wars if necessary to help their cause. They are crafty, intelligent, smooth religious politicians who live in a shadowy world of secrets, intrigue, and phony holiness. This pattern, seen in "The Secret History of the Jesuits," spiritually speaking can be seen in the Scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees at the time of Jesus Christ. This same evil spirit directed the Roman emperors to issue the ten murderous decrees to persecute the early Christian church.

The "Early Fathers" observed most of the ancient Babylonian system plus Jewish theology and Greek philosophy. They all perverted most of the teachings of Christ and His apostles. They paved the way for the Roman Catholic machine that was to come into existence. Piously, they attacked, perverted, added to and took away from the Bible. This religious anti-christ spirit working through them is seen again when Ignatius de Loyola created the Jesuits to secretly accomplish two major goals for the Roman Catholic Institution: 1) universal political power, and 2) a universal church, in fulfillment of the prophecies of Revelation 6, 13, 17 and 18.

By the time Ignatius de Loyola arrived on the scene, the Protestant Reformation had seriously damaged the Roman Catholic system. Ignatius de Loyola came to the conclusion that the only way his "church" could survive was by enforcing the canons and doctrines on the temporal power of the pope and the Roman Catholic institution; not by just destroying the physical life of the people alone as the Dominican priests were doing through the Inquisition, but **by infiltration and penetration into every sector of life.** Protestantism must be conquered and used for the benefit of the popes. That was Ignatius de Loyola's personal proposal, among others, to Pope Paul III. **Jesuits immediately went to work secretly infiltrating ALL the Protestant groups including their families, places of work, hospitals, schools, colleges, etc.** Today, the Jesuits have almost completed that mission.

The Bible puts the power of a local church into the hands of a Godly pastor. But the cunning Jesuits successfully managed over the years to remove that power into the hands of denomination headquarters, and have now pushed **almost all of the Protestant denominations into the arms of the Vatican.** This is

exactly what Ignatius de Loyola set out to accomplish: a universal church and the end of Protestantism.

As you read "The Secret History of the Jesuits," you will see there is a parallel between the religious and political sectors. The author, Mr. Paris, reveals the penetration and infiltration of the Jesuits into the governments and nations of the world to manipulate the course of history by setting up dictatorships, and **weakening democracies such as the United States of America, by paving the way for social, political, moral, military, educational and religious anarchy.**

The man, Edmond Paris

In the prophetic works of the Book of Revelation, Edmond Paris became a martyr for Jesus. In exposing such a conspiracy, he put his life at stake for truth of the prophetic signs to be known. Edmond Paris never knew me, but I knew him without meeting him personally when I, with other Jesuits under the extreme oath and induction, was being briefed on the names of institutions and individuals in Europe who were dangerous to the goals of the Roman Catholic Institution. His name was given to us.

Works by Edmond Paris

LE VATIAN CONTRE LA FRANCE GENOCIDE IN
THE SATELLITE CROATIA
THE VATICAN AGAINST EUROPE

The Edmond Paris works on Roman Catholicism brought about the pledge on the part of the Jesuits to: 1) destroy him, 2) destroy his reputation, including his family, and 3) destroy his work. And even now these great works of Edmond Paris are being tampered with, but we are praying that God will continue to preserve them when they are most needed for the salvation of Roman Catholic people.

YOURS FOR THE SALVATION OF THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC PEOPLE,

DR. ALBERTO RIVERA (EX-JESUIT PRIEST)

"The love of truth is our only salvation"
Jean Guehenno of the
French Academy

"Wherefore putting away lying,
speak every man truth
(Eph. IV, 25.)

Foreword

A last century writer, Adolphe Michel, recalled that Voltaire estimated the number of works published over the years, on the Jesuits, to be about six thousand. "What number have we reached a century later?", asked Adolphe

Michel, only to conclude immediately: "No matter. As long as there are Jesuits, books will have to be written against them. There is nothing new left to be said on their account, but new generations of readers come every day... Will these readers search old books?"(1)

The reason just mentioned would be enough to justify us taking up again this oft-told subject. In fact, most early books retracing the history of the Jesuits cannot be found any more. Only in public libraries can they still be consulted, which makes them out of reach for most readers. With the aim of succinctly informing the public at large in mind, a summary of these works seemed necessary.

There is another reason, as good as the one just mentioned. At the same time as new generations of readers come, new generations of Jesuits come to light. And these work today with the same tortuous and tenacious methods, which so often in the past set to work the defensive reflexes of nations and governments. The sons of Loyola are today—and may we say more than ever—the leading wing of the Roman Church. As well if not better disguised than of old, they remain the most eminent "ultramontanes", the discreet but efficacious agents of the Holy See throughout the world, the camouflaged champions of its politics, the "secret army of the Papacy".

For this reason, the subject of the Jesuits will never be exhausted and, even though the literature concerning them is so plentiful, every epoch will have the duty to add a few pages to it, to mark the continuity of this occult system started four centuries ago "for the great glory of God", but in fact for the glory of the pope. In spite of the general move towards an ever increasing "laicization", in spite of the ineluctable progress of rationalism which reduces a little more every day the domain of "dogma", the Roman Church couldn't give up the great purpose which has been her goal from the beginning: to gather under her crozier all the nations of the universe. This monumental "mission" must go on, whatever happens, amongst "pagans" as well as amongst "separated Christians". The secular clergy having, in particular, the duty to hold the acquired positions (which is quite arduous nowadays), it is up to certain regular orders to increase the flock of the faithful by converting the "heretics" and "pagans", a work even more arduous. The duty is to preserve or acquire, to defend or attack, and at the front of the battle there is that mobile force of the "Society of Jesus"—the Jesuits. Properly speaking, this society is not secular, nor regular in terms of its Constitution, but a kind of subtle company intervening where and when it is convenient, in the church and outside the church, in short "the agent most skilful, most persevering, most fearless, most convinced of the papal authority...", as wrote one of its best historians.(2) We will see how this body of "janissaries" was formed, what service without price it rendered the papacy. We will see also how so much effectual zeal was to make it indispensable to the institution it served, exerting such an influence over it that its General was named with good reason the "black pope", as it became more and more difficult to distinguish, in the government of the church, the authority of the white pope and that of its powerful coadjutor.

(1) Adolphe Michel: "Les Jesuites" (Sandoz et Fischbacher, Paris 1879)

It is then at the same time a retrospective and a bringing up to date of the history of "Jesuitism" which is found in this book. As the majority of works regarding the Jesuits do not refer to the paramount part they took in the events which have subverted the world during the past fifty years, we thought it was time to fill up the gap or, more precisely, to start with our modest contribution a deeper study into the subject, and do this without concealing the obstacles which will be met by the non-apologist authors wanting to make public writings on this burning subject.

Of all the factors which have played a part in the international life of a century full of confusion and upheavals, one of the most decisive—nevertheless best recognized—resides in the ambition of the Roman Church. Her secular desire to extend her influence towards the East made her the "spiritual" ally of Pan-Germanism and its accomplice in the attempt to gain supreme power which twice, in 1914 and 1939, brought death and ruin to the peoples of Europe.(2a)

(2) A. Michel, op.cit.

(2a) See Edmond Paris: *Le Vatican contre l'Europe* (Fischbacher, Paris), (also P.T.S., London), and L. Duca "*L'Or du Vatican*" (Laffront, Paris).

The public is practically unaware of the overwhelming responsibility carried by the Vatican and its Jesuits in the start of the two world wars—a situation which may be explained in part by the gigantic finances at the disposition of the Vatican and its Jesuits, giving them power in so many spheres, especially since the last conflict.

In fact, the part they took in those tragic events has hardly been mentioned until the present time, except by apologists eager to disguise it. It is with the aim of rectifying this and establishing the true facts that we present in this and other books the political activity of the Vatican during the contemporary epoch—activity which mutually concerns the Jesuits.

This study is based on irrefutable archive documents, publications from well-known political personalities, diplomats, ambassadors and eminent writers, most of whom are Catholics, even attested by the imprimatur.

These documents bring to light the secret actions of the Vatican and its perfidious actions in creating conflicts between nations when it served its interests. With the help of conclusive articles, we show the part played by the "church" in the rise of totalitarian regimes in Europe.

These testimonies and documents constitute a crushing indictment and, so far, no apologist has tried to disprove them.

On the first of May 1938, the "*Mercure de France*" reminded us of what had been said four years earlier:

"The *Mercure de France* of the 15th of January 1934 said—and nobody contradicted it—that **it was Pius XII who 'made' Hitler**. He came to power, not so much through legal means, but because the pope influenced the Centrum (German Catholic party)... Does the Vatican think it made a political error in opening the way to power to Hitler? It doesn't seem so..."

It didn't seem so when that was written, which was on the day following the "Anschluss" when Austria was united to the third Reich—nor later when Nazi aggressions multiplied—nor during the whole of the Second World War. In fact, on the 24th of July 1959 the successor of Pius XII, John XXIII, conferred on his personal friend Franz Von Papen the honorary title of secret chamberlain. This man had been a spy in the United States during the first world war and one of those responsible for the Hitler's dictatorship and the Anschluss. One must suffer from a peculiar kind of blindness not to see such plain facts.

Mr. Joseph Rovin, Catholic writer, comments on the diplomatic agreement between the Vatican and the Nazi Reich on the 8th of July 1933:

"The Concordat brought to the national-socialist government, considered nearly everywhere to be made up of usurpers, if not brigands, the seal of an agreement with the oldest international power (the Vatican). In a way, it was the equivalent of a diploma of international honorability". (Le Catholicisme politique en Allemagne, Paris 1956, p.231, Ed. du Seuil). Thus the Pope, not satisfied with giving his "personal" support to Hitler, **granted in this way the moral support of the Vatican to the Nazi Reich!** At the same time as the terror was beginning to reign on the other side of the Rhine and was tacitly accepted and approved, the so-called "Brown shirts" had already put 40,000 persons into concentration camps. The pogroms were multiplying to the accents of this Nazi march: "**When the Jewish blood streams from the knife, we feel better again.**" (Horst-Wessel-Lied).

In the following years, Pius XII saw even worse without being stirred. It is not surprising that the Catholic heads of Germany vied with each other in their servility towards the Nazi regime, encouraged as they were by their Roman "Master". One must read the dishevelled ravings and verbal acrobatics of opportunist theologians such as Michael Schmaus. He was later made a "prince of the church" by Pius XII, and described as "the great theologian of Munich" by the publication "La Croix" on the 2nd of September 1954— or again a certain book entitled Katholisch-Konservatives Erbgut, of which someone wrote:

"This anthology brings together texts from the main Catholic theorists of Germany, from Gorres to Vogelsang; it makes us believe that **national-socialism was born purely and simply out of Catholic ideas.**" (Gunther Buxbaum, "Mercure de France", 15th of January 1939).

The bishops, made to take an oath of allegiance to Hitler by the Concordat, always tried to excel each other in their "devotion": "Under the Nazi regime, we constantly find the fervent support of the bishops in all the correspondence and declarations from ecclesiastical dignitaries". (Joseph Rovin, op.cit. p.214).

In spite of the obvious difference between Catholic universalism and hitlerian racism, these two doctrines had been "harmoniously reconciled", according to Franz Von Papen; the reason for this scandalous accord was because "Nazism is a Christian reaction against the spirit of 1789".
(**Webmaster's note:** 1789 was the year of the start of the French Revolution.)

Let us come back to Michael Schmaus, professor at the Faculty of Theology in Munich, who wrote:

"Empire and church is a series of writings which should help the building up of the third Reich as it unites a national-socialist State to Catholic-christianity..

"Entirely German and entirely Catholic, these writings explore and favour relations and meetings between the Catholic Church and national-socialism; they open the way for a fruitful cooperation, as outlined in the Concordat.. "The national-socialist movement is the most vigorous and massive protest against the spirit of the 19th and 20th centuries.. The idea of a people of one blood is the focal point of its teachings and all Catholics who obey the instructions of the German bishops will have to admit that this is so.. **The laws of national-socialism and those of the Catholic Church have the same aim..**" (Begegnungen zwischen Katholischem Christentum und Nazional-sozialistischer Weltanschauung Aschendorff, Munster 1933).

This document proves **the primordial part played by the Catholic Church in the rise to power of Hitler**; in fact, it was a pre-established arrangement. It illustrates fully the kind of **monstrous agreement between Catholicism and Nazism**. The hatred of liberalism, which is the key to everything, comes out very clearly. (**Webmaster's note: In this case, liberalism means personal freedom of conscience in matters of faith as opposed to blind obedience to what the Catholic Church teaches.**)

In his book "Catholiques d'Allemagne", Mr Robert d'Harcourt of the French Academy writes:

"The most vulnerable point, in all the episcopal declarations which followed the triumphant elections of the 5th of March 1933, is found in the first official document from the church containing the signatures of all the German bishops. We are referring to the pastoral letter of the 3rd of June 1933, in which the whole of the German episcopate is involved.

"What form does this document take?" How does it start? On a note of optimism and with this cheerful declaration: 'The men at the head of this new government have, to our great joy, given us the assurance that they place themselves and their work on Christian ground. A declaration of such deep sincerity deserves the gratitude of all Catholics'. " (Paris, Plon, 1938, p. 108).

Since the start of the first world war, several popes have come and gone, but their attitude has been invariably the same towards the two factions which confronted each other in Europe.

Many Catholic authors couldn't hide their surprise—and grief—when writing about the inhuman indifference shown by Pius XII in the face of the worst kind of atrocities committed by those in his favour. Amongst many testimonies, we will quote one of the most moderate in its wording, brought against the Vatican by Mr. Jean d'Hospital, correspondent of "Monde":

"The memory of Pius XII is surrounded with misgiving. First of all, there is this burning question asked by observers from every nation, and even within the walls of the Vatican: Did he know of certain atrocities committed during this war, started and led by Hitler?

"Having at his disposition at all times, and from every quarter, the regular reports from the bishops... could he ignore what the German military heads could never pretend to: the tragedy of the concentration camps—the civilians condemned to deportation—the cold-blooded massacres of those who 'stood in the way'—the terror of the gas chambers where, for administrative reasons, millions of Jews were exterminated? And if he knew about it why didn't he, as trustee and first chorister of the Gospel, come out dressed in white, arms extended in the shape of the cross, to denounce a crime without precedent, to shout: No!?..."

"Pious souls will search in vain encyclical letters, speeches and addresses of the late pope; there is no trace of any condemnation of this 'religion of blood' instituted by Hitler, this Antichrist... they will not find the condemnation of racism, which is an obvious contradiction to the Catholic dogma". "Rome en confidence" (Grasset, Paris 1962, pp.91 ss).

In his book "Le silence de Pie XII" published by du Rocher, Monaco 1965, the author Carlo Falconi writes in particular:

"The existence of such monstrosities (exterminations en masse of ethnic minorities, prisoners and deported civilians) overthrows every standard of good and evil. They defy the dignity of their individual being and society in general to such an extent that we are compelled to denounce those who could have influenced public opinion, be they ordinary civilians or Heads of States.

"To keep quiet in the face of such outrages would amount in fact to downright collaboration. It would stimulate the villainy of the criminals, stirring up their cruelty and vanity. But, if every man has the moral duty to react when confronted with such crimes, it is doubly so of the religious societies and their heads, and above all the head of the Catholic Church.

"Pius XII never expressed a direct and explicit condemnation of the war of aggression, even less about the unspeakable crimes committed by the Germans or their accomplices during that war.

"Pius XII did not keep quiet because he did not know what was happening: **he knew of the gravity of the situation from the start**, maybe even better than any other head of state in the world..." (pp.12 ss).

There is better still! The Vatican gave a helping hand to the carrying out of these crimes by "lending" some of its prelates to be made into pro-Nazi agents; these were Messieurs Hlinka and Tiso. It also sent to Croatia its own legate—R.P. Marcone—who, with the help of Monseigneur Stepinac, had to keep an eye on the "work" of Ante Pavelitch and his oustachis. Wherever we look, the same "edifying" spectacle presents itself.

As we have already shown, it is not only this monstrous partiality and complacency that we object to. **The Vatican's unpardonable crime lies in the decisive part played in the bringing about of two world wars.**(3)

Listen to what Mr. Alfred Grosser, professor at the Institute of political studies of Paris University, says:

"The very concise book of Guenter Lewy "The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany" (New York McGrawhill-1964) says that all the documents agree to show the Catholic Church cooperating with the Hitler regime...

(3) E. Paris, "The Vatican against Europe" (P.T.S. London)

"In July 1933, when the Concordat forced the bishops to swear an oath of allegiance to the Nazi government, the concentration camps were already open... the reading of quotations compiled by Guenter Lewy proves this overwhelmingly. We find in them some crushing evidence from personalities such as Cardinal Faulhaber and the Jesuit Gustav Gundlach."(4)

Only empty words can be found to oppose this stack of evidence which proves the culpability of the Vatican and its Jesuits. Their help was the main force behind the lightning rise of Hitler who, together with Mussolini and Franco, who in spite of appearances were but war pawns manipulated by the Vatican and its Jesuits.

The thurifers (thurifer: one who carries a censer in a liturgical service) of the Vatican must bow their heads in shame when an Italian member of parliament cries out: "**The pope's hands are dripping with blood**". (Speech by Laura Diaz, member of parliament for Livourne, delivered at Ortona on the 15th of April 1946), or when the students of Cardiff University College choose as the theme for a conference: "Should the pope be brought to trial as a war criminal?" ("La Croix", 2nd of April 1946).

* * *

Here is how pope John XXIII expressed himself when referring to the Jesuits: "Persevere, dear sons, in the activities which have already brought you well-known merits.. In that way, you will gladden the Church and will grow with untiring ardour: the path of the just is as the light of dawn... "May that light grow and illuminate the moulding of the adolescents... In that way, you will help to carry out our spiritual wishes and concerns... "We give our Apostolic Blessing with all our heart to your Superior General, to you and your coadjutors, and to all the members of the Society of Jesus". And from pope Paul VI:(5).

"From the time of its restoration, this religious family enjoys the sweet help of God, and has enriched herself very quickly with great progress... the members of the Society have accomplished many important deeds, all to the glory of God and for the benefit of the Catholic religion... the church needs soldiers of Christ with valour, armed with a dauntless faith, ready to confront difficulties... that is why we have great hope in the help your activity will bring... may the new era find the Society on the same honorable path it trod in the past...

"Given in Rome, near St. Peter, on the 20th of August 1964, during his second year as pope".(6)

(4) Saul Friedlander: "Pie XII et le IIIe Reich", (Ed. du Seuil, Paris 1964)

(5) L'Osservatore Romano, 20th of October 1961.

(6) L'Osservatore Romano, 18th of September 1964.14

• • •

On the 29th of October 1965, "l'Osservatore Romano" announced: "The Very Reverend Father Arrupe, General of the Jesuits, celebrated Holy Mass for the Ecumenical Council on the 16th of October 1965".

Here is the apotheosis of "Papal ethics": the simultaneous announcement of a project to beatify Pius XII and John XXIII. "To strengthen ourselves in our striving for a spiritual renewal, we have decided to start the canonical proceedings for the beatification of these two great and godly pontiffs who are so dear to us".(7) -Pope Paul VI

May this book reveal to all those who read it the true nature of this Roman Master, whose words are as "mellifluous" (sweet) as his secret actions are ferocious.

(7) L'Osservatore Romano, 26th of November 1965.15

The founder of the Society of Jesus, the Spanish Basque don Inigo Lopez de Recalde, was born at the castle of Loyola, in the province of Guipuzcoa, in 1491. He was one of the strangest types of monk-soldier ever engendered by the Catholic world; of all the founders of religious orders, he may be the one whose personality has left the strongest mark on the mind and behaviour of his disciples and successors. This may be the reason for that "familiar look" or "trade-mark", a fact which goes as far as physical resemblance. Mr. Folliet disputes this fact (1), but many documents prove the permanence of a "Jesuit" type through the ages. The most amusing of these testimonies is found at the Guimet museum; on the golden background of a 16th century screen, a Japanese artist portrayed, with all the humour of his race, the landing of the Portuguese, and of the sons of Loyola in particular, on the Nipponese islands. The amazement of this lover of nature and bright colours is obvious in the way he depicted those long, black shadows with their mournful faces on which is congealed all the arrogance of the fanatic ruler. The likeness between the work of the oriental artist of the 16th century and our Daumier of 1830 is there for all to see.

Like many other saints, Inigo—who later Romanised his name and became Ignatius—looked far from being the one predestined to enlighten his contemporaries (2). His stormy youth was filled with mistakes and even "heinous crimes". A police report said he was "treacherous, brutal, vindictive". All his biographers admit that he yielded to none of his boon companions regarding the violence of the instincts, then a common thing. "An unruly and conceited soldier", said one of his confidants—"he led a disorderly life as far as women, gambling and duels were concerned", added his secretary Polanco (3). All this is related to us by one of his spiritual

sons, R.P. Rouquette, who tried somewhat to explain and excuse this hot temper which was eventually turned "ad majorem Dei gloriam". (To the greater glory of God).

(1) "La Croix", 31 st of July 1956.

(2) Like Saint Augustine, Saint Francis of Assisi and many others.

(3) R.P. Jesuit Robert Rouquette, "Saint Ignace de Loyola" (Ed. Albin Michel, Paris 1944, p.6).

As is the case for many heroes of the Roman Catholic Church, a violent physical blow was necessary to change his personality. He had been pageboy to the treasurer of Castille until his master's disgrace. Then he became a gentleman in the service of the Viceroy of Navarre; having lived the life of a courtier until then, the young man started the life of a soldier by defending Pampeluna against the French commanded by the Count de Foix. The wound which decided his future life was inflicted during that siege. A leg broken by a bullet, he was taken by the victorious French to his brother Martin Garcia, at the castle of Loyola. Now starts the martyrdom of surgery without anaesthesia, through which he had to go a second time as the work had not been done properly. His leg was broken again and reset. In spite of all this, Ignatius was left with a limp. One can understand that he only needed an experience such as this to cause him a nervous breakdown. The "gift of tears" which was then bestowed on him "in abundance"—and in which his pious biographers see a favour from on high—is maybe only the result of his highly emotional nature, henceforth to affect him more and more.

His sole entertainment, while lying wounded and in pain, was the reading of the "Life of Christ" and the "Life of the Saints", the only books found in the castle.

As he was practically uneducated and still affected by that terrible shock, the anguish of Christ's passion and the martyrdom of the saints had an indelible impact on him; this obsession led the crippled warrior on to the road of apostolate.

"He put the books to one side and day-dreamed. A clear case of the wakeful dream, this was a continuation into the adult years of the imaginary game of the child... if we let it invade the psychic realm, the result is neurosis and surrender of the will; that which is real takes second place!..."(4)

At first sight, this diagnosis seems hardly to apply to the founder of such an active order, nor to other "great mystics" and creators of religious societies, all of whom had apparently great capacities for organization. But we find that all of them are unable to resist their over-active imaginations and, for them, the impossible becomes possible.

(4) R.P. Jesuit Robert Rouquette, op.cit., p.9.

Here is what the same author says on this subject: "I want to point out the obvious outcome of the practice of mysticism by someone possessing a brilliant intelligence. The weak mind indulging in mysticism is on dangerous ground, but the intelligent mystic presents a far greater danger, as his intellect works in a wider and deeper way... When the myth takes over from the

reality in an active intelligence, it becomes mere fanaticism; an infection of the will which suffers from a partial enlargement or distortion".(5)

Ignatius of Loyola was a first-class example of that "active mysticism" and "distortion of the will". Nevertheless, the transformation of the gentlemen-warrior into the "general" of the most militant order in the Roman Church was very slow; there were many faltering steps before he found his true vocation. It is not our intention to follow him through all those different stages. Let us recall the main points: in the spring of 1522, he left the ancestral castle, with his mind made up to become a saint similar to those whose edifying exploits he had been reading about in that big "gothic" volume. Besides, did not the Madona herself appear to him one night, holding in her arms the child Jesus? After a thorough confession at the monastery of Montserrat, he was planning to go to Jerusalem. The plague was rife in Barcelona and, as all maritime traffic had stopped, he had to stay at Manresa for nearly a year. There, he spent his time in prayers, orisons, long fasts, flagellating himself, practicing all the forms of maceration, and never failing to appear before the "tribunal for penance", even though his confession at Montserrat had apparently lasted three whole days; such a thorough confession would have been sufficient to a less scrupulous sinner. All this depicts quite clearly the mental and nervous state of the man. At last delivered from that obsession of sin by deciding it was only a trick of Satan, he devoted himself entirely to the varied and plentiful visions which were haunting his feverish mind.

"It is because of a vision", says H. Boehmer, "that he started eating meat again; it is a whole series of visions that revealed to him the mysteries of the Catholic dogma and helped him to truly live it: in that way, he meditates upon the Trinity under the shape of a musical instrument with three cords; the mystery of the creation of the world through "something" hazy and light coming out of a ray of sunshine; the miraculous descent of Christ into the Eucharist as flashes of light entering the consecrated water, when the priest held it up while praying; the human nature of Christ and the holy Virgin under the form of a dazzling white body; and finally Satan as a serpentine and shimmering shape similar to a multitude of sparkling and mysterious eyes (6)." Is not this the start of the well-known Jesuitic image-making?

(5) Dr Legrain, "Le Mysticisme et la folie" (Ed. de l'Idée Libre, Herblay (S.-et-O.) 1931, pp. 14-16).

(6) H. Boehmer, professor at the University of Bonn, "Les Jesuites" (Armand Colin, Paris 1910, pp. 12-13).

Mr. Boehmer adds that the deep meaning of the dogmas was revealed to him, as a special favour from on-high, through transcendental intuitions. "Many mysteries of Faith and science became suddenly clear to him and later he pretended to have learned more in those short moments than during the whole of his studies; however, he was never able to explain what these mysteries were which suddenly became clear to him. There was only a hazy recollection left, a feeling of something miraculous as if, at that moment, he had become "another man with another intelligence".(7)

All this may be the result of a nervous disorder and can be identified with

what happens to smokers of opium and eaters of hashish: that enlargement or extension of the ego, that illusion of soaring up beyond what is real, a flashing sensation leaving only a dazed recollection. Blissful visions and illuminations were constant companions of this mystic throughout his life.

“He never doubted the reality of these revelations. He chased Satan with a stick as he would have done a mad dog; he talked to the Holy Spirit as one does to another person actually; he asked for the approval of God, the Trinity and the Madonna on all his projects and would burst into tears of joy when they appeared to him. On those occasions, he had a foretaste of celestial bliss; the heavens were open to him, and the Godhead was visible and perceptible to him.(8)

Is not this the perfect case of an hallucinated person? It will be this same perceptible and visible Godhead that the spiritual sons of Loyola will constantly offer to the world—not only for political reasons, leaning on and flattering the deep-rooted inclination in the heart of man for idolatry— but also by conviction, having been well and truly indoctrinated. From the start, mediaeval mysticism has prevailed in the Society of Jesus; it is still the great animator, in spite of its readily assumed worldly, intellectual and learned aspects. Its basic axiom is: “All things to all men”. The arts, literature, science and even philosophy have been mere means or nets to catch souls, like the easy indulgences granted by its casuists and for which laxity they were so often reproved. To this Order, there is not a realm where human weakness cannot be worked upon, to incite the spirit and will to surrender and go back to a more childish and restful devotion. So they work for the bringing about of the “kingdom of God” according to their own ideal: a great flock under the Holy Father’s crozier. That learned men could have such an anachronic ideal seems very strange, yet it is undeniably so and the confirmation of an oft-disregarded fact: the pre-eminence of the emotions in the life of the spirit. Besides, Kant said that every philosophy is but the expression of the philosopher’s temperament or character.

(7) H. Boehmer, professor at the University of Bonn, “Les Jesuites” (Armand Colin, Paris 1910, pp. 12-13).

(8) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p. 14.

Apart from individual methods, the Jesuitic “temperament” seems more or less uniform amongst them. “A mixture of piety and diplomacy, asceticism and worldly wisdom, mysticism and cold calculation; as was Loyola’s character, so is the trade-mark of this Order”.(9).

In the first place, every Jesuit chose this particular Order because of his natural dispositions; but he really becomes a “son” of Loyola after rigorous tests and systematic training lasting no less than fourteen years.

In that way, the paradox of this Order has continued for four hundred years: an Order which endeavours to be “intellectual” but, simultaneously, has always been, within the Roman Church and society, the champion of the strictest disposition.

(9) J. Huber, professor of Catholic theology in Munich, “Les Jesuites” (Sandoz et Fischbacher, Paris 1875, p. 127).

When the time came at last for Ignatius to leave Monresa, he couldn't foresee his destiny, but the anxiety concerning his own salvation was not his main concern any more; it is as a missionary, and not as a mere pilgrim, that he left for the Holy Land in March 1523. He arrived in Jerusalem on the 1st of September, after many adventures, only to leave again soon after, on the orders of the Franciscan's provincial who was not desirous to see the precarious peace between Christians and Turks endangered by an untimely proselytism.

The disappointed missionary passed through Venice, Genoa, and Barcelona on his way to the University of Alcala where he started theological studies; it is there also that his "cure of souls" amongst voluntary listeners began.

"In these conventicles, the most common manifestations of piety amongst the fair sex were fainting fits; by that, we realise how hard he applied his religious methods, and how such a fervent propaganda would soon arouse the curiosity and then the suspicion of the inquisitors... "In April 1527, the Inquisition put Ignatius in prison to try him on the grounds of heresy. The inquiry examined those peculiar incidents amongst his devotees, the strange assertions of the accused concerning the wonderful power his chastity conferred on him, and his bizarre theories on the difference between mortal and venial sins; these theories had striking affinities with those of Jesuit casuists of the subsequent epoch.(10) Released but forbidden to hold meetings, Ignatius left for Salamanque and soon started the same activities. Similar suspicions amongst the inquisitors led to imprisonment again. Release was only on condition of desisting from such conduct. Thus it was, he journeyed to Paris to continue his studies at the college of Montaigu. His efforts to indoctrinate his fellow-students according to his peculiar methods brought him into trouble again with the Inquisition. Becoming more prudent, he met with just six of his college friends, two of which will become highly esteemed recruits: Salmeron and Lainez.

(10) H. Boehmer, op.cit. pp.20-21, 25.

What did he have in himself that so powerfully attracted young people to an old student? It was his ideal and a little charm he carried on himself: a small book, in fact a very minute book which is, in spite of its smallness, amongst those which have influenced the fate of humanity. This volume has been printed so many times that the number of copies is unknown; it was also the object of more than 400 commentaries. It is the textbook of the Jesuits and at the same time the resume of the long inner development of their master: the "Spiritual Exercises".(11)

Mr Boehmer says later:

"Ignatius understood more clearly than any other leader of men who preceded him that the best way to raise a man to a certain ideal is to become master of his imagination. We "imbue into him spiritual forces which he would find very difficult to eliminate later", forces more lasting than all the best principles and doctrines; these forces can come up again to the surface, sometimes after years of not even mentioning them, and become so imperative that the will finds itself unable to oppose any obstacle, and has to follow

their irresistible impulse".(12)

Thus all the "truths" of the Catholic dogma will have to be, not only meditated, but lived and felt by the one who devotes himself to these "Exercises", with the help of a "director". In other words, he will have to see and relive the mystery with the greatest possible intensity. The candidate's sensitiveness becomes impregnated with these forces whose persistence in his memory, and even more so in his subconscious, will be as strong as the effort he made to evoke and assimilate them. Beside sight, the other senses such as hearing, smell, taste and touch will play their part. In short, it is mere controlled auto-suggestion. The angels' rebellion, Adam and Eve driven out of Paradise, God's tribunal, the evangelical scenes and phases of the Passion are, as one would say, relived in front of the candidate. Sweet and blissful scenes alternate with the most sombre ones at a skilfully arranged rhythm. No need to say that Hell has the prominent part in that "magic lantern show", with its lake of fire into which the damned are thrown, the awful concert of screams, the atrocious stretch of sulphur and burning flesh. Yet Christ is always there to sustain the visionary who doesn't know how to thank him for not having thrown him already into hell to pay for his past sins.

(1 1) and (12) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.25, 34-35.

Here is what Edgar Quinet wrote:

"Not only visions are pre-arranged, but also sighs, inhalings, breathing are noted down; the pauses and intervals of silence are written down like on a music sheet. In case you do not believe me, I will quote: "The third way of praying, by measuring the words and periods of silence". This particular manner of praying consists of leaving out some words between every breath; and a little further: "Make sure to keep equal gaps between every breath and choking sob and word". (Et paria anhelituum ac vocum interstitia observet), which means that the man, being inspired or not, becomes just a machine which must sigh, sob, groan, cry, shout or catch one's breath at the exact moment and in the order which experience shows to be the most profitable". (12a)

It is understandable that after four weeks devoted to these intensive Exercises, with a director as his only companion, the candidate would be ripe for the subsequent training and breaking.

This is what Quinet has to say when referring to the creator of such an hallucinatory method:

"Do you know what distinguishes him from all the ascetics of the past? The fact that he could observe and analyse himself logically and coldly in that state of rapture, while for all the others even the idea of reflection was impossible.

Imposing on his disciples actions which, to him, were spontaneous, he needed just thirty days to break, with this method, the will and reasoning, in the manner in which a rider breaks his horse. He only needed thirty days "triginta dies", to subdue a soul. Note that Jesuitism expanded together with

modern inquisition: while the inquisition dislocated the body, the spiritual Exercises broke up the thoughts under Loyola's machine".(12b)

In any case, one could not examine his "spiritual" life too deeply, even without the honour of being a Jesuit; Loyola's methods are to be recommended to the faithful and ecclesiastics in particular, as we are reminded by commentators such as R.P. Pinard de la Boullaye, author of "Mental prayer for all"; inspired by saint Ignatius, this very valuable aid for the soul would, we think, be more explicit if the title read "alienation" instead of "prayer".

(12a) Michelet et Guinet: "Des Jesuites", (Hachette, Paulin, Paris 1845, pp.185-187). (12b) Michelet et Guinet: "Des Jesuites", (Hachette, Paulin, Paris, 1845, pp.185- 187)

"The Society of Jesus" was constituted on Assumption Day in 1534, in the chapel of Notre-Dame de Montmartre.

Ignatius was then forty-four years old. After communion, the animator and his companions vowed to go to the Holy Land, as soon as their studies were finished, to convert the infidels. But the following year found them in Rome where the pope, who was then organising a crusade against the lurks with the German Emperor and the Republic of Venice, showed them how impossible their project was because of it. So Ignatius and his companions dedicated themselves to missionary work in Christian lands; in Venice, his apostolate roused again the suspicions of the Inquisition. The Constitution of the Company of Jesus was at last drafted and approved in Rome, by Paul III, in 1540, and the Jesuits put themselves at the disposition of the pope, promising him unconditional obedience, Teaching, confession, preaching and charitable work were the field of action for this new Order, but foreign missions were not excluded as, in 1541, Francis Xavier and two companions left Lisbon to go and evangelise the Far East. In 1546, the political side of their career was launched, when the pope chose Lainez and Salmeron to represent him at the Council of Trent in the capacity of "pontifical theologians".

Mr Boehmer writes:

"Then, the Order was employed by the pope only on a temporary basis. But it performed its functions with so much promptitude and zeal that, already under Paul III, it had implanted itself very firmly into all chosen kinds of activities and won the confidence of the Curia for all time".(12d) This confidence was fully justified; the Jesuits, and Lainez in particular, together with their devoted friend Cardinal Morone, became the cunning and untiring champions of pontifical authority and intangibility of the dogma, during the three sessions of that Council ending in 1562.

(1 2 d) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.47-48.

By their clever manoeuvres and dialectics, they succeeded in defeating the opposition and all "heretic" claims including marriage of priests, communion with the two elements, use of the vernacular in services and, especially, reform of the papacy. Only the reform of convents was retained on the agenda.

Lainez himself, by a forceful counter-attack, upheld pontifical infallibility which was promulgated three centuries later by the Vatican Council. (13) The Holy See emerged strengthened from the crisis where it nearly foundered, thanks to the steadfast actions of the Jesuits. The terms chosen by Paul III to describe this new Order in his Bull of Authorisation were then amply justified: "Regimen Ecclesiae militantis".

The fighting spirit developed more and more as time went on as, beside foreign missions, the activities of Loyola's sons started to concentrate on the souls of men, especially amongst ruling classes. Politics are their main field of action, as all the efforts of these "directors" concentrate on one aim: the submission of the world to the papacy, and to attain this the "heads" must be conquered first. And to realise this ideal? Two very important weapons: to be the confessors of the mighty and those in high places and the education of their children. In that way, the present will be safe while the future is prepared.

The Holy See soon realised the strength this new Order would bring. At first, the number of its members had been limited to sixty, but this restriction was promptly lifted. When Ignatius died, in 1556, his sons were working amongst pagans in India, China, Japan, the New World, but also and especially in Europe: France, Southern and Western Germany, where they fought against the "heresy", in Spain, Portugal, Italy and even England, getting in by way of Ireland. Their history, full of vicissitudes, will be of a "Roman" network they will constantly try to spread over the world, whose links will be forever torn and mended.

(13) Vatican Council (1870).

"Let us not forget, writes the Jesuit Rouquette, that, historically, "ultramontanism" has been the practical affirmation of "universalism"... This necessary universalism would be an empty word if it did not result in a practical cohesion or obedience of Christianity: this is why Ignatius wanted this team to be at the disposition of the pope... and be the champion of Catholic unity, unity which can be assured only through an effective submission to Christ's vicar".(13a)

The Jesuits wanted to impose this monarchical absolutism on the Roman Church and they maintained it in civil society as they had to look upon the sovereigns as temporal representatives of the Holy Father, true head of Christianity; as long as those monarchs were entirely docile to their common lord, the Jesuits were their most faithful supporters. On the other hand, if these princes rebelled, they found in the Jesuits their worst enemies.

In Europe, wherever Rome's interests required the people to rise against their king, or if these temporal princes had taken decisions embarrassing for the Church, the Curia knew she would not find more able, cunning, or daring outside the Society of Jesus when it came to intrigue, propaganda or even open rebellion".(14)

(13a) R.P. Jesuit Rouquette, op.cit. p.44.

(1 4) Rene Fulop-Muler: "Les Jesuites et le secret de leur puissance" (Librairie Plon, Paris 1933. p.61).

We have seen, through the spirit of the "Exercises", how the founder of this Company was behind his time in his simplistic mysticism, ecclesiastic discipline and, generally speaking, his conception of subordination. The "Constitutions" and "Exercises", fundamentals to this system, leave us without any doubts on that subject. No matter what his disciples may say—especially today as modern ideas on this subject are totally different—obedience has a very special place, in fact incontestably the first, in the summary of the Order's rules. Mr. Folliet may pretend to see in it nothing more than "religious obedience", necessary to any congregation; R.P. Rouquette writes boldly: "Far from being a diminution of man, this intelligent and willing obedience is the height of freedom... a liberation from oneself's bondage..."; one only has to read those texts to perceive the extreme, if not monstrous character of this submission of soul and spirit imposed to the Jesuits, making them always docile instruments in their superiors' hands, and even more from their very beginning the natural enemies of any kind of liberty.

The famous "perinde ac cadaver" (as a corpse in the undertaker's hands), can be found in all "spiritual literature", according to Mr. Folliet, and even in the East, in the Haschichins' Constitution; the Jesuits are to be in the hands of their superiors "as a staff obeying every impulse; as a ball of wax which can be shaped and stretched in any direction; as a small crucifix being lifted and moved at will"; these pleasant formulas are none the less very enlightening. Remarks and explanations from the creator of this Order leave us without any doubt as to their true meaning. Besides, amongst the Jesuits, not only the will, but also reasoning and even moral scruple, must be sacrificed to the primordial virtue of obedience which is, according to Borgia, "the strongest rampart of Society".

"Let us be convinced that all is well and right when the superior commands it", wrote Loyola. And again: "Even if God gave you an animal without sense for master, you will not hesitate to obey him, as master and guide, because God ordained it to be so."

And something even better: the Jesuit must see in his superior not a fallible man, but Christ Himself. J. Huber, professor of Catholic theology in Munich and author of one of the most important works on the Jesuits, wrote: "Here is a proven fact: the "Constitutions" repeat five hundred times that one must see Christ in the person of the General".(15)

The discipline of the Order, assimilated so often to that of the army, is then nothing compared to the reality. "Military obedience is not the equivalent of Jesuitic obedience; the latter is more extensive as it gets hold of the whole man and is not satisfied like the other, with an exterior act, but requires the sacrifice of the will and laying aside of one's own judgment".(16)

(15) J. Huber. "Les Jesuites" (Sandoz et Fischbacher, Paris 1875, pp. 71 & 73).

(16) J. Huber: "Les Jesuites" (Sandoz et Fischbacher, Paris 1875, pp. 71 & 73).

Ignatius himself wrote in his letter to the Portuguese Jesuits: **"We must see black as white, if the Church says so"**.

Such is this "height of freedom" and "liberation from one's own bondage", praised earlier on by R.P. Rouquette. Indeed, the Jesuit is truly liberated from himself as he is totally subjected to his masters; any doubt or scruple would be imputed to him as sin.

Mr. Boehmer writes:

"In the additions to the "Constitutions", the superiors are advised to command the novices, as God did with Abraham, things apparently criminal, to prove them; but they must proportion these temptations to each one's strength. It is not difficult to imagine what could be the results of such an education".(17)

The Order's life of ups and downs—there is not one country from which it wasn't expelled—testifies that these dangers were recognised by all governments, even the most Catholic. By introducing men so blindly devoted to their cause to teaching among the higher classes, the Company—champion of universalism, therefore ultra-montanism—was inevitably recognised as a threat to civil authority, as the activity of the Order, by the mere fact of their vocation, turned more and more towards politics.

In a parallel way, what we call the Jesuitic spirit was developing amongst its members. Nevertheless, the founder, inspired mainly by the needs of foreign and home "missions", had not neglected skilfulness. He wrote in his "Sententiae asceticae": "A clever carefulness together with a mediocre purity is better than a greater holiness coupled with a less perfect skilfulness. A good shepherd of souls must know how to ignore many things and pretend not to understand them. Once he is master of the wills, he will be able wisely to lead his students wherever he may choose. People are entirely absorbed by passing interests, so we must not speak to them too pointedly about their souls: it would be throwing the hook without the bait".

Even the desired countenance of Loyola's sons was emphatically stated: "They must hold their heads slightly down, without bending it to the left or right; they must not look up, and when they speak to someone, they are not to look them straight in the eyes so as to see them only indirectly..."(18) Loyola's successors retained this lesson well in their memory, and applied it very extensively in the pursuit of their plans.

(17) Gabriel Monod, in Introduction aux "Jesuites", de H. Boehmer, p. XVI (Armand Colin, Paris) (18) Pierre Dominique: "La politique des Jesuites" (Grasset, Paris 1955, p.37).

After 1558, Lainez, the subtle tactician of the Council of Trent, was made general of the Congregation with the power to organise the Order as he was inspired. The "Declarations" which he himself composed with Salmeron, were added to the "Constitutions" to form a commentary; they accentuated even more the despotism of the general elected for life. An admonitor procurator and assistants, residing in Rome too, will help him generally to administer the Order divided then into five congregations: Italy, Germany France, Spain,

England and America. These congregations were themselves divided into Provinces grouping the different establishments of the Order. Only the admonitor (or overseer) and assistants are nominated by the Congregation. The general appoints all other officials, promulgates the ordinances which are not to modify the Constitutions, administers the wealth of the Order according to his own wishes and directs its activities for which he is responsible to the pope only.

To this militia so tightly knit in the hand of its chief and which needs the greatest autonomy to make its actions effective, the pope concedes privileges which may seem exorbitant to other religious Orders.

By their Constitutions, the Jesuits were exempt from the cloistered rule which applied to monastic life in general. In fact, they are monks living "in the world" and, outwardly, nothing distinguishes them from the secular clergy. But, contrary to this and other religious congregations, they are not subjected to the bishop's authority. As early as 1545, a bull of Paul II enabled them to preach, hear confession, dispense the sacraments, and say mass; in short, exercise their ministry without having to refer to the bishop. The solemnisation of marriages is the only thing they are not allowed to perform.

They have the power to give absolution, change vows for others which are easier to fulfil, or even cancel them.

Mr Gaston Bally writes:

"The general's power concerning absolution and dispensations is even wider. He can lift all punishment inflicted on the members of the Society before or after them entering the Order, absolve all their sins, even the sin of heresy and schism, the falsification of apostolic writings, etc... "The general absolves, in person or through a delegate, all those who are under his obedience, of the unhappy state arising from excommunication, suspension or interdict, provided these censures were not inflicted for excesses so enormous that others, beside the papal tribunal, knew about them.

He also absolves the irregularity issuing, from bigamy, injuries done to others, murder, assassination... as long as these wicked deeds were not publicly known and the cause of a scandal".(19)

Finally, Gregory XIII bestowed on the Company the right to deal in commerce and banking, a right it made use of extensively later on.

These dispensations and unprecedented powers were fully guaranteed to them.

"The popes called even upon princes and kings to defend these privileges; they threatened with the great excommunication "latae sententiae" all those who would try to infringe them. In 1574, a bull of Pius V gave the general the right to restore these privileges to their original scope, against all attempts to alter or curtail them, even if such curtailments were authoritatively documented by papal revocation... By granting the Jesuits such exorbitant privileges which run counter to the Church's antiquated

constitution, the papacy wanted, not only to supply them with powerful weapons to fight the "Infidels", but especially use them as a bodyguard to defend her own unrestricted power in the Church and against the Church". "To preserve the spiritual and temporal supremacy they usurped during the middle ages, the popes sold the Church to the Order of Jesus and, in consequence, surrendered themselves into their hands... If the papacy was supported by the Jesuits, the whole existence of the Jesuits depended on the spiritual and temporal supremacy of the papacy. In that way, the interests of both parties were intimately bound together".(20)

But this select cohort needed secret auxiliaries to dominate civil society: this role fell on those affiliated to the Company called Jesuits. "Many important people were connected in that way with the Society: the emperors Ferdinand II and Ferdinand III, Sigismund III, king of Poland, who had officially belonged to the Company; Cardinal Infant, a duke of Savoy. And these were not the least useful".(21)

(19) Gaston Bally: "Les Jesuites" (Chambery, Imprimerie Nouvelle, 1902, pp.11-13). (20) Gaston Bally, op.cit., pp.9-10, 16-17. (21) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., p.37.

It is the same today; the 33,000 official members of the Society operate all over the world in the capacity of her personnel, officers of a truly secret army containing in its ranks heads of political parties, high ranking officials, generals, magistrates, physicians, Faculty professors, etc., all of them striving to bring about, in their own sphere, "l'Opus Dei", God's work, in reality the plans of the papacy.

"France", wrote Mr. Boehmer, "is the cradle of the Society of Jesus, but in Italy it received its programme and constitution. Therefore in Italy it first took root and from there it spread abroad".(1)

The author notes the increasing number of colleges and Jesuit academies (128 and 1680); "but", says he, "the history of Italian civilisation during the 16th and 17th centuries shows the results of it most strikingly. If a well-learned Italy thus embraced again the faith and ordinances of the Church, received a new zeal for asceticism and missions, composed again pious poems and hymns for the Church, dedicated conscientiously the painters' brushes and sculptors' chisels to exalt the religious ideal, is it not because the cultivated classes were instructed in Jesuits' colleges and confessionals?"(2)

Gone were "childish simplicity, joy, vivacity and the simple love of nature..."

The Jesuits' pupils are far too clerical, devout, absorbed to preserve these qualities. They are taken up with ecstatic visions and illuminations; they literally get drunk with the paintings of frightful mortifications and the martyrs' atrocious torments; they need the pomp, glittering and theatrical. From the end of the 16th century on, Italian art and literature reproduce faithfully this moral transformation... The restlessness, the ostentation, the shocking claim which characterise the creations of that period promote a feeling of repulsion instead of sympathy for the beliefs they are supposed to interpret and glorify".(3)

(1) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p.82. (2) and (3) Boehmer, op.cit., p.82-83.

It is the mark sui generis of the Company. This love for the distorted, finicky, glittering, theatrical could seem strange amongst mystics formed by the "Spiritual Exercises" if we did not detect in it this essentially Jesuitical aim to impress the mind. It is an application of the maxim: "The end justifies the means" applied with perseverance by the Jesuits in the arts, literature as well as politics and morals.

Italy had been hardly touched by the Reformation. Nevertheless, the Waldenses, who had survived since the middle ages in spite of persecutions and established themselves in the north and south of the peninsula, joined the Calvinist Church in 1532. On a report from the Jesuit Possevino, Emmanuel Philibert of Savoy launched another bloody persecution against his "heretic" subjects in 1561. The same thing happened in Calabria, at Casal di San Sisto and Guardia Fiscale. "The Jesuits were implicated in these massacres; they were busy converting the victims..."(4)

As for Father Possevino: "... he followed the Catholic army as their chaplain, and recommended the extermination by fire of the heretic pastors as a necessary and holy act".(5)

The Jesuits were all powerful in Parma, at the court of the Farnese, as well as in Naples during the 16th and 17th centuries. But in Venice, where they had been loaded with favours, they were banished on the 14th of May 1606, "as the most faithful servants and spokesmen of the pope..." They were nevertheless allowed to return in 1656, but their influence in the Republic was to be from now on but a shadow of the one they had in the past.

Portugal was a choice country for the Order. "Already under John III (1521-1559), it was the most powerful religious community in the kingdom".(6) Its influence grew even more after the revolution of 1640 which put the Braganza on the throne. "Under the first king of the house of Braganza, Father Fernandez was a member of the government and, under the minority of Alphonse VI, the counsellor most heeded by the regent Queen Louise. Father de Ville was successful in overthrowing Alphonse VI in 1667, and Father Emmanuel Fernandez was made a deputy to the "Cortes" in 1667 by the new King Peter II.. In spite of the fact that the Fathers were not fulfilling any public duty in the kingdom, they were more powerful in Portugal than in any other country. Not only were they spiritual advisers to all the royal family, but the king and his minister consulted them in all important circumstances. From one of their own testimonies, we know that not one place in the administration of the State and Church could be obtained without their consent; so much so that the clergy, the high classes and the people contended with each other to win their favours and approval. Foreign politics were also under their influence. Any sensible man would see that such a state of affairs was unprofitable to the good of the kingdom".(7)

(4) J. Huber, op.cit., p. 165.

(5) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p.89.

(6) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.85, 86, 87, 88.

(7) and (8) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.85, 86, 87, 88.

In fact, we can see the results by the decadent state into which this unfortunate land fell. All the energy and perspicacity of the marquis of Pombal, in the middle of the 18th century, were needed to tear Portugal out of the Order's deadly grip.

In Spain, the Order's penetration was slower. The higher clergy and the Dominicans opposed it for a long time. The sovereigns themselves, Charles V and Philip II, while accepting their services, distrusted these soldiers of the pope and feared encroachments on their authority. But, with much craftiness, the Order eventually defeated this resistance. "During the 17th century, they are all-powerful in Spain, among the high classes and at Court. Even Father Neidhart, former German cavalry officer, fully governed the kingdom as Counsellor of State, prime minister and Grand Inquisitor... In Spain as in Portugal, the kingdom's ruin coincided with the rise of the Order..."(8)

This is what Edgar Quinet had to say about it:

"Wherever a dynasty dies, I can see, rising up and standing behind her, a kind of bad genie, one of those dark figures that are the confessors, gently and paternally luring her towards death..."(9)

Indeed, one cannot impute Spain's decadence to this Order only.

"Nevertheless, it is true that the Company of Jesus, together with the Church and other religious orders, hastened her fall; the richer the Order became, the poorer Spain was, so much so that when Charles II died, the State's coffers did not even contain the necessary amount to pay for 10,000 masses usually said for the salvation of a deceased monarch's soul."(10)

(9) Michelet et Quinet, op.cit., p.259.

(10) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.85, 86, 87, 88.

"It was not southern Europe, but central Europe: France, Holland, Germany, Poland, which were the site for that historical struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism. So these countries were the main fields of battle for the Society of Jesus." (11)

The situation was particularly grave in Germany. "Not only notorious pessimists, but also thinking and wise Catholics considered the old church's cause in all German lands as almost lost. In fact, even in Austria and Bohemia, the break with Rome was so general that the Protestants could reasonably hope to conquer Austria within a few decades. Then how is it this change did not take place and the country was divided into two sections instead? The Catholic party, at the close of the 16th century, had no hesitation in answering this question, for it always acknowledged that the Wittelsbach, Habsburg and Jesuits were responsible for this happy turn of events."(12)

Rene Fulop-Miller wrote about the Jesuits' role in these events: "The Catholic cause could hope for a real success only if the Fathers were able to influence and guide the princes, at all times and in all circumstances. The confessionals offered the Jesuits the means to secure a lasting political influence, therefore an effectual action" .(13)

In Bavaria, the young duke Albert V, son of a zealous Catholic and educated at Ingolstadt, the old Catholic city, called on the Jesuits to combat effectively the heresy:

“On the 7th of July 1556, 8 Fathers and 12 Jesuit teachers entered Ingolstadt. It was the start of a new era for Bavaria... the State itself received a new Seal... the Roman Catholic conceptions directed the politics of princes and the behaviour of the high classes. But this new spirit got hold of the higher classes only. It did not gain the hearts of ordinary people... Nevertheless, under the iron discipline of the State and the restored Church, they again became devout Catholics, docile, fanatic, and intolerant towards any heresy...”

(11) and (12) H. Boehmer, *op.cit.*, pp.89, 104, ,112, 114. (13) Rene Fulop-Miller, *op.cit.*, II, pp.98, 102.

“It may seem excessive to attribute such prodigious virtues and actions to a mere handful of strangers. Yet, in these circumstances, their force was in inverse ratio to their numbers and they were immediately effective as no obstacles were met. Loyola’s emissaries won the country’s heart and mind from the start... From the next generation on, Ingolstadt became the perfect type of the German Jesuit city”.(14) One can judge the state of mind the Fathers introduced to this stronghold of faith by reading the following:

“The Jesuit Mayrhofer of Ingolstadt taught in his “Preacher’s mirror”: “We will not be judged if we demand the killing of Protestants, any more than we would by asking for the death penalty on thieves, murderers, counterfeiters and revolutionaries.”(15)

The successors of Albert V, and especially Maximilian I (1597-1651), completed his work. But Albert V already was conscientious in his “duty” of assuring his subjects’ “salvation”.

“As soon as the Fathers arrived in Bavaria, his attitude towards Protestants and those favourable to them became more severe. From 1563 on, he pitilessly expelled all recalcitrants, and had no mercy for the Anabaptists who had to suffer drownings, fire, prison and chains, all of which were praised by the Jesuit Agricola... In spite of all this, a whole generation of men had to disappear before the persecution was crowned a complete success. As late as 1586, the Moravian Anabaptists managed to hide 600 victims from the duke Guillaume. This one example proves that there were thousands and not hundreds who were driven out, an awful breach into a thinly populated country.

“But”, said Albert V to the Munich City council, “God’s honour and the salvation of souls must be placed above any temporal interests”. 16)

Little by little, all teaching in Bavaria was placed in the Jesuits’ hands, and that land became the base for their penetration in eastern, western and northern Germany.

“From 1585 on, the Fathers converted the part of Westphalia depending on Cologne; in 1586, they appear in Neuss and Bonn, one of Cologne’s archbishop’s residences; they open colleges at Hildesheim in 1587 and Munster

in 1588. This particular one already had 1300 pupils in 1618... A large part of western Germany was reconquered in that way by Catholicism, thanks to the Wittelsbach and Jesuits.

(14) H. Boehmer, *op.cit.*, pp.89, 104, 112, 114.

(15) Rene Fulop-Miller, *op.cit.*, II, pp.98, 102.

(16) H. Boehmer, *op.cit.*, pp.89, 104, 112, 114.

"The alliance between the Wittelsbach and Jesuits was maybe even more important for the "Austrian lands" than for western Germany".(17)

The archduke Charles of Styrie, last son of emperor Ferdinand, married in 1571 a Bavarian princess "who brought into Gratz castle the narrow Catholic tendencies and the friendship for the Jesuits which prevailed at the Court of Munich". Under her influence, Charles worked hard to "extirpate the heresy" from his kingdom and when he died, in 1590, he made his son and successor, Ferdinand, swear that he would go on with this work. In any case, Ferdinand was well prepared for this. "For five years, he had been a pupil of the Jesuits at Ingolstadt; besides, he was so narrow-minded that, to him, there was no nobler task than the reestablishment of the Catholic Church in his hereditary States. That this task was advantageous or not to his lands was of no concern to Him. "I prefer", said he, "to reign over a country in ruins, than over one which is damned". (18)

In 1617, the archduke Ferdinand was crowned king of Bohemia by the emperor. "Influenced by his Jesuit confessor Viller, Ferdinand started at once to combat Protestantism in his new kingdom. This signalled the start of that bloody war of religion which, for the next thirty years, kept Europe in suspense. When, in 1618, the unhappy events in Prague gave the signal for open rebellion, the old emperor Mathias tried at first to compromise, but he did not have enough power to make his intentions prevail against king Ferdinand, who was dominated by his Jesuit confessor; so, the last hope to settle this conflict amicably was lost". "At the same time, the lands of Bohemia had taken special measures and solemnly decreed that all Jesuits should be expelled, as they saw in them promoters of civil war".(19)

Soon after, Moravia and Silesie followed this example, and Protestants of Hungary, where the Jesuit Pazmany ruled with a rod of iron, rebelled also. But the battle of the White Mountain (1620) was won by Ferdinand, who had been made emperor again after the death of Mathias.

"The Jesuits persuaded Ferdinand to inflict the most cruel punishment on the rebels; Protestantism was rooted out of the whole country by means too terrible for words... At the end of the war, the country's material ruin was complete".

(17) and (18) H. Boehmer, *op.cit.*, pp.117, 120. (19) J. Huber, *op.cit.*, pp. 180-183.

"The Jesuit Balbinus, Bohemia's historian, wondered how there could still be some inhabitants left in that country. But moral ruin was even more terrible... The flourishing culture found amongst the nobles and middle classes, the rich national literature which could not be replaced: all this had been destroyed, and even nationality had been abolished. Bohemia was open to the Jesuits'

activities and they burned Czech literature en-masse; under their influence, even the name of the nation's great saint: John Huss, gradually grew dimmer until it was extinct in the hearts of the people... "The height of the Jesuits' power", said Tomek, "coincided with the country's greatest decadence in her national culture; it is because of the influence that Order had, that this unfortunate land's awakening came about one century too late..." "When the Thirty Years War came to an end, and a peace was concluded assuring German Protestants the same political rights enjoyed by the Catholics, the Jesuits did their uttermost to continue the fighting; it was in vain".(20)

But they obtained from their student Leopold the First, then reigning emperor, the promise to persecute the Protestants in his own lands, and especially in Hungary. "Escorted by imperial dragoons, the Jesuits undertook this work of conversion in 1671. The Hungarians rose to action and started a war which was to last for nearly a whole generation... But that insurrection was victoroius, under the leadership of Francis Kakoczy. The victor wanted to drive the Jesuits out of all the countries which fell under his power; but influential protectors of the Order managed to adjourn these measures, and the expulsion did not take place until 1707...

"Prince Eugene blamed, with a harsh frankness, the politics of the imperial house and the intrigues of the Jesuits in Hungary. He wrote: "Austria nearly lost Hungary because of their persecuting of the Protestants". One day, he bitterly exclaimed that the morals of the Turks were far superior to those of the Jesuits, in practice at least. "Not only do they want to dominate consciences, but also to have the right of life and death over men".

"Austria and Bavaria reaped the fruits of Jesuit domination in full: the compression of all progressive tendencies and the systematic stultification of the people".

"The deep misery which followed the war of religion, the powerless politics, the intellectual decadence, the moral corruption, a frightful decrease in the population and impoverishment of the whole of Germany: these were the results of the Order's actions".(21)

(20) Rene Fulop-Miller, op.cit., II, pp. 104-105. (21) J. Huber, op.cit., pp.183-186.

It was only during the 17th century that the Jesuits succeeded in establishing themselves successfully in Switzerland, after having been called, then banished, by a few cities of the Confederation, during the second half of the 16th century.

The archbishop of Milan, Charles Borromeo, who had favoured their installation at Lucerne in 1578, soon realised what the results of their actions would be, as we are reminded by J. Huber: "Charles Borromeo wrote to his confessor that the Company of Jesus, governed by heads more political than religious, is becoming too powerful to preserve the necessary moderation and submission... She rules over kings and princes, and governs temporal and spiritual affairs; the pious institution has lost the spirit which animated her originally; we shall be compelled to abolish it".(22)

At the same time in France, the famous legal expert Etienne Pasquier wrote: "Introduce this Order in our midst and, at the same time, you will introduce dissension, chaos and confusion".(23)

Is it not this identical complaint heard over and over again, and in all countries, against the Company? It was the same in Switzerland, when the evidence of her evil deeds broke through the flattering appearances with which she excelled in covering herself.

(22) J. Huber op.cit., p.131.

(23) Cite by H. Fulop-Miller: "Les Jesuites et le secret de leur puissance" (Plon, Paris 1933 p.57)

"Wherever the Jesuits managed to take root, they seduced great and small, young and old. Very soon, the authorities would start consulting them in important circumstances; their donations started flowing in, and it was not long before they occupied all the schools, the pulpits of most churches, the confessionals of all high ranking and influential people. Confessors looking after the education of all classes of Society, counsellors and intimate friends of members of the Council, their influence grew day after day, and they did not wait long before exercising it in public affairs. Lucerne and Fribourg were their main centres; from there, they conducted the exterior politics of most Catholic cantons...

"Any plan forged in Rome, or by other foreign powers, against Protestantism in Switzerland was assured of the Jesuits' full support... **"In 1620, they were successful in making the Catholic population of the Veltlin rise against the Protestants and they slaughtered six hundred.** The pope gave indulgence to all those who took part in that horrible deed. "In 1656, they kindled civil war between members of the various confessions... Later again a new war of religion was started by the Jesuits. "In 1712, peace was being discussed in Aarau; Lucerne and Uri had just accepted it when the Jesuits, on an order from Rome, did all they could to reverse things. They refused absolution to all those who would hesitate to take up arms. They proclaimed loudly from their pulpits that one was not obliged to keep his word, when it was given to heretics; they made moderate councillors to suspect, tried to remove them from their posts and provoked, in Lucerne, such a threatening uprising of the people against the government that the supreme authority resigned herself to break the peace. The Catholics were defeated in the fight which followed and signed an onerous peace.

Since that time, the Order's influence in Switzerland became smaller and smaller".(24)

Today, article 51 of the Swiss constitution forbids the Society of Jesus to hold any cultural or educative activity on the territory of the Confederation, and efforts made to abolish this rule have always been defeated.

(24) J. Huber, op.cit., pp.188 ss.

Jesuit domination was nowhere as deadly as it was in Poland. (Webmaster: The

land of my grandparents.) This is proved by H. Boehmer, a moderate historian who does not bear any systematic hostility towards the Society.

“The Jesuits were entirely responsible for Poland’s annihilation. The accusation so worded is excessive. The decadence of the Polish State had started before they came on the scene. But they undoubtedly hastened the kingdom’s decomposition. Of all the States, Poland, who had millions of orthodox Christians in her midst, should have had religious tolerance as one of the most essential principles of her interior politics. The Jesuits did not allow that. They did worse: **they put Poland’s exterior politics at the service of Catholic interests in a fatal manner**“.(25)

This was written at the end of the last century; it is very similar to what Colonel Beck, former Polish Foreign-Affairs minister from 1932 to 1939 said after the 1939-1945 war:

“The Vatican is one of the main causes of the tragedy of my country. I realised too late that we had pursued our foreign politics just to serve the interests of the Catholic Church“.(26)

So, with several centuries in-between, the same disastrous influence has made its mark once again on that unfortunate nation.

(25) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p.135.

(26) Declaration of the 6th of February 1940.

In 1581 already, Father Possevino, pontifical legate in Moscow, has done his best to bring together the Czar Ivan the Terrible and the Roman Church. Ivan was not strictly against it. Full of glad hopes, Possevino made himself, in 1584, the mediator of the peace of Kirewora Gora between Russia and Poland, a peace which saved Ivan from inextricable difficulties. This is just what the crafty sovereign had hoped for. There was no more talk of converting the Russians. Possevino had to leave Russia without having obtained anything. Two years later, an even better opportunity offered itself to the Fathers to get a hold on Russia: Grischka Ostrepjew, an unfrocked monk, revealed to a Jesuit that he actually was Dimitri, son of Czar Ivan, who had been assassinated; he declared himself ready to subdue Moscow for Rome if he was master of the Czars’ throne. Without thinking it over first, the Jesuits took it into their hands to introduce Ostrepjew to the Palatine of Sandomir who gave him his daughter in marriage; they spoke on his behalf to King Sigismond III and the pope regarding his expectations, and succeeded in making the Polish army rise against the Czar Boris Godounov. As a reward for these services, the false Dimitri renounced the religion of his fathers at Crascovie, one of the Jesuits’ houses, and promised the Order an establishment in Moscow, near the Kremlin, after his victory over Boris.

“But it was these favours from the Catholics which unleashed the hatred of the Russian Orthodox Church against Dimitri. On the 27th of May 1606, he was

massacred with several hundred Polish followers. Until then, one could hardly speak of a Russian national sentiment; but now, this feeling was very strong and took immediately the form of a fanatical hatred for the Roman Church and Poland.

“The alliance with Austria and the offensive politics of Sigismund III against the Turks, all of which were strongly encouraged by the Order, were just as disastrous for Poland. To put it briefly, **no other State suffered as much as Poland did under the Jesuits’ domination**. And in no other country, apart from Portugal, was the Society so powerful. Not only did Poland have a ‘king of the Jesuits’, but also a Jesuit King, Jean-Casimir, a sovereign who had belonged to the Order before his accession to the throne in 1649...

“While Poland was heading fast towards ruin, the number of Jesuit establishments and schools was growing so fast that the General made Poland into a special congregation in 1751 “.(27)

(27) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p.135 ss.

“In the Scandinavian countries”, wrote Mr. Pierre Dominique, “Lutheranism submerged everything else and, when the Jesuits made their counter-attack, they did not find what was found in Germany: a Catholic party already in the minority, but still strong”.(28)

Their only hope then was in the conversion of the sovereign who was secretly in favour of Catholicism; also, this king, Jean III Wasa, had married in 1568 a Polish princess, Catherine, a Roman Catholic. In 1574, Father Nicolai and other Jesuits were brought to the recently established school of theology where they became fervent Roman proselytizers, while officially assuming Lutheranism. Then, the clever negotiator Possevino secured the conversion of Jean III and the care of educating his son Sigismund, the future Sigismund III, king of Poland. When the time came to submit Sweden to the Holy See, the king’s conditions: marriage of priests, use of the vernacular in services and communion in both kinds, all of which had been rejected by the Roman Curia, brought the negotiations to a dead end. In any case, the king, who had lost his first wife, had remarried a Swedish Lutheran. The Jesuits had to leave the country.

“Fifty years later, the Order won another great victory in Sweden. Queen Christine, daughter of Gustave-Adolphe, the last of the Wasas, was converted under the teaching of two Jesuit professors, who had managed to reach Stockholm pretending to be travelling Italian noblemen. But, in order to change her religion without conflicts, she had to abdicate on the 24th of June 1654”.(29)

In England, on the other hand, the situation seemed more favourable to the Society and it could hope, for a while at least, to bring this country back under the Holy See’s jurisdiction.

(28) Pierre Dominique, op.cit, p.76.

(29) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.137, 138, 139.

“When Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558, Ireland was still entirely Catholic and England 50 per cent so... In 1542 already, Salmeron and Broet had been sent by the pope to survey Ireland”.(30)

Seminaries had been created under the Jesuits' direction in Douai, Pont-a-Mousson and Rome, with a view to train English, Irish and Scottish missionaries. In agreement with Philip II of Spain, the Roman Curia worked at overthrowing Elizabeth in favour of the Catholic Mary Stuart. An Irish uprising, provoked by Rome, had been crushed. But the Jesuits, who had arrived in England in 1580, took part in a large Catholic assembly at Southwark.

“Then, under diverse disguises, they spread from county to county, from country house to castle. In the evening, they would hear confession; in the morning, they would preach and give communion, then they would disappear as mysteriously as they had arrived. For, from the 15th of July, Elizabeth had proscribed them”.(31)

They printed and distributed secretly virulent pamphlets against the Queen and the Anglican Church. One of them, Father Campion, was caught, condemned for high treason and hanged. They also plotted at Edinburgh to win to their cause King James of Scotland. The result of all these disturbances was the execution of Mary Stuart in 1587.

Then came the Spanish expedition, the invincible Armada, which made England tremble for a while and brought about the “sacred union” around Elizabeth's throne. But the Company pursued none the less her projects and was training English priests at Valladolid, Seville, Madrid and Lisbon, while her secret propaganda continued in England under the direction of Father Garnett. After the Gunpowder Plot against James I, successor of Elizabeth, this Father Garnett was condemned for complicity and hanged, like Father Campion.

Under Charles I, then in Cromwell's Commonwealth, other Jesuits paid for their intrigues with their lives. The Order thought it would triumph under Charles II who, together with Louis XIV, had concluded a secret treaty at Dover, pledging to restore Catholicism in the land.

“The nation was not fully informed of these circumstances, but the little that transpired was enough to create an unbelievable agitation. All England shuddered before Loyola's spectre and the Jesuits' conspiracies”.(32)

(30) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.137-139.

(31) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.140-142.

(32) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.140, 142.

A meeting of them in the palace itself brought popular fury to a head.

“Charles II, who enjoyed the life of a king and did not want to go on another ‘journey across the seas’, hanged five Fathers for high treason at Tyburn... This did not abate the Jesuits.. However, Charles II was too prudent and too cynical for their liking, always ready to drop them. They thought victory was in sight when James II acceded to the throne. In fact, the king took up Mary Tudor’s old game, but used softer means. He pretended to convert England and established for the Jesuits, at the palace of Savoy, a college where four hundred students immediately took residence. A downright camarilla (a group of confidential, often scheming advisers; a cabal) of Jesuits took over the Palace...

“All these combinations were the main cause for the 1688 revolution. The Jesuits had to go against a stream too powerful. Then, England had twenty Protestants for each Catholic. The king was overthrown; all the members of the Company put in prison or banished. For some time, the Jesuits recommenced their work of secret agents, but it was nothing more than a futile agitation. They had lost the cause”.(33)

(33) Pierre Dominique, op.cit, pp.101, 102.

In 1551, the Order started to establish itself in France, which was seventeen years after its foundation in the chapel Saint-Denis at Montmartre.

Indeed, they presented themselves as effective adversaries of the Reformation which had won about one seventh of the French population, but people mistrusted these soldiers too devoted to the Holy See. So, their penetration on French soil was slow at first. As in all other countries where general opinion was not in their favour, they insinuated themselves first amongst people at Court, then, through them, into the upper classes. But in Paris, the Parliament, the University and even the clergy remained hostile. It came out clearly when they first attempted to open a college there.

“The Faculty of Theology, whose mission is to safeguard the principles of religion in France, decreed on the 1 st of December 1554, that ‘this society appears to be extremely dangerous regarding the faith, she is an enemy of the Church’s peace, fatal to the monastic state and seems to have been born to bring ruin rather than edification’ “. (34)

The Fathers were nevertheless allowed to settle at Billom, in a corner of Auvergne. From there, they organised a great action against the Reformation in the provinces of southern France. The famous Lainez, the man at the Council of Trent, distinguished himself in polemics, especially at the Colloquy of Poissy, in an unhappy attempt to conciliate the two doctrines (1561).

(34) Gaston Bally, op.cit., p.69.

Thanks to the Queen-Mother Catherine of Medici, the Order opened its first Parisian establishment, the College of Clermont, which was in competition

with the University. The opposition from this university, the clergy and the parliament was more or less pacified with concessions, verbal at least, made by the Company who promised to conform to the common right; but the University had fought hard and long against the introduction of "men bribed at the expense of France to arm themselves against the King", according to Etienne Pasquier, and whose words were proved right not long after.

There is no need to ask if the Jesuits "consented" to the Saint Bartholomew Massacre (1572). Did they "prepare" it? Who knows?... The Company's politics, subtle and supple in their proceedings, have very clear aims; it is the popes' politics: "destray heresy". Everything must be subordinated to this major aim. "Catherine of Medici worked towards this aim and the Company could count on the Guises".(35)

But this major design, helped so much by that massacre on the night of the 24th of August 1572, provoked a terrible blaze of fratricidal hatred. Three years later, it was the League, after the assassination of the duke de Guise, nicknamed "the king of Paris", and the appeal to His Most Christian Majesty to fight the Protestants.

"The shrewd Henry III did his best to avoid a war of religion. In agreement with Henry of Navarre, they gathered the Protestants and most of the moderate Catholics against Paris, the League and these partisans, mad Romans backed by Spain...

"The Jesuits, powerful in Paris, protested that the king of France had surrendered to heresy... The directing committee of the League deliberated at the Jesuits' house in the Street Saint-Antoine. Was Spain holding Paris? Hardly. The League? The League was only an instrument in skilful hands... "This Company of Jesus who had been fighting in the name of Rome for thirty years now... This was Paris's secret master".

"So, Henry III was assassinated. As the heir was a Protestant, the murder seemed at first glance to have been for other than political reasons; but is it not possible that those who planned it and persuaded the Jacobin Clement to carry it out were hoping for an uprising of Catholic France against the Huguenot heir? The fact is that a little later Clement was called an "angel" by the Jesuit Camelet, and Guignard, another Jesuit who was eventually hanged, gave his students as a means of moulding their opinions tyrannicidal texts as subjects for their latin exercises".(36)

Amongst other things, these school exercises contained this: "Jacques Clement has done a meritorious act inspired by the Holy Spirit... If we can make war against the king, then let us do it; if we cannot make war against him, then let us put him to death..." And this: "We made a big mistake at the Saint-Bartholomew; we should have bled the royal vein".(37)

(35) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., p.84.

(36) and (37) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., pp.85, 86, 89.

In 1592, a certain Barriere who tried to assassinate Henry IV confessed that Father Varade, rector of the Jesuits in Paris, had persuaded him to do it. In 1594, another attempt was made by Jean Chatel, former pupil of the Jesuits

who had heard his confession just before carrying it out. It was on that occasion that the previously mentioned school exercises were seized at the house of Father Guignard. "The Father was hanged at Greve while the king confirmed an edict of Parliament banishing the sons of Loyola from the kingdom, as "corrupters of youth, disturbers of public peace and enemies of the State and crown of France...". The edict was not carried out fully and, in 1603, it was revoked by the king against the advice of Parliament. Aquaviva, the general of the Jesuits, had been clever in his manoeuvres and led king Henry IV to believe that the Order, reestablished in France, would loyally serve national interests. How could he, subtle as he was, believe that these fanatical Romans would indeed accept the Edict of Nantes (1498) which determined the rights of Protestants in France, and, even worse, they would back up his projects against Spain and the Emperor? The fact is, Henry IV chose as his confessor and tutor for the Dauphin one of the most distinguished members of the Company, Father Cotton (38a).

On the 16th of May 1610, on the eve of his campaign against Austria, he was murdered by Ravaillac who confessed having been inspired by the writings of Fathers Mariana and Suarez. These two sanctioned the murders of heretic "tyrants" or those insufficiently devoted to the papacy's interests. The duke of Epernon, who made the king read a letter while the assassin was lying in wait, was a notorious friend of the Jesuits, and Michelet proved that they knew of this attempt. "In fact, Ravaillac had confessed to the Jesuit Father d'Aubigny just before and, when the judges interrogated the priest, he merely replied that God had given him the gift to forget immediately what he heard in the confessional".(38)

Parliament, persuaded that Ravaillac had only been a tool for the Company, ordered the executioner to burn Mariana's book.

"Fortunately, Aquaviva was still there. Once again, this great general schemed well; he condemned most severely the legitimacy of tyrannicide. The Company always had authors who, in the silence of their studies, exposed the doctrine in all its rectitude; she also possessed great politicians who, when necessary, would put the right masks on it".(39)

(38a) His adversaries used to say that he had "cotton" in his ears!

(38) Henri Fulop-Miller, *op.cit.*, p. 113.

(39) Pierre Dominique, *op.cit.*, p.95.

Thanks to Father Cotton who took the situation in hand, the Society of Jesus came out of the storm unscathed. Her wealth, the number of her establishments and adherents grew rapidly. But when Louis XIII came to the throne, and Richelieu took the affairs of State in hand, there was a clash of wills. The Cardinal would not let anyone oppose his politics. The Jesuit Caussin, confessor of the king, was able to find that out when he was put in prison at Rennes, on Richelieu's order, as a State criminal. This act produced the best results. In order to stay in France, the Order went as far as collaborating with the redoubtable Minister.

H. Boehmer wrote this about it: "The lack of consideration for the Church always shown by the French government, since Philippe le Bel, in the

conflicts between national and ecclesiastic interests had been, once again, the best politics".(40)

(40) H. Boehmer, *op.cit.*, p. 100.

The accession of Louis XIV marked the start of the most prosperous time for the Order. The "laxism" of Jesuit confessors, this clever leniency they used to attract sinners not very anxious to make penance, was employed extensively amongst ordinary people as well as at Court, especially with the king who was more a ladies' man than devout.

His Majesty had no intention of renouncing his amorous affairs, and his confessor was careful to keep off the subject, in spite of it being plain adultery. So, all the royal family was soon provided with Jesuit confessors only, and their influence grew more and more amongst the high society. The priests of Paris attacked in their "Writings" the loose morals of the famous Company's casuists, but to no avail. Pascal himself intervened, in vain, in favour of the Jansenists, during the great theological quarrel of that time; in his "Provincial letters", he exposed their too worldly opponents, the Jesuits, to eternal ridicule.

In spite of it, the secure place they held at Court assured them of victory, and those of Port-Royal succumbed. The Order was to win another great victory for Rome, whose consequences were against national interests. It goes without saying that they had only unwillingly accepted the religious peace assured through the Edict of Nantes, and had continued a secret war against the French Protestants. As Louis XIV was getting older, he turned more and more to bigotry under the influence of Madame de Maintenon and Father La Chaise, his confessor. In 1681, they persuaded him to restart the persecution against the Protestants. Finally, on the 17th of October 1685, he signed the "Revocation of the Edict of Nantes", making those of his subjects who refused to embrace the Catholic religion outlaws. Soon after, to accelerate the conversions, those famous "dragonnade" started; that sinister name became part of all subsequent attempts to proselytize by fire and chains. While the fanatics cheered, the Protestants fled from the kingdom en-masse. According to Marshal Vauban, France lost in that way 400,000 inhabitants and 60 million francs. Manufacturers, merchants, shipowners, skilful artisans went to other countries and brought them the benefit of their abilities.

"17th of October 1685 was a day of victory for the Jesuits, the final reward for a war which had gone on for one hundred and twenty-five years without respite. But the State paid the cost of the Jesuits' victory. "The depopulation, the reduction of national prosperity were the acute material consequences of their triumph, followed by a spiritual impoverishment which could not be cured, even by the best Jesuit school. This what France suffered and the Society of Jesus had to pay for very dearly later".(41)

During the century following, the sons of Loyola saw, not only France, but all the european countries reject them from their midst—but, once again, it was only for a while; these fanatical janissaries of the papacy had not finished to accumulate ruins in the pursuit of their impossible dream.

(41) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p.103.

The conversion of "pagans" had been the first objective of the Society of Jesus' founder. Even though the necessity to combat Protestantism in Europe involved its disciples more and more, and this political as well as religious action, of which we just gave a short summary, became their main task, they still pursued the evangelisation of distant lands.

Their theocratic ideal: to bring the world under the Holy See's authority, required that they should go into all the regions of the globe, in the conquest of souls.

Francis Xavier, one of Ignatius' first companions who, like him, was canonised by the Church, was the great promoter of Asia's evangelisation. In 1542, he disembarked at Goa and found there a bishop, a cathedral and a convent of Franciscans who, together with some Portuguese priests, had already tried to spread around them the religion of Christ. He gave that first attempt such a strong impetus that he was surnamed the "Apostle of India". Actually, he was more a pioneer and "exciter" than one who really accomplished something lasting. Fiery, enthusiastic, always on the look-out for new fields of action, he showed the way more than he cleared the ground. In the kingdom of Travancore, at Malacca, on the islands of Banda, Macassar and Ceylon, his personal charm, and his eloquent speeches did wonders and, as a result, 70,000 "idolaters" were converted especially amongst the low caste. To obtain this, he did not despise the political and even military support of the Portuguese. These results, more showy than solid, were bound to rouse interest for the missions in Europe as well as throwing a brilliant lustre over the Society of Jesus.

The untiring but little persevering apostle soon left India for Japan, then China, where he was about to enter when he died at Canton, in 1552.

His successor in India, Robert de Nobile, applied in that country the same methods the Jesuits used in Europe very successfully. He appealed to the higher classes. To the "untouchables", he gave the consecrated water only on the end of a stick.

He adopted the clothes, habits and way of living of the Brahmins, mixed their rites with Christian ones, all with the approval of Pope Gregory XV. Thanks to this ambiguity, he "converted", so he claimed, 250,000 Hindus. But, "about a century after his death, when the intransigent pope Benedict XIV forbade the observance of these Hindu rites, everthing collapsed and the 250,000 pseudo-Catholics disappeared".(1)

In the north Indian territories of the Great Mogol Akbar, a tolerant man who even tried to introduce into his States a religious syncretism, the Jesuits were allowed to build an establishment at Lahore in 1575. Akbar's successors granted them the same favours. But Aureng-Zeb (1666-1707), an orthodox Moslem, put an end to this enterprise.

In 1549, Xavier embarked for Japan with two companions and a Japanese he had converted at Malacca called Yagiuro. The beginnings were not very promising.

"The Japanese have their own mortality and are rather reserved; their past has set them in paganism. The adults look at those strangers with amusement and the children follow them, jeering".(2) Yagiro, a native, managed to start a small community of one hundred adherents. But Francis Xavier, who did not speak Japanese very well, could not even obtain an audience from the Mikado. When he left that country, two Fathers stayed behind who eventually secured the conversion of the daimos of Arima and Bungo. When this particular one so decided in 1578, he had been considering the matter for 27 years. The following year, the Fathers settled at Nagasaki. They pretended to have converted 100,000 Japanese. In 1587, the internal situation of the land, torn apart by clan wars, changed entirely. "The Jesuits had taken advantage of that anarchy and their close relations with Portuguese merchants."(3) Hideyoshi, a man of low birth, had usurped power and taken the title of Taikosama. He distrusted the Jesuits' political influence, their association with the Portuguese and their connections with the great and wild vassals, the Samurai. In consequence, the young Japanese Church was violently persecuted, six Franciscans and three Jesuits were crucified; many converts were murdered and the Order was banished.

(1) "Les Jesuites", in "Le Crapouillot", Nr. 24, 1954, p.42. (2) "Le Crapouillot", op.cit., p.43. (3) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p.162.

Nevertheless, the decree was not carried out. The Jesuits continued their apostolate in secret. But, in 1614, the first Shogun, Tokugawa Ieyasu, became uneasy with their occult actions and the persecution started again. Besides, the Dutch had taken the place of the Portuguese at the business' counters and were closely watched by the government. A profound distrust of all foreigners, ecclesiastics or laymen inspired from then on the conduct of leaders and, in 1638, a rebellion of the Nagasaki Christians was drowned in blood. For the Jesuits, the Japanese adventure had come to an end, and was to remain so for a long time.

We can read in the remarkable work of Lord Bertrand Russell "Science and Religion" the following racy passage about Francis Xavier the miracle worker: "He and his companions wrote many long letters which were kept; in them, they gave accounts of their labours, but none of those written in his lifetime made any mention of miraculous powers. Joseph Acosta, the Jesuit who was so much troubled by Peru's animals, expressly denied that these missionaries had been helped by miracles in their efforts to convert the pagans. But, soon after Xavier's death, stories of miracles started to abound. It was said that he had the gift of tongues, even though his letters were full of allusions to the difficulties he had to master the Japanese language or find good interpreters.

"Stories were told of how, when his friends had felt thirsty at sea, he had changed salt water into fresh. When he dropped his crucifix into the sea, a crab brought it back to him. According to a later version, he had thrown the crucifix into the sea to still a tempest. When he was canonised in 1622, it was proved, to the satisfaction of the Vatican authorities, that he had accomplished miracles, as no one can become a saint without them. The pope gave his official guarantee to the gift of tongues and was particularly impressed by the fact that Xavier had made the lamps burn with holy water

instead of oil.

"This same pope, Urban VIII, refused to believe Galileo's statements. The legend continued to improve: a biography by Father Bonhours, published in 1682, tells us that the saint had resuscitated fourteen persons during his lifetime. "Catholic authors still attribute to him the gift of miracles; in a biography published in 1872, Father Coleridge of the Society of Jesus restated that he had the gift of tongues".(4)

Judging by the exploits just mentioned, saint Francis Xavier well deserved his halo.

In China, the sons of Loyola had a long and favourable time with only a few expulsions in-between; they obtained this on condition they would work there mainly as scientists and bow to the thousands of years old rite of this ancient civilisation.

(4) Lord Bertrand Russell: "Science and religion" (Ed. Gallimard, Paris 1957, pp.84-85)

"Meteorology was the main subject. Francis Xavier had already found out that the Japanese did not know the earth was round and were very interested in what he taught them on that and other similar subjects. "In China, it became official and, as the Chinese were not fanatical, things developed peaceably." "An Italian, Father Ricci, was the initiator of it.

Having made his way to Peking, he played the part of an astronomer before the Chinese scientists... Astronomy and mathematics were an important part of Chinese institutions. These sciences enabled the sovereign to date their various seasonal religious and civil ceremonies... Ricci brought information which made him indispensable and he used this opportunity to speak about Christianity... He sent for two Fathers who amended the traditional calendar, establishing the accord between the course of the stars and earthly events. Ricci helped with lesser tasks as well; for instance, he drew a mural map of the empire, where he carefully put China at the center of the universe..."(5)

This was the Jesuits' main work in that Celestial Empire; as for the religions side of their mission, the interest in it was minute. It is rather amusing to think that, in Peking, the Fathers were busy rectifying the astronomical mistakes of the Chinese, while, in Rome, the Holy See persistently condemned the Copernican system, and that until 1822! In spite of the fact that the Chinese had very little inclination for mysticism, the first Catholic church opened at Peking in 1599. When Ricci died, he was replaced by a German, Father Shall von Bell, an astronomer who also published some remarkable tracts in the Chinese language; in 1644, he was given the title of "President of the mathematical Tribunal", which created jealousy amongst the mandarins. In the meantime, the Christian communities organised themselves. In 1617, the emperor must have foreseen the dangers of this pacific penetration when he decreed the banishment of all foreigners. The good Fathers were sent to the Portuguese at Macao in wooden cages. But, soon after, they were called back. They were such good astronomers!

In fact, they were just as good as missionaries with 41 residences in China ,

159 churches and 257,000 baptised members. But a new reaction against them called for their banishment and Father Shall was condemned to death. No doubt he had not incurred this sentence merely for his work in mathematics! An earthquake and the burning of the imperial palace, cleverly presented as a sign of wrath from heaven, saved his life and he died peacefully two years later. But his companions had to leave China. In spite of all, the esteem for the Jesuits was so great that emperor Kang- Hi felt obliged to call them back in 1669, and ordered solemn funerals for the remains of Iam Io Vam (Jean-Adam Shall). These unusual honours were only the start of exceptional favours".(6)

(5) "Le Crapouillot", op.cit. p.44.

(6) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p. 168.

A Belgian Father, Verbiest, followed Shall at the head of the missions— and also the Imperial mathematical Institute. He was the one who gave to Peking's Observatory those famous instruments whose mathematical precision is concealed by chimeras, dragons, etc. Kang-Hi, "the enlightened despot", who reigned for 61 years, appreciated the services of that scientist who gave him wise advice, accompanied him to war and even managed a foundry for cannons. But this profane and war-like activity was directed "ad majorem Dei gloriam", as the good Father reminded the emperor in a note he sent him before his death: "Sir, I die happy as I used nearly every moment of my life to serve Your Majesty. But I pray Him very humbly to remember, after my death, that my aim in all I did was to procure a protector for the most holy religion in the universe; and this protector was you, the greatest king in the East".(7)

However, in China as in Malabar, this religion could not survive without some artifice. The Jesuits had to bring the Roman doctrine to the Chinese level, identify God with heaven (Tien) or the Chang-Ti (Emperor from on-high), blend Catholic rites with Chinese rites, accept Confucian teachings, the cult of the ancestors, etc.

Pope Clement XI, who was told of it by rival Orders, condemned this doctrinal "laxism" and, as a result, all the missionary work of the Jesuits in the Celestial Empire collapsed.

The successors of Kang-Hi proscribed Christianity and the last Fathers left in China died there and were never replaced.

(7) "Correspondence" of Verbiest (Brussels 1931, p.551)

The missionaries of the Society of Jesus found the New World much more favourable to their proselytism than Asia. There, they found no old and learned civilisations, no religions solidly established, nor any philosophical traditions, but only poor and barbarian tribes, unarmed spiritually as well as temporally before the white conquerors. Only Mexico and Peru, with the memory of Aztec and Inca gods still fresh in their minds, resisted this imported religion for quite a long time. Also, the Dominicans and Franciscans had already established themselves solidly. It was then amongst the wild tribes, nomadic hunters and fishermen, that the sons of Loyola exercised their devouring activity; the results they obtained varied according to the fierceness and opposition of the various populations.

In Canada, the Hurons, peaceful and docile, accepted easily their catechism, but their enemies, the Iroquois, attacked the stations created around Fort Sainte-Marie and massacred the inhabitants. The Hurons were practically exterminated within ten years and, in 1649, the Jesuits had to leave with about three hundred survivors. They did not make a strong impression when they went through the territories which, today, make up the United States, and it was only during the 19th century that they started putting some roots down in that part of the continent.

In South America, the Jesuits' action met with some good and bad fortunes, In 1546, the Portuguese had called them to work in the territories they possessed in Brazil; while converting the natives, they encountered many conflicts with civil authority and other religious Orders. The same thing happened in New Granada. But Paraguay was the land for the great "experience" of Jesuitical colonisation; this country spread then from the Atlantic to the Andes and comprised territories which, today, belong to Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina. The only means of access through the virgin jungle was on the Paraguay and Parana rivers. The population of that land was made up of nomadic and docile Indians, ready to bow to anyone's domination as long as they were supplied with enough food and a little tobacco. The Jesuits could not find better conditions to establish, away from the corruption of whites and half-castes, the perfect type of colony, a city of God according to their heart's desire. At the start of the 17th century, Paraguay was made into a Province by the general of the Order who had been given all powers by the Court of Spain, and the "Jesuit State" developed and flourished.

These good savages were duly catechised and trained to live a sedentary life under a discipline as gentle as it was strong: "as an iron hand in a velvet glove". These patriarchal societies deliberately ignored liberties of any kind. "All that a Christian possesses, and uses, the hut in which he lives, the fields he cultivates, the livestock which provide his food and clothes, the arms he carries, the tools he works with, even the only table knife given to every young couple when they set up home, is "Tupambac" God's property. From the same conception, the "Christian" cannot dispose of his time and person freely. The suckling child is under his mother's protection. As soon as he can walk, he is in the Fathers' or their agents' power... When the child grows up, it learns, if it is a girl, to spin and weave, and if it is a boy, to read and write, but only in guarani; for Spanish is severely prohibited so as to prevent all trading with the corrupted Creoles... As soon as a girl is fourteen and a boy sixteen years of age, they are married, as the Fathers are anxious not to see them fall into some carnal sin... None of them can become priest monk, and even less Jesuit... They have practically no liberty left. But they are obviously very happy, materially speaking... In the morning, after mass, each gang of workers go to the fields one after another, singing and preceded by some holy image; in the evening, they come back to the village in the same manner, to hear the catechism or recite the rosary. The Fathers have also thought out some honest entertainments and recreations for the "Christians" ...

"The Jesuits watch over them like fathers; and, like fathers also, they punish the smallest mistakes... The whip, fasting, prison, pillory on the

public square, public penance in the church, these are the chastisements they use... So, the "red" children of Paraguay know no other authority than that of the good Fathers. They do not even vaguely suspect that the king of Spain is their sovereign".(8)

Is this not a picture somewhat caricatured the perfect picture of the ideal theocratic society?

But let us consider how it affected the intellectual and moral advancement of the beneficiaries of that system, these "poor innocents" as they were called by the marquess de Loreto: "The missions' high culture is nothing more than an artificial product from an hot-house, carrying in itself a seed of death. Because, in spite of all this breaking in and training, the Guarani remained deep down what he was: a lazy savage, narrow-minded, sensual, greedy and sordid. As the Fathers themselves say, he only works when he feels the overseer's goad behind him. As soon as they are left to themselves, they are indifferent to the fact that the harvest is rotting in the field, implements are deteriorating and the herds are scattered; if he is not watched when working in the fields, he can even suddenly unyoke an ox and butcher it on the spot, light a fire with the wood of the plough and, with his companions, start eating the half-cooked flesh until none of it is left. He knows that he will get 25 lashings of the whip for it, but also that the good Fathers would never let him starve to death".(9)

(8) and (9) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp. 197 ss.

In a book recently published, we can read the following concerning the Jesuits' punishments: "The culprit, dressed in the clothes of a penitent, was escorted to church where he confessed his fault. Then he was whipped on the public square according to the penal code... The culprits always received this chastisement, not only without murmurs, but also with thanksgivings..." "The guilty one, having been punished and reconciled, kissed the hand of the one who struck him, saying: "May God reward you for freeing me, by this light punishment, from the eternal sorrows which threatened me".(10)

After reading this, we can understand Mr. H. Boehmer's conclusion: "The Guarani's moral life enriched itself very little under the Fathers' discipline. He became a devout and superstitious Catholic who sees miracles everywhere and seems to enjoy flagellating himself until blood appears; he learned to obey and was attached to the good Fathers, who cared so well for him, with a filial gratitude which, even though not very deep, was nevertheless very tenacious. This not very brilliant result proves that there was some important defect in the educative methods of the Fathers. What was that defect? The fact that they never tried to develop, in their "red" children, the inventive faculties, the need for activity, the feeling of responsibility; they themselves invented games and recreations for their christians, they thought for them instead of encouraging them to think for themselves; they merely submitted those who were under their care to a mechanical "breaking in" instead of educating them".(11)

(10) Clovis Lugon: "La Republique communiste chretienne des Guaranis" p.197. (11) H. Boehmer, op.cit. pp.204-205.

How could it be otherwise when they themselves had gone through a “breaking in” lasting fourteen years? Were they going to teach the Guaranis and their white pupils to “think for themselves”, when they were absolutely forbidden to do so?

It is not a Jesuit of old, but a contemporary one who writes: “He (the Jesuit) will not forget that the characteristic virtue of the Company is total obedience of the action, the will, and even the judgement... All the superiors will be bound in the same way to higher ones and the Father General to the Holy Father... It was so arranged as to render the Holy See’s authority universally efficacious, and saint Ignatius was sure that teaching and education would henceforth bring back to Catholic unity a Europe torn apart”.

It is with the hope of “reforming the world”, wrote Father Bonhours, “that he particularly embraced this means: the instruction of youth...” (12)

The education of Paraguay’s natives was done on the same principles the Fathers used to apply, now apply and will apply on everyone and everywhere; their aim, deplored by Mr. Boehmer, but which is ideal to the eyes of those fanatics: the renouncement of all personal judgement, all initiative, a blind submission to the superiors. Is it not that “height of freedom”, “the liberation from one’s own bondage” praised by R.P. Rouquette and which we mentioned earlier on?

In fact, the good Guaranis had been “liberated” so well by the Jesuitical method for more than one hundred and fifty years that, when their masters left during the 18th century, they went back into their forests and returned to their ancient customs as if nothing had happened.

(12) F. Charmot, s.j.: “La Pedagogie des Jesuites” (Edit. Spes, Paris 1943, p.39).

“The pedagogic method of the Company”, wrote R.P. Charmot, S.J., “consists first of all of surrounding the pupils with a great network of prayers...” Later, he quotes the Jesuit Father Tacchini: “May the Holy Spirit fill them as alabasters are filled with perfumes; may He penetrate them so much that, as time goes on, they will be able to breathe in more and more celestial fragrance and the perfume of Christ!”

Father Gandier also has a contribution: “Let us not forget that education, as seen by the Company, is the ministry most similar to that of angels”. (1)

Later, Father Charmot has this to say: “Let us not be anxious as to where and how mysticism is inserted into education!...” “It is not done through a system or artificial technique, but by infiltration, by “endosmosis”. The children’s souls are impregnated because of their being in close “contact with masters who are literally saturated with it”.(2)

From the same author, here is “the aim of the Jesuit professor”: “Through his teaching, he aims to form, not an intellectual Christian elite, but elite christians”.(3)

(1,2,3) F. Charmot, S.J. op.cit., pp.413, 415, 417, 442, 493.

These few quotations tell us enough about the principal aim of these educators. Let us see now how they form these elite Christians, and what kind of mysticism is "inserted" (or inoculated), "infiltrated" or "pumped into" children submitted to their educational system.

At the front—it is characteristic of this Order—we find the Virgin Mary. "Loyola had made the Virgin the most important thing in his life. The Worship of Mary was the base of his religious devotions and was handed down by him to his Order. This worship developed so much that it was often said, and with good reason, that it was the Jesuits' real religion".(4)

This was not written by a Protestant, but by J. Huber, professor of Catholic theology.

Loyola himself was convinced that the Virgin had inspired him when he had drawn up his "Exercises". A Jesuit had a vision of Mary covering the Society with her mantle as a sign of her special protection. Another one, Rodrigue de Gois, was so enraptured with her inexpressible beauty that he was seen soaring into the air. A novice of this Order, who died in Rome in 1581, was sustained by the Virgin in his fight against the devil's temptations; to strengthen him, she gave him a taste of her Son's blood from time to time and "the comfort of her breasts".(5)

Duns Scot's doctrine of the Immaculate Conception" was enthusiastically adopted by the Order which was successful in having it made into a dogma by Pius IX in 1854.

"Erasmus satirically depicted the worship of Mary of his time. During the fourth century, the tale of Loretto's house had been invented; this house had apparently been brought from Palestine by angels. The Jesuits welcomed and defended this legend. Canisius went as far as producing letters from Mary herself and, thanks to the Order, great wealth started to pour in at Loretto (as at Lourdes, Fatima, etc..)

"The Jesuits brought forth all kinds of relics of the Mother of God. When they made their entrance into the church of Saint-Michael at Munich, they offered to the veneration of the faithful pieces of Mary's veil, several tufts of her hair and pieces of her comb; they instituted a special cult, consecrated to worship these objects..."

"This worship degenerated into licentious and sensual manifestations, in particular in the hymns dedicated to the Virgin by Father Jacques Pontanus. The poet knew of nothing more beautiful than Mary's breasts, nothing sweeter than her milk and nothing more delightful than her abdomen".(6)

One could multiply these citations endlessly. Ignatius wanted his disciples to have a "perceptible", or even sensual piety, similar to his own, and they obviously succeeded. No wonder they were so successful with the Guarani; this erotic fetichism suited them perfectly. But the good Fathers always thought it would suit the "whites" just as well. As the foundation of their doctrine is an utter contempt for people as human beings, "whites" or "reds" were just the same, and both had to be treated as if they were children.

(4) and (5) J. Huber, op.cit., pp.98-99.

(6) "Oeuvres completes" de Bucher (Munich 1819, II, p.477 ss.)

So they work relentlessly at propagating this spirit and these idolatrous practices; because of the influence they hold over the Holy See, which cannot do without them, they force them on the Roman Church, in spite of the resistance which has gradually decreased.

"Father Barri wrote a book entitled: "Paradise opens through one hundred devotions to the Mother of God". In it, he expounds the idea that the way by which we enter paradise is not important: the important thing is to enter. He enumerates exercises of exterior piety to Mary which open heaven's doors. Amongst other things, these exercises consist of giving to Mary morning and evening salutations; frequently charging the angles to greet her; expressing the desire to build her more churches than all those built by monarchs put together; carrying day and night a rosary as a bracelet, an image of Mary, etc...

"These practices are enough to assure our salvation and if the devil, when we are about to die, makes claims on our souls, we just have to remind him that Mary is responsible for us and he must sort things out with her".(7)

In his "Pietas quotidiana erga S.D. Mariam", Father Pemble recommends the following: "To beat or flagellate ourselves, and offer each blow as a sacrifice to God, through Mary to carve with a knife the holy name of Mary on our chest: to cover ourselves decently at night so as not to offend the chaste gaze of Mary; to tell the Virgin you would be willing to offer her your place in heaven if she didn't have her own; to wish you had never been born or go to hell if Mary had not been born; to never eat an apple, as Mary had been kept from the mistake of tasing of it".(8)

All this was written in 1764, but one only has to glance through similar works published today in great numbers, or just the Catholic press, to establish the fact that, for two hundred years, this wild idolatry had done nothing but grow and embellish. The late pope Pius XII distinguished himself as far as the ownership of Mary is concerned. Under his rule, a large part of the Roman Church followed suit.

Moreover, the sons of Loyola, who are always anxious to conform to the spirit of the age, try to today to accommodate these mediaeval puerilities, and there are several tracts published by some of these good Fathers under the grand auspices of the "Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique" (C.N.R.S.)

If we add to this the scapulars of various colours with their appropriate virtues, the worship of saints, images, relics, the apology of the "miracles", the adoration of the Sacred Heart, we will have some idea of the "mysticism" with which "the children's souls are impregnated" through their contact with masters "who are saturated with it"—as R.P. Charmot wrote in 1943.

(7) and (8) J. Huber, op.cit., 106-108.

There is no other way to form "elite Christians". Nevertheless, if they were to win their fight against the Universities, the Jesuit colleges had to expand their teaching and include secular subjects, as the Renaissance had awakened a thirst for learning. We know that they gladly carried it out while taking all the necessary precautions to prevent this learning going against the aim of their teaching: maintaining the minds in complete obedience to the Church.

That is why their pupils are first of all "surrounded" by this "great web of prayers", which would not be sufficient if the learning imparted was not carefully purged from all heterodox spirit and ideas. So, Greek and Latin, (Latin is regarded very highly in these colleges), were studied for their literary value; but the "antique" orthodox thought was expounded just enough to establish the so-called superior scholastic philosophy. These "humanists" they were training were able to compose discourses and latin verses, but the only master of their thoughts was saint Thomas Aquinas, a monk of the 13th century.

Listen to "Ratio Studiorum", fundamental treatise of Jesuit pedagogy, quoted by R.P. Charmot: "We will carefully discard secular subjects which do not favour good morals and piety. We will compose poems; but may our poets be Christians and not followers of pagans who invoke Muses, mountain nymphs, sea-nymphs, Calliope, Apollo, etc... or other gods and goddesses. What's more, if these are to be mentioned, may it be with the view to caricature them, as they are only demons..."(9)

So, all sciences—and especially natural sciences—will be "interpreted" in like manner.

In fact, R.P. Charmot doesn't even try to hide it in what he said about the Jesuit professor in 1943: "He teaches sciences, not for themselves, but only with the view to bring about God's greatest glory. It is the rule laid down by Saint Ignatius in his "Constitutions". 10)

And again: "When we speak of a whole culture, we do not mean that we teach all subjects and sciences, but we give a literary and scientific education which is not purely secular and impermeable to the lights of Revelation".(11)

The instruction dispensed by the Jesuits was therefore bound to be more flashy than profound, or "formalistic" as it is often called. "They did not believe in liberty, which was fatal as far as teaching is concerned", wrote H. Boehmer.

"The truth is that the relative merits of the Jesuits' teaching diminished while science and the methods of education and instruction progressed and developed, on the basis of a wider and deeper conception of Humanity. Buckle said: "The more civilisation advanced, the more the Jesuits lost ground, not merely because of their own decadence, but because of all the modifications and changes in the minds of those around them... During the 16th century, the Jesuits were ahead, but during the 18th century, they were behind their time".(12)

(9,10,11) F. Charmot, S.J. op.cit., pp.318-319, 508-509, 494. (12) J. Huber, op.cit., II, p.177.

The conquering spirit of their Society, the burning desire to attract consciences and hold them under their exclusive influence, could only induce the Jesuits to be more lenient with the penitents than confessors of other Orders or the secular clergy. "We do not catch flies with vinegar", rightly says the proverb.

As we have already seen, Ignatius expressed the same idea in different terms and his sons drew their inspiration from it. "The extraordinary activity deployed by the Order in the field of moral theology already shows that this subtle science had, for him, a much greater practical importance than the other sciences".(13)

Mr. Boehmer, who wrote the phrase we just quoted, reminds us that confession was very rare during the Middle Ages and the faithful resorted to it only in the gravest cases. But the domineering character of the Roman Church made the practice of it spread and grow more and more. In fact, during the 16th century, confession had become a religious duty which had to be diligently observed. Ignatius considered it most important and recommended to his disciples that as many of the faithful as possible should observe it regularly.

"The results of this method were extraordinary. The Jesuit confessors soon enjoyed everywhere the same consideration shown to the Jesuit professors, and the confessional was considered by all as the symbol of the Order's power and activity, as were the professorial chair and the Latin grammar...

"If we read Ignatius' Instructions regarding confession and moral theology, we must admit that, from the beginning, the Order was prepared to treat the sinner kindly, that as time went on, it showed more and more indulgence until this kindness degenerated into slackness...

"We can understand easily why this clever leniency made them such successful confessors. This is how they won the favours of the nobles and high-ups of this world who always needed the condescension of their confessors more than the mass of ordinary sinners.

"The Courts of the Middle Ages never had any all-powerful confessors. This characteristic figure appeared in the life of the Courts only in modern times and it is the Jesuit Order which implanted it everywhere".(14)

(13) and (14) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.244-246.

Mr Boehmer wrote: "During the 17th century, these confessors not only obtained an appreciable political influence everywhere, but even accepted, and sometimes openly, political posts or functions. It is then that Father Neidhart took the direction of Spanish politics as 'prime minister and Grand Inquisitor'; Father Fernandez sat and was entitled to speak and vote in the Portuguese Council; Father La Chaise and his successor held the functions of ministers for Ecclesiastical Affairs at the Court of France. "Let us remember

also the part played by the Fathers in general politics, even outside the confessional: Father Possevino as pontifical legate in Sweden, Poland and Russia; Father Petre, a Minister in England; Father Vota as intimate counsellor of Jean Sobieski of Poland, as 'maker of kings' in Poland, as mediator when Prussia was made into a kingdom; –one must admit that no other Order showed so much interest and talent for politics, and deployed so much activity in it than the Jesuit Order".(15)

"If the 'indulgence' of these confessors towards their august penitents helped greatly the interests of the Order and the Roman Curia, it was the same in the more modest spheres where the Fathers used similar convenient methods. With their meticulous, and even meddlesome spirit, which they inherited from their founder; the famous "casuists" such as Escobar, Mariana, Sanchez, Busenbaum, etc., applied themselves to studying each rule in particular and their applications to all the cases which could be presented at the tribunal of penance; their tracts on "moral theology" gave the Company a universal reputation as their subtlety to distort and pervert the most evident moral obligations was so apparent.

(15) and (16) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.247-248, 238 ss.

Here are some examples of these acrobatics: "The divine Law prescribes "You shall not bear false witness". "There is false witness only if the one who took the oath uses words which he knows will deceive the judge. The use of ambiguous terms is therefore allowed, and even the excuse of mental reservation in certain circumstances..." "If a husband asks his adulterous wife if she has broken the conjugal contract, she can say "no" without hesitation as that contract still exists. Once she has obtained absolution at the confessional, she can say: "I am without sin", if, while she says it, she thinks of that absolution which took the load of her sin. If her husband is still incredulous, she can reassure him by saying that she has not committed adultery, and if she adds (under her breath) adultery she is obliged to confess."

It is not hard to imagine that such a theory was successful with their beautiful penitent ladies!

In fact, their gallant escorts were treated just as well: "The Law of God commands: "You shall not kill". "But it doesn't mean that every man who kills sins against this precept. For example, if a nobleman is threatened with blows or beating, he can kill his aggressor; but of course this right is only for the nobleman and not the plebeian, as there is nothing dishonourable for a common man to receive a beating... "In the same way, a servant who helps his master seduce a young girl is not committing a mortal sin if he can fear serious disadvantages or bad treatment in case he refuses. If a young girl is pregnant, a miscarriage can be induced if her fault is the cause of dishonour for herself or a member of the clergy."(17) As for Father Benzi, he had his hour of fame when he declared: "it is only a slight offence to feel the breasts of a nun", and, because of it, the Jesuits were nicknamed the "mamillary theologians".

But, as far as that is concerned, the famous Casuist, Thomas Lanchz, deserves

the prize for his tract "De Matrimonio", in which the pious author studies with outrageous details all the varieties of "carnal sin". Also, let us study further these convenient maxims as far as politics are concerned, especially those relative to the legitimacy of assassinating "tyrants" found guilty of lukewarmness towards the sacred interests of the Holy See. Mr. Boehmer has this to say: "As we have just seen, it is not difficult to guard against mortal sin. Depending on circumstances, we only have to use the excellent means permitted by the Fathers: "equivocation, mental reservation, the subtle theory of the direction of intentions," and we will be able to commit, without sin, acts which are considered criminal by the ignorant masses, but in which even the most severe Father will not be able to find an atom of mortal sin".(18)

(17) and (18) H. Boehmer, op.cit., pp.238, 241.

Amongst the most criminal Jesuitic maxims, there is one which roused public indignation to the highest point and deserves to be examined; it is: "A monk or priest is allowed to kill those who are ready to slander him or his community."

So, the Order gives itself the right to eliminate its adversaries and even those of its members who, having come out of it, are too talkative. This pearl is found in the "Theology of Father L'Amy".

There is another case where this principle finds its application. For, this same Jesuit was cynical enough to write: "If a Father, yielding to temptation, abuses a woman and she publicises what has happened, and, because of it, dishonours him, this same Father can kill her to avoid disgrace!"

Another son of Loyola, quoted by "Le grand flambeau" Caramuel, thinks that this maxim must be upheld and defended: "the Father can use it as an excuse to kill the woman and so preserve his honour". This monstrous theory was used to cover many crimes committed by ecclesiastics and probably was, in 1956, the reason if not the cause for the lamentable affair of the priest of Uruffe.

The successes the Society of Jesus obtained in Europe and far-off lands, even though interspersed by some misfortunes, assured it a preponderant situation for a long time. But, as we have already mentioned, time was not working in its favour. As ideas evolved and the progress of sciences tended to liberate the minds, ordinary people and monarchs found it more and more difficult to endure the ascendancy of these champions of "theocracy". Also, many abuses, born out of its successes, impaired the Society inwardly. Apart from politics in which it was deeply involved as one has seen, to the detriment of national interests, its devouring activity had soon made itself felt in the domain of economics.

"The Fathers became involved too much in affairs which had nothing to do with religion, in commerce, exchange, as liquidators of bankruptcies. The Roman College, which should have remained the intellectual and moral model of all Jesuit colleges had cloth made in huge quantities at Macerata and sold it

in fairs at a low price. Their centres in India, Antilles, Mexico and Brazil soon started trading in colonial products. At Martinique, a procurator created vast plantations which were cultivated by negro slaves".(19)

(19) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., pp.190-191.

This is the commercial side of Foreign Missions which is just the same today. The Roman Church never scorned at extracting a temporal profit from her "spiritual" conquests. As far as that is concerned, the Jesuits were just like all other religious Orders; they even surpassed them. In any case, we know that, recently, the White Fathers were amongst the richest landowners in North Africa.

The sons of Loyola were as intensely active at making the best of the "pagan's" labours as at winning their souls. "In Mexico, they had silver mines and sugar refineries; in Paraguay, tea and cacao plantations, carpet factories; they also reared cattle and exported 80,000 mules every year".(20)

As we can see, the evangelisation of their "red children" was a good source of revenue. And to make an even bigger profit, the Fathers did not hesitate to defraud the state treasury, as seen in the well-known story of the so-called boxes of chocolate unloaded at Cadix which were full of gold powder.

Bishop Palafox, sent as apostolic visitor by Pope Innocent VIII, wrote to him in 1647 "All the wealth of South America is in the hands of the Jesuits". Financial affairs were just as advantageous. "In Rome, the coffers of the Order made payments to the Portuguese embassy in the name of the Portuguese government. When Auguste le Fort went to Poland, Vienna's Fathers opened a credit account for this needy monarch with the Jesuits of Varsovie. In China, the Fathers lent money to the merchants at 25, 50 and even 100% interest".(21)

The scandalous greediness of the Order, its loose morals, its ceaseless political intrigues and also its encroachings upon the prerogatives of the secular and regular clergy had stirred up mortal enmity and hatred everywhere. Amongst the higher classes, it had been brought into complete disrepute and, in France at any rate, its efforts to maintain the people in a formalist and superstitious piety gave way to the inevitable emancipation of the minds.

Nevertheless, the material prosperity enjoyed by the Society, the acquired positions at the Courts and especially the support of the Holy See which they thought immovable, maintained the Jesuits in their complete assurance, even on the eve of their ruin. Had they not already gone through several storms, suffered about thirty expulsions from the time of their foundation until the middle of the 18th century? Nearly every time, they had been back sooner or later to reoccupy their lost positions.

But this new eclipse threatening them was to be nearly total, this time, and last for more than forty years.

(20) Andre Mater, quoted by Pierre Dominique, op.cit., p.191. (21) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., p.191.

The strange thing is that the first assault against the powerful Society came from the very Catholic Portugal, one of their principal strongholds in Europe. The influence exercised over that country by England since the beginning of the century was probably one of the causes of this uprising. A treaty fixing the boundaries in America, concluded between Spain and Portugal in 1750, had given the Portuguese a vast territory east of the river Uruguay where the Jesuits were working. In consequence, the Fathers had to retreat with their converts on this side of the new frontier, on Spanish territory. So they armed their Guaranis, led a long guerilla war and finally remained masters of the land which was given back to Spain.

The marquess of Pombal, Portuguese prime minister, felt really insulted. Besides, this former pupil of the Jesuits had not kept their "trade-mark" and drew his inspiration from French and English philosophers rather than from his old educators. In 1757, he drove out the Jesuit confessors of the Royal family and forbade the members of the Society to preach. After several quarrels with them, he issued pamphlets to the public—one of which was "Short account of the Jesuits' kingdom in Paraguay" which made a great noise—obtained an inquiry into their conduct by pope Benedict XIV and finally banished the Society from all his territories. The affair caused a sensation in Europe, and especially in France where, soon after, the bankruptcy of Father La Valette broke out; he was a "businessman" handling huge transactions in sugar and coffee for the Company. Its refusal to pay the Father's debts was fatal. The Parliament, not content with a civil condemnation, examined its Constitutions, declared its establishment in France illegal and condemned twenty four works of its principal authors. On the 6th of April 1762, it issued a 'statement of arrest' (Indictment) in the following terms: "The said Institute is inadmissible in any civilised State, as its nature is hostile to all spiritual and temporal authority; it seeks to introduce into the Church and States, under the plausible veil of a religious Institute, not an Order truly desirous to spread evangelical perfection, but rather a political body working untiringly at usurping all authority, by all kinds of indirect, secret and devious means..." In conclusion, the Jesuits' doctrine was described as follows: "perverse, a destroyer of all religious and honest principles, insulting to Christian morals, pernicious to civil society, hostile to the rights of the nation, the royal power, and even the security of the sovereigns and obedience of their subjects; suitable to stir up the greatest disturbances in the States, conceive and maintain the worst kind of corruption in men's hearts". In France, the Society's properties were confiscated for the benefit of the Crown and none of its members was allowed to stay in the kingdom unless he renounced his vows and swore to submit to the general rules of France's clergy.

In Rome, the Jesuits' general, Ricci, obtained from Pope Clement XIII a bull confirming the Order's privileges and proclaiming its innocence. But it was too late. In Spain, the Bourbons suppressed all the establishments of the Society, the metropolitan ones as well as the colonial ones. So ended Paraguay's Jesuit State. The governments of Naples, Parma, and even the Grand-Master of Malta also banished the sons of Loyola from their territories. The 6,000 who were in Spain had a strange experience after they had been thrown in prison: "King Charles III sent all the prisoners to the pope with a grand

letter in which he said that he “put them under the wise and immediate control of Your Holiness”. But, when the wretches were about to disembark at Civita-Vecchia, they were welcomed with the thunder of cannon shot on the order of their own general who already had to look after the Portuguese Jesuits and couldn’t even feed them. They just managed to find them a wretched sanctuary in Corsica”.(22)

“Clement XIII, elected on the 6th of July 1758, had resisted a long time the pressing requests of several nations demanding the Jesuits’ suppression. He was about to yield and had already arranged a consistory for the 3rd of February 1769 at which he was to tell the cardinals about his resolution to comply with the wishes of these Courts; on the night before that particular day, he suddenly felt ill as he was going to bed and cried out: “I am dying...”. It is a very dangerous thing to attack the Jesuits!”(23)

A conclave assembled and went on for three months. At last, cardinal Ganganelli put on the mitre and took the name of Clement XIV. The Courts which had banished the Jesuits kept on asking for the total suppression of the Society. But the papacy was in no hurry to abolish this primordial instrument for the carrying out of its politics, and four years passed before Clement XIV, constrained by the firm attitude of his opponents, who had occupied some of the pontifical States, at last signed the Brief of dissolution: “Dominus ac Redemptor” in 1773. Ricci, the Order’s general, was even imprisoned at the castle of Saint-Ange where he died a few years later.

“The Jesuits only appeared to submit to this verdict which condemned them... They wrote innumerable pamphlets against the pope and to incite rebellion; they told lies and slanders without number concerning so-called atrocities committed when their properties in Rome were confiscated”.(24)

The death of Clement XIV, fourteen months later, was even attributed to them by a section of European opinion.

“The Jesuits, in principle at least, were no more; but Clement XIV knew very well that, by signing their death warrant, he was signing his own as well: “This suppression is done at last”, he exclaimed, “and I am not sorry about it.. I would do it again if it was not done already; but this suppression will kill me”.(25)

(22) Pierre Doninique, op.cit., p.209.

(23) Baron de Ponnat, “Histoire des variations et des contradictions de l’Eglise romaine”, p.215. til.

(24) J. Huber, op.cit., p.365.

(25) Caraccioli: “Vie du Pape Clement XIV” (Desant, Paris 1776, p.313)

Ganganelli was right; soon, posters started to appear on the palace walls which invariably displayed these five letters: I.S.S.S.V., and everyone wondered what it meant. Clement understood immediately and boldly declared: “It means “In Settembre, Sara Sede Vacante”, (In September, the See will be vacant’, (that the Pope will be dead)”.(26)

Here is another testimony: “Pope Ganganelli did not survive long after the Jesuits’ suppression”, said Scipion de Ricci. “The account of his illness and

death, sent to the Court of Madrid by the Minister for Spain in Rome, proved that he had been poisoned; as far as we know, no inquiry was held concerning this event by the cardinals, nor the new pontiff. The perpetrator of that abominable deed was then able to escape the judgement of the world, but he will not be able to escape God's justice!"(27)

"We can positively affirm that, on the 22nd of September 1774, Pope Clement XIV died by poisoning".(28)

Meanwhile, the empress of Austria, Marie-Therese, had also banished the Jesuits from all her States. Only Frederik of Prussia and Catherine II, empress of Russia, welcomed them in their countries as educators. But, in Prussia, they only managed to stay for ten years, until 1786. Russia was favourable to them longer but, there also, and for the same reason, they eventually aroused the animosity of the government.

"... The suppression of the schism and the rallying of Russia to the pope attracted them like a lamp attracts a moth. They launched an active propaganda programme in the army and aristocracy and fought against the Bible Society created by the Czar. They won several successes and converted prince Galitzine, nephew of the Minister for Worship. So the Czar intervened and we have the Ukase of the 20th of December 1815".(29)

No need to say that the grounds for this Ukase, which banished the Jesuits from Saint-Petersburg and Moscow, were the same as in all the other countries. "We came to realise that they did not fulfill the duties expected of them... Instead of living as peaceful inhabitants in a foreign country, they disturbed the Greek religion which has been since ancient times, the predominant religion in our empire and on which rests the peace and happiness of the nations under our sceptre. They abused the confidence they obtained and turned the youth entrusted to them and inconsistent women away from our worship... We are not surprised that this religious Order was expelled from every country and that their actions were not tolerated anywhere".(29)

In 1820 at last, general measures were taken to drive them out of the whole of Russia.

But, because of political events favouring it, they had set foot again in western Europe when their Order was solemnly reestablished by Pope Pius VII in 1814.

The political significance of this decision is clearly expressed by M. Daniel-Rops, a great friend of the Jesuits. He wrote, concerning the "reappearance of the sons of Loyola": "It was impossible not to see in it an obvious act of counter-revolution".(30)

(26) Baron de Ponnat, *op.cit.*, p.223.

(27) Potter: "Vie de Scipion de Ricci", (Brussels 1825), I, p. 18).

(28) Baron de Ponnat: "Histoire des variations et contradictions de l'Eglise romaine" (Charpentier, Paris 1882, II, p.224).

(29) Pierre Dominique, *op.cit.*, p.220.

(30) Daniel-Rops, of the French Academy: "Le retablissement de la Compagnie de Jesus" (Etudes, September 1959).

We mentioned that, when Clement XIV was constrained to suppress the Jesuit Order, he apparently said: "I have cut off my right hand". The phrase seems plausible enough. The Holy See must certainly have found it hard to part with its most important instrument in the domination of the world. The Order's disgrace, a political measure imposed by circumstances, was gradually attenuated by the successors of Clement XIV: Pius VI and Pius VII; and if the official eclipse of the Jesuits lasted forty years, it was because of the upheavals in Europe resulting from the French Revolution. In any case, that eclipse was never total.

"Most of the Jesuits had stayed in Austria, France, Spain, Italy, mingling with the clergy. They met with each other or gathered in large numbers as much as possible. In 1794, Jean de Tournely founded the Society of the Sacred Heart in Belgium as a teaching body. Many Jesuits joined it. Three years later, the Tyrolean Paccanari, who thought he was another Ignatius, founded the Society of the Brothers of Faith. In 1799, the two Societies merged with Father Clariviere as the head; he was the only surviving French Jesuit. In 1803, they joined the Russian Jesuits. Something coherent was coming back to life again, but the masses, and even most of the politicians, did not recognize it at first".(31)

(31) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., p.219—Here is, according to M. Daniel-Rops, the strange death of Paccacaci, founder of the Brothers of Faith: "He was brought before the Holy See, imprisoned at the castle of Saint-Ange and finally was "assassinated". (Etudes, September 19 59).

The French Revolution, and then the Empire, gave the Company of Jesus an unexpected credibility again; it was a defensive reaction against new ideas springing up in the ancient monarchies.

Napoleon the First described the Society as "very dangerous; she will never be allowed in the Empire". But, when the Holy-Alliance triumphed, the new "monarchs" did not disdain the help of these absolutists in bringing back the people to a strict obedience.

But times had changed. All the skill of the good Fathers could only delay and not stop the propagation of liberal ideas and their efforts were more harmful than useful. In France, the Restoration experienced it in a bitter way. Louis XVIII, an unbeliever and clever politician, tried to contain the rise of "ultras" as much as he could. But under Charles X, narrow-minded and very devout, the Jesuits had it easy. The law which expelled them in 1764 was still being enforced. No matter. They enlivened the famous "Congregation", first kind of Opus Dei. This pious brotherhood, composed of ecclesiastics and laymen, was found everywhere, pretending to "purge" the army, the magistracy, the administration, the teaching profession; it held "missions" all over the country, planting commemorative crosses wherever it went; many of these are still there today; it stirred up the believers to fight the infidels and made itself so hateful that even the very Catholic and very legitimist Montlosier exclaimed:

"Our missionaries have started fires everywhere. If something has to be sent to us, we would rather have Marseille's plague than more missionaries". In 1828, Charles X withdrew the Order's right to teach, but it was too late. The

dynasty collapsed in 1830.

Hated and covered with shame, the sons of Loyola nevertheless stayed in France, but disguised, as the Order was still officially abolished. Louis-Philippe and Napoleon III tolerated them. The Republic scattered them in 1880 only, under the administration of Jules Ferry. The closing of their establishments was effective only in 1901, under the law of separation. During the 19th century, the Company's history in America and half of Europe was equally full of ups and downs as in the past, while fighting the new ideas.

"Wherever liberal-minded people gained victories, the Jesuits were expelled. On the other hand, when the other side triumphed, they reestablished themselves to defend the throne and the altar. So, they were banished from Portugal in 1534, Spain in 1820, 1835 and 1868, from Switzerland in 1848, Germany in 1872 and France in 1880 and 1901. "In Italy, from 1859 on, all their colleges and establishments were gradually taken from them, so much so that they were forced to stop all the activities prescribed in their laws. The same thing happened in the republics of Latin America. The Order was suppressed in Guatemala in 1872, Mexico in 1873, Brazil in 1874, Ecuador and Colombia in 1875 and Costa-Rica in 1884.

"The only countries where the Jesuits lived in peace were the States where Protestantism was in the majority: England, Sweden, Denmark, the United States of America. It may seem surprising at first glance, but the explanation lies in the fact that, in these countries, the Fathers were never able to exercise a political influence. Without any doubt, they accepted the fact more by necessity than inclination. Otherwise, they would have taken every opportunity to influence legislation and administration, in a direct manner by manoeuvring the ruling classes, or indirectly by constantly stirring up the Catholic masses".(32)

To be truthful, this immunity of the Protestant countries towards Jesuitic ventures was far from complete.

"In the United States", wrote M. Fulop-Miller, "the Company has deployed a systematic and fruitful activity for a long time, as she is not hindered by any laws... "I am not happy about the rebirth of the Jesuits", wrote the former president of the John Adams Union to his successor Thomas Jefferson, in 1816. "Swarms of them will present themselves under more disguises ever taken by even a chief of the Bohemians, as printers, writers, publishers, school teachers, etc. If ever an association of people deserved eternal damnation, on this earth and in hell, it is this Society of Loyola. Yet, with our system of religious liberty, we can but offer them a refuge..." And Jefferson answered his predecessor: "Like you, I object to the Jesuits' reestablishment which makes light give way to darkness".(33)

The fears so expressed were to be proved right, one century later, as we shall see.

(32) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p.285.

(33) Rene Fulop-Miller, op.cit., pp. 149-150.

In the previous chapter, we mentioned the wide tolerance enjoyed by the Society of Jesus in France, under Napoleon III, even though it was officially prohibited. In any case, it could not be otherwise as that regime owed its existence—largely at least—to the Roman Church whose support never failed, as long as the regime lasted. But it was to be very costly for France.

The readers of the “Progres du Pas-de-Calais”, a publication for which the future emperor wrote several articles in 1843 and 1844, could not then suspect him of leniency towards “ultramontanism”, judging from the following:

“The clergy demands, under the cover of freedom of teaching, the right to instruct youth. The State, on the other hand, also demands the right to direct public instruction for her own interests. This struggle is the result of divergent opinions, ideas and feelings between government and Church. Both want to influence the new generations coming up in opposite directions and for their own benefit. We do not believe, as one well-known orator does, that all ties between the clergy and civil authority must be broken in order to stop this diversion. Unfortunately, France’s ministers of religion are generally opposed to democratic interests; to allow them to build schools without control is to encourage them to teach the people the hatred of revolution and liberty”.

And again: “The clergy will stop being ultramontane as soon as one compells them to be brought up, as formerly in an up-to-date manner and to mingle with the people gaining their education from the same sources as the general public.”

Referring to the way in which German priests were trained, the author clarifies his thoughts in the following manner: “Instead of being shut away from the rest of the world, from childhood, and so be instilled in the seminaries with hatred for the society in which they must live, they would learn early to be citizens before being priests”.(34)

This did not encourage political clericalism for the future sovereign, then a “Carbonari”. But the ambition to sit on the throne soon made him more docile towards Rome. Did not Rome herself help him climb the first step? “Having been made president of the Republic on the 10th of December 1848, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte gathers several ministers around himself, one of which is M. de Falloux. Who is this M. de Falloux? A tool of the Jesuits... On the 4th of January 1849, he institutes a commission whose job is to “prepare a big legislative reform of primary and secondary education”... In the course of the discussion, M. Cousin takes the liberty to remark that maybe the Church is wrong to tie her destiny to the Jesuits. Monseigneur Dupanloup defends energetically the Society... A law on teaching is being prepared which would “make amends” to the Jesuits. In the past, the State and the University had been protected against the Jesuits’ invasions; we were wrong and unjust; we demanded that the government applied its laws against these agents from a foreign government and we ask their forgiveness for it. They are good citizens who were slandered and misjudged; what can we do to show them the respect and esteem which are due to them?

“Put in their hands the teaching of the young generations”. “This in fact is

the aim of the law of the 15th of March 1850. This law appoints a superior council for Public Instruction in which the clergy dominates, (first art.); it makes the clergy masters of the schools, (art.44); it gives religious associations the right to create free schools, without having to explain about the non-authorized congregations (Jesuits), (art. 17,2); it said that the letters of obedience would be their diplomas, (art.49); M. Barthelemy Saint-Hilaire tries in vain to demonstrate that the aim of the authors of that project is to give the monopoly to the clergy, and that this law would be fatal to the University... Victor Hugo exclaims, also vainly: "This law is a monopoly in the hands of those who try to make teaching come out of the sacristy and the government out of the confessional".(35)

(34) "Oeuvres de Napoleon III" (Amyot et Plon, Paris 1856, II, pp.31 and 33). (35) Adolphe Michel, op.cit., pp.66 ss.

But the Assembly ignores these protestations. It prefers listening to M. de Montalembert who exclaims: "We will be swallowed up if we don't stop immediately the current trend of rationalism and demagogy; what's more, it can be stopped only with the help of the Church".

"M. de Montalembert adds these words to make sure the significance of this law is well described: "To the demoralising and anarchical army of teachers, we must oppose the army of the clergy". The law was passed. Never before in France had the Jesuits won a more complete victory.

M. de Montalembert admitted it proudly... He said: "I am defending justice by backing as well as possible the government of the Republic, which has done so much to save order and maintain the union of the French people; it especially rendered more services to the Catholic Church than all the other governments in power during the last two centuries".(36)

All this happened more than one hundred years ago, but seems rather familiar today. But let us see how the "Republic", presided over by prince Louis-Napoleon, was acting internationally.

The revolution of 1848 had, amongst other repercussions in Europe, provoked the uprising of the Romans against Pope Pius IX, their temporal sovereign, who had fled to Gaete. The Roman Republic had been proclaimed. Through a scandalous paradox, it was the French Republic, in agreement with the Austrians and the king of Naples, who put back on the throne the undesirable sovereign.

"A French regiment besieged Rome, took it on the 2nd of June 1849 and restored pontifical power; it managed to maintain itself with the help of a French division of occupation which left Rome only after the first disasters in the Franco-German war of 1870".(37)

This beginning was very promising.

"The coup of the 2nd of December 1851 brought about the proclamation of the Empire. Louis-Napoleon, President of the Republic, had favoured the Jesuits in every way. Now emperor, he refused nothing to his accomplices and allies. The clergy poured out its blessings and "Te Deum" profusely on the massacres

and proscriptions of the 2nd of December. The one responsible for this abominable ambush was looked upon as a providential saviour: "The archbishop of Paris, Monseigneur Sibour, who saw the massacres on the boulevard, exclaims:

"The man who was prepared by God has come; the finger of God was never more visible than in the events which produced these great results". The bishop of Saint-Flour said from his pulpit: "God pointed out Louis- Napoleon; He already had elected him to be emperor. Yes, my dear brethren, God consecrated him beforehand through the blessing of His pontiffs and priests; He acclaimed him Himself; can we not recognise God's elect?"

(36) Adolphe Michel, *op.cit.* pp.55,66. (37) Larousse, VII, p.371.

The bishop of Nevers falsely saluted "Providence's visible instrument". "These pitiable adulations, which could be multiplied still further, deserved a reward. This reward was a complete freedom given to the Jesuits as long as the Empire lasted. The Society of Jesus was literally master of France for eighteen years... she enriched herself, multiplied her establishments and spread her influence. Her action was felt in all the important events of that time, especially in the expedition to Mexico and the declaration of war in 1870".(38)

"The Empire means peace", declared the new sovereign. But, barely two years after he acceded to the throne, the first of all those wars which succeeded each other throughout his reign started; history could regard the motives which brought about these wars as unconnected if we didn't see what united them: the defence of the Roman Church's interests. The Crimean war, the first of these mad enterprises which weakened us and was not nationally profitable, is a characteristic example.

It was not someone anticlerical, but the Abbe Brugere, who wrote: "One must read the speeches the famous Theatine (Father Ventura) gave in the chapel of Les Tuileries during Lent in 1857. He presented the Empire's restoration as God's work... and praised Napoleon III for having defended the religion in Crimea and made the great days of the Crusades shine a second time in the East... The Crimean war was regarded as a compliment to the Roman expedition... It was praised by the whole clergy, full of admiration for the religious fervour of the troops besieging Sebastopol. Saint-Beuve movingly narrated how Napoleon III had sent an image of the Virgin to the French fleet".(39)

What was this expedition which aroused the enthusiasm of the clergy. M. Paul Leon, member of the Institute, explains: "A quarrel between monks revives the question of the East: it was born out of rivalries between the Latin and Orthodox Churches regarding the protection of the Holy places (in Palestine). Who would watch over Bethlehem's churches, hold the keys, direct the work? How is it possible that such small matters could set two great empires against each other?... But, behind the Latin monks is France's Catholic party, provided with ancient privileges and supporter of the new regime; behind the growing demands of the Orthodox, who had grown in numbers, is the Russian influence".(40)

The Czar invokes the protection of the Orthodox Church which he has to assure and, to make it effective, asks that his fleet should use the Dardanelles passage; England, which is backed by France, refuses, and the war breaks out.

“France and England can reach the Czar only through the Black Sea and the Turkish alliance... From now on, the war of Russia becomes the Crimean war and is entirely centered on the siege of Sebastopol, a costly episode without issue. Bloody battles, deadly epidemics and inhuman sufferings cost France one hundred thousand dead”.(41)

(38) Adolphe Michel, *op.cit.*, pp.71-72.

(39) Abbe J. Brugerette: “Le Pretre francais et la societe contemporaine” (Lethielleux, Paris 1933, I, pp.168 and 180).

(40) and (41) Paul Leon, of the Institute, “La guerre pour la Paix”, (Ed. Fayard, Paris 1950 pp.321-323).

We must point out that these one hundred thousand dead were Christ’s soldiers and glorious “martyrs of the faith”, according to Monseigneur Sibour, Archbishop of Paris, who declared at that time: “The Crimean war, between France and Russia, is not a political war, but a holy war; it is not a State fighting another State, people fighting other people, but singularly a war of religion, a Crusade...”(42)

The admission is not ambiguous. Anyway, haven’t we heard the same, not long ago, during the German occupation, expounded in identical terms by the prelates of His Holiness Pius XII and by Pierre Laval himself, president of the Council of Vichy?

In 1863, it is the expedition to Mexico. What is it about? To transform a lay- republic into an empire and offer it to Maximilien, archduke of Austria. Austria is the papacy’s number one pillar. The aim is also to erect a barrier which would contain the influence of the Protestant United States over the States of South America, strongholds of the Roman Church. M. Albert Bayet wrote with sagacity: “The war’s aim is to establish a Catholic empire in Mexico and curtail the peoples’ right to self rule; as during the Syrian campaign and the two Chinese campaigns, it tends especially to serve Catholic interests”.(43)

(42) Quoted by Monseigneur Journet: “Exigences chretiennes en politique”(Ed. L.V.F. Paris 1945, p.274).

(43) Albert Bayet: “Histoire de France” (Ed. du Sagittaire, Paris 1938, p.282).

We know how, in 1867, after the French army had re-embarked, Maximilien, the unfortunate champion of the Holy See, was made prisoner when Queretaro surrendered and was shot dead, making way for a republic of which the victor Juarez was president.

Nevertheless, the time was getting nearer when France was to pay, once again, much more dearly for the political support the Vatican assured the imperial throne. While the French army was spilling its blood in the four corners of the world, and getting weaker while defending interests which were not hers, Prussia, under the heavy hand of the future “iron chancellor”, was busy expanding its military might in order to unite the German states in a single block.” Austria was the first victim of its will and power. In agreement with

Prussia which was to seize the Danish duchess of Schleswig and Holstein, Austria was cheated by her accomplice. The war which followed was soon won by Prussia at Sadowa on the 3rd of July 1866. It was a terrible blow for the ancient Hapsburg monarchy which was declining; the blow was just as hard for the Vatican, as Austria had been for so long its most faithful stronghold within the Germanic lands. From now on, Protestant Prussia will exercise her hegemony over them. Unless... the Roman Church finds a "secular arm" capable of stopping completely the expansion of the "heretic" power. But who can play this part in Europe apart from the French Empire? Napoleon III, "the man sent by Providence", will have the honour of avenging Sadowa. The French army is not ready. "The artillery is out of date. Our cannons are still loaded through the muzzle", wrote Rothan, French minister at Frankfurt who can see disaster coming. "Prussia knows of her superiority and our lack of preparation", he adds with many other observers. The war instigators are not concerned. The candidature of a Hohenzollern prince for the vacant Spanish throne is the excuse for that conflict; also, Bismark wants it. When he faked the dispatch of Ems, the advocates of war had the game in their hands and they aroused public opinion.

France herself declared war. this "war of 1870 which was proved by history to be the work of the Jesuits", as M. Gaston Bally wrote. The composition of the government which sent France to disaster is described as follows by the eminent Catholic historian, Adrien Dansette: "Napoleon III started by sacrificing Victor Duruy, then resolved to appoint to his government men from the people's party (January 1870). The new ministers were nearly all sincere Catholics, or ecclesiastics believing in social conservatism".(44)

It is easy to understand, now, what was inexplicable: the haste of this government to extract a "casus belli" from this faked dispatch, even before receiving a confirmation.

"The consequences were: the collapse of the Empire and the counter-coup for the papal throne which followed... The imperial edifice and the papal edifice, crowned by the Jesuits, fell in the same mud, in spite of the Immaculate Conception and papal infallibility; but, alas! it was over the ashes of France".(45)

(44) Adrien Dansette: "Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine" (Ed. Flammarion, Paris 1948, I, p.432)

(45) Gaston Bally, op.cit., pp.100, 101.

One can read, in a book from the Abbe Brugere, the following passage in the chapter entitled "The clergy under the Second Empire":

"Particular devotions, old or new, were honoured more and more at a time when romanticism still exalted the senses to the detriment of austere reason. The worship of saints and their relics, restrained for so long by the cold breath of rationalism, had taken a new vigour. The worship of the holy Virgin, thanks to apparitions at La Salette and Lourdes, acquired an extraordinary popularity. Pilgrimages to these places privileged by miracles multiplied.

"The French Episcopate... favoured new devotions. It warmly and thankfully

welcomed, in 1854, the encyclical letter of Pius IX proclaiming the dogma of the Immaculate Conception... It was also the episcopate, brought together in Paris, in 1856, for the baptism of the imperial Prince, who asked Pius IX that the feast of the Sacred-Heart... should be made into a solemn feast of the universal Church".(46)

(46) Abbe J. Brugerette: "Le pretre francais et la societe contemporaine", (Ed. Lethielleux Paris 1933, I, pp. 183-184).

These few lines clearly show the preponderant influence exercised by the Jesuits under the Second Empire, in France as much as over the Holy See, As we saw earlier on, they were and remain the great propagators of these "particular devotions, old or new", this "perceptible" and almost sensual piety made the masses excessively scrupulous in religious matters, especially women. As far as that is concerned, we must admit that they were realists. The time had gone—already under Napoleon III—when the public as a whole, the learned and the ignorant, took a deep interest in theological questions. Intellectually, Catholicism had ended its career.

It is then more by necessity than because of their formation that the sons of Loyola endeavoured, during the 19th century and today, to awaken superstitious religiosity, especially amongst women who make up most of the flock; this was to counter-balance "rationalism", For the secondary education of girls, the Order promoted the founding of several congregations of women. "The most famous and active was the "Congregation des Dames du Sacre-Coeur"; in 1830, it comprised 105 houses with 4,700 teachers and its influence over the higher classes was very important".(47)

As far as the worship of Mary is concerned, which was always so dear to the Jesuits, it was greatly helped, under the Second Empire, by the very opportune "apparitions" of the Virgin to a little shepherdess of Lourdes; this happened two years after Pius IX promulgated the dogma of the Immaculate Conception (1854), at the instigation of the Company of Jesus. The main acts of this pontificate were all victories for the Jesuits whose all- powerful influence over the Roman Curia affirmed itself more and more. In 1864, Pius IX published the encyclical letter "Quanta Cura", accompanied by the "Syllabus" which anathematized the best political principles of the contemporary societies.

"Anathema on all that is dear to modern France! Modern France wants the independance of the state; the 'Syllabus' teaches that the ecclesiastical power must exercise its "authority without the assent and permission of the civil power. Modern France wants the liberty of conscience and liberty of worship; the 'Syllabus' teaches that the Roman Church has the right to use force and reinstate the Inquisition. Modern France acknowledges the existence of several types of worship; the 'Syllabus' declares that the Catholic religion must be considered as the only religion of the state and all others are excluded. Modern France proclaims that the people are sovereign; the 'Syllabus' condemns universal suffrage. Modern France professes that all French people are equal before the law; the 'Syllabus' affirms that ecclesiastics are exempt from ordinary civil and criminal tribunals."

"These are the doctrines taught by the Jesuits in their colleges. They are at the front of the army of counter-revolution... Their mission consists of bringing up the youth put in their care with a hatred for the principles on which French society rests, principles laid down by former generations at a great cost. By their teaching, they try to divide France into two and call into question all that has been done since 1789. We want harmony, they want strife; we want peace, they want war; we want France to be free, they want her enslaved; they are a combatant society receiving its orders from outside; they are fighting us, let us defend ourselves; they threaten us, let us disarm them".(48)

(47) H. Boehmer, op.cit., p.290.

(48) Adolphe Michel: "Les Jesuites" (Sandoz et Fischbacher, Paris 1879, pp.77 ss)

The Holy See's everlasting pretension to dominate civil society was then reaffirmed, as Renan had already said in 1848, in an article entitled "Clerical liberalism": "It demonstrated that the people's sovereignty, the liberty of conscience and all modern liberties were condemned by the Church. It presented the Inquisition as "the logical consequence of the whole orthodox system", as "the summary of the Church's spirit". It added: "When she will be able to, the Church will bring back the Inquisition; if she doesn't do it, it is because she cannot do it".(49)

The power of the Jesuits over the Vatican was shown even more strongly, a few years after the 'Syllabus', when the dogma of Pontifical Infallibility was promulgated; the Abbe Brugerette wrote that this dogma was to "throw over the tragic years of 1870-1871, which put France into mourning, the brightness of a great Christian hope".

The same author added: "One can say that, during the first half of the year 1870, the Church of France was not in France anymore; she was in Rome, passionately busy with the General Council which Pius IX had just called at the Vatican..." "According to Monseigneur Pie, this French clergy had completely "thrown off its own liveries, maxims and French or Gallic liberties". This bishop of Poitiers added that it was done as a sacrifice to the principle of authority, sound doctrine and common right; it placed all that under the feet of the sovereign pontiff, made a throne of it for him and sounded the trumpet, saying: "The pope is our king; not only is his will our command, but his wishes are our rules".(49a)

The resignation of the whole of a "national" clergy into the hands of the Roman Curia is clear enough and, because of it, the subjection of the French Catholics to the will of a foreign despot who, under the cover of dogma or morals, was going to impose on them his political directions without any opposition. The liberal Catholics protested in vain against the exorbitant pretention of the Holy See to dictate its laws in the name of the Holy Spirit. The Abbe Brugerette informs us, their head, M. de Montalembert, published in the Gazette de France an article in which he vehemently protested against those who "sacrifice justice and truth, reason and history, to the idol they set up at the Vatican".(50)

(49), (49a) and (50) Abbe J. Brugerette, op.cit., pp.221, 223.

Several notorious bishops such as Fathers Hyacinthe Loyson and Gratry took the same line; the latter not without spirit; Father Gratry said: "He published successively his four Letters to Monseigneur Deschamps. In them, he did not merely discuss historical events, such as the condemnation of Pope Honorius, who, according to him, opposed the proclamation of pontifical infallibility; but, in a sharp and bitter manner, he denounced also the contempt of authoritative Catholics for the truth, and scientific integrity. One of them, an ecclesiastical candidate for the Doctorate of Theology, even dared to justify false decretals before the Faculty of Paris, declaring that "it was not an odious fraud". And Gratry added: "Even today it is being stated that Galileo's condemnation was opportune". "You, men of little faith, with miserable hearts and sordid souls! Your tricks are scandalous. On the day when the great science of nature was raised above the world, you condemned it."

"Do not be surprised if men, before forgiving you, expect from you confession, penance, deep contrition and amends for your faults".(51) No need to say that the Jesuits, inspiring agents of Pius IX and all-powerful over the Council, were not anxious about confession, penance, contrition or reparation, at a time when they almost reached the goal they had set themselves at the Council of Trent, in the middle of the 16th century. At that time Lainez already supported the idea of papal infallibility. It only meant consecrating as a dogma a pretention nearly as old as the papacy itself. No other Council until then had been willing to ratify it, but the time seemed just right, then; besides, the patient work of the Jesuits had prepared the national clergy for the surrender of their last liberties; the imminent collapse of the popes' temporal power—it happened before the Council voted—called for a reinforcement of his spiritual authority, according to the ultramontanes. The argument prevailed and the "dictatus papae" of Gregory VII, principles of the mediaeval theocracy, triumphed right in the middle of the 19th century.

(51) Father Gratry, quoted by the Abbe J. Brugerette, op.cit., p.229.

What the new dogma especially consecrated was the omnipotence of the Company of Jesus in the Roman Church.

"Under the cover of the Jesuits, who have established themselves at the Vatican since the secular powers have rejected them from all free countries as an association of malefactors, the papacy has aspired to new ambitions. These evil men, who have made the Gospel into a Spectacle of tears and blood and remain the worst enemies of democracy and freedom of thought, dominate the Roman Curia; all their efforts concentrate on maintaining, in the Church, their pernicious preponderance and shameful doctrines."

"Dedicated to the cause of extreme centralisation, irreducible apostles of theocracy, they are the recognised masters of contemporary Catholicism and stamp their seal on its theology, its official piety and its crooked politics". "True emissaries of the Vatican, they inspire everything, rule everything, penetrate everywhere, set up "informing" as a system of government, faithful to a casuistry whose profound immorality has been revealed by history and inspired Pascal's immortal pages of sublime mockery.

Through the 'Syllabus' of 1864 which they themselves drew up, Pius IX declared war on all free thought and sanctioned, a few years later, the dogma of infallibility which is a real historical anachronism and of which modern science could not care less".(52)

For those who, against all probability, would persist to see a spiteful exaggeration and disparagement in the lines we just quoted, we cannot do better than present the confirmation itself of these facts, from the very orthodox pen of M. Daniel-Rops. This confirmation carries even more weight by the fact that it was published in 1959, under the title "The Reestablishment of the Company of Jesus", in the Jesuits' own publication "Etudes". It is then in a true speech for the defence that we read: "For many reasons, this reorganisation of the Company of Jesus had a considerable historical importance. The Holy See rediscovered this faithful band, utterly devoted to its cause, and which was to be needed soon after. Many Fathers were to exercise, during that century and until now, a discreet, but deep influence on certain dispositions taken by the Vatican; a kind of proverb was even heard in Rome: "The pope's penholders are Jesuits". Their influence was obvious in the development of the worship of the Sacred-Heart as well as in the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, in the editing of the 'Syllabus' as well as in the definition of 'Infallibility'. The "Civiltà Cattolica", founded by the Neapolitan Jesuit Carlo Curci, was supposed to reflect the pope's thought during most of Pius IX's pontificate".(53)

This confession is clear enough. We would only remind the departed spirit of this pious academician that, logically, and judging by all the previous context, it was rather the pope's thought which was reflected in the opinions of the "Civiltà Cattolica".

No need to say that the Jesuits, all-powerful in Rome, as much because of their spirit as of their organisation, were going to engage the papacy in international politics more and more, as M. Louis Roguelin wrote: "Since she lost her temporal power, the Church of Rome took advantage of every opportunity to regain all the ground she was constrained to abandon, through a recrudescence of diplomatic activities; as her cleverly concealed scheme is to divide in order to reign, she tried to turn every conflict in her favour."

Boivent, 1927, pp.79 to 81).

(53) Daniel-Rops: "Le Retablissement de la Compagnie de Jesus" (Etudes, September 1959)

According to the plan of Loyola's subjects, the dogma of Papal infallibility greatly favoured this action of the Holy See, whose importance can be measured from the fact that most states have a diplomatic representative accredited to it. Under the cover of dogma and morals, subjects which in principle restrict the infallible word, the pope today disposes of an unlimited authority over the consciences of the faithful. So, during the 20th century, we see the Vatican actively engaged in the interior and exterior politics of countries, and even govern them thanks to Catholic parties. What's more, we will see it support "providential" men such as Mussolini and Hitler who, because of its help, will unleash the worst kind of catastrophes.

Christ's vicar acknowledged profusely the services of this famous society

which worked so hard and well in his favour. These "sons of Satan" as some brave ecclesiastics qualified them, are all tarnished, but they can, in return, boast about the august testimonial of complete satisfaction accorded to them by the deceased pope S.S. Pius XII whose confessor, we know, was a German Jesuit.

In this text, published by "La Croix" on the 9th of August 1955, we can read: "The Church does not want auxiliaries of another type than those of this Company... may the sons of Loyola strive to follow the footprints of former ones..."

Today, like yesterday, they are doing just that, to the great evil of the nations.

The collapse of the Empire should, it seems, have brought about a reaction against the ultramontane spirit in France. But it was not so as Adolphe Michel shows:

"When the throne fell into the mud of Sedan on the 2nd of December, when France was definitely defeated, when the Assembly of 1871 met at Bordeaux, while waiting to come to Versailles, the clerical party was more audacious than ever. In all the disasters befalling the homeland, it spoke as master. Who wouldn't remember the Jesuits' presumptuous manifestations and their insolent threats during these past few years? Like a certain Father Marquigny announcing the civil burial of the principles of '89; or M. de Belcastel, on his own authority, dedicating France to the Sacred-Heart; the Jesuits erecting a church on the hill of Montmartre, in Paris, and so defying the Revolution; the bishops prompting France to declare war on Italy in order to reestablish the temporal power of the pope..."(54)

Gaston Bally explains very well the reason for that apparently paradoxical situation: "During that cataclysm, the Jesuits, as always, quickly went back into their hole, leaving the Republic to get herself out of the muddle as best she could. But when most of the work had been done, when our territory was delivered from the Prussian invasion, the black invasion started again and "pulled the chestnuts out of the fire". The land was just emerging from a kind of nightmare, a terrible dream, and it was just the right time to get hold of the panic-stricken masses".(55)

(54) Adolphe Michel: op.cit., pp.72, 73.

(55) (56) and (57) Gaston Bally, op.cit., pp. 101,107,108,109.

But is it not the same after every war? It is an incontestable fact that the Roman Church has always benefited from the great public disasters; that death, misery and sufferings of every kind incite the masses to search for illusive consolations in pious practices. In that way, the power of those who let loose these disasters is strengthened, if not increased, by the victims themselves. As far as that is concerned, the two world wars had the same consequences as the one of 1870.

Then, France was conquered; on the other hand, it was a brilliant victory for the Company of Jesus when, in 1873, a law was passed, allowing the building

of a basilica of the Sacred-Heart on Montmartre Hill. This church, said to be a "National wish", by a cruel irony no doubt, was going to materialise in stone the triumph of Jesuitism, at the place where it commenced its life.

At first glance, this invocation to the Sacred-Heart of Jesus extolled by the Jesuits may seem, though basely idolatrous, quite innocent. "To realise the danger", wrote Gaston Bally, "we must look behind the facade, witness the manipulation of souls and see the aim of their various associations: the Brotherhood of "Perpetual Adoration"; the Brotherhood of the "Guard of Honour", the Apostolate of Prayer, the Reparative Communion, etc, etc. The brotherhoods, associates, apostles, missionaries, worshipers, zealots, guards of honour, restorers, mediators and other federates of the Sacred-Heart seem to intend exclusively to, as Mademoiselle Alacoque invited them to, unite their homage to those of the nine choirs of Angels.

So, in reality, it is far from innocent. "The brotherhoods stated their aims many times. They couldn't accuse me of slandering them; I will but quote a few passages from their most clear declarations and gather up their confessions.

"Public opinion was shocked with the remarks of Father Olivier when the victims of the Bazaar of Charity were buried. The monk had seen in the catastrophe only another proof of divine clemency. God was saddened by our "mistakes" and was inviting us, gently, to make amends. "This seemed monstrous. The building of the Basilica on Montmartre was a result of the same "thought", but this was forgotten".(56)

What was then the terrible sin France had to confess? The aforementioned author answers: "...THE REVOLUTION". This is the abominable crime we must "expiate". "And the Basilica of the Sacred-Heart symbolises France's repentance (Sacratissimo cordi Jesu Gallioe poenitens et devoter); it expresses also our firm intention to repair the wrong-doings. It is a monument of expiation and reparation..."(57)

"Save Rome and France in the name of the Sacred-Heart", became the anthem of the Moral Order.

"So we were able to hope against all hopes", wrote the Abbe Bruguerette, "and expect from the "pacified heaven" some time or other the great event of the restoration of order and the salvation of the homeland."(58) It seems though that "heaven", angered with the France of the rights of man, was not "pacified" enough by the erection of the famous basilica, the three candle snuffers, as the "restoration of order", or rather the monarchical restoration, was slow in coming. The same author explains it in the following manner:

"Even though the grandiose manifestations of the Catholic faith, during the years following the war of 1870, may seem impressive, it would be a lack of the sense of observation if French society of that epoch was judged only on the grounds of that exterior piety; we would also be lacking in psychological spirit and be outside the truth. We must wonder then if the religious sentiment was a direct answer, for the whole of that society, to the

expression of faith revealed by the imposing pilgrimages organised by the bishops and the earnestness of the masses in the churches...

“Without wanting to attenuate in any way the importance of the religious move in France brought about by the two wars of 1870 and 1914, which also raised such high hopes, we must nevertheless admit that this revival of the faith had not the depth, nor the extent which a true religious renewal would have...

“For, even then, the Church of France was unfortunately comprised of not only thousands of unbelievers and adversaries, but also a very large number of those who were Catholics only by name and not conviction. Religious practices were performed, not by conviction, but rather from habit... “Soon after it was done, France seemed to regret the desperate move which made her send a Catholic majority to the National Assembly, for, five months later, she reversed her position at the complementary elections of the 2nd of July! On that day, the country was to elect 113 deputies. It was a complete defeat for the Catholics and victory for between 80 to 90 Republicans. All the elections following that consultation of universal suffrage had the same character of republican and anticlerical opposition. It would be childish to pretend that they were not the expression of society’s sentiments and wishes”.(59)

(58) and (59) Abbe Brugere, op.cit., II, pp.10 to 14.

The Abbe Brugere, speaking about the great pilgrimages organised at that time for the “uplifting of the country”, admits that they were the cause of “some mistakes and excesses” which aroused the suspicions of the “Church’s adversaries”.

“The pilgrimages will be for them enterprises organised by the clergy for the restoration of monarchy in France and pontifical power in Rome. And the attitude taken by the clergy on these two aims will look like justifying this accusation from the irreligious press and will give, on that account, as we shall see later, a mighty impetus to anticlericalism. Without breaking away from its religious habits revived so much during the years after the war, French society will rebel against this “government of priests”, as Gambetta stigmatized it. Deep down, the French people had kept an invincible instinct of resistance against anything which even vaguely resembled the Church’s political domination. On the whole, this nation loved religion, but the spectre of “theocracy” revived by the opposition press frightened it. The eldest daughter of the Church did not want to forget that she was also the mother of Revolution”.(60)

Yet, the clergy with the Jesuits at their head were making such efforts to persuade the French people to abjure the republican spirit! “Since the Falloux law was enforced, the Jesuits, expanded freely their colleges where they brought up the children of the ruling middle-classes and they obviously did not teach them a great love for the Republic...” “As for the “Assumptionists” created in 1845 by the intransigent Father d’Alzon, they wanted to give back to the people the faith it had lost...”(61) But there were many other envious flourishing teaching congregations:

Oratorians, Eudistes, Dominicans of the Third-Order, Marianists, Marists, which Jules Simon called "the second volume" of the Jesuits bound in asses skin and the famous "Brothers of the Christian Schools", better known under the name of Ignorantins, who taught the "good doctrine" to the offsprings of the middle-classes as well as to more than one and a half million children of the ordinary people. It is not surprising that this situation put the republican regime on the defensive. A law, proposed in 1879 by Jules Ferry, wanted to remove the clergy from the Councils for Public Instruction into which they had been introduced by the laws of 1850 and 1873, and give back to the state's faculties the exclusive right to grade the degrees of the teachers. Article 7 of this law also specified that "no one would be allowed to take part in public or free teaching if he belongs to an unauthorised religious congregation".

"The Jesuits are aimed at before anyone else in that famous article 7. The priests of the deanery of Moret (Seine-et-Marne) will declare then that "they are on the side of all religious communities, including the venerable Fathers of the Company of Jesus". "To strike them", they write, "is to strike ourselves"... The confession is explicit.

The Abbe Bruguerette, who wrote that passage, describes the resistance put up by the Catholics against what he calls a "treacherous attack", but he adds:

"The clergy still ignore the immense progress of the laity; it has not understood yet that, because of its opposition to the principles of '89, it has lost all deep influence over the direction of public spirit in France".(62)

Article 7 is rejected by the Senate, but Jules Ferry invokes the existing laws concerning the congregations.

(60) Abbe Bruguerette, *op.cit.*, II, pp.164, 165.

(61) Adrien Dansette, *op.cit.*, p.29.

(62) (63) (64) and (65) Abbe Bruguerette, *op.cit.*, II, pp.164, 165, 166, 167, 176, 185.

"In consequence, on the 29th of March 1880, the "Journal Officiel" contains two decrees compelling the Jesuits to break up, and all unauthorised congregations of men and women to "obtain recognition and approval for their regulations and legal status within three months..." Without any delay, a movement of opposition is organised; "The Church, deeply wounded, is aroused", according to M. Debidour. After the 11th of March, Leo XIII and his Nuncio express a grievous protestation... "Now it is the turn of all the bishops to defend energetically the religious Orders".(63)

The sons of Loyola were nevertheless expelled. But let us listen to what the Abbe Bruguerette has to say on that subject: "In spite of all, the Jesuits, experts at re-entering through the windows when they have been thrown out through the door, had already been successful in putting their colleges into the control of laymen or secular ecclesiastics. Even though not residing in these colleges, they could be seen coming in at certain times of the day to perform duties of direction and supervision".(64)

But the deceit was discovered and the Jesuits' colleges finally closed. In

all, the decrees of 1879 were enforced on 32 congregations who refused to submit to the legal dispositions. In many places, the expulsion was carried out by the military arm "manu militari" against the opposition of the faithful aroused by the Fathers. These not only refused to ask for the legal authorisation, but also refused to sign a declaration disclaiming all idea of opposition to the republican regime; this would have been enough for M. de Freycinet, then president of the Council and favouring them, to still "tolerate" them. When the Orders decided to sign this formal declaration of loyalty, the manoeuvre had been made void and M. de Freycinet had to resign because he had tried to negotiate this accord against the wishes of parliament and his colleagues of the Cabinet.

The Abbe Brugerette comments on the declaration the religious Orders had to sign and found so repugnant:

"This declaration of respect for the institutions France gave herself freely... may seem very harmless and inoffensive, today, when compared with the solemn oath of loyalty demanded from the German bishops by the Concordat of the 20th of July 1933 between the Holy See and the Reich. "Article 16.—"Before taking possession of their diocese, the bishops will take an oath of loyalty before the president of the Reich or a competent Reichsstatthalter in the following terms:

"Before God and on the Holy Scriptures, I swear and promise, as a bishop should, loyalty to the German Reich and the State. I swear and promise to respect and make my clergy respect the government established according to the constitutional laws. As is my duty, I will work for the good and in the interests of the German State; in the exercise of the holy ministry entrusted to me, I will try to stop everything which would be detrimental to it". (Concordat between the Holy See and the German Reich)(65). The difference is certainly great between a mere promise of non- opposition to France's regime and this solemn pledge to uphold the Nazi state. Just as great as the difference between the two regimes, one democratic and liberal, so hated by the Roman Church, the other totalitarian and brutally intolerent, wanted and set up by the united efforts of Franz von Papen, the pope's secret chamberlain, and Monseigneur Pacelli, nuncio in Berlin and future Pius XII.

It is again the Abbe Brugerette who, after having declared that the government's aim had been reached as far as the Company of Jesus was concerned, admits also:

"We could not speak of the destruction of the institution of congregations. The women's congregations had not been touched and the authorised ones, "as dangerous as the others for the lay spirit", were still standing. We knew also that nearly all the men's congregations, expelled from their houses because of the decrees of 1880, had quietly gone back to their monasteries".(66)

But this lull was short-lived. The intention of the state to collect taxes and rights of succession on the wealth of the ecclesiastical communities provoked a general outcry amongst them, as they had no intention to submit to the common law. "The organisation of resistance was the work of a committee

directed by the PP. Bailly, "Assumptionist", Stanislas, a Capuchin, and Le Dore, superior of the Eudists... Father Bailly was reviving the great zeal of the clergy by writing: "Like Saint Laurent, the monks and nuns must go back to the rack or thumb-screws rather than surrender".(67)

As by accident, the main revivalist of that "great zeal", Bailly, was an "Assumptionist", or, in fact, a camouflaged Jesuit. As for the rack and the thumb-screws, we could have reminded the good Father that these instruments of torture are in the tradition of the Holy-See and not the one of the republican state.

Finally, the congregations paid—about half of what they owed—and the aforementioned Abbe admits that "the prosperity of their work was not impaired", as we can well imagine.

We cannot go into details concerning the laws of 1880 and 1886 which tended to assure the confessional neutrality of the state schools, this "secularisation"(67a) which is natural to all tolerant minds, but is rejected by the Roman Church as an abominable attempt at forcing consciences, something she has always claimed for herself. We could expect her to fight for this so-called right as violently as for her financial privileges.

(66) and (67) Abbe Brugerette, op.cit., pp. 185,196,191.

(67a) See Jan Cotereau: "Anthologie des grands textes laiques" (Fischbacher, Paris)

In 1883, the Roman congregation of the Index, inspired by Jesuitism, enters the fight by the condemnation of certain school books on moral and civic teaching. Of course, the matter is grave: one of the authors, Paul Bert, dared to write that even the idea of miracles "must vanish before the critical mind!" So, more than fifty bishops promulgate the decree of the Index, with fulminating comments, and one of them, Monseigneur Isoard, declares in his pastoral letter of the 27th of February 1883 that the teachers, the parents and the children who refuse to destroy these books will be barred from the sacraments.(67b)

The laws of 1886, 1901 and 1904, declaring that no teaching post could be held by members of religious congregations, also started a flood of protestations from the Vatican and the "French" clergy. But, in fact, the teaching monks and nuns only had to "secularise" themselves. The only positive result of these legal dispositions was that the professors of the schools "so-called free" had from now on to produce adequate pedagogic qualifications, a good thing when we know that, before the last war, the Catholic primary schools in France numbered 11, 655 with 824,595 pupils As for the "free" colleges, and especially the Jesuits', if their number is being reduced it is because of several factors which have nothing to do with the legal wrangles. The superiority of the university's teaching, acknowledged by the majority of parents, and, more recently, its being without change, are the main causes for its growing popularity. Besides, the Society of Jesus has voluntarily reduced the number of its schools.

(67b) See Jean Cornec: "Laicite" (Sudel, Paris).

The hostility of which the devout party pretended to be the victim, at the end of the 19th century, from the Republican state, would not have lacked justification, even though this hostility, or more accurately mistrust, had been even more positive. In fact, the clerical opposition to the regime which France gave herself freely showed itself at every opportunity, according to the Abbe Bruguerette. In 1873, the attempt to restore monarchy with the Count of Chambord failed, even though strongly supported by the clergy, because the Pretender stubbornly refused to adopt the tricoloured flag, to him the emblem of Revolution.

“Such as it is, Catholicism seems bound to politics, or to a certain kind of politics... Loyalty to the Monarchy was transmitted from generation to generation in the old noble families as well as in the middle-classes and the common people, in the Catholic regions of the West and South. Their nostalgia of an ancient and idealised Regime, pictured in an epic Middle Age was coupled with the wishes of fervent Catholics whose main preoccupation was the salvation of the religion; they rallied, behind Veillot, with the legitimate and devout royal family of Chambord, considered to be the form of government most favourable to the Church. Out of the union of these political and religious forces was born, in the strained situation after the war, a kind of reactionary mysticism, illustrated perfectly by Monseigneur Pie, bishop of Poitiers, and its best incarnation in the ecclesiastical world: “France, who awaits another chief and calls for a master..., will again receive from God “the sceptre of the Universe which fell from her hands for a while”, on the day when she will have learned anew how to go down on her knees”.(68)

(68) Adrien Dansette, *op.cit.*, II, pp.37, 38.

This picture, described by a Catholic historian, is significant. It helps to understand the moves which followed, a few years later, the unsuccessful restoration attempt of 1873.

The same Catholic historian describes in the following manner the political attitude of the clergy at that time:

“At election time, the presbyteries become centers for the reactionary candidates; the priests and officiating ministers make home-calls for the electoral propaganda, slander the Republic and its new laws on teaching they declare that those who vote for the free-thinkers, the present government or freemasons described as “bandits”, “riffraffs” and “thieves”, are guilty of mortal sin. One declares that an adulterous woman will be forgiven more easily than those who send their children to lay schools, another one: that it is better to strangle a child than give support to the regime, a third one: that he will refuse the last sacraments to those who vote for the regime’s partisans. The threats are carried out: republican and anticlerical tradesmen are boycotted; destitute people are refused any help and workmen are dismissed”.(69)

These excesses from a clergy affected more and more by Jesuitic ultramontaniam are even less acceptable from the fact that they emanate “from ecclesiastics paid by the government, as the Concordat is still enforced”.

Also, the majority of public opinion is not happy at all with this pressure on the consciences, as the aforementioned author writes: "As we have seen, the French people, as a whole, is indifferent to religious matters, and we cannot mistake the hereditary observance of religious practices for a real faith... "The fact is that the political map of France is identical to her religious map... we can say that in the regions where faith is strong, the French people vote for Catholic candidates elsewhere, they consciously elect anticlerical deputies and senators... They do not want clericalism, which is ecclesiastical authority in the matter of politics and commonly called "the government of priests".

"For a large number of Catholics, the fact that the priest, this troublesome man, interferes through the sermon's instructions and the confessional's prescriptions in the behaviour of the faithful, checking thoughts, sentiments, acts, food and drink, and even the intimacies of married life, is enough; they intend, at least, to limit his empire by preserving their independence as citizens".(70)

(69) and (70) Adrien Dansette, *op.cit.*, II, pp.46, 47, 48.

We would like to see this spirit of independence as lively today. But, even though the opinion of that "large number of Catholics" was such, the ultramontanes would not disarm and pursue, at every opportunity, the fight against the hated regime. They thought for a while that they had found the "providential man" in the person of General Boulanger, minister for War in 1886, who, having organised his personal propaganda extremely well, looked like being a future dictator. "A tacit agreement", wrote M. Adrien Dansette, "is established between the general and the Catholics, and becomes clear during the summer... He has also concluded a secret agreement with royalist members of parliament such as Baron de Mackau and Count de Mun, faithful defenders of the Church at the Assembly...

'The phlegmatic minister for the Interior, Constans, threatens to arrest him and, on the 1st of April, the dictator candidate escapes to Brussels, with his mistress.

"From now on, "Boulangism" declines rapidly. France has not been taken: she recovers... "Boulangism" is crushed at the polls on the 22nd of September and 6th of October 1889..."(71)

We can read, from the pen of the same historian, what the attitude of the pope of that time was regarding this adventurer; he was Leo XIII who, in 1878, had succeeded Pius IX, the pope of the Syllabus, and who pretended to advise the faithful of France to join the republican regime:

"In August (1889), the German ambassador to the Vatican pretends that the pope sees in the general (Boulanger) the man who will overthrow the French Republic and re-establish the throne; we can read an article in which the "Monitor of Rome" envisages that the dictatorial candidate will take over power and that the Church "could benefit greatly from it"... General Boulanger sent one of his former officers to Rome with a letter for Leo XIII in which he promises the pope "that on the day when he would hold in his hands the

sword of France, he would do his uttermost to make the rights of the papacy acknowledged".(72)

Such was this Jesuit pontiff; the intransigent clerics objected to his supposed excess of "liberalism"!

The boulangist crisis revealed well enough the action led by the religious party against the lay Republic, under the cover of nationalism. But the colourless nature of the principal character, as well as the resistance of a majority of the nation, had defeated the attempt in spite of all this forced agitation. Nevertheless, these chauvinistic tactics had proved quite effective, especially in Paris, and they were to be used again at another, and better, opportunity. This came about—or was it provoked?—and the disciples of Loyola were, of course, at the head of this movement. "Their friends are here", wrote M. Pierre Dominique, "a bigoted nobility, a bourgeoisie which rejects Voltaire, and many military men. They will especially work on the army, and the result will be the famous alliance of "the sword and the sprinkler of Holy water".

(71) and (72) Adrien Dansette, *op.cit.*, II, p p . 1 1 4 ss.

"In 1890, it is not the king of France's conscience they rule any more, but the general-staff, or, at least, its chief; then, the "Dreyfus Affair" breaks out, a real civil war which divides France into two".(73) The Catholic historian, Adrien Dansette, sums up the beginning of the Affair as follows:

"On the 22nd of December 1894, the Captain of artillery Alfred Dreyfus is proved guilty of treason, condemned to deportation for life imprisonment and cashiering. Three months earlier, our Intelligence Service had discovered, at the German Embassy, a list of several documents to do with national defence; it established a resemblance between the writing of Captain Dreyfus and the one on that list Immediately, the general-staff cried out: "It's him; it's the Jew". They only had this presumption as the treason had no psychological explanation (Dreyfus had a good reputation, was rich and led an orderly life); the unfortunate man is nevertheless imprisoned, condemned by a military tribunal after an inquiry so swift and partial that the judgement must have been preconceived. To make it worse, it will be learned later that a secret document was given to the judges, without the knowledge of the counsel for the accused..

"But there was more leakage at the general-staff after Dreyfus' arrest and commandant Picquart, chief of the Intelligence Service after July 1895, learns of a certain project called "petit bleu" (express letters), between the German military attache and the French commandant (of Hungarian origin) Esterhazy; he is a disreputable man who has nothing but hatred and contempt for his country of adoption. But an officer in the Intelligence Service, Commandant Henry, adds to the Dreyfus file,—as we shall see- a false document which would be crushing for the Jewish officer if it was genuine; he also erases and re-writes the name of Esterhazy on the "petit bleu" to give the impression that the document was faked. So Picquart is disgraced in November 1896".(74)

(73) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., p.239.

(74) and (78) Adrien Dansette, op.cit., II, pp.263, 264.

The disgrace of the chief of the Intelligence Service is easy to understand: his zeal to dissipate the accumulated darkness was too excessive. The most trustworthy testimony is found in the "Carnets de Schwartzkoppen", published after his death, in 1930. It was from Esterhazy, and not Dreyfus, that the author, then first military attache at the German embassy in Paris, received secret documents of the French national defence.

"Already sometime before, in July, Picquart thought the time had come to warn by letter the chief of the general-staff, who was then in Vichy, about his suspicions concerning Esterhazy. The first meeting was on the 5th of August 1896. General de Boisdeffre approved of everything Picquart had done so far concerning this affair and gave him the permission to carry on with his investigation. "The minister for War, General Billot, was equally informed from August about Picquart's suspicions; he also sanctioned the measures taken by Picquart. Esterhazy, whom I had dismissed, had tried, using his connections with the deputy Jules Roche, to be posted to the ministry for War. presumably to try to get in touch with me again, and had written several letters to the minister for War as well as to his aide-de- camp. One of his letters was given to Picquart who, for the first time, realised that his writing was the same as the one on the "list"! He showed a photo of that letter to Du Paty and Bertillon, without telling them, of course, who wrote it... Bertillon said: "Oh, that's the writing on the list!"(75)

"Feeling his conviction of Dreyfus' culpability crumbling away, Picquart decided to consult the "small file" which had been given only to the Judges, The archivist Gribelin gave it to him. It was evening. Left alone in his office, Picquart opened Henry's unsealed envelope, on which was Henry's paraph written with a blue pencil... Great was his amazement when he realised the nullity of those pitiful documents, none of which could be applied to Dreyfus. For the first time, he knew that the condemned man on the "Ile du Diable" (Devils Island) was innocent. The following day, Picquart wrote a letter to General de Boisdeffre in which he exposed all the charges against Esterhazy and his recent discovery. When reading about that "secret file", the general jumped up, exclaiming: "Why was it not burned as agreed?"(76)

Von Schwartzkoppen wrote further: "My position became extremely uncomfortable. This question was before me: should I tell the whole truth and so repair the horrible mistake and liberate that poor innocent man? If I had been able to act as I wanted to, I would certainly have done just that! Looking at these things in detail, I came to the conclusion that I shouldn't get involved in that matter, for, as things were, nobody would have believed me; also, diplomatic considerations were standing in the way of such an action. Considering that the French government was able to take the necessary measures to clear the matter and make up for the injustice, I really made up my mind not to do anything".(77)

(75) and (77) "Les Carnets de Schwartzkoppen" Rieder, Paris 1933, pp.147, 148, 162.

(76) Armand Charpentier, "Histoire de l'affaire Dreyfus" (Fasquelle, 1933, p.73).

(78) See earlier on.

"We can see coming to life the tactics of the general-staff, notes Adrien Dansette: "If Esterhazy is guilty, the officers who provoked the illegal condemnation of Dreyfus, and most of all General Marcier, minister for War at that time, are guilty also. The interests of the army require the sacrifice of Dreyfus; we must not interfere with the sentence of 1894".(78) We remain dumbfounded, today, at the thought that such an argument could be invoked to justify, if we dare express ourselves so, an iniquitous condemnation. It was to be so all through the Affair which was then just beginning. Of course, we were then in an Anti-Semitic fever. The violent dissertations of Edouard Drumont, in the "Libre Parole", showed up every day the children of Israel as agents of national corruption and dissolution. The unfavourable prejudice so created incited a large section of public opinion to believe, "a priori", in Dreyfus' guilt. But, later, when the innocence of the accused became evident, the monstrous argument of the "infallibility" of the military tribunal was still upheld, and from now on with a perfect cynicism.

Was it the Holy Spirit inspiring these judges in uniform who could not make any mistake? It would be tempting to believe in that celestial intervention—so similar to the one which guarantees papal infallibility—when we read about Father du Lac, of the Company of Jesus, who had a lot to do with the Affair:

"He directed the college of the "Rue des Postes" where the Jesuits prepared the candidates for the larger Schools. He is a very intelligent man with important connections. He converted Drumont, is the confessor of de Mun and de Boisdeffre, chief of the Army's general-staff, whom he sees every day".(79)

The Abbe Brugere also mentions the same facts quoted by Joseph Reinach: "Is it not this Father du Lac who converted Drumont and urged him to write "The Jewish France", who supplied the means to create the "Libre Parole"? Does not General de Boisdeffre see the famous Jesuit every day? The chief of the general-staff doesn't take any decision before consulting first his director".(80)

There, on Devil's Island, which deserves its name so well in that deadly climate, the victim of this atrocious plot was treated in an extremely cruel manner, as the Anti-Semitic press had spread the report that he had tried to escape. The minister for Colonies, Andre Lebon, gave orders accordingly. "On the Sunday morning, the 6th of September, the head warder, Lebar, informed his prisoner that he would not, from then on, be allowed to walk in the part of the island which had been reserved for him, and that he would be confined to his hut. In the evening, he was told that he would be chained at night. At the foot of his bed, made up of three planks, were rivetted two double iron shackles which encircled the convict's feet. When the nights were torrid, this punishment was especially painful."

(79) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., p.240.

(80) (83) and (85) Abbe Brugere, op.cit., II, pp.454, 432, 467.

"At dawn, the guards unfastened the prisoner who, when he got up, trembled on his feet. He was forbidden to leave his hut where he had to stay day and

night. In the evening, he was shackled again, and this went on for forty nights. After a while, his ankles were covered with blood and they had to be bandaged; his guards, moved with compassion, secretly wrapped up his feet before chaining them".(81)

Nevertheless, the convict still proclaimed his innocence; he wrote to his wife: "There must be somewhere, in this beautiful and generous land of France, an honest man who is courageous enough to search for, and discover, the truth".(82)

In fact, the truth was not in doubt any more. What was lacking was the will to let it burst forth. The Abbe Brugere himself testifies of the fact: "The presumptions of innocence of the convict on Devil's Island multiply in vain; M. de Bulow's declarations at the Reichstag and those transmitted by M. de Munster, his ambassador, to the French government, also state the innocence of Dreyfus in vain; an innocence proclaimed also by Emperor Guillaume and confirmed when Schwarzkoppen (the German military attache) was recalled to Berlin as soon as Esterhazy was accused by Mathieu Dreyfus (brother of the convict). The general-staff remains opposed to any re-examination of the trial... Someone is busy covering up for Esterhazy. Secret documents are communicated to him for his defence, and even his writing is not allowed to be compared with that on the "list"...

"Shielded in that way, the villain Esterhazy is audacious enough to ask to appear before a Council of war. There, he is unanimously acquitted, on the 17th of January 1898, after a deliberation lasting three minutes".(83)

We must mention that, a few months later, when Colonel Henry was convicted of forgery, Esterhazy fled to England and, in the end, confessed that he was the author of the famous "list" attributed to Dreyfus. We cannot cite all the many happenings in this drama, the forgeries added to more forgeries in an attempt to conceal an obvious truth, the dismissal of the chief of the general staff, the downfall of ministers, the suicide of Henry, detained at Mont Valerien, who slit his throat and so signed with his own blood the confession of his culpability.

In December 1898, this semi-official note was published by the German press: "The declarations of the imperial government have established that no German personality, high or low, had any kind of relations with Dreyfus. Then, from the German point of view, we see no inconvenience as to the unabridged publication of the secret file.(84)

(81) Armand Charpentier, op.cit., p.75.

(82) "Lettres d'un innocent", January and February 1895.

(84) Maurice Paleologue: "Journal de l'Affaire Dreyfus" (Plon, Paris 1955, p. 149)

At last, the inevitable re-examination is decided by the High-Court. Dreyfus has to appear again before the council of war at Rennes, on the 3rd of June 1899, and it is the start of another torture for him. "He could not suppose that he was to meet hatred more odious than when he left and that his former chiefs, conspiring to set him again on the road to Devil's Island, would have no pity for this wretch, this poor creature who thought he has endured all the suffering there is to endure".(85)

"So", wrote the Abbe Brugere, "the council of war at Rennes will only add a new injustice to the iniquity of the 1894 trial. The illegality of this trial, the guilt of Esterhazy, the criminal manoeuvres of Henry will come out clearly during the twenty-nine sessions of that trial at Rennes. But the council of war... will judge Dreyfus on other spying charges which were never the cause of an accusation or report. All the previous leakages will be attributed to him and documents will be produced which had nothing to do with him... At last, and contrary to all our legal traditions, we will require that Dreyfus himself establish that such a document or paper was not handed over by him, as if it was not the task of the prosecution to prove the crime any more".(86)

The partiality of Dreyfus' accusers was so obvious that public opinion outside France was aroused. In Germany, the semi-official "Cologne Gazette" published, on the 16th and 29th of August, in the middle of the trial, two articles in which we read the following phrase: "If, after the declarations of the German government and the debates of the highest court of appeal in France, someone still believes Dreyfus guilty, we can only answer that person that he must be mentally ill or he consciously wants an innocent to be condemned".(87)

(85) See earlier on (86) and (89) Abbe Brugere, op.cit., II, pp.469, 471, 472.

(87) Maurice Paleologue, op.cit., p.237.

(88) "L'Aurore", 14th of September, 1899.,

But the hatred, nonsense and fanaticism were not disarmed for all that Even new forgeries were used, replacing those which had lost all credit. To sum it all up, it was nothing more than sinister buffoonery. The end of it, for Dreyfus, was the condemnation to ten years' detention, with mitigating circumstances!

"This miserable trial provoked an indignant stupor all over the world France was despised. Who could have imagined such terrible sorrow?"(88) exclaimed Clemenceau at the reading of English and German newspapers. Mercy was indispensable. Dreyfus accepted it to "carry on", said he, "seeking the reversal of the awful military mistake of which he was the victim. "For this reversal, it was no use counting on the justice of the Councils of war. This justice had been seen at work! It came, once again, from the highest court of appeal which, after thorough investigations and long debates, annulled once and for all the verdict of Rennes. A few days later, the Assembly and Senate, by a solemn vote, reinstated Dreyfus in the army: Dreyfus, upon whom was conferred the Legion of Honour and who was publicly reinstated".(89)

This late reversal, obtained so laboriously, was due to "honest and courageous" men, such as those the innocent on Devil's Island wished to see coming forth. Their number grew more and more as truth came to light. After the swift acquittal of the traitor Esterhazy, by a Council of war in January 1898, Emile Zola published in the "Aurore", Clemenceau's publication, his famous open letter "I accuse". He wrote: "I accuse the first Council of war to have violated the law by condemning an accused person on the grounds of some document remaining secret, and I accuse the second Council of war to have covered up this illegality by committing also a judicial crime in

knowingly acquitting a culprit".

But the "knights" of our famous Company were on the watch out to hush up anything which could have enlightened the public. A question from the Catholic deputy de Mun brought Zola before the Assize Court of the Seine, and the courageous writer was condemned to one year imprisonment, the maximum penalty, as a result of this iniquitous trial.

Public opinion had been deceived so well by the outcries of the "cleric-nationalists" that the elections of May 1898 were in their favour. Nevertheless, the public revelation of forgeries, the dismissal of the chief of the general-staff, the evident criminal partiality of the judges opened the eyes of those sincerely seeking the truth more and more. But these came almost exclusively from the ranks of the Protestants, Jews and laymen. "In France, the Catholics were few and far between, among whom few were prominent, who took sides with Dreyfus... The action of this handful of people made very little noise. The conspiracy of silence surrounded it..."(90) "Most priests and bishops remain convinced of Dreyfus' culpability", wrote the Abbe Brugere. Georges Sorel declares also: "While the Dreyfus affair brought division amongst all social groups, the Catholic world was absolutely united against a re-examination." Peguy himself admits that "all the political forces of the Church have always been against Dreyfus". Must we recall the lists of subscriptions open by the "Libre Parole" and "La Croix", in favour of the widow of the forger Henry who committed suicide? The names of the subscribing priests were often accompanied by "comments not very evangelical", as we are told by M. Adrien Dansette who quotes these:

"A certain Abbe Cros asks for a bedside mat made of Jewish skin which he would be able to stamp on morning and evening; a young priest would like to crush Reinach's nose with his heel; three priests would love to slap the filthy face of the Jew Reinach".(91)

(89) See earlier on. (90) and (91) Adrien Dansette, op.cit., II, pp.275, 276.

Only the secular clergy is still somewhat reserved. In the Congregations, things are more virulent:

"On the 15th of July 1898, prize-giving day at the College of Arcueil, presided over by Generalissimo Jamont (vice-president of the Superior Council of War), Father Didon, rector of the School Albert-le-Grand, gave a violent speech in which he advocated using violence against the men whose crime had been the courageous denunciation of a military error... "Must we", said the eloquent monk, "let the wicked go free? Certainly not! The enemy is: intellectualism pretending to despise force, and civilians wanting to subordinate the military. When persuasion has failed, when love(!) has been ineffectual, we must brandish the sword, spread terror, chop off heads, make war, strike..."

"This speech seemed to be a challenge thrown before all the sympathisers of that condemned wretch".(92)

But how many of them have we heard since then? These calls to bloody

repressions, coming from gentle clerics, especially during the German occupation! As for the cry of hatred against intellectualism, we can find the perfect echo to it in this declaration from a certain general: "When someone speaks of intelligence, I draw my revolver".

To crush the thought by force is a principle of the Roman Church which has never altered.

The Abbe Brugerette wonders, however, about the fact that nothing disturbed the clergy's belief in the culpability of Dreyfus: "Such a great and dramatic event, coming like a clap of thunder in a blue sky and bringing to light the Department for forgeries operating at the general-staff, must have opened the eyes, even of those not wanting to find the truth. We are referring to the discovery of forgeries made by Henry...

"Had not the time come for the French clergy and the Catholics to repudiate a mistake which had gone on for too long... They, the priests and the faithful could have gone, en-masse, and at the eleventh hour like the workmen mentioned in the gospels, to increase the ranks of the defenders of justice and truth... But the most evident facts do not always shed their light on minds dominated by certain prejudices, as prejudices are opposed to examination and, by their nature, rebel against evidence".(93)

Anyway, what efforts are made to maintain Catholics in error! "Could they guess that they were scandalously deceived by a press stubbornly keeping covered all the proofs of innocence, all the testimonies favourable to the convict of Devil's Island, and also determined to impede the course of Justice by any means?"(94)

(92) Abbe Brugerette, op.cit., II, p.451. (93) (94) and (96) Abbe Brugerette, op.cit., II, pp.443, 444, 448.

At the forefront of that press was "La Libre Parole", created, as we have seen, with the help of the Jesuit Father du Lac, and "La Croix" of the "Assumptionist" Father Bailly. The Order of "Assumption" being a camouflaged branch of the Company of Jesus, we must then attribute to them the start and pursuit of the anti-Dreyfus campaign. A not very suspicious witness, Father Lecanuet, writes boldly: "The Congregations and especially the Jesuits are denounced by the Affair's historians. And, this time, we must admit that the Jesuits took the first shot with a very thoughtless temerity".(95)

"The provincial Catholic newspapers, such as the "Nouvelliste" of Lyon, to informative and widely read, will nearly all take part in that dark plot against truth and justice. It seems that the watchword was passed around to stop light breaking through and to keep the public in the dark".(96)

In reality, one would need a peculiar blindness not to discern, behind the furor shown by the "Croix" in Paris and in the provinces, the "watchword" mentioned by the Abbe Brugerette. And one would also be very naive not to know the origin.(96a)

M. Adrien Dansette says this also: "It is the "Assumptionist" Order as a whole and with it the Church which are exposed by the campaign of "La Croix"...

Father Bailly boasts that the 'Holy-Father' approved of him".(97)

In fact, there isn't any doubt concerning that approval! The Jesuits, to whom the "Assumptionists" lend their name, are they not, since the Order was founded, the pope's political instruments? We have to smile at the story cleverly spread around—which is echoed by apologist historians—that Leo XIII had apparently "advised moderation" to the directors of "La Croix". It is a classical trick, but still somewhat efficacious. Today, there are still some folk who believe in a kind of "independence" of the Holy-See's official voice! Let us see now what was published in Rome itself by the "Civiltà Cattolica", the Jesuits' official publication, under the title "Il caso Dreyfus":

"The Jews' emancipation has been the result of the so-called principles of 1789, whose yoke weighs heavily on all French people... The Jews hold the Republic in their hands, which is more Hebraic than French... The Jew has been created by God to be used as a spy wherever some treason is being prepared... It is not only in France, but also in Germany, Austria and Italy that the Jews must be excluded from the nation. Then, with the great harmony of former times re-established, nations will find again their lost happiness".(98)

(95) Father Lecanuet, "Les Signes avant-coureurs de la Separation", p. 179.

(96a) The newspaper "La Croix" was then widely published. (Note of the author).

(97) Adrien Dansette, op.cit., p.277.

(98) The "Civiltà Cattolica" of the 5th of February 1898.

In the previous chapters, we gave a short summary of the "great harmony" and "happiness" enjoyed by the nations when the sons of Loyola heard the confessions and inspired the kings. As we have just seen, "harmony" was also reigning when they were the confessors and counsellors of the general-staffs chiefs.

According to the Abbe Brugere, General de Boisdeffre, penitent of the Jesuit Father du Lac, tasted the same bitterness as many others before him who were equally deceived by these "directors of consciences". The confessions of the forger Henry put him under an obligation to resign. "Being a very honest man, he will himself proclaim that he was "Scandalously deceived", and those who knew him were aware that he felt very bitter about the "plot" of which he had been the victim".(99) And the Abbe Brugere adds that he stopped "all communications" with his former confessor "and even refused to see him again when dying".

After reading all this, written and published in the "Civiltà Cattolica", it would be superfluous to dwell even deeper on the Order's culpability and we can only agree with what Joseph Reinach wrote then: "You see, it is the Jesuits who contrived this dark affair. And, for them, Dreyfus is only a pretext. What they want, and they admit it, is to strangle the laity and a redirected French Revolution..., abolish foreign gods, the dogmas of 1789".

This is clear enough. But, as some still insist, against all evidence, that there was a possible disagreement between the pope and his secret army, between the intentions of one and the actions of the other, it is easy to show the emptiness of such a supposition. The case of Bailly is very

enlightening in that aspect.

What can we read in "La Croix" of the 29th of May 1956? Nothing less than this: "As we have announced, His Eminence Cardinal Feltin ordered a research into Father Bailly's writings; he was the founder of our publication and the "Maison de la Bonne Press". Here is the text of that ordinance dated 15th of May 1956:

"We, Maurice Feltin, by the grace of God and of the apostolic Holy-See, cardinal-priest of the Holy Roman Church whose title is Holy-Mary-of- Peace, archbishop of Paris.

(99) Abbe Brugerette, op.cit., II, pp.435, 454.

"In view of the plan submitted by the Congregation of the Assumption's Augustinians and approved by us, to introduce in Rome the cause of God's servant Vincent-de-Paul Bailly, founder of "La Croix" and "Bonne Press". "In view of the dispositions... and instructions of the Holy See regarding the act of beatification and research into the writings of God's servants: "We have ordered and order the following: "Anyone who knew this servant of God or who can tell us something special about his life must let us know about it... "Anyone who possesses writings of this servant of God must let us have them before the 30th of September 1956, be it printed books, handwritten notes, letters, memoranda... even instructions or advices not written by him, but which he dictated... "For all these communications, we designate Canon Dubois, secretary of our archbishopric, and promoter of faith for this cause".(100)

Here is a "servant of God" well on the way to receive the just reward for his loyal services in the form of a halo. And we dare say that, as far as his "writings" are concerned and which were so carefully searched for, the "promoter of faith" will have too much to choose from. As for the "printed" material, the collection of "La Croix", especially between 1895 and 1899, will supply the most edifying kind.

"Their attitude (of the Catholic newspapers), and especially the one of "La Croix", constitute at the moment for all "enlightened and upright minds", what M. Paul Violet, Catholic member of the Institute calls an "indescribable scandal"; and this scandal upholds, in the Dreyfus Affair, the most shocking mistakes, the lying and crime against truth, uprightness and justice. "The Court of Rome", he adds, "knows it, as all the Courts of Europe do".(101) Indeed, the Court of Rome knew better than anyone else! As we have seen, in 1956, she had not forgotten the pious exploits of this "servant of God" as she was preparing his beatification.

No doubt, the promoter of faith credited our future "saint" with those famous lists of subscriptions in favour of the widow of the forger Henry, about which the Abbe Brugerette says: "Today, when we consider those calls for the Inquisition to be brought back, for the persecution of the Jews, for the murder of Dreyfus' defenders, it is like listening to the delirious imaginations of wild and grotesque fanatics. Nevertheless, these are presented to us by "La Croix" as a great, comforting and cheering spectacle".(102)

(100) "La Croix" of the 29th of May 1956.

(101) Abbe Brugerette, op.cit., p.443.

(102) Abbe Brugerette, op.cit., II, p.450.

All those pious wishes concerning the Jews, Father Bailly did not have the joy to see them realised, in his lifetime, by these wild fanatics, under the swastika. He could only take delight in that "great, comforting and cheering spectacle" from heaven, even though, up there, spectacles of that sort are quite common, according to the "learned", and especially Saint Thomas d'Aquin, the Angel of the School:

"In order to help the saints enjoy their blessedness more, and increase their thanksgivings to God, they are allowed to contemplate in all its awfulness the torture of the godless... The saints will rejoice in the torments of the godless". (Sancti de poenis impiorum gaudebunt) (103).

As we can see, Father Bailly, Founder of "La Croix", had what it takes to make a saint: persecute the innocent, curse those who defend him, give them up to be murdered, uphold with all one's strength lying and iniquity, stir up discord and hatred; these are, to the eyes of the Roman Church, solid titles for glory, and we can understand her wish to bestow the halo on the author of these pious deeds.

However, this question is asked, "Is this 'servant of God' a wonder-worker also? Because we know that, to deserve such a promotion, one must have accomplished miracles well and truly checked."

What were the miracles accomplished by the director-founder of "La Croix"? Was it the transmutation, for his readers, of black into white and white into black? To have presented a lie as the truth and the truth as a lie? Naturally, but a greater miracle was the fact that he persuaded members of the general-staff (and then the public) that, after having committed an initial mistake, and when this mistake was discovered, it was in their "honour" to deny the evidence, transforming in that way the mistake into abuse of power! "Errare humanum est, perseverare diabolicum". The "servant of God" was not taking much notice of that proverb. Instead of letting it inspire him, he hid it under his cassock. In fact, the "mea culpa" is for the simple faithful and not the ecclesiastics, nor—as we have just seen—for the military chiefs who have Jesuit confessors.

The result—sought for—was the exaltation of partisan passions and the division of the French people.

This is stated by the eminent historian Pierre Gaxotte: "The Dreyfus Affair was the decisive turning point... judged by officers, it involved the military institution... The Affair grew, became a political conflict, divided families, cut France into two. It had the effects of a war of religion... It created hatred against the officers corps... It started anti-militarism".(104)

(103) "Somme theologique", in Supple. XCIV, I, 3.

(104) Pierre Gazotte, de l'Academie Francaise, "Histoire de Francais" (Flammarion, Paris 1951, tome II, pp.516, 517.

When we think of Europe at that time, Germany over-equipped with arms and surrounded by her two allies, when we recollect the Vatican's responsibility in the start of the 1914 conflict, we cannot believe that the diminution of strength in our military potential was not premeditated. How could we not notice that, in fact, the "Dreyfus Affair" started in 1894, the year of the Franco-Russian alliance. Then, the spokesmen of the Vatican were very outspoken about the accord with a "schismatic" power which, to their eyes, was a scandal. Even today, a "prelate of His Holiness", Monseigneur Cristiani, dares write:

"Through politics strangely blind and ill considered, our country seemed to take pleasure in provoking war-like inclinations in her formidable neighbour (Germany)... In fact, the Franco-Russian alliance seemed to threaten Germany with encirclement".(105)

For the respectable prelate, the Triple Alliance (Germany, Italy, Austria-Hungary) was not a threat to anyone and France was wrong not to stay isolated before such a block. With three against one, the "coup" would have been easier and our Holy Father the pope would not have had to deplore, in 1918, the defeat of his champions.

(105) Mgr Cristiani, "Le Vatican politique" (Ed. du Centurion, Paris 1957, p. 102).

So, as wrote the Abbe Brugere: "Under the image of Jesus crucified, divine symbol of the idea of justice, "La Croix" had passionately co-operated with the work of deception and of crime against truth, uprightness and justice".(106)

Justice had nevertheless triumphed in the end and the Abbe Fremont, who did not fear mentioning the sinister crusade led by Innocent III against the Albigenses when referring to the Affair, seemed to be a true prophet when he said:

"The Catholics are winning and they think they will overthrow the Republic because of the hatred for the Jews. But they will, I am afraid, only overthrow themselves".(107)

In fact, when opinion was enlightened, the reaction was fatal. Ranc had learned the lesson of the Affair when he exclaimed: "The Republic will break the power of the Congregations, or she will be strangled". In 1899, a ministry "of republican defence" was constituted; Father Picard, superior of the "Assumptionists", Father Bailly, director of "La Croix", and ten other members of that Order were brought to trial before the tribunal of the Seine for breach of the law on associations. The Congregation of the "Assumptionists" was dissolved.

Waldek-Rousseau, president of the Council, declared in a speech pronounced at Toulouse on the 28th of October 1900: "Dispersed, but not suppressed, the religious Orders formed themselves again, bigger in numbers and more militant; they cover the territory with the network of a political organisation whose links are innumerable and tightly knit, as we have seen through a recent trial".

(106) Abbe Brugere, op.cit., II, p.478.

(107) Agnes Siegfried: "L'Abbe Fremont" (F. Alcan. Paris 1932, II, p.163).

At last, in 1901, a law is passed, ruling that no Congregation can be formed without an authorisation, and that those who do not ask for it within the legal time will be automatically dissolved.

It will be these regulations, quite natural on the part of public authorities whose duty it is to check the associations found in their territory, which will be presented to the Catholics as an intolerable abuse. "A man's house is his castle", goes the saying; but the Church is not having any of it: the common law is not for her.

The resistance of the clerics to the application of the law would be enough to show how necessary it was. This resistance will only strengthen the government's attitude, especially under minister Combes; and Rome's intransigence, especially when Pius I succeeded to Leo XIII, will bring about the law of 1904, abolishing the teaching Orders. After that, friction between the French government and the Holy See will be constant. Besides, the election of the new pope was done in significant circumstances.

"Leo XIII died on the 20th of July 1903. The conclave, meeting to designate his successor, gives, after several ballots, 29 votes for Cardinal Rampolla, -42 are needed to be elected-, when the Austrian Cardinal Puzyna stands up and declares that His Apostolic Majesty the Emperor of Austria, king of Hungary, is inspired officially to exclude the secretary of State to Leo XIII. We know that Cardinal Rampolla is pro-French".(108) Cardinal Sarto is elected. Through the manoeuvre of Austria, which substituted itself for the Holy-Spirit to "inspire" the cardinals of the conclave, this election is a victory for the Jesuits. Indeed, the new pontiff, described as a mixture of "village priest and archangel with a fiery sword", is the perfect type of man wished for by the Order. This is what M. Adrien Dansette says about it:

"When we love the pope, we do not limit the field in which he can and must exercise his will".(109)

Or this from his first consistorial address: "We know that we will shock many people when we declare that we will necessarily be involved in politics. But anyone wanting to judge fairly can see that the Sovereign Pontiff, invested by God with a supreme authority, doesn't have the right to separate politics from the domain of faith and morals".(110) So Pius X, as soon as he had acceded to Saint-Peter's throne, publicly declared that, for him, the pope's authority must be felt in every domain, and that political clericalism is not only a right but a duty. He also chose for his secretary of State a Spanish prelate, Monseigneur Merry del Val who was thirty-eight years old and, like him, passionately pro-German and anti-French. This state of mind is not surprising when we read these words from the Abbe Fremont:

(108) (109) and (110) Adrien Dansette, op.cit., pp.317, 318, 319.

"Merry del Val, whom I met at the Roman College, was the "Jesuits' favorite pupil". (111)

The relations between the Holy See and France soon felt the effects of that choice. First of all, it was the nomination of bishops by the civil power which brought about a conflict.

“Before the war of 1870, the Holy See learned the names of the new bishops only after they had been nominated. The pope reserved the right, if one was not acceptable to him, to stop him being a bishop by withholding the canonical institution. In fact, the difficulties were enormous as the governments, under any kind of regime, were careful to elect candidates worthy of the episcopal office”.(112)

As soon as Pius X was pope, most of the nominations for new bishops were refused by Rome. Besides, the nuncio in Paris, Lorenzelli, was, as we are told by M. Adrien Dansette, “a theologian who has gone astray in diplomacy and madly hostile to France”. Some will say: “Just another one added to all the others!” But such a choice for such a post clearly shows what were the intentions of the Roman Curia towards our country.

This systematic hostility was going to show itself even more clearly in 1904, when M. Loubet, president of the Republic, went to Rome to return the visit paid to him in Paris sometime before by the king of Italy, Victor-Emmanuel III.

M. Loubet wished to be received by the pope also. But the Roman Curia produced a supposed “invincible protocol”: “The pope could not receive a head of state who, when visiting the king of Italy in Rome, seemed to acknowledge as lawful the “usurpation” of that ancient pontifical State. But there were precedents: twice, in 1888 and 1903, a head of state—and not one of the less important—had been received in Rome by the king of Italy and the pope. Of course, this visitor was not the president of a Republic, but the German Emperor Guillaume II... The same honour had been given to Edward VII, King of England, and the Czar.

The insulting intention of that refusal was evident, and even emphasised by a note sent to the various chancelleries by the secretary of State Merry del Val. A Catholic author, M. Charles Ledre, recently wrote this concerning the matter:

“Could the pontifical diplomacy ignore the decisively important objective which, behind the visit of president Loubet to Rome, was really takingshape?”(113)

(111) Agnes Siegfried, *op.cit.*, p.342.

(112) Adrien Dansette, *op.cit.*, p.323.

(113) Charles Ledre: “Un siecle sous la tiare” (Bibliothèque catholique Amiot-Dumont, Paris 1955, p. 125).

Of course, the Vatican knew about the plan to separate Italy from her partners of the Triple Alliance: Germany and Austria-Hungary, these two Germanic powers considered by the Roman Church to be her best secular arms. This was the very crux of the matter, and was, in fact the reason for the Vatican’s frequent bursts of temper.

Other conflicts arose concerning French bishops, considered in Rome to be too

Republican. At last, tired of the constant difficulties arising from the Vatican's infringements of the terms of the Concordat, the French government put an end, on the 29th of July 1904, to "relations which were made void by the Holy See".

The breaking of diplomatic relations was bound to lead, soon after, to the separation of Church and state.

"We find it normal today", wrote M. Adrien Dansette, "that France should maintain diplomatic relations with the Holy See, and that State and Church should live under the regime of separation. Diplomatic relations are necessary as France must be represented wherever she had interests to defend, outside any doctrinal consideration. But separation is necessary as, in a democracy founded on the sovereignty of a people divided by several beliefs, the state only owes liberty to the Church".(114) And the author adds: "This is, at least, the general opinion".

We can only agree with this reasonable opinion, without forgetting, of course, that the papacy would never endorse it. The Roman Church never stopped proclaiming her preeminence over civil history, throughout her own history, and, for want of being able to impose it openly in recent times, she has done her best to implant it with the help of her secret army, the Company of Jesus.

Besides, it was at that time that Father Wernz, general of this Order, wrote: "The State is under the Church's jurisdiction; so, secular authority is indeed under the subjection of ecclesiastical authority and has to obey".(U5)

That is the doctrine of these intransigent champions of theocracy, counsellors as well as those who execute their commands, who made themselves indispensable at the Vatican, so much so that, today, it would be absolutely impossible to distinguish even the smallest difference between "the black pope" and "the white pope"; they are one and the same. And, when we refer to the politics of the Vatican, we simply mean the Jesuits' politics.

(114) and (117) Adrien Dansette, *op.cit.*, pp.333, 361.

(115) Pierre Dominique, *op.cit.*, p.241.

(116) Agnes Siegfried, *op.cit.*, p.421.

With many other qualified observers, the Abbe Fremont admits it as follows: "The Jesuits dominate the Vatican".(116) Before the irreducible opposition of the Jesuits, all-powerful in the Church, to the Republic, the State is constrained to enforce the law of Separation, with several amendments, from 1905 to 1908. This law does not want to decrease the Church's wealth and her buildings set up for worship. The faithful can form themselves into local associations, under the direction of the priest, to manage them. What is Rome going to do?

"In the encyclical letter "Vehementer" (11th of February 1906), Pius X condemned the principle of separation and the one pertaining to the local associations. But does he go beyond the principles?"(117) We will soon know. In spite of the advice from the French episcopate, he rejects all settlement, on the 10th of August 1906, in the encyclical letter "Gravissimo".

This is another disappointment for the liberal Catholics: "When I think", exclaims Brunetiere, "that what is refused to the French Catholics, with the certain knowledge that such refusal will unleash a religious war in our poor country which needs peace so much, is granted to the German Catholics, that the "local associations" have been operating there for thirty years to everyone's satisfaction, I cannot help, as a patriot as well as a Catholic, feeling most indignant".(118)

There was some trouble, in fact, when an inventory of ecclesiastical properties was taken, but not a religious war... Even though the ultramontanes were stirring up trouble, the population as a whole remained calm when some of the Church's properties were returned to the state, by her, rather than submit to the conciliatory measures laid down by the law.

Did, then, the writer Brunetiere understand fully the reason for that difference in which the French Catholics and German Catholics were treated by the Holy See? The first world war was to reveal all the significance of it. While the Jesuits had effectually worked, through the "Dreyfus Affair", at dividing the French people and weakening the prestige of our army, in Germany, they were doing the exact opposite.

Bismark who, himself, had launched in the past the "Kulturkampf" against the Catholic Church, was being loaded with her favours. This is what we are told by the Catholic writer, Joseph Rovon, who also explains it: "Bismark will be the first Protestant to receive the "Order of Christ" with jewels, one of the highest honours of the Church. The German government allows newspapers devoted to it to publish the fact that the chancellor would be ready effectually to uphold the pope's pretensions of a partial restoration of his temporal authority".(119)

(118) Adrien Dansette, op.cit., p.363. (119) and (121) Joseph Rovon, op.cit., pp.121, 150 ss.

"In 1886, the Centre-German Catholic party-was hostile to the military projects presented by Bismark. Leo XIII intervened in the German interior affairs in favour of Bismark. His secretary of State wrote to the nuncio of Munich: "In view of the approaching revision of the religious legislation which, as we have reasons to believe, will be carried out in a conciliatory manner, the Holy-Father wishes that the Centre promote, in every possible way, the projects of the military".(120)

This is what Joseph Rovon has to say: "German diplomacy intervenes- it is already an old habit-at the Vatican to make the pope exercise his influence over the Zentrum (Catholic party), so as to favour the military projects... The German Catholics are going to speak about the great "political mission" of Germany which is, at the same time, a universal moral mission... The "Zentrum" makes itself also responsible for the prolongation of a reign which, from, blustering in weakness, war-like speeches over naval armaments to more war-like harangues, will eventually lead Germany to catastrophe... The "Zentrum" enters the war (of 1914) convinced of the uprightness, purity and moral integrity of its country's leaders, of the agreement of their plans and programme with the plans of eternal justice".(121)

As we can see, the papacy had done what was necessary to implant this conviction. Besides, as Monseigneur Fruhwirth said in 1914: "Germany is the base on which the Holy-Father can and must establish great hopes".

(120) Jean Bruhat: "Le Vatican contre les peuples" (Paralleles, 21st of December 1950)

To the fury aroused at the Vatican by the Franco-Russian alliance and shown so well in the Dreyfus Affair, to the anger which the Franco-Italian union incited, and to which the Loubet incident clearly testified, was added a bitter resentment caused by the Entente Cordiale with England. France had firmly decided not to stand alone opposite her 'formidable neighbor' and Austria-Hungary. Politics so "blind and ill-considered", according to Monseigneur Cristiani, were looked upon most unfavourably by the Catholic Holy of Holies. For, besides jeopardizing the "thorough bleeding" godless France needed, these politics were a priceless support for schismatic Russia, this lost sheep whose return to the Roman Catholic fold had never ceased to be hoped for, though its accomplishment might mean a war. But for the time being the Orthodox Church stayed firmly implanted in the Balkans, especially in Serbia, where the treaty of Bucarest, ending the conflict of the Balkans, had made it a centre of attraction for the Slavs of the South and in particular for those under the yoke of Austria. The ambitious plans of the Vatican and the apostolic imperialism of the Hapsburgs were then in perfect accord, as in the past. To Rome and Vienna, the growing power of Serbia marked her out as the enemy to overthrow.

This is indeed established in a diplomatic document found in the Austrian-Hungarian archives; it reports, for the benefit of the Austrian minister Berchtold, on the talks Prince Schonburg had at the Vatican in October-November 1913:

"Amongst the subjects discussed first of all with the cardinal secretary of State (Merry del Val) last week, the question of Serbia came up, as anticipated. First of all, the cardinal expressed his joy at our firm and opportune attitude of recent months. During the audience I had that day with His Holiness, the Holy-Father, who started the conversation by THE FIRST WORLD WAR mentioning our energetic steps taken in Belgrade, he made some characteristic remarks: "It would certainly have been better", said his Holiness, "if Austria-Hungary had punished the Serbians for all the wrongs they had done".(1)

So, the war-like sentiments of Pius X were clearly expressed in 1913 already. There is nothing surprising about this when we consider the inspirers of Roman politics.

"What were the Hapsburgs supposed to do? Chastise Serbia, an Orthodox nation. The prestige of Austria-Hungary, of these Hapsburgs who, with the Bourbons of Spain, were the last supporters of the Jesuits, and especially the prestige of the heir, Francois-Ferdinand, their man, would have been greatly increased. For Rome, the affair became one of almost religious importance; a victory of apostolic monarchy over Czarism could be considered as a victory of Rome over the schism of the East".(2)

However, the affair dragged on in 1913. But, on the 28th of June 1914, the archduke Francois-Ferdinand was murdered at Sarajevo. The Serbian government had nothing to do with this crime committed by a Macedonian student, but it was the perfect excuse for the emperor Francois-Joseph to start hostilities.

“Count Sforza maintains that the main problem was to persuade Francois-Joseph that war was necessary. The advice of the pope and his minister was the one which could best influence him”.(3)

This advice was of course given to the emperor, and of the kind which could be expected from this pope and his minister, “favourite pupil of the Jesuits”. While Serbia was trying to maintain peace by giving in to all the wishes of the Austrian government which had sent a threatening note to Belgrade, Count Palffy, Austrian representative to the Vatican, gave to his minister Berchtold, on the 29th of July, a summary of the talks he had had on the 27th with the cardinal-secretary of State, Merry del Val; this conversation was about “the questions which are disturbing Europe at the moment”.

The diplomat scornfully denies the “fanciful” rumours about the supposed intervention of the pope who apparently “implored the emperor to spare the Christian nations the horrors of war”. Having dealt with these “absurd” suppositions, he expounds the “real opinion of the Curia”, as conveyed to him by the secretary of State:

(1) “Document” P.A. XI/291. (2) and (3) Pierre Dominique, *op.cit.*, pp.245, 246, 250.

“It would have been impossible to detect any spirit of indulgence and conciliation in the words of His Eminence. It is true that he described the note to Serbia as very harsh, but he nevertheless approved of it entirely and, at the same time and indirectly, expressed the wish that the Monarchy would finish the job. Indeed, added the cardinal, it was a pity that Serbia had not been humiliated much earlier, as it could have been done, then, without such great risks attached. This declaration echoes the wishes of the pope who, over the past few years, often expressed regret that Austria-Hungary had neglected ‘chastising’ her dangerous neighbour on the Danube”.(4) This indeed is just the opposite to the “fanciful” rumours about a pontifical intervention in favour of peace.

In fact, the Austrian diplomat is not the only one who reports on the “real opinion” of the Roman pontiff and his minister.

The day before, on the 26th of July, Baron Ritter, Bavarian Charge d’Affaires to the Vatican, had written to his government:

“The pope agrees with Austria dealing severely with Serbia. He doesn’t think much of the Russian and French armies and is of the opinion that they could not do very much in a war against Germany. The cardinal-secretary of State doesn’t see when Austria could make war if she does not decide now”.(5)

(4) “Veröffentlichungen der (Commission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs”, 26 Wien- Leipzig 1930, pp.893, 894. (5) This communication appears in “Bayerische Dokumentenzum Kriegsausbruch”, III , p 205.

So, the Holy See was fully conscious of the "great risks" represented by a conflict between Austria and Serbia, but, nevertheless, did all in its power to encourage it.

The Holy-Father and his Jesuit counsellors were not concerned about the sufferings of "Christian nations"! It was not the first time that these nations were used for the benefit of Roman politics. The opportunity wished for had come at last to use the Germanic secular arm against Orthodox Russia, "godless" France which needed a "thorough bleeding", and, as a bonus, against "heretic" England. Everything seemed to promise a "lively and happy" war. Pius X did not see its unfolding and result, both contrary to his forecasts. He died at the beginning of the conflict, on the 20th of August 1914. But, forty years later, Pius XII canonised this august pontiff, and the "Precis d'Histoire Sainte" (Summary of Holy History), used for parochial catechism, dedicated to him these edifying words:

"Pius X did all he could to prevent the start of the 1914 war and he died of anguish when he foresaw the sufferings it would unleash".

If this was satire, it could not be put in a better way!

A few years before 1914, M. Yves Guyot, a true prophet, said: "If war breaks out, listen, you men who think that the Roman Church is the symbol of order and peace, and do not search for blame outside of the Vatican: it will be the sly instigator, as in the war of 1870".(6) Instigator of the slaughter, the Vatican was going to uphold no less craftily her Austro- German champions right through the war. The military excursion, in France, which the Kaiser boasted he was going to make, was stopped at the Marne and the aggressor brought back to the defensive after every one of his furious attacks. But, at least, pontifical diplomacy brought him all the help possible, and this is not surprising when we consider that Divine Providence seemed to delight in favouring the central empires.

Indeed, Cardinal Rampolla, considered to be pro-French—and for that reason kept away from the pontifical throne on a veto from Austria—wasn't any more amongst those who could become pope as he had died a few months before Pius X, a death it seems very opportune. But this was not the whole of "God's" intervention: As he had promised, even before voting took place, the new pope, Benedict XV appointed Cardinal Ferrata as secretary of State.

But the cardinal(7) did not even have the time to take up fully his new position. Having entered the secretary's office at the end of September 1914, HE DIED SUDDENLY on the 20th of October, victim of a terrible indisposition after partaking of some "LIGHT REFRESHMENTS".

"He was sitting at his desk when he suddenly became violently sick. He fell as if lightning had struck him. The servants hastened to come to his help. The doctor, who had been called immediately, realised straightaway the gravity of the situation and asked for a quick consultation. As for Ferrata, he had already understood and knew there was no hope... He pleaded that he should not be left to die at the Vatican... The medical consultation took place immediately at his hotel with six doctors... They refused to draw up a medical

bulletin; the one published bore no signatures".(8) He was not suffering from any kind of sickness or infirmity. "The scandal of this death was such that an inquest could not be avoided. The result of it was: a jar had been broken at the office. The presence of pounded glass in the sugar bowl used by the cardinal was explained quite simply in that way. Granulated sugar can be useful! The inquest was stopped there..."(9)

(6) Yves Guyot: "Bilan politique de l'Eglise", p. 139.

(7) He was not very friendly towards the Jesuits.

(8) and (9) Abbe Daniel: "Le Bapteme de sang", (Ed. de l'Idée Libre, Herblay 1935, pp.28-30).

The Abbe Daniel adds that the sudden departure, a few days later, of the servant of the deceased cardinal provoked quite a lot of remarks, especially as he had apparently been the servant of Monseigneur Von Gerlach before his master entered Holy Orders. This Germanic prelate, a notorious spy, was to flee from Rome in 1916: he was going to be arrested and charged with the sabotage of the Italian battleship "Leonard de Vinci" which blew up in the bay of Tarente, taking with it 21 officers and 221 seamen". His trial was resumed in 1919. Von Gerlach did not appear and was condemned to twenty years hard labour".(10)

Through the case of this "participating chamberlain", editor of the "Osservatore Romano", we get a clear idea of the state of mind in the Vatican's high spheres.

It is again the Abbe Bruguerette who describes the "entourage of the Holy See": "Professors or ecclesiastics, they are not put off by any obstacles in their pursuit of impressing on the Italian clergy and the Catholic world in Rome respect and admiration for the Germanic army, contempt and hatred for France".(11)

Ferrata, who favoured neutrality, had died just at the right time, and Cardinal Gasparri became secretary of State; in perfect agreement with Benedict XV, he did his best to serve the interests of the central empires "Considering all this, it is not surprising then that Pope Benedict XV, in the following months, worked hard to maintain Italy on the path of intervention which would best serve the Jesuits, friends of the Hapsburgs..."(12)

At the same time, the morale of the Allies was cunningly undermined. "On the 10th of January 1915, a decree signed by Cardinal Gasparri, secretary of State to Benedict XV, ordered that a day of prayer should be observed to hasten peace... One of the compulsory exercises of piety was the reciting of a prayer written by Benedict XV himself... The French government ordered that the pontifical document should be seized. This prayer for peace was considered to be a softening and destructive manifestation capable of slackening the efforts of our armies, at a time when the German hordes were feeling the irresistible pressure which would push them out of our territory, and when the Kaiser could see coming the terrible punishment his unpardonable crimes deserved... The pope, it was said, wanted peace come what may, at a time when it could only be in favour of the central empires. The pope does not like France; he is "German".(13)

M. Charles Ledre, another Catholic writer, confirms: "On two occasions, mentioned in some famous articles of "La Revue de Paris", the Holy See, by inviting Italy and later the United States to keep out of the war, did not merely wish for a quicker end of the conflict... According to the Abbe Bruguerette, it served the interests of our enemies and worked against us".(14) But the actions of the Jesuits, therefore the actions of the Vatican, were not only felt in Italy and the United States. Any means, every place, is good enough for them.

(10) (11) and (13) Abbe Bruguerette, op.cit., III, pp.553, 528, 529. (12) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., p.252. (14) Charles Ledre, op.cit., p. 154.

"It is not surprising then to see pontifical diplomacy busy from the start at hindering our food supply; dissuading the neutrals from joining our side, in order to break the bond holding the 'Entente' together... Nothing was considered too insignificant if it could help this great task, and bring about peace by provoking some weakness amongst the Allies.

"There was worse: Solicitations for a separate peace. Between the 2nd and the 10th of January 1916, some German Catholics went to Belgium to preach, in the name of the pope they said, a separate peace. The Belgian bishops accused them of lying, but the nuncio and the pope remained silent... "Then, the Holy See thought of bringing together France and Austria, so hoping to make France sign a separate peace or demand that, with her allies, they should negotiate a general peace... A few weeks later, on the 31st of March 1917, Prince Sixte of Bourbon gave the famous letter of the emperor Charlesto the president of the Republic.

"As the manoeuvre had failed on this side of the Alps, it was bound to be tried again elsewhere, in England, in America, and especially in Italy... "Break up the temporal forces of the 'Entente' in order to stop its offensive attacks, ruin its moral prestige with the view to weaken its courage and bring it to terms... these two things make up the politics of Benedict XV and all the efforts of his impartiality always have been and are still aimed at hamstringing us".(15)

This was written by a notorious Catholic, M. Louis Canet; and this is what the Abbe Bruguerette wrote:

"We only learned four years later, through the declarations of M. Erzberger published in the "Germania" of the 22nd of April 1921, that the proposal of peace proclaimed by the Pope in August 1917 had been preceded by a secret accord between the Holy See and Germany".(16) Another interesting point is that the ecclesiastical diplomat who negotiated this "secret accord" was the nuncio in Munich, Monseigneur Pacelli, future Pius XII.

One of his apologists, the R.P. Jesuit Fernesolle, wrote: "On the 28th of May (1917), Monseigneur Pacelli presented his letters of appointment to the king of Bavaria... He tried hard to enlist the co-operation of William II and the chancellor Bethmann-Holveg. On the 29th of June, Monseigneur Pacelli was solemnly received by the emperor William II at the headquarters of Kreuznach".(17)

(15) Louis Canet: "Le Politique de Benoit XV", (Revue de Paris, 15th of October and 1st of November 1918). (16) Abbe Brugerette, op.cit., III, p.543. (17) R.P. Fernesolle, S.J. "Pro pontifice". Imprimatur 26th of June 1947,(Beauchesne, Paris 1947, p. 15.)

So, the future pope was starting his twelve years as nuncio in Munich, then in Berlin, in the way he meant to go on, for, during those years, he multiplied the intrigues to overthrow the German Republic established after the first world war and prepare the revenge of 1939 by bringing Hitler to power.

Yet, when the Allies signed the treaty of Versailles, in July 1919, they were so conscious of the part played by the Vatican in the conflict that it was carefully kept away from the conference table. And, even more surprising, it was the most Catholic State, Italy, which had insisted on its exclusion.

"Through art. XV of the pact of London (26th of April 1915), which defined Italy's participation in the war, Baron Sonnino had obtained the promise from the other Allies that they would oppose any intervention of the papacy in the peace arrangements". 18) This measure was wise but insufficient. Instead of applying the sanctions against the Holy See which it deserved for sparking off the first world war, the victors did nothing to prevent the further intrigues of the Jesuits and the Vatican; these eventually, 20 years later, led to a catastrophe even worse, maybe the worst the world has known.

(18) Charles Pichon: "Histoire du Vatican" (Sefi, Paris 1946, p. 143).123

In 1919, the sons of Loyola reaped the bitter fruits of their criminal politics. France had not succumbed to the "thorough bleeding". The apostolic empire of the Hapsburgs, which they had encouraged to "punish the Serbians", had disintegrated, liberating the Orthodox Slavs from the yoke of Rome. Russia, instead of coming back to the Roman fold, had become marxist, anti-clerical and officially atheistic. As for invincible Germany, it foundered in the chaos.

But the proud nature of the Company would never consider confessing a sin. When Benedict XV died, in 1922, it was ready to start again on a new basis. Is it not all-powerful in Rome?

Let us listen to M. Pierre Dominique: "The new pope Pius XI who is, according to some, a Jesuit, tries to patch things up. He asks the Jesuit Father d'Herbigny to go to Russia, in an attempt to rally whatever is left of Catholicism, and especially to see what could be done. Vague and big hope: to rally around the pontiff the persecuted Orthodox world.

"In Rome, there are thirty-nine ecclesiastical colleges, whose foundation marks the dates of great counter-offensives; most of these counter-offensives were Jesuitical in their working and direction: Germanic college (1552), English (1578), Irish (1628, re-established in 1826), Scottish (1600), North-American (1859), Canadian (1888), Ethiopian (1919, re-constituted in 1930).

"Pius XI creates the Russian college (Ponteficio collegio russo di S. Teresa

del Bambino Gesu) and puts it under the Jesuits' care. They also look after the Oriental Institute, the Institute of Saint-John Damascene, the Polish college, and later the Lithuanian college. Are these reminders of Father Possevino, Ivan the Terrible and the false Dimitri? The second of the three great objectives during Ignatius' time takes first place. The Jesuits, once again, are the inspiring agents and performers in that great enterprise".(19)

In the defeat they just suffered, the sons of Loyola can see a glimmer of some hope. The Russian revolution, by eliminating the Czar, protector of the Orthodox Church, had it not decapitated the great rival and helped the penetration of the Roman Church? We must strike while the iron is hot! The famous "Russicum" is created and its clandestine missionaries will take the Good News to this schismatic country.(19a) One century a f t e r their expulsion by Czar Alexander the First, the Jesuits will again undertake the conquest of the Slav world. Since 1915, their general is Nalke von Ledochowski.

From M. Pierre Dominique again: "Some will say that I see Jesuits everywhere! But I am compelled to point out their presence and actions; to say that they were behind the monarchy of Alphonso XIII whose confessor was Father Lopez; that, when the Spanish monarchy was ended and their monasteries and colleges burned down, they were found again behind Gil Robles, then, when civil war broke out, behind Franco. In Portugal, they uphold Salazar. In Austria and Hungary, the Emperor Charles who was dethroned three times; (what part did they play in those attempts to regain the throne of Hungary? Who knows!) They kept the seat warm not knowing much for whom or what. Monsignor Seipel, Dolfuss and Schussnigg are from their ranks. They dream for a while of a great Germany, with a Catholic majority, to which the Austrians would necessarily belong: a modern version of the old 16th century alliance between the Wittelsbach and Hapsburg. In Italy, they support first of all Don Sturzo, founder of the popular party, then Mussolini... The Jesuit Father Tacchi Venturi, general-secretary of the Company, served as the middleman between Pius XI, whose confessors are Fathers Alissiardi and Celebrano (Jesuits), and Mussolini.

"The pope, in February 1929, at the time of the treaty of Lateran, calls Mussolini "the man whom Providence allowed us to meet". Rome does not condemn what is commonly called the "Ethiopian aggression" and, in 1940, the Vatican is still Mussolini's sincere friend.

"The Jesuits have their secret abode in it. From there, they survey the Universal Church with the cold and calculating eye of the politician".(20) This is a perfect summary of the Jesuit activity between the two world wars. The "secret abode" of Loyola's sons is the political brain of the Vatican. The confessors of Pius XI are Jesuits; those of his successor, Pius XII, will also be Jesuits and Germans for good measure. No matter if, because of it, the plot becomes evident: everything, it seems, is ready for revenge.

(19) and (20) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., pp.253, 254. (19a) See also Frederic Hoffet's "L'Equivoque catholique et le nouveau clericalisme" (Fischbacher, Paris).

But, under the pontificate of Pius XI, it is the preparatory period. The

Germanic "secular arm", defeated, has dropped the sword. While waiting to put it back into its hands, we will prepare, in Europe, a field worth its future exploits, and first of all stop the threatening rise of democracy. Italy will be the first field of action. There is, there, a noisy socialist chief who gathers ex- servicemen around him. This man proclaims an apparently intrasigent doctrine, but he is ambitious and lucid enough to realise how precarious his position is, in spite of his extravagant boastings. Jesuit diplomacy will soon win him over to its side.

M. Francois Charles-Roux, of the Institute, who was our (i.e. French) ambassador to the Vatican at that time, says: "At the time when the future Duce was only a simple deputy, Cardinal Gasparri, secretary of State, had a secret interview with him... The fascist chief had immediately agreed that the pope should exercise a temporal sovereignty over a part of Rome... "When reporting to me about that interview, Cardinal Gasparri concluded: "With this promise, I was sure that, if this man came to power, we would succeed". "

"I will not mention his account of the negotiations between the secret agents of Pius XI and Mussolini..."(21)

These secret agents, the main one being the Jesuit Father Tacchi Venturi, fullfilled their mission extremely well. This is not surprising when we know that Father Tacchi Venturi was secretary of the Company of Jesus and Mussolini's confessor at the same time. In fact, he was "directed" into this "cajolery" of the Fascist chief by the general of his Order, Halke von Ledochowski, as we are told by M. Gaston Gaillard.(22)

"On the 16th of November 1922, Parliament elected Mussolini by 306 votes against 116, and, in that meeting, one saw the Catholic group of don Sturzo, supposedly Christian-Democrat, voting unanimously for the first fascist government".(23)

Ten years later, the same manoeuvre brought about a similar result in Germany. The Catholic "Zentrum" of Monsignor Kass assured, by its massive vote, the dictatorship of Nazism.

In fact, Italy had been, in 1922, the trial ground for the new formula of authoritarian conservatism: fascism, dressed up, when local circumstances demanded it, with some pseudo-socialism. From now on, all the efforts of the Vatican's Jesuits will tend to spread this "doctrine" in Europe, the ambiguity of which is typical of them.

(21) Francois Charles-Roux: "Huit ans au Vatican", Flammarion, Paris 1947, pp.47 ss (22) Gaston Gaillard, p.353 "La fin d'un temps" (Ed. Albert, Paris, 1933). (23) Pietro Nenni "Six ans de guerre civile en Italie" (Librairie Valois, Paris 1930, p. 146)

Even today, the collapse of Mussolini's regime, nor the defeat, nor the ruins have been enough to discredit, to the eyes of Italy's Christian democrats, the megalomaniac Dictator imposed on their country by the Vatican. Disowned only outwardly, his prestige remains intact in the hearts of the clerics. The following could be read in the press:

"We have decided: visitors coming to Rome for the Olympic Games, in 1960,

will see the marble obelisk erected by Benito Mussolini to his own glory as it dominates, from the banks of the Tiber, the Olympic stadium. This memorial thirty-three meters high bears the inscription "Mussolini- Dux" and is decorated with mosaics and inscriptions praising fascism. The phrase "Long live the Duce" is repeated more than one hundred times and the slogan "Many enemies means much honour" several times as well. The monument has, on either side, marble blocks commemorating the main events of fascism, from the foundation of the publication "Popolo d'Italia", by Mussolini, until the establishment of the short-lived fascist empire, and including the war in Ethiopia. The obelisk was to be crowned with a gigantic statue of Mussolini, as a naked athlete, nearly one hundred meters high. But the regime collapsed before this strange project could be realised. "After a year of controversy, the Segni government has just decided that the duce's obelisk should stay". (24)

The war, the blood which flowed profusely, the tears and the ruins do not matter. They are mere trifles, small spots on the monument erected to the glory of "the man whom Providence allowed us to meet", as he was described by Pius XI.

No shortcomings, mistakes or crimes can erase his main merit: the fact that he re-established the temporal power of the pope, proclaimed Roman Catholicism as the religion of the State, and gave the clergy, through laws still being enforced, complete power over the life of the nation.

It is to testify to this that Mussolini's obelisk must stand in the heart of Rome, for the benefit of foreign tourists looking at it admiringly or ironically, and in the hope of better times which would allow the erection of the "naked athlete" one hundred meters high, symbolic champion of the Vatican.

The Lateran Treaty, by which Mussolini showed his gratitude to the papacy, gave the Holy See, apart from the payment of one thousand 750 million liras (i.e. £20,000,000) the temporal sovereignty over the territory of Vatican city. Monseigneur Cristiani, prelate of His Holiness, explains the significance of this event:

"It is certain that the Constitution of the Vatican city was a matter of prime importance in order to establish the papacy as a political power". (25)

(24) "Press italienne, New York Herald Tribune, Time and Paris-Presse", 3rd of November 1959. (25) Monseigneur Cristiani: "Le Vatican politique", Imprimatur 15th of June 1956 (Ed. du Centurion, Paris 1957, p. 136).

We will not waste time trying to conciliate this explicit confession with the phrase so often heard that "the Roman Church is not involved in politics". We will only point out the unique position in the world of a state which is secular and sacred, of equivocal nature as well, and the consequences of that position.

What are the Jesuitical crafty tricks used by this power which, depending on circumstances, makes use of her temporal or spiritual character, to be exempted from all the rules laid down by international laws? The nations

themselves have lent their hand to this trickery and, by doing that, helped its penetration into their midst, the Trojan horse of clericalism. "The Pope seemed to identify himself too much with the dictators"(26), wrote M. Francois Charles-Roux, French ambassador to the Vatican. But could it be otherwise when the Holy See itself had raised these men to power? Mussolini, the prototype, was the inaugurator of that series of "providential" men, these sword-bearers who would prepare the revenge for 1918. From Italy, where it prospered so well under the care of the Jesuit Father Tacchi Venturi and his acolytes, fascism was soon to be exported to Germany. "Hitler receives his impetus from Mussolini; the ideal of the Nazi s is the same as in Italy... Since Mussolini is at the head, all the sympathies are for Berlin... In 1923, his Fascism merges with National- Socialism; he becomes friends with Hitler to whom he supplies arms and money".(27)

At that time, Monseigneur Pacelli, future Pius XII and, then, the Curia's best diplomat, is Nuncio in Munich, capital of Catholic Bavaria. There, the star of the future German dictator starts to rise; he is also a Catholic, like his most important associates. Of that country, cradle of Nazism, M. Maurice Laporte tells us: "Its two enemies are called Protestantism and Democracy". Prussia's anxiety is therefore understandable.

"It is easy to guess what kind of special care the Vatican gives Bavaria where Hitler's National-Socialism recruits its strongest contingents".(28) To take from "heretic" Prussia the control of the German "secular arm" and transfer it to Catholic Bavaria; what a dream! Monseigneur Pacelli puts all in his power to realise it, acting in concert with the chief of the Company of Jesus.

(26) Francois Charles-Roux, op.cit., p.231. (27) Antonio Aniante: "Mussolini" (Grasset, Paris 1932, pp.123 ss.). (28) Maurice Laporte: "Sous le casque d'acier" (A. Redier, Paris 1931, p. 105).

"After the other war (1914-1918), the Jesuits' general, Halke von Ledochowski, had conceived a vast plan... the creation, with or without emperor Hapsburg, of a federation of the Catholic nations in central and eastern Europe: Austria, Slovakia, Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, Croatia and, of course, Bavaria.

"This new central Empire had to fight on two fronts: on the eastern side against the Soviet Union, on the western side against Prussia, Protestant Great-Britain and republican, rebellious France. At that time, Monseigneur Pacelli, future Pius XII, was nuncio in Munich, then in Berlin, and an intimate friend of Cardinal Faulhaber, von Ledochowski's main collaborator. The Ledochowski plan was the dream of Pius XII's youth".(29)

But was it only a dream of youth? The "Mittel-Europa" Hitler tried to organise was very similar to that plan, apart from the presence, in that block, of Lutheran Prussia, a not very dangerous minority, and the recognised zones of influence which—maybe temporarily—belonged to Italy. In fact, it was the Ledochowski plan, adapted to the needs of the time, which the Fuhrer was trying to realise, under the patronage of the Holy See, with the help of Franz von Papen, secret chamberlain of the pope, and the nuncio to Munich,

then Berlin, Monseigneur Pacelli. M. Francois Charles-Roux writes: "During the contemporary epoch world politics never felt the Catholic intervention more than during the ministry of Monseigneur Pacelli".(30)

And from M. Joseph Rovani: "Now, Catholic Bavaria... is going to welcome and protect all those who sow trouble, all those confederates and assassins of de la Saint-Vehme".(31)

From amongst these agitators, the choice of Germany's "regenerators" will fall upon Hitler, who is destined to triumph over the "democratic mistakes" under the Holy Father's standard. Of course, he is a Catholic, like his principal collaborators.

"The Nazi regime is like a return to the government of southern Germany. The names and origins of its chiefs demonstrate it: Hitler is specifically Austrian, Goering is Bavarian, Goebbels is Rhenish, and so on".(32)

In 1924, the Holy See signs a Concordat with Bavaria. In 1927, we can read in "Cologne's Gazette": "Pius XI is certainly the most German pope who ever sat on the throne of Saint-Peter".

His successor, Pius XII, will rob him of this palm. But, for the time being, he pursues his diplomatic career—rather his political career—in this Germany for which, as he later told Ribbentrop, "he would always have a special affection".

(29) VLa Tribune des Nations", 30th of June 1950.

(30) Francois Charles-Roux, op.cit., p.93.

(31) Joseph Rovani, op.cit., p.195.

(32) Gonzague de Reynold: "D'ou vient l'Allemagne" (Plon, Paris 1939, p. 185).

Promoted nuncio in Berlin, he works, with Franz von Papen, at destroying the Weimar Republic. On the 20th of July 1932, a state of siege is proclaimed in Berlin and the ministers expelled "manu militari". It is the first step towards hitlerian dictatorship. New elections are prepared which will establish the success of the Nazis.

"With Hitler's approval, Goering and Strasser got in contact with Monseigneur Kaas, party chief of the Catholic Centre".(33) Cardinal Bertram, archbishop of Breslau and primate of Germany, declared: "We, Christians and Catholics, do not recognise any religion or race...". With many other bishops, he tried to warn the faithful against "the pagan ideal of the Nazis". Obviously, this prelate had not understood papal politics, but he was soon going to be taught.

"The "Mercure de France" gave an excellent study in 1934: "In the beginning of 1932, German Catholics did not consider they had lost the cause but, in the spring, their chiefs seemed somewhat irresolute: they had been told that "the Pope was personally in favour of Hitler". "That Pius XI was sympathetic to Hitler should not surprise us... For him, Europe could settle down again only through Germany's hegemony... The Vatican had thought of changing the centre of gravity of the Reich, through the Anschluss, for a long time, and the Company of Jesus was openly working towards that aim (Ledochowski's

plan), especially in Austria. We know how Pius XI depended on Austria to make what he called his politics triumph. What had to be prevented was the hegemony of Protestant Prussia and, as the Reich was the one to dominate Europe... a Reich had to be rebuilt where the Catholics would be masters... "In March 1933, the German bishops, meeting at Fulda, took advantage of the speech Hitler gave at Potsdam to declare: We must admit that the highest representative of the government of the Reich, who is at the same time the head of the national-socialist movement, has made public and solemn declarations, by which the inviolability of the Catholic doctrine, the work and unchangeable rights of the Church are recognised... "Von Papen leaves for Rome. This man, whose past is so wicked, becomes a pious pilgrim with the mission to conclude a Concordat (for the whole of Germany) with the Pope. He too will have to emulate Mussolini's overtures towards the Vatican.(34)

In fact, the same happens in both countries: in Italy, the Catholic party of don Sturzo ensures Mussolini's accession to power; in Germany, the "Zentrum" of Monseigneur Kaas does the same for Hitler—and, on both occasions, a Concordat seals the pact.

(33) Walter Gorlitz and Herbert A. Quint: "Adolf Hitler" (Amiot, Dumont, Paris 1953, p.32).

(34) "Mercure de France"; "Pius XI and Hitler" (15th of January 1934).

M. Joseph Rovin admits this as follows: "Thanks to von Papen, deputy at the Zentrum since 1920 and owner of the party's official publication 'Germania'. Hitler came to power on the 30th of January 1933... "German political Catholicism, instead of becoming Christian Democrat, was eventually made to confer full powers on Hitler, on the 26th of March 1933... To vote in favour of full powers, a two-thirds majority was necessary and the votes of the "Zentrum" were indispensable to obtain it".(35) The same author adds: "In the correspondance and declarations of ecclesiastical dignitaries, we will always find, under the Nazi regime, the fervent approval of the bishops".(36)

This fervour is easily explained when we read the following from von Papen: "The general terms of the Concordat were more favourable than all other similar agreements signed by the Vatican", and, "the Chancellor Hitler asked me to assure the papal secretary of State (Cardinal Pacelli) that he would immediately muzzle the anticlerical clan".(37)

This was not an empty promise. Already during that year (1933), apart from the massacre of Jews and assassinations perpetrated by the Nazis. there were 45 concentration camps in Germany, with 40,000 prisoners of various political opinions, but mostly liberals. Franz von Papen, the pope's secret chamberlain, defined perfectly the deep meaning of the pact between the Vatican and Hitler by this phrase worth engraving: "Nazism is a Christian reaction against the spirit of 1789".

In 1937, Pius XI, under the pressure of world opinion, "condemned" the racial theories as incompatible with Catholic doctrine and principles, in what his apologists amusingly call the "terrible" encyclical letter "Mit brennender Sorge". Nazi racism is condemned, but not Hitler, its promoter: "Distinguo". And the Vatican takes care not to denounce the "advantageous" Concordat concluded, four years earlier, with the Nazi Reich.

While the cross of Christ and the Swastika were co-operating in Germany. Benito Mussolini set forth on the easy conquest of Ethiopia, with the Holy Father's blessing.

"... The Sovereign Pontiff had not condemned Mussolini's politics and had left the Italian clergy fully free to co-operate with the Fascist government... The ecclesiastics, from the priests of humble parishes to the cardinals, spoke in favour of the war...

(35) and (36) Joseph Rovani, op.cit., pp. 197,209,214.

(37) Franz von Papen, op.cit., p.207.

(38) The enthusiasm of Cardinal Schuster is understandable as the Company of Jesus had suffered the same fate, in Abyssinia, as in the European countries. With the help of usurper Segud, whom they had converted and put on the throne, the sons of Loyola tried to impose Catholicism to the whole country, provoking uprisings and bloody repressions; but they were finally expelled by the Negus Basilides. (Note from the author).

"One of the most striking examples came from the Cardinal-Archbishop of Milan, Alfredo Ildefonso Schuster (Jesuit), who went as far as calling this campaign "a Catholic crusade".(38) "Italy", clarified Pius XI, "thinks this war is justified because of a pressing need for expansion..." "Ten days later, when speaking to an audience of ex-servicemen, Pius XI expressed the wish that the legitimate claims of a great and noble nation from which, he reminded them he himself descended, would be satisfied".(39) The Fascist aggression against Albania, on Good Friday in 1939, enjoyed the same "understanding", as we are told by M. Camille Cianfarra:

"The Italian occupation of Albania was very advantageous for the Church... Out of a population of one million Albanian people, which became Italian subjects, 68% were Moslems, 20% Greek Orthodox and only 12% Roman Catholics... From the political point of view, the annexation of the country by a Catholic power was bound to improve the position of the Church and please the Vatican".(40)

In Spain, the establishment of the republic had not ceased to be resented by the Roman Curia as a personal offence. "I never dared mention the Spanish question to Pius XI", wrote M. Francois Charles-Roux. "He probably would have reminded me that the Church's interests, in that great and historical land of Spain, were a matter for the papacy only".(41) So, this "protected hunting-ground" was soon provided with a dictator similar to those who had been already successful in Italy and Germany. The adventure of General Franco only started in mid-July 1936 but, on the 21st of March 1934, the "Pact of Rome" had been sealed, between Mussolini and the chiefs of Spain's reactionary parties, one of whom was M. Goicoechea, chief of the "Renovacion Espanola". By this pact, the Italian fascist party undertook to supply the rebels with money, war material, arms and ammunition. We know that they even did more than what they had promised, and that Mussolini and Hitler kept on "refuelling" the Spanish rebellion with material, aviation and "volunteers".

As for the Vatican, oblivious of its own principle that the faithful must respect the established government, it oppressed Spain with its threats. "The Pope excommunicated the heads of the Spanish Republic and declared spiritual war between the Holy See and Madrid. Then he produced the encyclical letter

'Dilectissimi Nobis'... Archbishop Goma, new primate of Spain, proclaimed the civil war".(42)

(39) and (40) Camille Cianfarra: "La Guerre et le Vatican" (Le Portulan, Paris 1946, pp.46,47,48).

Note from the author: Cardinal Schuster was also rector of this strange institution: "L'Ecole de mystique fasciste" (school of fascist mysticism)

(41) Francois Charles-Roux, op.cit., p.181.

(42) Andre Ribard: "1960 et le secret du Vatican" (Libr. Robin, Paris 1954, p.45.)

The prelates of His Holiness joyfully accepted the horrors of this fratricidal conflict, and Monsignor Gomara, bishop of Carthagene, interpreted admirably their apostolic sentiments when he said: "Blessed are the cannons if, in the breaches they open, the Gospel springs up!"

The Vatican even recognised Franco's government, on the 3rd of August 1937, twenty months before the end of the civil war.

Belgium was also looked after by Catholic Action, needless to say, an organisation eminently ultramontane and Jesuitical. The ground had to be prepared for the approaching invasion of the Fuhrer's armies! So, under the pretence of "spiritual renewal", the Hitlerite Fascist gospel was diligently preached there by Monseigneur Picard, Jesuit, Father Arendt, Jesuit, Father Foucart, Jesuit, etc. A young Belgium, who was their victim like many others, testifies to this: "At that time, all of us were already obsessed with a kind of fascism... The Catholic Action to which I belonged was very sympathetic to Italian fascism... Monseigneur Picard proclaimed from the rooftops that Mussolini was a genius and wished fervently for a dictator... Pilgrimages were organised to favour contacts with Italy and Fascism. "When, with three hundred students, I went to Italy, everybody, on our return home, saluted in the Roman fashion and sang Giovinezza.(43)

Another witness says: "After 1928, the group of Leon Degrelle regularly collaborated with Monseigneur Picard... Monseigneur Picard enlisted the help of Leon Degrelle for a particularly important mission: to manage a new publishing house at the Catholic Action centre. This publishing house was given a name which soon became famous: it was 'Rex'...

"The calls for a new regime multiplied... The results of this propaganda in Germany were observed with much interest. In October 1933, an article in 'Vlan' reminded us that the Nazis numbered only seven in 1919, and that Hitler brought them, a few years later, no other dowry than his talent for publicity... Founded on similar principles, the 'rexist' team started an active propaganda programme in the country. Their meetings soon attracted a few hundreds, then thousands of listeners".(44)

Of course, Hitler had brought to the new-born national-socialism, as Mussolini did to Fascism, more than the talent for publicity:- the support of the papacy!

Being only a pale shadow of these two, Leon Degrelle, chief of "Christus Rex", was the beneficiary of the same support—but for a very different purpose, as his job was to open his country to the invader.

M. Raymond de Becker says: "I collaborated with the 'Avant-Garde'... This publication (issued by Monseigneur Picard) aimed at breaking the ties uniting Belgium, France and England".(45)

(43) and (45) Raymond de Becker: "Livre des vivants et des morts" (Ed. de la Toison d'Or Brussels 1942, pp.72,73,175).

(44) Jacques Saint-Germain: "La Bataille de Rex" (Les oeuvres francaises, Paris 1937, pp.67,69).

We know how quickly the German armies defeated the Belgian defence betrayed by the clerical fifth column. Maybe we remember also that the apostle of "Christus Rex", donning the German uniform, went, accompanied by much publicity, to "fight on the Eastern front" at the head of his "Waffen SS", recruited mainly amongst the youth of Catholic Action; then an opportune retreat enabled him to reach Spain. But, before that, he gave full vent to his "patriotic" feelings for the last time. M. Maurice de Behaut writes: "Ten years ago (in 1944), the port of Anvers, the third most important in the world, fell almost intact into the hands of the British troops... At the time when the population was beginning to see the end of its sufferings and privations, the most diabolic Nazi invention fell on it: the flying bombs, V1 and V2. This bombardment, the longest in History, as it went on for six months, day and night, was kept carefully hidden, on the order of the allied headquarters. This is the reason why, today, the martyrdom of the cities of Anvers and Liege is still generally ignored.

"On the eve of the first bombardment (12th of October), some had heard on Radio Berlin the alarming remarks of the "rexist" traitor Leon Degrelle: "I asked my Fuhrer", he screeched, "for twenty thousand flying bombs. They will chastise an idiotic people. I promise you that they will make of Anvers a city without a port, or a port without a city".

"... From that day on, the rhythm of the bombardments was going to accentuate, catastrophes and disasters being the results, while the traitor Leon Degrelle was bawling on Radio Berlin, promising cataclysms even more terrible".(46)

Such was the last farewell to his homeland of this monstrous product of the Catholic Action. Obedient pupil of Monseigneur Picard, Jesuit, Father Arendt, Jesuit, etc., the chief of "Christus Rex" strictly followed the papal rules.

"The men of the Catholic Action", wrote Pius XI, "would fail in their duty if, as opportunities allow it, they did not try to direct the politics of their province and of their country".(47)

Indeed, Leon Degrelle did his duty and the result—as we have seen— was in proportion to his zeal.

We read in M. Raymond de Beckers's book: "The Catholic Action had found, in Belgium, exceptional men to orchestrate its themes, such as Monsignor Picard (the most important)... Canon Cardijn, founder of the 'jocist' movement, a bilious ill-tempered and visionary man..."(48)

(46) Review "Historia", December 1954.

(47) Pius XI's Letter "Peculari Quadam", quoted by R.P. Jesuit de Soras, in the "Action

catholique et action temporelle" (Ed. Spes, Paris 1938, p. 105). Imprimatur 1938.
(48) Raymond de Becker, op.cit., p.66.

This particular one swears today that he has never "seen or heard" his fellow-member Leon Degrelle. So, these two leaders of the Belgian Catholic Action, both working under the crook of Cardinal Van Roey, had apparently never met! By what miracle? Of course, the former Canon doesn't tell us that; since then, he has been made "Monseigneur" by Pius XII and director of the 'jocist' movements for the whole world.

Another miracle: nor has Monseigneur Cardijn ever met the disreputable chief of 'Rex' during the great congress described by Degrelle: "I remember the great congress of the Catholic Youth at Brussels, in 1930. I was behind Monseigneur Picard, who himself was at the side of Cardinal Van Roey. One hundred thousand youths had marched past us for two hours, cheering the religious authorities assembled on the platform..."(49)

Where, then, was the head of the J.O.C. hiding, whose troops were taking part in that gigantic march past? Was it, through a special decree of Providence, that these two men were condemned to rub shoulders without seeing each other, on official platforms as well as at the Catholic Action centre which they attended constantly?

Monseigneur Cardijn, a Jesuit, goes further. He pretends to have also "verbally" fought 'rexism'.

Really, this Catholic Action was a peculiar organisation! Not only were the chiefs of its two principal "movements" 'J.O.C. and Rex' playing hide and seek in the corridors, but also one could as he says, "fight" what the other did with the full approval of the "hierarchy"!

This fact cannot be disputed: Degrelle was put at the head of 'Rex' by Monseigneur Picard himself, under the authority of Cardinal Van Roey and the apostolic nuncio Monseigneur Micara. So, according to Monseigneur Cardijn, he keenly disapproved of the actions of his colleague in Catholic Action, under the patronage, like himself, of Belgium's Primate,—and without any consideration for the Nuncio, his "protector and revered friend", according to Pius XII".(50)

The assertion is rather severe. We are even more aware of it when we examine what was the attitude, after Hitler's invasion of Belgium, of those such as Monseigneur Cardijn and his associates who, today, repudiate Degrelle and 'rexism'. In a book which was "put under the bushel" when it was published, the chief of 'Rex' himself refreshed memories, as we shall see, and, to our knowledge, what he said was never refuted.

(49) Leon Degrelle: "La cohue de 1940" (Robert Crausaz, Lausanne 1949, pp.214-215). (50) "La Croix", 24th of May 1946.

Being a fervent Christian, and acquainted with the interpenetrations of spiritual and temporal, I would not have considered collaborating (with Hitler) without first consulting the religious authorities of my country... I had asked for an interview with His Eminence, Cardinal Van Roey... The cardinal

received me in a friendly manner, one morning, at the episcopal palace of Malines... He is animated by a total and cyclonic fanaticism... If he had lived a few centuries earlier, he would have, while singing the 'Magnificat', put the infidels to the sword, or burned or let fall into the convent dungeons the not so obedient sheep of his flock. As it is the 20th century, he only has the crosier, but makes it accomplish a great work. For him, everything was important as long as it served the Church's interests: if it was something good, we would support it, but anything bad was crushed; and the Church has so many avenues of 'service': her works, parties, newspapers, agricultural co-operatives (Boerenbond), banking institutions which assured the temporal power of the divine institution...

"And now, I can sincerely and honestly say that this was the meaning of the cardinal's remarks: "collaboration was the proper thing to do, in fact the only thing a sensible person would do. During the whole interview, he didn't even consider that another attitude could be possible. For the cardinal, in the Autumn of 1940, the war was finished. He didn't even mention the name 'English' or utter the supposition that an allied recovery was conceivable... The cardinal did not think that, politically, anything else but collaboration was possible... He did not object to any of my conceptions and projects... He could have—or should have—warned me if he thought my ideas concerning politics were going astray, as I had come for his advice... Before I left, the cardinal gave me his paternal blessing... "Other Catholics as well, in the Autumn of 1940, looked towards the great tower of Saint-Rombaut... Many entered the episcopal palace to ask the advice of Monseigneur Van Roey or his entourage, concerning the morality, usefulness or necessity of collaboration...

"More than one thousand Catholic Burgomasters, all the general secretaries, even though carefully chosen, adapted themselves immediately to the new Order... All those good people imprisoned or insulted in 1944 must have wondered, in 1940: What does Malines think? But who would believe that neither Malines, their bishops, nor their priests had been able to put their minds at rest!

"Eight out of ten Belgian collaborationists were Catholics... "During those decisive weeks, because of the choice which had to be made, Malines and the various bishoprics ever issued written or verbal negative advice, to myself or to all those other collaborationists.

"Even though not very pleasant, this, is the plain or naked truth. The attitude of the high Catholic clergy abroad could only strengthen the conviction of the faithful that collaboration was perfectly compatible with the faith... In Vichy, the highest French prelates had their photo taken as they stood with Marshal Petain and Pierre Laval, after the interview between Hitler and Petain. In Paris, Cardinal Baudrillart publicly declared that he was a collaborationist.

"In Belgium itself, Cardinal Van Roey allowed one of the most famous priests of Flanders—his greatest Catholic intellectual—Abbe Ver-schaeve, declare, on the 7th of November 1940, during a solemn session of the Senate and in the presence of a German general, president Raeder:

"It is the duty of the Cultural Council to build the bridge which will unite Flanders and Germany..."

"On the 29th of May 1940, the day after the surrender, Cardinal Van Roey described the invasion as a kind of present from heaven: "Be sure", he wrote to the faithful, "that we are witnessing at the moment an exceptional intervention of Divine Providence which is displaying its power through great events".

"So, after all that, Hitler seemed to be nothing less than a purifying instrument, providentially chastising the Belgian people".(51) Something very similar was happening in our own country, (France), where we were constantly reminded that "defeat is more fruitful than victory", as, before 1914, when a purifying "thorough bleeding" was wished upon France.

Also in these memoirs which fell—or rather were thrown into the oubliette—we find some very interesting details concerning the "Boerenbond, the great Catholic and political and financial machine of Cardinal Van Roey which largely financed the Flemish section of Louvain's University..."(52)

"The printing-house "Standaard" was making sure its presses were kept working by printing the most collaborationist appeals of the V.N.V. (Vlaamsch Nationalist Verbond). Very soon, the business was rolling in money... Being two hundred per cent Catholic and pillars of the Church in Flanders, the leaders of "Standaard" would not have considered collaborating unless the cardinal had first given his blessing to it clearly and distinctly.

"The same was said about the whole of the Catholic press..."(53)

All these efforts were aiming at nothing less than Belgium's break-up, as we are reminded by another Catholic writer, M. Gaston Gaillard:

(51) (52) and (53) Leon Degrelle, op.cit., pp.213,216ss, 219ss.

"The Flemish-speaking Catholics and the autonomist Catholics of Alsace justified their attitude by their tacit support always given to the Germanic propaganda by the Holy See. When they referred to the memorable letter sent by Pius XI to his secretary of State, Cardinal Gaspari, on the 26th of June 1923, they were easily convinced that their politics had the approval of Rome, and, of course, Rome did nothing to persuade them otherwise. Had not the nuncio Pacelli (future Pius XII) ably supported German nationalists and encouraged the so-called "oppressed" population of High-Silesia? Had not the autonomist plots of Alsace, Eupen-Malmedy and Silesia received ecclesiastical approval which had not always been given discreetly? It was then easy for the Flemish to hide their deeds against Belgium's unity behind the Roman directives..."(54)

Also, in 1942, Pope Pius XII asked his nunciature in Berlin to convey his condolences to Paris on the death of Cardinal Baudrillart, so signifying that he considered the annexation of Northern France by Germany as a fact. It also confirmed once again the "tacit support" always given to the Germanic expansion by the Holy See, and himself in particular.

Today, we can but scornfully smile when we see the Jesuits of His Holiness quibble over something so obvious and repudiate all complicity with the fifth column they themselves had organised, and especially with Degrelle. As for him—safely kept in his refuge as he knows too much—he can recollect at leisure the famous verses of Ovid: “Donee eris felix, multos munerabis amicos. Tempora si fuerint nubila, solus eris”.(55)

We smile when we read the following from R.P. Fessard (Jesuit): “In 1916 and 1917, we waited for the American reinforcements with so much impatience! In 1939, we sadly realised that, even after war had been declared, Hitler was looked upon favourably by a large part of American opinion; even, and especially by Catholics! In 1941 and 1942, we wondered again if the United States would or would not intervene”.(56)

So, it seems the Good Father viewed the results obtained in America by his own Jesuitical brothers “With sadness”! For, and this is an historical fact, the “Christian Front”, a Catholic movement opposed to the United State’s intervention, was directed by the Jesuit Father Coughlin, a notorious pro-Hitlerite.

“This pious organisation lacked nothing and received, from Berlin, a plentiful supply of propaganda material prepared by Goebbel’s office. “Through its publication ‘Social Justice’ and radio broadcasts, the Jesuit Father Coughlin, apostle of the swastika, reached a vast public. He also looked after secret “commando cells” in the main urban centres, led according to the sons of Loyola’s methods and trained by Nazi agents”.(57)

A secret document of the Wilhelmstrasse clarifies the following point:

“Studying the evolution of anti-semitism in the United States, we note that the number of listeners to the radio broadcasts of Father Coughlin, well-known for his anti-semitism, exceeds 20 millions”.(58)

(54) Gaston Gaillard: “La fin ‘un temps” (Ed. Albert , Paris 1933 , II, p . 141).

(55) As long as you will be happy, you will have many friends; when the clouds appear, you will be alone.

(56) R.P. Fessard S.J .: “ Libre meditation sur un message de Pie XII” , (Plon , Paris 1957, p.202).

(57) Edmond Paris: “The Vatican against Europe” (P.T.S ., London 1959 , p .141)

(58) Secret archives of the Wilhelmstrasse, document 83-26 19/1, (Berlin, 25th of January 1939).

Must we recall the actions of the Jesuit Father Walsh, an agent of the pope, Dean of the School of political sciences at the University of Georgetown, Jesuitic nursery of American diplomacy—and a zealous propagandist of German politics?

At that time, the General of the Society of Jesus was, as by chance, Halke von Ledochowski, a former general in the Austrian army; he succeeded Wernz, a Prussian, in 1915.

Has the R.P. Fessard also forgotten what ‘La Croix’ wrote all through the war, and especially this: “There is nothing to be gained from an intervention of troops from the other side of the Channel and Atlantic”.(59)

Does he not remember either this telegram of His Holiness Pius XII: The pope sends his blessing to 'La Croix', the voice of pontifical thought".(60)

Considering so much forgetfulness, must we come to the conclusion that members of the Society of Jesus have very short memories? They did not incur this reproach even from their enemies, though! Let us rather point out that R.P. Fessard expressed his patriotic fears of 1941-1942 in 1957 only. His "free meditations" over fifteen years brought some results and he had time to re-read a certain passage of the "Spiritual Exercises" which says that "the Jesuit must be ready, if the Church declares that what he sees as black is white, to agree with her, even though his senses tell him the opposite".(61)

As far as that is concerned, R.P. Fessard seems to be an excellent Jesuit! On the 7th of March 1936, Hitler brought the Wehrmacht into the de-militarised Rhine region, so tearing up the pact of Locarno. On the 11th of March 1938, it was the Anschluss (union of Austria and Germany), and on the 29th of September of the same year, in Munich, France and England had imposed on them by the Reich the annexation of Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia.

The Fuhrer had come to power, thanks to the votes of the Catholic Zentrum, only five years before, but most of the objectives cynically revealed in 'Mein Kampf' were already realised; this book, an insolent challenge to the western democracies, was written by the Jesuit Father Staempfle and signed by Hitler. For—as so many ignore the fact—it was the Society of Jesus which perfected the famous Pan-German programme as laid out in this book, and the Fuhrer endorsed it.

(59) "La Croix", 10th of August 1943.

(60) "La Croix", 28th of January 1942).

(61) "... siquid quod oculis nostris apparet album, nigrum illaesse definierit debemus itidem quod nigrum sit pronuntiare". "Institutum Societatis Jesus" (Roman edition of 1869, II p.417).

Let us see how the Anschluss was prepared:

First of all, and by a "providential" synchronism, when Mussolini seized power in Italy thanks to don Sturzo, Jesuit and chief of the Catholic party, Monseigneur Seipel, a Jesuit, became chancellor of Austria. He held that position until 1929, with an interregnum of two years, and, during those decisive years, he led the Austrian interior politics on to the reactionary and clerical road; his successors followed him on that road which led to the absorption of that country into the German block. The bloody repression of working-class uprisings earned him the nickname "Keine Milde Kardinal": the Cardinal Without Mercy.

"In the early days of May (1936), von Papen entered into secret negotiations with Dr Schusnigg (Austrian Chancellor) working on his weak point and showed him how advantageous a reconciliation with Hitler would be as far as the Vatican's interests were concerned; the argument may seem odd, but Schusnigg was very devout, and von Papen the pope's chamberlain". (62) Not surprisingly, it was the secret chamberlain who led the whole affair which ended, on the 11th of March 1938, with the resignation of the pious

Schussnigg (pupil of the Jesuits), in favour of Seyss-Inquart, chief of the Austrian Nazis. The following day, the German troops entered Austria and the puppet government of Seyss-Inquart proclaimed the union of the country to the Reich. This event was welcomed by an enthusiastic declaration of Vienna's archbishop: Cardinal Innitzer (Jesuit).

"On the 15th of March, the German press published the following declaration from Cardinal Innitzer: "The priests and the faithful must unhesitatingly uphold the great German state, and the Fuhrer whose struggle to set up Germany's power, honour and prosperity is in accord with the wishes of Providence.

(62) G.E.R. Gedye: "Suicide de l'Autriche" (Union latine d'editions, Paris 1940, p. 188).

The newspapers printed a facsimile of this declaration to dispel any doubt as to its authenticity. Reproductions were posted up on walls in Vienna and in the other Austrian cities. Cardinal Innitzer.. had, with his own hand, written the following words before his signature: "Und Heil Hitler!" "Three days later, the whole of the Austrian episcopate addressed a pastoral letter to its diocesans; the Italian newspapers published the text of this letter on the 28th of March: it was a straightforward adhesion to the Nazi regime whose virtues were highly extolled".(63)

Cardinal Innitzer, highest representative of the Roman Church in Austria, also wrote in his declaration: "I invite the chiefs of Youth organisations to prepare their union to the organisation of the German Reich".(64)

So, not only did the cardinal-archbishop of Vienna, followed by his episcopate, throw in his lot with Hitler most enthusiastically, but he handed over also the "Christian" youth to be trained according to Nazi methods; these methods had been "officially condemned" in the 'terrible' encyclical letter: "Mit brennender Sorge"!

Then, the 'Mercure de France' justifiably observed: "... These bishops have not taken a decision which involves the Church as a whole on their own accord; the Holy See gave them directives which they merely followed".(65)

This is obvious. But what other "directives" could be expected from this Holy See which brought to power Mussolini, Hitler, Franco and, in Belgium, created the 'Christus-Rex' of Leon Degrelle?

We understand, then, why English authors such as F.A. Ridley, Seeker and Warburg object to the Politics of Pius XI which favoured fascist movements everywhere".(66)

As for the Anschluss, M. Francois Charles-Roux tells us why the Church was so much in favour of it: "Eight million Austrian Catholics united to the Catholics of the Reich could make a German Catholic body more able to make its weight felt".(67)

Poland was in the same situation as Austria when Hitler, after having invaded it, annexed part of it in the name of the Fatherland. A few more million Catholics to reinforce the German contingent under the Roman obedience: the

Holy See could only be in favour of this, in spite of all its love for its "dear Polish people". In fact, it did not frown at the brutal re-grouping of Catholics in Central Europe, according to the plan of the Jesuits' general, Halke von Ledechowski.

(63) Francois Charles-Roux, op.cit., pp.118, 122.

(64) Ernest Pezet, former vice-president of the Commission for Foreign Affairs, "L'Autriche et la paix" (Ed. Self, Paris 1945, p. 149).

(65) Austria and Hitler ("Mercure de France", 1st of May 1938, p.720).

(66) J. Tchernoff: "Les Demagogies contre les democracies" (R. Pichon and Durand-Auzias, Paris 1947, p.80).

(67) Francois Charles-Roux, op.cit., p.114.

The Vatican's licensed thurifers keep on reminding their readers that Pius XII "protested" against the aggression in the encyclical letter "Summi Pontificatus". In reality, this ludicrous document, like all other such documents, which numbers no less than 45 pages, **contains only one phrase, at the end, concerning Poland crushed by Hitler. And this short allusion is an advice to the Polish people to pray much to the Virgin Mary!** The contrast is striking between those few words of trite condolences and the nattering pages devoted to fascist Italy and the exaltation of the Lateran Treaty; this treaty was concluded by the Holy See and Mussolini, Hitler's collaborator who, at the time when the pope was writing his encyclical letter, delivered a scandalous speech, as a challenge to the world, and started it with these words: "Liquidata la Polonia!" (Italian for Poland liquidated)

But what risks are there in using these derisory alibis, when preaching to the converted? Besides, how many of them would be anxious to examine such references?

Nevertheless, when we study the Vatican's behaviour in this affair, what do we see? First of all, we see the nuncio in Warsaw, Monseigneur Cortesi, urge the Polish government to give in to Hitler in everything: Dantzig, the "corridor", the territories where German minorities live (68). Then, when this is done, we see also the Holy-Father lend his help to the aggressor when trying to make Paris and London ratify the amputation of a large part of his "dear Poland".(69)

To those who would be surprised at such behaviour towards a Catholic country, we will quote a famous precedent: after the first division of Poland in 1772, a catastrophe in which the Jesuits' intrigues played a large part, Pope Clement XIV, when writing to the Empress of Austria, Marie-Therese, expressed his satisfaction as follows:

"The invasion and division of Poland were not done for political reasons only; it was in the interests of religion, and necessary to the spiritual profit of the Church, that the Court of Vienna should extend its domination over Poland as much as possible".

Obviously, there is nothing new under the sun—especially at the Vatican. In 1939, there was no need to change one single word in that cynical declaration, apart from "the spiritual profit of the Church" which, this time, consisted of several million Polish Catholics joining the Great Reich.

(68) Cf. the "Journal", (1933-1939) of Count Szembeck (Plon, Paris 1952, pp.499). (69) Cf. Camille Cianfarra, op.cit., pp.259, 260.

This fact easily explains the parsimony of papal condolences in "Summi Pontificatus".

In Czechoslovakia, the Vatican did even better: it provided Hitler with one of its own prelates, a secret chamberlain, to be made into the head of this satellite state of the Reich.

"The Anschluss had made a great noise in Europe. From now on, the hitlerian threat was hovering over the Republic of Czechoslovakia and war was in the air. But, at the Vatican, nobody seemed concerned. Let us listen to M. Francois Charles-Roux:

"In the middle of August, I had tried to persuade the pope that he should speak in favour of peace—a just peace, of course... My first attempts were unsuccessful. But, from the beginning of September 1938 on, when the international crisis reached its worst level, I started gathering, at the Vatican, soothing impressions contrasting strangely with the rapidly deteriorating situation.".(70)

"All my attempts", adds the former French ambassador, "received the same answer from Pius XI: "It would be useless, unnecessary, inopportune". I could not understand his obstinacy in keeping silent". (71) Events were soon going to explain this silence. It was first of all the annexation of Sudetenland by the Reich, with the support of the Christian Social Party, of course; this annexation was ratified by the Munich accord, and the Republic of Czechoslovakia was divided. But Hitler, who had undertaken to respect its territorial integrity, intended in reality to annexe the Czech countries independent of Slovakia, and reign over it as well by his own appointee.

It was easy for him to attain these ends as most of the main political Slovakian chiefs were Catholic ecclesiastics, according to Walter Hagen (72), and, amongst these, the priest Hlinka (Jesuit), had at his disposal a "guard" trained on Nazi S.A. principles.

We know that, according to canon law, no priest can accept a public post or a political mandate without the Holy See's consent.

This is confirmed and explained by the R.P. Jesuit de Soras: "How could it be otherwise? We have said so already: a priest, by virtue of the 'character' his ordination marked him with, by virtue of the official functions he exercises within the Church itself, by virtue of the cassock he wears, is bound to act as a Catholic, at least when a public action is concerned. Where the priest is, there is the Church".(73)

(70) Francois Charles-Roux, op.cit., pp.127, 128. (71) Francois Charles-Roux, op.cit., 127, 128. (72) Cf. Walter Hagen: "Le Front secret" (Les lies d'Or, Paris 1950). (73) R.P. de Soras, op.cit., p.96.

It was then with the Vatican's consent that members of the clergy sat in the Czechoslovak Parliament. Still more, one of these priests had to have the

Holy See's approval when the Fuhrer himself invested him as head of state - and later conferred on him the highest hitlerian distinctions: the Iron Cross and the Black Eagle decoration.

As anticipated, on the 15th of March 1939, Hitler annexed the rest of Bohemia and Moravia, and put the Republic of Slovakia, which he had created with a stroke of his pen, "under his protection". At the head, he placed Monseigneur Tiso (Jesuit), "who dreamed of combining Catholicism and Nazism". A noble ambition, and easily realised as it had already been proved by the German and Austrian episcopates.

"Catholicism and Nazism", proclaimed Monseigneur Tiso, "have much in common; they work hand in hand at reforming the world".(74)

Such must have been also the Vatican's opinion as—in spite of the "terrible" encyclical letter "Mit Brennender Sorge"—it did not haggle over its approval of the gauleiter priest.

"In June 1940, Radio Vatican announced: "The declaration of Monseigneur Tiso, chief of the Slovakian state, stating his intention to build up Slovakia according to a Christian plan, has the full approval of the Holy See".(75)

"Tiso's regime, in Slovakia, was especially afflicting for the Protestant Church of that country, which comprised one fifth of the population. Monseigneur Tiso tried to reduce the Protestant influence to its minimum, and even eliminate it... Influential members of the Protestant Church were sent to concentration camps".(76)

These could count themselves fortunate, as we consider this declaration from the Jesuits' general Wernz, a Prussian (1906-1915): "The Church can condemn heretics to death as any rights they have is because of our forbearance".

Let us see now what kind of apostolic gentleness was used by the gauleiter prelate Tiso towards the Jews: "In 1941, the first contingent of Jews from Slovakia and upper-Silesia arrive at Auschwitz; from the start, those who were not able to work are sent to the gas chamber, in a room of the building containing the crematory furnaces".(77)

Who wrote this? A witness who could not be challenged, Lord Russell of Liverpool, a judicial counsellor at the trials of war criminals. So, the Holy See had not "lent" one of its prelates to Hitler in vain. The Jesuit head of state was doing a good job and the satisfaction expressed by Radio Vatican is understandable. To have been Auschwitz's first provider, what a glory for this holy man and for the whole Company of Jesuits! In fact, this triumph lacked nothing. At the time of the Liberation, this prelate was handed over to Czechoslovakia by the Americans, condemned to death in 1946 and hanged—the palm, for a martyr!

(74) and (75) Henriette Feuillet: "France Nouvelle", 25th of June 1949. (76) "Reforme", 17th of August 1947. (77) Lord Russell of Liverpool: "Sous le signe de la croix gammes", (L'Ami du livre, Geneva 1955, p.217).

"Anything done against the Jews, we do it because of our love for this nation

of ours. The love for our fellow-men and the love for our country have developed into a fruitful fight against the enemies of Nazism".(78)

Another high dignitary of the Roman Church, in a neighbouring country, could have appropriated this declaration of Monseigneur Tiso to himself. For, if the foundations of the Slovakian "City of God" were hatred and persecution, according to the steadfast tradition of the Church, what can be said of the eminently Catholic state of Croatia, offspring of the collaboration between the killer Pavelitch and Monseigneur Stepinac, and with the assistance of the pontifical legate Marcone!

We would have to look back as far as the conquest of the New World, couple the actions of the adventurers of Cortes and the no less ferocious converter monks to find something worth comparing with the atrocities of those "Oustachis", upheld, commanded and prompted by madly fanatical clerics. What these "Assassins in the Name of God", as they were so rightly nicknamed by M. Herve Lauriere, did over four years defies all imagination, and the annals of the Roman Church, even though so rich in such material, cannot produce the equivalent in Europe. Do we need to add that the crony of the blood-thirsty Ante Pavelitch was Monseigneur Stepinac, another Jesuit?

The Croatian terrorist organisation of the "Oustachis", led by Pavelitch, had come to the notice of the French people through the assassination, in Marseille, of King Alexander the First of Yugoslavia and our Foreign-Affairs' minister, Louis Barthou, in 1934. "As Mussolini's government was obviously mixed up in the crime"(79), the extradition of Pavelitch, who had taken refuge in Italy, was demanded by the French government; the Duce obviously took care not to grant it, and the Assize Court of Aix-en-Provence had to impose the death sentence by default on the head of the "Oustachis". This chief of terrorists, hired by Mussolini, "worked" for the Italian expansion on the Adriatic coast. When, in 1941, Hitler and Mussolini invaded and divided Yugoslavia, this supposed Croatian patriot was put, by them, at the head of the satellite state they created under the name of "Independent State of Croatia". On the 18th of May of that same year, in Rome, Pavelitch offered the crown of that state to the Duke of Spolete who took the name "Tomislav II". Of course, he took care never to set foot on the blood-stained soil of his pseudo-kingdom. "On the same day, Pius XII gave a private audience to Pavelitch and his 'friends', one of whom was Monseigneur Salis-Sewis, vicar-general to Monseigneur Stepinac. "So, the Holy See did not fear shaking hands with a certified murderer, sentenced to death by default for the murder of King Alexander the First and Louis Barthou, a chief of terrorists having the most horrible crimes on his conscience! In fact, on the 18th of May 1941, when Pius XII gladly welcomed Pavelitch and his gang of killers, the massacre of Orthodox Croats was at its height, concurrently with forced conversions to Catholicism".(79a)

(78) Henriette Feuillet: "France Nouvelle", 25th of June 1949. (79) Francois Charles-Roux, op.cit., p. 132. (79a) Cf. Herve Lauriere: "Assassins in the Name of God", (Ed. Dufour, Paris 1951, pp.40 ss)

It was the Serbian minority of the population they were after, as the author Walter Hagen explains: "Thanks to the 'Oustachis', the country was soon

transformed into a bloody chaos... The deadly hatred of the new masters was directed towards the Jews and Serbians who were officially outlawed... Whole villages, even whole regions were systematically wiped out . . . As the ancient tradition wanted Croatia and the Catholic Faith, Serbia and the Orthodox Church to be synonymous, the Orthodox believers were constrained to join the Catholic Church. These compulsory conversions constituted the completion of "croatisation".(80)

Andrija Artukovic, minister of the Interior, was the great organiser of these massacres and compulsory conversions; but, while doing it, he "morally" defended himself, according to a witness in a high position. Indeed, when the Yugoslav government asked for his extradition from the United States where he had taken refuge, someone spoke on his behalf: the R.P. Jesuit Lackovic, residing also in the United States, and secretary to Monseigneur Stepinac, archbishop of Zagreb, during the last war. "Artukovic", states the Jesuit, "was the lay spokesman of Monseigneur Stepinac. Between 1941 and 1945, not one day went by without seeing him in my office or myself going to his. He asked the archbishop's advice on all his actions, as far as their moral aspect was concerned".(81)

When we know what the "actions" of this executioner were, we realise what kind of edifying "moral" advice Monseigneur Stepinac gave him. Massacres and "conversions" took place until the Liberation, and the good-will of the Holy-Father towards the killers never altered. One must read, in the Croatian Catholic newspapers of that time, the exchanges of compliments between Pius XII and Pavelitch, the "Poglavnik", to whom Monseigneur Saric, Jesuit archbishop of Sarajavo and a poet in his spare time, dedicated verses impregnated with a rapturous adoration.

(80) Walter Hagen op.cit., pp. 168,176,198,199. (81) "Mirror News" of Los Angeles, 24th of January 1958. (82) With other Catholic ecclesiastics such as Monseigneur Aksamovic, the Jesuits Irgolis, Lonacir, Pavunic, Mikan, Polic, Severovic, Sipic, Skrinjar, Vucetic (note of the author).

But this was only a show of good manners: "Monseigneur Stepinac becomes member of the "Oustachi" parliament (82). He wears "Oustachi" decorations, he is present at all important "Oustachi" official manifestations at which he even gives speeches... "Must we then wonder at the respect given to Monseigneur Stepinac by the satellite state of Croatia'? or that his praises were sung by the "Oustachi" press? It is, alas, too evident that, without the support of Monseigneur Stepinac, on the religious and political side, Ante Pavelitch would never have obtained the collaboration of Catholic Croats to such an extent".(83)

To comprehend the full extent of that collaboration, one must read the Croatian Catholic press, the "Katolicki Tjednik", the "Katolick List", the "Hrvatski Narod", and so many other publications which vied with each other in flattering the bloody "Poglavnik"; Pius XII was so pleased that he was a "practising Catholic", and the high esteem of the Sovereign Pontiff embraced even the accomplices of the great man.

The "Osservatore Romano" informs us that, on the 22nd of July 1941. the pope received one hundred members of the Croatian Security Police, led by the

chief of Zagreb's police, Eugen Kvaternik-Dido. This group of Croatian S.S., the pick of the executioners and torturers operating in the concentration camps, were presented to the Holy-Father by one who perpetrated crimes so monstrous that his own mother committed suicide in despair.

The goodwill of His Holiness Pius XII is easily explained by the apostolic zeal of these killers. Another "practising Catholic", Mile Budak, minister for Worship, exclaimed in August 1941, at Karlovac: "The "Oustachi" movement is based on religion. All our work rests on our loyalty to religion and the Catholic Church".(84)

Besides, on the 22nd of July, at Gospic, the same minister for Worship had perfectly defined this work: "We will kill some Serbians, deport others, and the rest will be compelled to embrace the Roman Catholic religion".(85) This fine programme was carried out to the letter. When the Liberation put an end to this tragedy, 300,000 Serbians and Jews had been deported and more than 500,000 massacred. By this means the Roman Church had also made 240,000 Orthodox believers enter its fold... who quickly went back to the religion of their ancestors when their freedom was restored. But, to obtain this ridiculous result, what horrors fell on that unfortunate country! One must read, in the book of M. Herve Lauriere "Assassins in the Name of God", details of the monstrous tortures that these practising Catholics who were the Oustachis inflicted on their poor victims."

(83) "Le Monde" 27th of May 1953. (84) Cf. Herve Lauriere: "Assassins in the Name of God", (Ed. Dufour, Paris 1951, p.97). (85) "L'Ordre de Paris", 8th of February 1947.

The English journalist J.A. Voigt wrote: "Croatian politics consisted of massacres, deportations or conversions. The number of those who were massacred reaches hundreds of thousands. The massacres were accompanied by the most bestial tortures. The "Oustachis" put out their victims' eyes and made garlands with them, which they wore, or presented as mementos".(86)

"In Croatia, the Jesuits implanted political clericalism".(87)

It is the present invariably offered by the famous Company to the nations which welcome it. The same author adds: "With the death of the great Croatian tribune, Raditch, Croatia loses its main opponent to political clericalism which will embrace the mission of the Catholic action defined by Friedrich Muckermann. This German Jesuit, well-known before Hitler's advent, made it known, in 1928, in a book whose foreword was written by Monseigneur Pacelli, then apostolic nuncio in Berlin. Muckermann expressed himself as follows: "The pope appeals in favour of the Catholic Action's new crusade. He is the guide who carries the standard of Christ's Kingdom... The Catholic Action means the gathering of world Catholicism. It must live its heroic age... The new epoch can be acquired for Christ only through the price of blood".(88)

Ten years after this was written, the one who wrote the foreword of the Jesuit Father Muckermann's book sat on the throne of Saint-Peter and, during his pontificate, "the blood for Christ" literally flowed in Europe; but Croatia suffered the worst of the atrocious deeds of that "new epoch". There, not only were the priests advocating all out slaughter from the pulpit, but

some even marched at the head of the murderers. Others held, apart from their sacred ministry, official posts as prefects or chiefs of the "Oustachi" police, even as chiefs of concentration camps where horrors were not outdone by even Dachau or Auschwitz.

To this bloody list of honours, we must enter the names of the Abbe Bozidar Bralo, the priest Dragutin Kamber, the Jesuit Lackovic and the Abbe Yvan Salitch, secretaries to Monseigneur Stepinac, the priest Nicolas Bilogrivic, etc... and numberless Franciscans; one of the worst of these was Brother Miroslav Filipovitch, main organiser of those massacres, chief of and executioner at the concentration camp of Jasenovac, the most hideous of these earthly hells.

Brother Filipovitch's fate was the same as Monseigneur Tiso's, in Slovakia: when Liberation came, he was hanged, wearing his cassock. But many of his rivals, not very anxious to win the palm of the martyr, fled to Austria, pell-mell with the assassins they had assisted so well. But what was the "hierarchy" doing, when confronted with the blood-thirsty frenzy of so many of its subordinates?

(86) "Nineteenth Century and After", August 1943. (87) and (88) Herve Lauriere, op.cit., pp.82,84,85.

The "hierarchy", or the episcopate and its leader, Monseigneur Stepinac, voted in the "Oustachi" Parliament for the decrees concerning the conversion of the Orthodox to Catholicism, sent "missionaries" to the terrorized peasants, converted without wincing whole villages (89), took possession of the Serbian Orthodox Church's properties and without ceasing showered praises and blessings on the Poglavnik, copying the example set from on high by Pope Pius XII.

His Holiness Pius XII was personally represented at Zagreb by an eminent monk, the R.P. Marcone. This "Sancti Sedis Legatus" was given the place of honour at all the ceremonies of the "Oustachi" regime, and had himself sanctimoniously photographed at the home of the chief of killers— Pavelitch—with his family which received him as a friend. "Birds of a feather flock together".

So, the most sincere cordiality always reigned in the relations between the assassins and ecclesiastics—of course, many of these ecclesiastics held both positions, for which they were never blamed. "The end justifies the means". When Pavelitch and his 4,000 "Oustachis"—which included archbishop Saric, a Jesuit, bishop Garic and 400 clerics—left the scene of their exploits to go first to Austria then on to Italy, they left behind part of their "treasures": films, photographs, recorded speeches of Ante Pavelitch, chests full of jewels, gold coins, gold and platinum from the teeth, bracelets, wedding rings and pieces of dentures made of gold and platinum. This spoil taken from the poor wretches who had been murdered were hidden at the Archiepiscopal palace where they were eventually found. As for the fugitives, they took advantage of the "Pontifical Commission for Assistance", created expressly to save war criminals. This charitable institution hid them in convents, mainly in Austria and Italy, and provided the chiefs with false

passports which enabled them to go to "friendly" countries, where they would be able to enjoy the fruits of their robberies in peace. This was done for Ante Pavelitch, whose presence in Argentina was revealed, in 1957, through an attempt upon his life in which he was wounded.

(89) In Monseigneur Stepinac's own diocese, Kamensko, 400 came back to the Roman Catholic fold in one day. On the 12th of June 1942, "Radio Vatican" announced these mass-conversions, stating that it had been "spontaneous and without any pressure on the part of civil and ecclesiastical authorities".

Since then, the dictatorial regime collapsed in Buenos Aires. Like former president Peron himself, his protege had to leave Argentina. From Paraguay where he went first, he reached Spain where he died on the 28th of December 1959, at the German hospital of Madrid. On that occasion, the French press recalled his bloody career and—more discreetly the "powerful accomplices" who enabled him to escape punishment. Under the title "Belgrade demanded his extradition in vain", we read in "Le Monde": "The brief information published in the press this morning revived, amongst the Yugoslav people, souvenirs of a past filled with sufferings and bitterness towards those who, by hiding Ante Pavelitch, for nearly fifteen years, obstructed the course of justice".(90) "Paris- Presse" points out the last shelter offered to the terrorist with this short, but significant phrase: "He ended up in a Franciscan monastery of Madrid".(91)

It is from there, in fact, that Pavelitch was taken to hospital where he paid his debt to nature—but not to justice, scoffed at by these "powerful accomplices" who are easy to identify.

Monseigneur Stepinac who had, as he said, a "clear conscience", stayed in Zagreb where he was tried in 1946. Condemned to hard labour, he was in fact only made to reside in his native village. The penance was easy to bear, as we can see, but the Church needs martyrs. The archbishop of Zagreb was then made a member of the holy cohort, in his lifetime, by Pius XII who hastened to confer on him the title of "Cardinal", in recognition of "his apostolate which displays the purest brightness".

We are acquainted with the symbolic meaning of the Cardinals' Purple: the one who dons it must be ready to confess his Faith "usque ad sanguinis effusionem": to the point of shedding blood. We cannot deny that this shedding was abundant in Croatia, during the apostolate of this holy man, but the blood which flowed there in torrents was not the prelate's: it was the blood of Orthodox believers and Jews. Must we see there a "reversibility of merits."

If that is the case, the right to cardinalship of Monseigneur Stepinac cannot be contested. In the diocese of Gornji Karlovac, part of his archbishopric, out of 460,000 Orthodox people who lived there, 50,000 were able to hide in the mountains, 50,000 were sent to Serbia, 40,000 were converted to Catholicism through the regime of terror and 280,000 were massacred".(92)

On the 19th of December 1958, we read in "Catholic France": "To exalt the greatness and heroism of His Eminence the Cardinal Stepinac, a great meeting will take place on the 21st of December 1958, at 4 o'clock, in the crypt of

Sainte-Odile, 2, Avenue Stephane-Mallarme, Paris 17. It will be presided over by His Eminence the Cardinal Feltin, archbishop of Paris.

(90) "Le Monde", 31st of December 1959. (91) "Paris-Presse", 31st of December 1959. (92) Cf. Jean Hussard: "Vu en Yougoslavie" (Lausanne 1947, p.216).

Senator Ernest Pezet and the Reverend Father Dragoun, national rector of the Croatian Mission in France, will take part. His Excellency Monseigneur Rupp will celebrate mass and communion".

This is how a new figure, and not one of the least important, the one of Cardinal Stepinac, came to enrich the gallery of Great Jesuits. Another aim of this meeting on the 21st of December 1958, in the crypt of Sainte-Odile, was to "launch" a book written in the defense of Zagreb's archbishop, by the R.P. Dragoun himself; Monseigneur Rupp, coadjutor of Cardinal Feltin, wrote the foreword. We cannot give here a full analysis but will say this:

The book is entitled "The Dossier of Cardinal Stepinac", which seems to promise the reader an objective exposition of the trial at Zagreb. In fact, in this volume which numbers 285 pages, we find the speeches of the archbishop's two counsels in full, accompanied by extensive remarks from the author, but, neither the charge itself, nor the speech for the prosecution are mentioned, even briefly.

The R.P. Dragoun seems to ignore the French proverb "Qui n'entend qu'une cloche n'entend qu'un son" (there are two sides to every story)-unless, of course, he knows it too well!

Be that as it may, this systematic obliteration of the opposite side of the story would be enough to close the debate.

Let us consider, though, the good reasons invoked for the discharge of Zagreb's archbishop. But first of all, this question: Was Monseigneur Stepinac really the metropolitan of Croatia and Slovenia? The book of the R.P. Dragoun does not answer this question. On page 142 of that book, we read this concerning the copy of a report by Monseigneur Stepinac, the authenticity of which was contested by the defence:

"In the text of the copy, the archbishop is described as "Metropolitan Croatiae et Slavoniae", but the archbishop is not a metropolitan and never presented himself as such.

This would clear the matter up if we didn't read, on page 114, the following taken from Monseigneur Stepinac's own declarations before the tribunal:

"The Holy See often emphasized that the small nations and the national minorities have the right to be free. Should not I, as "bishop and metropolitan", have the right to discuss it?" The more we read, the less we understand!

No matter! As we are reminded again and again, Monseigneur Stepinac could not influence in any way the behaviour of his flock and clergy. To those who bring out the articles of the Catholic press praising the accomplishments of

Pavelitch and his hired assassins, the answer is: "It is simply ridiculous to make Monseigneur Stepinac responsible for what the newspaper wrote".

Even when this paper was the "Katolicki List", the most important Catholic publication in Zagreb, diocese of Monseigneur Stepinac! In those conditions, we won't bother mentioning the "Andjeo Cuvar" (The Guardian Angel) belonging to the Franciscans, the "Glasnik Sv. Ante" (The Voice of Saint-Anthony) to the conventuals of the "Katolicki Tjednik", (The Catholic Weekly) of Sarajevo, bishop Saritch, nor, of course, the "Vjesnik Pocasne Straze Srca Isusova" (The Publication of the Guard of Honour of the Heart of Jesus(!), belonging to the Jesuits).

So, it is claimed that Monseigneur Stepinac, "contested metropolitan", had no influence over these publications, of which he was president, and which constantly tried to surpass each other in their adulation of Pavelitch and his regime of blood.

Neither did he have any authority, so they say, over the "Oustachi" bishops Sacric, Garic, Aksamovic, Simrak, etc., who showered praise on the Poglavnik and applauded his crimes, nor over the "Crusaders" of the Catholic Action, these auxiliaries of "Oustachi" converters, nor over the Franciscans murderers, nor over the nuns of Zagreb who marched past, their hands raised in the hitlerian fashion.

What a strange "hierarchy" which had authority over nothing and nobody! The fact that he sat, with ten other Catholic priests, in the "Sabor" ("Oustachi" Parliament) does not compromise the archbishop—or, at least, we must presume this, as the fact is simply ignored.

We should not reproach him either for his presidency over Episcopal Conferences nor over the Committee for the application of the Decree concerning the conversion of Orthodox people. In this apology, the "humanitarian" pretext of having made so many enter the Roman Church by force, is fully—and skilfully—expounded. We read this, concerning the "awful dilemma" facing Monseigneur Stepinac: "His pastoral duty was to maintain intact the canonical principles but, on the other hand, dissidents who refused to embrace Catholicism were massacred; so, he lessened the severity of the rules."

We become even more bewildered when we read a little further on: "He tried to resolve this dramatic alternative in the circular letter of the 2nd of March 1942, in which he ordered the priests to closely screen the motives for conversion".

This is indeed a peculiar method to "attenuate the severity of the rules" and resolve the "dramatic alternative"!

Was Monseigneur Stepinac opening or shutting the doors of the Roman Church to the false converts? It would be absolutely impossible to find it out if we referred only to this speech for the defence. The archbishop's apologists seem to choose the "shutting", though, when they declare: "... The cases of re-baptisms were very rare in the territory of Zagreb's archdiocese (92a)."

Unfortunately, statistics tell us otherwise, as we said earlier: "... In the diocese of Gornji Karlovac alone, part of Zagreb's archbishopric, 40,000 people were re-baptised".

It is evident that such results could be obtained only through mass-conversions of whole villages, such as Kamensko, in that same archdiocese of Monseigneur Stepinac, where 400 lost sheep returned to the Roman fold in one day, "spontaneously and without any pressure on the part of civil and ecclesiastical authorities".

Then why conceal these numbers? If they were really due to the "charitable sentiments" of the Croatian Catholic clergy, and not to the cynical exploitation of terror, they should have been proud of them. The truth is that the veil thrown over these infamies in an attempt to hide them is transparent and not wide enough. To cover Stepinac, others have to be uncovered: Bishops Saric, Garic, Simrak, the priests Bilogrivic, Kamber Bralo and their associates—the Franciscans and Jesuits have to be uncovered, and finally the Holy See.

We might as well leave this peculiar archbishop to enjoy his "clear conscience", this primate of Croatia supposedly stripped of any authority, calling himself "metropolitan" when he wasn't so and who, to crown the paradox, was opening doors when shutting them. But, at the side of this fantastic prelate, there was another one, consistent and corpulent, the R.P. Marcone, personal representative of Pius XII.

Was this "Sancti Sedis legatus" also destitute of any authority over the Croatian clergy? Nobody knows! For the "dossier" so well expurgated makes no mention whatsoever of this great person; we could even be oblivious of his existence if we didn't have other information, such as photographs which show him officiating at Zagreb's cathedral, enthroned, amongst the "Oustachi" general-staff, and above all sharing a meal with the family of Pavelitch, the "practising" Catholic who organised the massacres.

Confronted by such a document, it is not surprising that the presence of the pope's representative was "blacked-out"; the mystics would call this "enlightening darkness"! But these few lines from the "dossier" are even more enlightening:

"The procurator himself, in his bill of indictment, names the Holy See's Secretary of State, Cardinal Maglione, who had, in 1942, advised Archbishop Stepinac to establish more cordial and sincere relations with the "Oustachi" authorities".(92b)

This is sufficient to put an end to any more quibbling.

(92a) R.P. Dragoun: "The Dossier of Cardinal Stepinac" (Nouvelles Editions Latines, Paris 1958, pages 46 and 163). (92b) R.P. Dragoun: "The Dossier of Cardinal Stepinac", (Nouvelles Editions Latines, Paris 1958, p.32).

The collusion between the Vatican and the "Oustachi" murderers is clear enough. The Holy See itself was urging Monseigneur Stepinac to collaborate with them, and the personal representative of Pius XII, by taking his place

at Pavelitch's table, was applying the pontifical instructions to the letter: sincerity and cordiality in the relations with murderers of Orthodox believers and Jews.

This does not surprise us! But what do the Jesuits think of it all, as they obstinately affirmed that the constant co-operation given to the dictators, by the prelates of His Holiness, was an "option" entirely personal and not dictated by the Vatican?

When Cardinal Maglione sent the previously mentioned recommendations to Zagreb's archbishop, was it his "personal option" he expressed, under the seal of the State's secretary's office? The proof of the connivance between the Holy See and the "Oustachis" supplied by the R.P. Dragoun, which has just been mentioned, puts an end to this chapter.

But here is a new confirmation of the evangelical sentiments which flourished, and still flourish amongst the faithful of the Croatian Catholic Church towards the Orthodox Serbians.

The "Federation Ouvriere Croate en France" (Federation of Croatian workmen in France) sent out an invitation to the solemn meeting organised for Sunday, 19th of April 1959, at the "General Confederation of Christian workmen" centre, in Paris, to celebrate the 18th anniversary of the foundation of the "Oustachi" Croatian state.

This invitation read: "The ceremony will start with holy mass being said at the Church of Notre-Dame-de-Lorette. But the reader, edified by this pious start, is the more startled when he discovers, soon after, this straight exhortation: "DEATH TO THE SERBIANS... !"(93)

So, this not so banal document expresses the regrets that not more of these "brothers in Christ" were killed.

The book of the R.P. Dragoun, rector of the Croatian Mission in France, implies that the welcome given by the French Catholics to the Croatian refugees was not warm enough. We are told this on pages 59 and 60, and, on pages 280 and 281, the author mentions the "grievous disappointment" these refugees experienced at "being met by a total lack of understanding on the part of their brothers in the faith".

(93) Cf. "Le Monde", 19th of April 1959.

Considering the aforementioned document, this "lack of understanding" seems comprehensible; we are glad that our fellow-countrymen, in spite of the most grand invitations, show little sympathy to a form of piety in which the call to murder walks hand in hand with the "holy mass", in the best Roman and "Oustachi" tradition. We would be even more glad if such blood-thirsty tracts were not allowed to be printed and distributed openly in Paris itself.

On the 10th of February 1960, the infamous archbishop of Zagreb, Alois Stepinac, died at his native village of Karlovice, where he had been made to reside. This death gave the Vatican an opportunity to organise one of its spectacular manifestations for which it excels.

On that occasion, a lot had to be done as many Catholics had no illusions as far as the Stepinac "case" was concerned. So, the Holy See surpassed itself to give this apotheosis all the pomp possible. The "Osservatore Romano" and all the Catholic press dedicated many columns to the rapturous praises of the "martyr", his "spiritual testament", and the speeches of His Holiness John XXIII proclaiming "his respect and supernatural affection"; these were the motives which prompted him to give to this cardinal who was not part of the Curia the honours of a solemn service at St. Peter's, in Rome, where he himself would give the General Absolution. And to complete this glorification, the press announced that the beatification of that illustrious person would soon be started.

We must admit that he deserved so much praise, and even the halo, for 'having observed the "holy obedience", and carried out to the letter the pressing instructions of the Holy See concerning the "cordial and sincere" relations wished for between himself and the "Oustachis". But, even amongst Catholics, we hope that some will be found who will discern, behind the exaltation of this future saint and the burial under flowers of the bloody souvenirs of his "apostolate", the attempt of the Vatican to hide its own crime.

We have seen how the Catholic Action, with Leon Degrelle and his associates at the head, prepared the way for Hitler in the Belgium of "Christus Rex". In France, the same undermining action was going on; it started when Mussolini came to power and ended up, in 1940, with the collapse of the national defence. As for Belgium, it was, so we are told, the "spiritual values" which had to be restored for the good of the country. The F.N.C.: "Federation nationale catholique" (National Catholic Federation) was born and placed under the presidency of General de Castelnau; as many as three million adherents joined it. The choice of its chief was clever: the general, a great military figure and, then, 78 years of age, covered with his personal prestige—but, of course, unknown to him—an intense clerico-fascist propaganda programme.

That the F.N.C, as the whole Catholic Action, was Jesuit through and through is obvious to anyone. But we know also that the good Fathers, whose besetting sin is pride, like to put their signature on the creations of their genius. This they did for the F.N.C. when they consecrated this Catholic army to the Sacred-Heart of Jesus, a worship set up by their Company and whose basilica stands on Montmartre hill, from where Ignatius of Loyola and his companions set off to conquer the world. A book concerning the F.N.C, whose foreword was written by the R.P. lanvier, preserved for posterity the act of consecration read "at the altar" by the old general. We will quote just a few phrases:

"Sacred Heart of Jesus, The chiefs and representatives of French Catholics, prostrating themselves now before you, have assembled and organised the National Catholic Federation (F.N.C.) to re-establish your reign over this land... All of us, those who are present and those who are absent, have not always been irreproachable... We carry the burden of the crimes the French nation committed against you... It is then with the view to repair and expiate that we present to you, today, our desires, intentions and unanimous resolution to re-establish over the whole of France your sacred and royal

sovereignty, and liberate the souls of her children from a sacriligious teaching... We will not flinch any more before this fight for which you condescended to arm us. We want everything to be bent before and devoted to your service...

"Sacred Heart of Jesus, we beseech you, through the Virgin Mary, to receive the homage... "etc".(94)

As for the "crimes of the French nation", the same Catholic author enumerates them: Fatal words and general directives: socialism is condemned... liberalism is condemned... Leo XIII showed that the freedom of worship is unjustifiable. The pope also showed that the freedom of speech and expression cannot be justifiably accorded... So, the freedom of thought, press, teaching and worship, considered by some as rights natural to man, cannot possibly be given...

"We must", said Pius XI, "re-instate these teachings and regulations of the Church".

Such is the main aim of the F.N.C., under the Hierarchy's control assured by the decentralization of the diocesan Committees. "In the Catholic Action, as in the war, the famous word of General de Castelnau remains true: "Forward".(95)

This is certainly clear and explicit. We know, then, what to expect when we read this, from Pius XI: "The Catholic Action is the faithful's apostolate..." (Letter to Cardinal Van Roey, 15th of August 1929).

Strange apostolate, consisting of the rejection of all liberties valued by civilised countries and to be the patron of, instead of, of the totalitarian gospel! Is this "the right to communicate to other minds the treasures of Redemption"? (Pius XI, "Non abbiamo bisogno").

In Belgium Leon Degrelle and his friends, heroes of the Catholic Action spread around them these "treasures of Redemption"... revised and up- dated by the **Jesuit Father Staempfle, the discreet author of "Mein Kampf"**.

It was the same in France where lay apostles, "joining in the activity of the hierarchical apostolate" (Pius XI "dixit"), were busy setting up another "collaboration". Let us read what Franz von Papen, the pope's secret chamberlain and the Fuhrer's right hand man, wrote concerning this subject:

"Our first meeting took place in 1927, when a German delegation, to which I had the honour to belong, came to Paris, for the "Social Week of the Catholic Institute", under the presidency of Monseigneur Baudrillart.

(94) and (95) Georges Viance: "La Federation nationale catholique", foreword by the R.P. Janvier (Flammarion, Paris 1930, pp. 186,187,188,78).

This was indeed a fruitful first contact as it marked the start of a long exchange of visits between important personalities from France and Germany.

"On the French side, the RR. PP. Delattre (Jesuit), de la Briere (Jesuit) and

Denset (Jesuit)... were present at these conferences".(96) Further on, the good apostle adds that, at times, "this conference of Catholics reached superhuman heights of greatness".

This "greatness" reached its zenith on the 14th of June 1940, the day which saw the flag adorned with the swastika fly victoriously over Paris. We know that Goebbels, chief of hitlerian propaganda, indicated that date three months before, on the 14th of March, and that the German offensive was only launched on the 10th of May.

The accuracy of this forecast is not as astonishing as it may seem. "Here is the secret report of agent 654 J.56, working for the German Secret Service, who sent these revelations to Himmler: "Paris, 5th of July 1939. "I can declare that, in France, the situation is now in our hands. Everything is ready for J day and all our agents are at their posts. Within a few weeks, the police force and military system will collapse like a pack of cards".

Many secret documents relate that the traitors had been chosen a long time before. Men like Luchaire, Bucard, Deat, Doriot... and Abel Bonnard (of the French Academy)".(97)

(This particular one fled to Spain at the Liberation. He came back to France on the 1st of July 1958, gave himself up, but was immediately released on a temporary basis by the president of the High-Court of Justice!) The extremely well documented book of M. Andre Guerber gives details of payments allocated to these traitors by the German SR. This money was well and truly earned, for their work was very effective. Besides, the atmosphere had been prepared for a long time, now. To "regenerate" the land according to the wishes of the Catholic Action, a whole brood of apprentice-dictators, on the model of Leon Degrelle, had hatched, men like Deat, Bucard, Doriot who was—according to M. Andre Guerber—"agent No.56 BK of the German Secret Service". Of all this motley band he was also the one best thought of by the archbishopric and those well-disposed towards them... and, of course, by Hitler who, later on at Sigmaringen, gave him full power. Doriot was the rising star; but, for the immediate future and to treat cautiously the transition after the foreseen and wanted defeat, another man was needed, a highly respected military chief who would be able to dress up the disaster and present it as a "national recovery".

(96) Franz von Papen: "Memoires" (Flammarion, Paris 1953, p.91). (97) Andre Guerber: "Himmler et ses crimes" (Les Documents Nuit et Jour, Paris, 1981)

In 1936 already, Canon Coube wrote: "The Lord who brought forth Charlemagne and the heroes of the Crusades can still raise up saviours... Amongst us, there must be men whom He has marked with His seal and who will be revealed when his time has come... Amongst us, there must be men of the cloth who are the workmen in the great national restorations. But what are the necessary conditions they need to accomplish this mission? Natural qualities of intelligence and character; also supernatural qualities that is to say obedience to God and His Law is just as indispensable, as this political work is moral and religious before anything else. These saviours are men with generous hearts who work only for the glory of God..."(98)

When the disciple of Loyola expounded these political and religious thoughts, he knew who this pious "saviour" would be, as his name was not a secret amongst clerics and fascists; this is told us by M. Francois Ternand: "A clever and persistent propaganda campaign began in favour of a "Petain dictatorship"..."

"In 1935, Gustave Herve published a pamphlet which we are going to examine... The tract is entitled "We need Petain"... its foreword is an enthusiastic apology of the "Italian recovery" and "the even more amazing recovery of Germany", also an exaltation of the wonderful chiefs who were the authors of these recoveries. Now what about our own French people?... There is a man around whom we could gather... We also have a providential man... Do you want to know his name? It is Petain".

"We need Petain", for the homeland is in a dangerous position; and not only the homeland, but Catholicism also: "Christian civilisation is condemned to death if a dictatorial regime is not set up in every country"... "Listen: "In peace time, a regime can only be swept away by a coup d'Etat if it is willing or if it has no support from the army and administrations. The operation can be a success only through a war and especially a defeat".(99) So, the path to follow was already made clear in 1935 to "re-christianise" France, the regime had to be swept away, and the best way to attain this was to suffer a military defeat which would place us under the German yoke. In 1943, this was confirmed by Pierre Laval, the pope's count and president of the Vichy government:

"I hope Germany will be victorious. It may seem strange to hear the one who is defeated wish for the victor's victory. It is because this war is not like previous ones. It is a true war of religion! Yes, a war of religion".(100) (98) Canon Coube: "Sainte Therese de l'Enfant Jesus et les crises du temps present", (Flammarion, Paris 1936, pp.165 ss). Imprimatur: 11th of January 1936.

(99) Francois Ternand: "L'Ascension politique du Marechal Petain", (Ed. du livre francais, Paris 1946, pp.40 ss). (100) National Radio, 2nd of January 1943.

This indeed was what the Church wanted, even though unpleasant for the forgetful Jesuit Fessard, whom we mentioned earlier on, who doesn't want to know any more what was said on the American radio for the 20 million listeners of the "Christian Front", by his Loyolan brother Father Coughlin: "The German war is a battle for Christianity".(101)

But during the same period, in occupied France, Cardinal Baudrillard, rector of the Catholic Institute in Paris, was saying the same thing. Listen to him:

"Hitler's war is a noble enterprise undertaken for the defence of European culture".(102)

So, on both sides of the Atlantic, as indeed all over the world, the clerical voices were singing the praises of victorious Nazism. In France, Cardinal Suhard, archbishop of Paris, set the example to all the episcopate by "collaborating" fully, and so did the Jesuit nuncio Monseigneur Valerio Valeri.

After the Liberation, the government asked the Vatican to recall no less than thirty bishops and archbishops who were deeply compromised. In the end, it consented to recall three of them.

“France has forgotten...”, wrote M. Maurice Nadeau. ‘La Croix’, the most dangerous mouthpiece at the service of collaboration, takes its place amongst the publications of a liberated France; the prelates who were urging the French youth to work for the victory of Germany have not been brought to trial”.(103)

One could read in “Artaban” of the 13th of December 1957:

“In 1944, ‘La Croix’ was prosecuted for having favoured the enemy and brought before the Court of Justice in Paris; the case was put in the hands of Judge Raoult who dismissed it. The affair was discussed at the Chamber, on the 13th of March 1946 (see J.O. Parliamentary Debates, pages 713-714) and it was learned, then, that M. de Menthon, minister for Justice and thorough at purging the French press, had spoken in favour of ‘La Croix’.

In fact, “the voice of pontifical thought”—as Pius XII called it, in 1942, when sending it his blessing—was the only one exempted from the general measures taken to suppress all the newspapers published during the occupation, even though, as ‘Artaban’ reminds us:

“‘La Croix’ received instructions from the German Lieutenant Sahn and, in Vichy, from Pierre Laval”.

Of course, the ‘pontifical thought’ and hitlerian instructions happily coincided. This is confirmed when we study the war-time editions of this estimable paper.

(101) 7th of July 1941. (102) 30th of July 1941. , (103) Foreword to “L’Eglise a-t-elle collabore”?, by Jean Cotereau (Spartacus, Paris, May 1946).

One of the Jesuits’ attributions, and not one of the least important, is to supervise all the Catholic press. In the various papers adapted to the need of their readers, they bring out, as necessary, the various shades of the ‘pontifical thought’ which, under its undulating aspects, nevertheless reaches implacably towards its aims. There is not one “Christian newspaper or periodical that does not enjoy the collaboration of some- discreet—Jesuits.

These Fathers who are “all things to all men” are of course the best at playing Chameleons. This they did, as we know, and, after the Liberation, we had the surprise to see coming up, everywhere, Fathers “who had belonged to the resistance” (they joined it later than others!), and who testified that the Church had NEVER NEVER “collaborated”.

Forgotten, abolished, evaporated were the articles of ‘La Croix’ and other Catholic newspapers, the episcopal mandates, the pastoral letters, the official communications from the Assembly of Cardinals and Archbishops, the exhortations of Cardinal Baudrillart calling on French youths to don the Nazi uniform and serve in the L.V.F. after having taken an oath of allegiance to Hitler! All this was past and forgotten!

"History is a novel", said a disillusioned thinker. The one of our epoch will be true to this definition: the novel is being written under our eyes. Many 'historians' are contributing to it, well-disposed ecclesiastics and laymen, and we can be certain that the result will be edifying: a Catholic novel, of course. The Jesuits' contribution is extensive, as worthy heirs of Father Loriquet whose "History of France" gave such a fanciful picture of Napoleon. Compared to this skilful feat, it was a simple matter to camouflage the collaboration between the clerics and the German occupier, from 1940 to 1944, and make it vanish. And this is still going on; over the years, so many articles have been written in newspapers, periodicals, books, under the patronage of the "Imprimatur", to sing the praise of the misjudged super-patriots such as Suhard, Baudrillart, Duthoit, Auvity, Du Bois de la Villerabel, Mayol de Luppe, etc.! What a lot of pages blackened to exalt the attitude—so heroic—of the episcopate, during the war years in which France experienced "a situation which led the French bishops to become the "defenders of the city"!, as a wry joker wrote.(104)

"Slander, and slander again! there is bound to be something left", advised Basile, this perfect type of Jesuit. "Whitewash, and whitewash again", say his successors, great writers of "historical novels". And this whitewashing is being carried out extensively.

(104) R.P. Deroo: "L'Episcopat francais dans la melee de son temps", (Bonne Presse, Paris 1955, p. 103). Imprimatur 1955.

Future generations, submerged by a torrent of exaggerations, will devote a thankful thought—at least, we hope they will—to these "defenders" of the city, these heroes of the Roman Church and Homeland, "dressed with a candid honesty of white linen" by the work of their apologists; some of them were even canonised!

On the 25th of August 1944, the Jesuit Cardinal Suhard, archbishop of Paris (since the 11th of May 1940!) and leader of the clerical collaborators, imperturbably decided to celebrate the "Te Deum" of victory at Notre-Dame. We were spared this unseemly farce only through "the strong protest of the general chaplain of the F.F.I."

We read in "France-Dimanche" of the 26th of December 1948: "His Eminence, Cardinal Suhard, archbishop of Paris, on the anniversary of his entering the priesthood has just received an autographic letter from His Holiness Pius XII who congratulates him, amongst other things, for the part he played during the occupation. We know that the cardinal's behaviour during that period had been severely criticized after the Liberation. When General de Gaulle arrived back in Paris, in August 1944, he refused to meet the cardinal at the "Te Deum" in Notre-Dame. At that time, the prelate was openly accused of "collaborationist tendencies".

The Holy-Father's congratulations are then understandable. But there is another story of "Te Deum" even more edifying!:

After the allies disembarked, the city of Rennes suffered much in the fighting which followed, and many died amongst the civilian population as the

commanding officer of the German garrison had refused to evacuate them. When the city was taken, the traditional "Te Deum" was going to be celebrated, but the archbishop and primate of Britany, Monseigneur Roques, absolutely refused, not only to officiate himself but also to allow this ceremony to take place in his cathedral. To thank Heaven for the liberation of his city was an intolerable scandal to the eyes of this prelate. Because of this attitude, he was confined to the archbishop's residence by the French authorities.

Such loyalty to the "pontifical thought" called for an equivalent reward. It came from Rome, soon after, in the shape of a Cardinal's hat. We can blame the late Pius XII with many things, but we must admit that he always "acknowledged his own". A flattering letter to Cardinal Suhard, distinguished collaborator, the Cardinal's purple for Monseigneur Roques, hero of the... German Resistance: this "great pope" was practising a strict distributive justice.

(105) 'La Croix', 10th of October 1958.

Of course, his entourage was of the kind which could advise him wisely: two German Jesuits, R.P. Leiber and R.P. Hentrich, "his two private secretaries and his favourites".(105) His confessor was the German Jesuit Bea. Sister Pasqualina, a German nun, supervised his household and above all cooked for him. Even the canary, answering to the sweet name of "Dumpfaf", had been imported from beyond the Rhine. But had not the Sovereign Pontiff told Ribbentrop, after Hitler invaded Poland, that "he would always have a special affection for Germany"?(106).

(106) We read in "Documentation catholique" of the 15th of March 1959: "As far as the very estimable German nation is concerned, we will follow the example given to us by our Predecessor (Pius XII), signed John XXIII. The spirit of continuity is one of the Vatican's attributes.

If Pius XI and Pius XII's goodwill and friendliness never failed towards the Fuhrer whom they had brought to power, we must admit that he fulfilled all the conditions of the pact by which he was bound to the Vatican. As he had expressly promised to "strangle" the anticlericals, they soon followed the liberals and Jews into the concentration camps. We know how the chief of the Third Reich had decided the fate of the Jews: they were simply massacred or, when more advantageous, made to work until worn out then liquidated. In this case the 'final solution' was only delayed.

But let us see, first, how an especially "authorised" personality, Franco, Knight of the Order of Christ, expressly confirmed the collusion between the Vatican and the Nazis. According to "Reforme", this is what the press of the Spanish dictator (Franco) published on the 3rd of May 1945, the day of Hitler's death:

"Adolf Hitler, son of the Catholic Church, died while defending Christianity. It is therefore understandable that words cannot be found to lament over his death, when so many were found to exalt his life. Over his mortal remains stands his victorious moral figure. With the palm of the martyr, God gives

Hitler the laurels of Victory".(107)

(107) "Reforme", 21st of July 1945.

This funeral oration of the Nazi chief, a challenge to the victorious allies, is voiced by the Holy See itself, under the cover of Franco's press. It is a communique of the Vatican given via Madrid.

Of course, this missing hero well deserved the gratitude of the Roman Church and they do not attempt to conceal it. He served her faithfully: all those this Church pointed out to him as her adversaries felt the consequences. And this good 'son' wasn't slow in admitting what he owed to his Most Holy Mother, and especially to those who made themselves her soldiers in the world.

"I learned much from the Order of the Jesuits", said Hitler... "Until now, there has never been anything more grandiose, on the earth, than the hierarchical organisation of the Catholic Church. I transferred much of this organisation into my own party... I am going to let you in on a secret... I am founding an Order... In my "Burgs" of the Order, we will raise up a youth which will make the world tremble... Hitler then stopped, saying that he couldn't say any more.."(108)

Another highly placed hitlerian, Walter Schellenberg, former chief of the German counter-espionage, completed this confidence from the Fuhrer, after the war:

"The S.S. organisation had been constituted, by Himmler, according to the principles of the Jesuits' Order. Their regulations and the Spiritual Exercises prescribed by Ignatius of Loyola were the model Himmler tried to copy exactly... The "Reichsfuhrer SS"—Himmler's title as supreme chief of the SS—was to be the equivalent of the Jesuits' "General" and the whole structure of the direction was a close imitation of the Catholic Church's hierarchical order. A mediaeval castle, near Paderborn in Westphalia, and called "Webelsbourg", was restored; it became what could be called a SS monastery".(109)

For their part, the best theological pens were busy demonstrating the similarity between the Catholic and Nazi doctrines. And, for that work, the sons of Loyola were the busiest. As an example, let us see how Michael Schmaus, Jesuit theologian, presented to the public a series of studies on this subject:

"Empire and Church" is a series of writings which should help the building up of the Third Reich as it unites a national-socialist state to Catholic-christianity... The national-socialist movement is the most vigorous and massive protest against the spirit of the 19th and 20th centuries... A compromise between the Catholic faith and liberal thinking is impossible... Nothing is more contrary to Catholicism than democracy... The re-awakened meaning of "strict authority" opens up again the way to the real interpretation of ecclesiastical authority... The mistrust of liberty is founded on the Catholic doctrine of original sin... The national-socialist

Commandments and those of the Catholic Church have the same aim..."(110)

(108) Hermann Rauschning, former national-socialist chief of the government of Dantzig: "Hitler m'a dit", (Ed. Co-operation, Paris 1939, pp.266, 267, 273 ss).

(109) Walter Schellenberg: "Le Chef du contre-espionnage Nazi vous parle" (Julliard, Paris 1957, pp.23-24).

(110) "Begegnungen zwischen Katholischem Christentum und National-sozialistischer Weltanschauung", by Michael Schmaus, professor at the Faculty of Theology of Munich. (Aschendorf, Munster 1933).

This aim was the "new middle-ages" Hitler promised Europe. The similarity is obvious between the passionate anti-liberalism of this Jesuit from Munich and the equal fanaticism expressed during the "act of consecration of the F.N.C. in the basilica of Montmartre". During the occupation, the R.P. Merklen wrote: "These days, liberty no longer seems to merit any esteem".(111)

Quotations such as these could be multiplied by the thousand. Is not this hatred of liberty under all its forms the character itself of the Roman Master? It is easy also to understand how the Catholic "doctrine" and the Nazi "doctrine" could harmonise so well. The one who ably demonstrated this accord, "The Jesuit Michael Schmaus", was called by 'La Croix', ten years after the war, the "great theologian of Munich"(112), and nobody will be surprised to learn that he was made a "Prince of the Church" by Pius XII. Under the circumstances, what becomes of the "terrible" encyclical letter "Mit brennender Sorge", from Pius XI, which was supposed to condemn Nazism? No casuist has tried to tell us... naturally!

The "great theologian" Michael Schmaus had many rivals, according to a German author who sees in the "Katholisch-Konservatives Erbgut" the strangest book ever published by the German Catholic Publications: "This anthology which brings together texts from the main Catholic theorists of Germany, from Gorres to Vogelsang, makes us believe that national-socialism was born out of Catholic ideas".(113) When writing this, the author certainly didn't realise he was describing it so perfectly. Another well informed person, the mainspring of the pact between the Holy See and Berlin and the pope's secret chamberlain, Franz von Papen, was even more explicit:

"The Third Reich is the first world power which not only acknowledges but also puts into practice the high principles of the papacy".(114) To this, we will add the result of this "putting into practice": 25 million victims of the concentration camps—the official figure issued by the United Nations Organisation.

Here, we find it necessary to add something especially for candid minds, for those who cannot admit that the organised massacres were one of the papacy's "high principles". Of course, this candour is diligently maintained:

(111) "La Croix", 2nd of September 1951. (112) "La Croix", 2nd of September 1954. (113) Gunter Buxbaum- "Les Catholiques en Europe centrale" ("Mercure de France", 15th of January 1939). (114) Robert d'Harcourt of the French Academy: "Franz von Papen, l'homme a tout faire" L'Aube, 3rd of October 1946).

—"Such barbarian deeds belong to the past"!

So say some good apostles to the simple, while shrugging their shoulders before the non-Catholics "for whom the fires of the Holy Inquisition are still burning".(115)

So be it! Let us set aside the superabundant testimonies about the clerical ferocity of years gone by to consider the 20th century. We will not recall either the exploits of men like Stepinac and Marcone in Croatia, nor Tiso in Slovakia, but will confine ourselves to examining the orthodoxy of certain "high principles" they put so well into practice. Are they really out-dated today—these principles—disowned by an "enlightened doctrine", officially rejected by the Holy See with other mistakes of a dark past? It is easy to find out.

Let us, for example, open the "Great Apologetics", by the Abbe Jean Vieujan, which can hardly be described as mediaeval as it is dated "1937". What do we read?

"To accept the principle of the Inquisition, one only needs a Christian mentality, and this is what many Christians lack... The Church has no such timidity".(116)

One could not put it better.

Is another proof, no less orthodox and modern, necessary? Listen to the R.P. Janvier, a famous conference speaker at Notre-Dame: "By virtue of her indirect power over temporal matters, should not the Church have the right to expect Catholic States to oppress heretics even to the point of death, so as to suppress them?"

Here is my answer:

"I do advocate this, even to the point of death!... Leaning first of all on the practice, then on the teaching of the Church itself; and I am convinced that no Catholic would say the opposite without erring gravely".(117)

We could not accuse this theologian of speaking in riddles. His speech is clear and concise. It would be impossible to say more with fewer words. Everything is there, concerning the right the Church arrogates to herself to exterminate those whose beliefs do not correspond with hers: the "teaching" which compels her, the "practice" which legitimates by tradition, and even the "call to the Christian states", of which the hitlerian crusade was such a perfect example.

The following words, far from ambiguous, were not pronounced in the darkness of the Middle-Ages either:

(115) "Temoignage chretien", 6th of December 1957. (116) Abbe Jean Vieujan: "Grande Apologetique" (Bloud et Gay, Paris 1937, p.1316). (117) Conference of the 25th of March 1912.

"The Church can condemn heretics to death, for any rights they have are only through our tolerance, and these rights are apparent not real". The author of this was the Jesuits' general Franz Wernz (1906-1915), and the fact that he

was German as well gives even more weight to his declaration. During the 20th century also, Cardinal Lepicier, notorious prince of the Church, wrote: "If someone professes publicly to be an heretic or tries to pervert others, by his speech or example, he can not only be excommunicated, but also justly killed..."(118 & 118a). If that's not a characteristic appeal to murder, I might as well be "changed into a peppermill" as the late Courteline said.

Is the Sovereign Pontiffs contribution wanted as well? Here it is, from a modern pope whose "liberalism" was criticised by intransigent clerics, the Jesuit Pope Leo XIII: "Anathema on the one who says: the Holy Spirit does not want us to kill the heretic".

What higher authority could be invoked after this one, apart from that of the Holy Spirit?

Even though this may displease those who manipulate the smokescreen (reference to those who put out smoke signals during the choice of a Pope), the soothers of disquieted consciences, the papacy's "high principles" remain unchanged and, amongst other things, the extermination for the Faith is as valid and canonical today as it was in the past. A conclusion most "enlightening"—to use a word dear to mystics—when we consider what happened in Europe between 1939 and 1945.

"Hitler, Goebbels, Himmler and most members of the party's "old guard" were Catholics", wrote M. Frederic Hoffet. "It was not by accident that, because of its chiefs' religion, the National-socialist government was the most Catholic Germany ever had... This kinship between National-socialism and Catholicism is most striking if we study closely the propaganda methods and the interior organisation of the party. On that subject, nothing is more instructive than Joseph Goebbel's works. He had been brought up in a Jesuit college and was a seminarist before devoting himself to literature and politics... Every page, every line of his writings recall the teaching of his masters; so he stresses obedience... the contempt for truth... "Some lies are as useful as bread!" he proclaimed by virtue of a moral relativism extracted from Ignatius of Loyola's writings..."(119) Hitler did not award the palm of Jesuitism to his chief of propaganda, though to the Gestapo's chief, as he told his favourites: "I can see Himmler as our Ignatius of Loyola"(120).

(118) "De stabilitate et progressu dogmatis", first part, art VI 9 I ("Typographia editrix romana, Romae 1908"). (118a) See Sol Ferrer-Francisco Ferrer. Un Martyr au XXe siecle (Fischbacher, Paris). (119) Frederic Hoffet: "L'Imperialisme protestant" (Flammarion, Paris 1948, pp.172 ss). (120) Adolf Hitler: "Libres propos" (Flammarion, Paris 1952, p.164).

To speak thus, the Fuhrer must have had some good reasons. First of all, we notice that Kurt Heinrich Himmler, Reichsfuhrer of the SS, Gestapo and German police forces, seemed to be the one most impregnated by clericalism amongst the Catholic members of Hitler's entourage. His father had been director of a Catholic school in Munich, then tutor of Prince Ruprecht of Bavaria. His brother, a Benedictine monk, lived at the monastery of Maria Laach, one of the Pan-German high places. He also had an uncle who had held the important position of Canon at the Court of Bavaria, the Jesuit Himmler.

The German author Walter Hagen gives also this discreet information: "The

Jesuits' general, Count Halke von Ledochowski, was ready to organise, on the common basis of anti-communism, some collaboration between the German Secret Service and the Jesuit Order".(121) As a result, within the SS Central Security Service, an organisation was created, and most of its main posts were held by Catholic priests wearing the black uniform of the SS. The Jesuit Father Himmler was one of its superior officers.

After the Third Reich's capitulation, the Jesuit Father Himmler was arrested and imprisoned at Nuremberg. His hearing by the international tribunal would have apparently been most interesting, but Providence was keeping a watchful eye: Heinrich Himmler's uncle never appeared before that court. One morning, he WAS FOUND DEAD IN HIS CELL, and the public never learned the cause of his death.

We will not insult the memory of this cleric by supposing that he willingly ended his days, against the solemn teaching laws of the Roman Church. Nevertheless, his death was as sudden and opportune as the one of another Jesuit, sometime before, Father Staempfle, the unrecognised author of 'Mein Kampf'. Strange coincidence indeed...

But let us come back to Kurt Heinrich Himmler, chief of the Gestapo, which meant he held in his hand the essential reins of power of the regime. Was it his personal merits which earned him such a high position? Did Hitler see in him a superior genius when he compared him to the creator of the Jesuit Order? It is certainly not what the testimonies of those who knew him imply as they saw in him nothing more than mediocrity.

(121) Walter Hagen, op.cit., p.358.

Was that star shining with a borrowed brightness? Was it really Kurt Heinrich Himmler, the ostensible chief, who actually reigned over the Gestapo and the secret services? Who was sending millions of people, deported for political reasons, and Jews to their death? Was it the flat-faced nephew or the uncle, former Canon at the Court of Bavaria, one of von Ledochowski's favourites, a Jesuit Father and superior officer of the SS? It may seem reckless, and even presumptuous, to take such an indiscreet look behind the scenes of History. The play is performed on the stage, before the combined lights of the footlights, the stagelights and the arc lights. This is normal for any show; and the one who wants to see behind the props may well be regarded as troublesome and ill-bred.

However, the spell binding actors on whom the public's gaze is fixed have all come from behind the scenes. This is more than evident when we study these "sacred monsters" and realise that they are far from equal to the individuals they are supposed to represent.

Such seems to have been the case of Himmler. But wouldn't it be right to say the same of the one whom he helped as his right hand man, Hitler? When we saw Hitler gesticulating on the screens or heard him bawling his hysterical speeches, did we not have the impression of looking at the movements of an automaton ill adjusted, with overstretched springs? Even his most simple and composed movements reminded us of a mechanical puppet. And what about his

dull and globular eyes, flabby nose, bloated physiognomy whose vulgarity could not be disguised by that famous lock of hair and brush moustache which seemed glued under his nostrils. Was this snarler at public meetings really a chief? the "real" master of Germany, an "authentic" Statesman whose genius was going to turn the world upside-down?

Or was he just a bad substitute for all that? A covering skin cleverly blown up and a phantom for the use of the masses, a rabble rouser? He himself admitted it when he said: "I am only a clarion". M. Francois- Poncet, then French ambassador to Berlin, confirms that Hitler worked very little, was not a reader and let his collaborators have their own way. His helpers gave the same impression of emptiness and unreality. The first one, Rudolf Hess, who flew to England in 1941, looked on his own trial at Nuremberg as a total stranger, and we never learned if he was completely insane or just a lunatic. The second one was the grotesque Goering, vain and obese, who wore the most spectacular comic-opera uniforms, a glutton, a great robber of paintings and, to top it all, a morphine drug addict.

The other main personalities of the party bore the same resemblance and, at the trials of Nuremberg, it was one of the journalists greatest surprises to have to report that—apart from their own particular defects— these Nazi heroes lacked in intellect, character, and were more or less insignificant. The only one who stood above that vulgar mob—because of his astuteness and not his moral worth—was Franz von Papen the chamberlain of His holiness, "the man for every job"... who was bound to be acquitted.

If the Fuhrer comes out as an extraordinary puppet, was the one he modelled himself upon more consistent? Let us recall the ridiculous exhibitions of that "Caesar fit for a carnival", rolling his big black eyes that he wanted to flash under that strange hat decorated with curtain tassels! And those photographs meant for propaganda, taken from his feet and depicting only his jaws, jutting out against the sky, the wonder man, as an immovable rock—symbol of a will which knew no obstacles!

What a will! From the confidences of some of his companions, we get the picture of a man constantly undecided; this "formidable man" who was going to "invade everything", with elemental force (to use terms of Cardinal Ratti, future Pius XI), did not resist the advances made to him by the Jesuit Cardinal Gasparri, secretary of State, on behalf of the Vatican.

Just a few secret meetings persuaded the revolutionist to enlist bag and baggage under the Holy Father's standard, to carve out the brilliant career we know so well, and the well known former minister Carlo Sforza could write: "One day, when time will have attenuated the bitterness and hatred, it will be recognised we hope, that the orgy of bloody brutalities which turned Italy into a prison for twenty years, and ruins through the 1940-1945 war, found its origin in an almost unique historical case: the utter disproportion between the legend artificially created around a name and the real capacities of the poor devil who bore that name, a man who was not obstructed by culture".(122)

This perfect formula is applicable to Hitler, as well as Mussolini: same

disproportion between the legend and capacities, same lack of "culture" in those two mediocre adventurers with almost identical pasts; their lightning careers can find an explanation only in their gift for haranguing the masses, a gift which brought them before the glare of publicity.

That the legend was "artificially created" is evident enough when we know that, today, the Fuhrer's retrospective apparition on the screens of Germany provokes nothing more than a huge laugh.

But was not the obvious inferiority of these "providential men" the very reason for which they were chosen to be elevated to power? The fact is that the same lack of personal qualities can be found in all those the papacy elected to be its champions.

In Italy and Germany, there were some "real" statesmen, "real" chiefs, who were able to take the helm and govern without having to resort to this delirious "mystic". But these were too bright intellectually and not sufficiently pliable. The Vatican, and especially the "black pope", von Ledochowski, could not have held them "as a baton in his hand", according to the fiery formula, and made them serve his aims at all costs until catastrophe struck.

(122) Count Carlo Sforza: "L'Italie telle que je l'ai vue", (Grasset, Paris 1946, p.158).

We have seen how the revolutionist Mussolini was turned inside out, as one would do with a glove, by the Holy See's emissaries who promised him power.

The unbending Hitler was to prove just as malleable. The Ledochowski's plan was, originally, to create a federation of the Catholic nations in central and eastern Europe, in which Bavaria and Austria (governed by the Jesuit Seipel) would have had the pre-eminence. Bavaria had to be separated from the German Republic of Weimar—and, as by chance, the agitator Hitler, of Austrian origin, was then a Bavarian separatist. But the chance to realise this federation and place a Hapsburg at its head became more and more slim, whilst Monseigneur Pacelli, the nuncio who had left Munich for Berlin, became the more conscious of the German Republic's weakness because of the poor support the Allies gave it. The hope to get hold of Germany as a whole was then born at the Vatican and the plan was modified accordingly:

"The hegemony of Protestant Prussia had to be prevented and as the Reich was to dominate Europe—to avert the Germans' federalism—a Reich had to be reconstituted in which the Catholics would be masters".(123)

This was enough. Turning completely round with his "brown shirts", Hitler, who had been until then a Bavarian separatist, became overnight the inspired Apostle of the Great Reich.

(123) Mercure de France: "Pius XI and Hitler", 15th of January 1934.

To what extent the Catholics were masters of Nazi Germany soon became apparent as also did the severity with which some of the "Papacy's high principles" were applied.

The liberals and Jews had plenty of spare time to find out that these principles were far from out-dated, as the most orthodox voices confirmed it. The right the Church arrogates herself to exterminate slowly or speedily those who are in the way was "put into practice" at Auschwitz, Dachau, Belsen, Buchenwald, and other death camps.

The Gestapo of Himmler, "our Ignatius of Loyola", diligently performed these charitable deeds; civilian and military Germany had to submit "perinde ac cadaver" to this all-powerful organization.

No need to say that the Vatican washed its hands of these horrors. When giving an audience to Dr Nerin F. Gun, a Swiss journalist who had been deported himself and who wondered why the pope had not intervened, at least by providing some assistance to so many unfortunate people, His Holiness Pius XII had the effrontery to answer:

"We knew that, for political reasons, violent persecutions were taking place in Germany, but We were never informed as to the inhuman character of the Nazi repression".(124)

And that at the time when the speaker of Radio Vatican, the R.P. Mistiaen, was declaring that "overwhelming documentary proof" concerning the cruelty of the Nazis had been received".(125)

Without any doubt, the Holy Father was not informed either on what was going on in the "Oustachi" concentration camps, in spite of his own legate's presence in Zagreb.

(124) "Gazette of Lausanne", 15th of November 1945. (125) R.P. Duclos: "Le Vatican et la seconde guerre mondiale", (Ed. Pedone, Paris 1955. p.255) Imprimatur 1955.

Once, though, the Holy See was seen to take some interest in the fate of certain people condemned to deportation. They were 528 Protestant missionaries, survivors of all those who had been taken prisoners, by the Japanese, in the islands of the Pacific and interned in concentration camps in the Philippines. M. Andre Ribard, in his excellent book "1960 and the secret of the Vatican", reveals the pontifical intervention on behalf of these unfortunates. The text appears under No.1591, dated: Tokio 6th of April 1943, in a report from the Department for Religious Affairs in occupied territories, and I quote the following extract: it expressed the wish of the Roman Church to see the Japanese pursue their politics and prevent certain religious propagators of error to regain a freedom to which they were not entitled".(126)

From the "Christian" point of view, this charitable step needs no comment, but is it not most significant, politically speaking? In Slovakia— as we know—Monseigneur Tiso, the Jesuit Gauleiter, was also free to persecute the "separated brethren" even though Germany, to which his State was a satellite, was mainly Protestant. It says a lot about the influence the Roman Church had in the Hitlerian Reich!

We have also seen the part played in Croatia by the representatives of that Church, in the extermination of Orthodox believers.

As for the anti-Jewish crusade, the Gestapo's masterpiece, it may seem superfluous to mention again the part played in it by Rome, as we have already related the exploits of Monseigneur Tiso, the first provider of Auschwitz's gas chambers and crematoria furnaces. We will just add a few characteristic documents to this dossier.

First of all, here is a letter from M. Leon Berard, ambassador of the Vichy government to the Holy See:

Marshall Petain, Sir,

In your letter dated 7th of August 1941, you honoured me in asking certain information touching the questions and difficulties which could arise, from the Roman Catholic point of view, out of the measures your government took concerning the Jews. I have the honour to answer that nothing has been said to me, at the Vatican, which could be interpreted as a criticism or disapproval of the laws or directive deeds in question..."(127) The periodical "L'Arche", when mentioning this letter in an article entitled "The Silence of Pius XII", tells of a subsequent and complementary report which M. Leon Berard sent to Vichy on the 2nd of September 1941:

(126) Andre Ribard: "1960 et le secret du Vatican", (Librairie Robin, 38, rue de Vaugirard. Paris 1954, p.80) and Frederic Hoffet: "Politique romaine et demission des Protestants" (demission des laiques) (Fischbacher, Paris). (127) and (129) Leon Poliakov: "Breviaire de la haine" (Calmann-Levy, Paris 1951, pp 345, 350, 351).

Is there a contradiction between the Status of the Jews and the Catholic doctrine? Only one, and Leon Berard respectfully points it out to the head of State. It resides in the fact that the law of the 2nd of June 1941 defines the Jews as a race... The Church (wrote Vichy's ambassador), never professed that the same rights should be given to all citizens... As someone in authority at the Vatican told me, you will not find yourselves in difficulties over the Status of the Jews".(128)

There is, "translated into practice", the "terrible" encyclical letter "Mit brennender Sorge", against racism, widely referred to by apologists. But we find something even better, in M. Leon Poliakov's book: "The proposal of the Protestant Church in France that, together with the Roman Church, they should take some measures against the rounding-up of Jews, during the Summer of 1942, was rejected by the Catholic dignitaries".(129)

Many Parisians still remember how the Jewish children were taken from their mothers and sent, by special trains, to the crematory furnaces of Auschwitz. These deportations of children are confirmed, amongst several other official documents, in a note of the "SS Hauptsturmfuhrer Danneker", dated 21st of July 1942.

The awful callousness of the Roman Church—and of its chief in particular—inspired, not long ago, these revengeful lines from the aforementioned periodical "L'Arche":

"Over five years, Nazism was the author of outrage, profanation, blasphemy and crime. Over five years, it massacred six million Jews. Amongst these six million, 1,800,000 were children. Who, yes, who said once: let the little

children come unto me? And for what reason "Let them come unto me so that I can butcher them?" The militant Pope has been followed by a diplomatic pope.

From occupied Paris, we go to Rome, occupied also by the Germans after the Italian collapse. Here is a message addressed to von Ribbentrop, Nazi Foreign Affairs minister:

"German Embassy at the Holy See. Rome, 28th of October 1943. Even though urged on every side, the pope has not expressed any demonstrative reprobation of the deportation of Jews from Rome. He can expect our enemies to reproach him in this attitude, and see it exploited by the Protestants of Anglo-Saxon countries in their propaganda against Catholicism; when considering this delicate question, the endangerment of our relations with the German government was the deciding factor..."

Signed: Ernst von Weiszaeker (130)

(128) "L'Arche", November 1958.

(129) See earlier on.

(130) "Secret archives of the Wilhelmstrasse".

When relating the career of this Baron von Weiszaeker—tried as a war criminal "for having prepared extermination lists"—"Le Monde" of the 27th of July 1947 wrote:

"Perceiving a German defeat, he had himself appointed at the Vatican, taking this opportunity to work closely with the Gestapo". For the benefit of our readers not yet fully convinced, we will quote the following official German document which sets out the Vatican's dispositions—and those of the Jesuits—towards the Jews, before the war: "Studying the evolution of anti-semitism in the United States, we note with interest that the number of listeners to the radio broadcasts of Father Coughlin (a Jesuit), well known for his anti-semitism, exceeds 20 millions".(131)

The militant anti-semitism of the Jesuits in the United States, as everywhere else, is not surprising on the part of these ultramontanes, as it is in perfect accord with the "doctrine". Let us see what M. Daniel-Rops, of the French Academy, has to say on the subject; this author specialises in pious literature and publishes only under the auspices of "the Imprimatur". We read in one of his best known works, "Jesus and His times", published in 1944, during the German occupation:

"Over the centuries, wherever the Jewish race was scattered, blood flowed, and always the call for murder uttered at Pilate's judgment hall drowned the cry of despair repeated a thousand times. The face of a persecuted Jewish nation fills History, but it cannot obliterate this other face, smeared with blood and spittle, for which the Jewish crowd felt no pity. No doubt, Israel had no choice in the matter and had to kill its God after disowning Him, and, as blood mysteriously calls for blood, Christian charity may have no choice either; should not the divine will compensate with the horror of the programs the unbearable horror (the Crucifixio') (132)

How well said! Or, to put it more bluntly: if millions of Jews had to go through the gas chambers and crematory furnaces of Auschwitz, Dachau and

elsewhere, it was their just desert. This adversity was wanted by the "divine will" and "Christian charity" would err if turning towards them. The eminent professor M. Jules Isaac, president of the "Amitie judeo- chretienne", exclaimed when referring to this passage:

(131) "Secret archives of the Wilhelmstrasse", (document 83-26 19/1, Berlin 25th of January 1939). (132) Daniel-Rops: "Jesus en son temps" (Artheme Fayard, Paris 1944, pp.526, 527). Imprimatur, 17th of April 1944.

"These terrible and blasphemous phrases provoke an unbearable horror themselves", aggravated the more by a note which says: "Amongst the Jews today..., some of them... try to shrug off this heavy responsibility... Honourable sentiments indeed, but we cannot go contrary to the evidence of History... the terrible weight (of Jesus' death) which Israel must bear is not up to men to reject".(133)

M. Jules Isaac brings to our notice that the phrases in question have been altered by the publisher "in the more recent editions" of this edifying book—that is to say, after the Liberation. There is "a time" for everything: the crematory furnaces were out-dated.

So, from the doctrinal affirmation of the papacy's high principles to their putting into practice by Himmler, "our Ignatius of Loyola", the ring is closed—and we will add the half mad anti-semitism of the Fuhrer thus loses much of its mystery.

But—going back to this subject—does it not also shed more light on that baffling individual?

The things which were imagined, before the war, in an attempt to explain the evident disproportion between the man and the part he had to play! There was a gap, an obvious vacuum felt by all. To fill this gap, legends were abounding: stories were spread abroad not always without the secret purpose of misleading!, Occult sciences, oriental magicians, astrologers inspired, so we were told, the sleep-walking hermit of Berchtesgaden. And the choice of the swastika as the Nazi party's insigna, which originated from India, seemed to corroborate the idea.

M. Maxime Mourin refuted this particular assertion:

"Adolf Hitler had been a pupil at the school of Lambach and sang amongst the choir boys in the abbey bearing the same name. He discovered the swastika there, as it was the heraldic sign of Father Hagen, the abbey's administrator".(134)

The Fuhrer's "inspirations" are also easily explained, without having to resort to mysterious or exotic philosophies. If it is obvious that this "son of the Catholic Church", as he was described by Franco, was submitted to the impulses of mysterious leaders, we know also that these had nothing to do with oriental magic.

The earthly hells which devoured 25 million victims bear another stamp, easily recognisable: the one of people who had to go through a lengthy and

meticulous training, as prescribed in the "Spiritual Exercises" (of the Jesuits).

(133) Jules Isaac: "Jesus et Israel" (Albin Michel, Paris 1948, p.382). (134) Maxime Mourin: "Histoire des Grandes Puissances" (Payot. Paris 1958, p.134).177

Among the various causes which decided the Vatican to start the first world war, by urging the emperor of Austria, Francis-Joseph, to "chastise the Serbians", the main one was, as we have seen, to strike a decisive blow against the Orthodox Church, this hated and centuries old rival.

Beyond the small Serbian nation, the Vatican aimed at Russia, the traditional protector of Orthodox believers in the Balkans and the East. M. Pierre Dominique wrote:

"To Rome, this affair became most important; a victory of apostolic monarchy over Czarism could be looked upon as a victory of Rome over the schism of the East".(135)

The Roman Curia was in no way concerned that such a victory could only be acquired through a gigantic holocaust. The risk, rather the certainty of it, was accepted, as the alliances made it unavoidable. Urged on by his secretary of State, the Jesuit Merry del Val, Pius X made no secret of it and the Bavarian Charge d'Affaires wrote to his government, on the eve of the conflict: "He (the pope) does not think the French and Russian armies would be successful in a war against Germany".(136)

This wicked calculation proved wrong. The first World War, which ravaged the north of France and left several millions dead, did not fulfil Rome's ambitions; it divided Austria-Hungary instead, so depriving the Vatican of its main stronghold in Europe and liberating the Slavs who were part of that double monarchy from Vienna's apostolic yoke.

In addition, the Russian revolution liberated from the Vatican's control those Roman Catholics, for the most part of Polish origins, who lived in the Czars former empire.

The defeat was total. But the Roman Church "patiens quia aeterna" was going to pursue with fresh efforts her politics of the "Drang nach Osten", the thrust towards the East which combined so well with the Pan-German ambitions.

(135) Pierre Dominique, op.cit., p.246. (136) Bayerische Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch, III , p.206.

For that, as we mentioned earlier on, the raising up of Dictators and the second world war with its retinue of horrors; the "cleaning up" of the Wartheland, in Poland, and the "compulsory Catholicisation" of Croatia were two examples, especially atrocious, of these horrors.

It was of no importance that 25 millions died in concentration camps, 32 millions soldiers were killed on the battle fields and 29 millions were wounded and maimed; these are the official statistics of the United Nations Organisation (137) and show the magnitude of that carnage! This time, the

Roman Curia thought her aims had been reached, and one could read in 'Basler Nachrichten' of Basle:

"The German action in Russia poses the question of that country's evangelisation; the Vatican is most highly interested in it".(138)

And this, from a book devoted to the glorification of Pius XII:

"The Vatican and Berlin signed a pact allowing the Catholic missionaries of the Russicum college to go to occupied territories and the placing of the Baltic territories under Berlin's nunciature".(139)

The "Catholicisation" of Russia was about to be launched, under the protection of the Wehrmacht and SS, in the manner Pavelitch and his associates were carrying it out in Croatia, but on a much vaster scale. This was indeed a triumph for Rome!

What a disappointment, then, when the hitlerian thrust was stopped at Moscow and when von Paulus and his army were trapped in Stalingrad! It was Christmas time, Christmas of 1942, and one must re-read the Message—rather the vibrant call to arms—addressed to the "Christian nations" by the Holy Father:

"This is not a time for lamentation, but action. May the Crusades' enthusiasm get hold of Christianity, and the call of "God wants it!" will be heard; may we be ready to serve and sacrifice ourselves, as the Crusaders of old..." We exhort and implore you to take upon yourselves the awful gravity of the present situation... As for the volunteers who participate in this Holy Crusade of modern times, "raise the standard high, declare war on the darkness of a world separated from God".(140)

(137) "La Croix", 7th of September 1951. (138) "Basler Nachrichten", 27th of March 1942. (139) and (140) "War messages to the world", by Pius XII (Ed. Spes, Paris 1945, pp.34 and 257 ss).

On this day of the Nativity, we were far from "Pax Christi"!

This war-like address was not the expression of the "strict neutrality" the Vatican flatters itself to observe in international matters. This address was made even more improper by the fact that Russia was the ally of England, America and Free France. We smile while reading the vehement contestation of Pius XII's thurifers who tell us that Hitler's war was not a real "crusade", when that word is mentioned in the Holy Father's Message. The "volunteers" the pope called to arms were those of the "Azul Division" and those recruited by Cardinal Baudrillart in Paris. "Hitler's war is a noble enterprise in the defence of European culture", he exclaimed on the 30th of July 1941.

We note, though, that the Vatican is not interested any more in the defence of this culture now that it strives to make African nations revolt against France. Pius XII said: "The Catholic Church does not identify herself with western culture". (141 and 141a)

The impostures and gross contradictions are endless on the part of those who accuse Satan of being the "father of all lies".

The defeat sustained in Russia by Hitler's armies, "these noble defenders of European culture", involved also the Jesuit converters. One wonders what Saint-Theresa was doing before such a disaster! Pius XI had proclaimed her "patron-saint of unfortunate Russia" and Canon Coube represented her standing, "smiling but as terrible as an army set for battle against the Bolshevik giant".(142)

Had the Saint of Lisieux—used for all kinds of work by the Church— succumbed under the new and gigantic task assigned to her by the Holy lather? It would not be surprising.

But, instead of the little saint, there was still the Queen of Heaven who had taken upon herself, in 1917 already, under certain conditions, to bring back schismatic Russia to the Roman Church's fold. Let us read what 'La Croix' said about it:

"We will remind our readers that the Virgin of Fatima had herself promised the conversion of the Russians, if all Christians sincerely and joyfully practised all the commandments of the evangelical law".(143) We want to point out that, according to the Jesuit Fathers who are great specialists in miraculous matters, the celestial Mediator recommended as especially effective the daily use of the rosary. This promise from the Virgin had even been sealed by a "dance of the Sun", a wonder which occurred again in 1951, in the gardens of the Vatican, for the benefit of His Holiness Pius XII only.

(141) "Le Monde", 13th of April 1956 (Congress of African Catholic students). (141a) See also Francois Mejan: "Le Vatican contre la France d'Outre-Mer" (Fischbacher). (142) Canon Coube: "Sainte Therese de l'Enfant Jesus et les crises du temps present" (Flammarion, Paris 1936, p.6 ss). IMPRIMATUR 11th of January 1936. (143) "La Croix", 11th of June 1947.

Nevertheless, the Russians entered Berlin, in spite of the crusade called tor by the pope—and, until now, the fellow-countrymen of Mr. Khrushchev have not shown any eagerness, as far as we know, to appear before the doors of Saint-Peter in penitent garb with the halters around their necks.

What went wrong? Had Christians not 'told' sufficient beads on their rosaries? Were Heaven's requisite number of 'tens' not fulfilled? We would be tempted to believe this to be the cause if there wasn't that rather scabrous detail in the wonderful story of Fatima. The promise of Russia's conversion, sensibly given to the clairvoyant Lucia in 1917, was "revealed" by her in 1941 only, when she had become a nun, and made public in October 1942 by Cardinal Schuster, a keen partisan of the Rome- Berlin Axis; it was made public by request, or shall we say order, from Pius XII—this same Pius XII who, three months later, expressed the aforementioned call for a Crusade.

Very "enlightening" indeed: One of Fatima's apologists admits that, because of it, the matter "evidently loses some of its prophetic value..."(144) This is the least one could say about it! A certain canon, great specialist in the matter of the "Portuguese miracle" tells us in confidence: "I must confess that, as far as I am concerned, it is only with great reluctance that I added to my first editions the text revealed to the public by His Eminence Cardinal Schuster..."(145)

We certainly understand the good canon's feelings:

So, the Holy Virgin told the shepherdess Lucia, in 1917: "If my requests are heeded, Russia will be converted...", while charging her to keep this "secret" to herself. How, then, could the Christians have come to know these "requests" and meet them? "Credibile quia ineptum".

It seems that, from 1917 until 1942, "unfortunate Russia" did not need to have prayers offered on her behalf, and that they were urgently needed only after the Nazi defeat at Moscow and when von Paulus was trapped in Stalingrad.

At least, it is the only conclusion this late revelation allows. The supernatural—as we have said already—is a powerful thing, but it must be handled with some care.

After Montoire, the Jesuits' general, Halke von Ledochowski, already spoke haughtily about the general meeting the Company would hold in Rome, after England had capitulated, the importance and brilliance of which would not find an equal in all its history.

(144) Michel Agnellet: "Miracles a Fatima" (Ed. de Treves, Paris 1958, p.54). Imprimatur 1958. (145) Canon Barthas: "Fatima, merveille du XXe siecle", (Fatima Editions, Toulouse 1957, p.81) Imprimatur 1957.

But Heaven had decided otherwise, in spite of Saint-Theresa and the Lady of Fatima. Great Britain braced herself against the enemy, the United States entered the war, (even though the Jesuit Father Coughlin had worked so hard), the Allies disembarked in North Africa and the Russian campaign was a disaster for the Nazis.

For Ledochowski, it was the collapse of his great dream. Wehrmacht, SS, "cleaner-ups" and Jesuit converters were retreating together. The general's health did not stand up to such a disaster and he died. Let us see, though, what this "Russicum" is which Pius XI and von Ledochowski added, in 1929, to the already so rich and varied Roman organisation.

"With the apostolic Constitution "Quam Curam", Pius XI created this Russian seminary, in Rome, where young apostles of every nationality would be trained, "on condition that they adopt, before anything else, the Byzantine-Slav rite, and that their minds were made up to devote themselves entirely to the task of bringing Russia back into Christ's fold"(146)

This is the aim of the Russian pontifical College, alias "Russicum", the Oriental pontifical Institute and the Roman College—these three Centres are also administered by the Company of Jesus.

At the "Roman College"—45, Piazza del Gesu—we find the Jesuits' noviceship and, amongst the novices, some bear the name of "Russipetes", as they are destined to "petere Russiam", or go to Russia. Orthodox believers should watch out, for so many valorous champions are determined to crush them. We must point out, though, that the aforementioned "Homme nouveau" affirms:

"All these priests are certainly destined to go to Russia. But this project cannot be realised for the time being".(147)

According to this particular publication, the Soviet press calls these apostles "the Vatican's parachutists". And, from the testimony of someone well-informed on the subject, we come to the conclusion that this name fits them quite well.

The person in question is no less than the Jesuit Alighiero Tondi, professor at the Gregorian pontifical University, who repudiated Ignatius of Loyola, the "Spiritual Exercises" though not without a considerable row and resigned from the famous Company, together with its pomp and deeds. We can read the following, amongst other declarations, in an interview he gave to an Italian newspaper:

(146) "L'Homme nouveau" (L'Avenir catholique), 7th of December 1958. (147) "L'Homme nouveau" (L'Avenir catholique), 7th of December 1958.

"The activities of the Collegium Russicum and other organisations linked to it are many and varied. For example, together with Italian fascists and what remains of German Nazism, the Jesuits organise and co-ordinate the various anti-Russian groups, on the ecclesiastical authority's order. The ultimate aim is to be ready, eventually, to overthrow the governments of the East. Finances are provided by the ruling ecclesiastical organisations. This is the work the leaders of the clergy apply themselves to. These same ones would readily tear their cassocks apart, out of grief, when they are accused of meddling in politics and urging the bishops and priests of the East to conspire against their governments."

"When talking to the Jesuit Andrei Ouroussof, I said that it was disgraceful to affirm in the "Osservatore Romano", the Vatican's official voice, and in other ecclesiastical publications, that the unmasked spies were "martyrs of the faith". Ouroussof burst out laughing.

"—What would you write, Father? he asked me. Would you call them spies, or something worse? Today, the Vatican's politics need martyrs. But, at the moment, martyrs are difficult to find. So they are fabricated.

—But this is a dishonest game!

"He shook his head ironically.

—You are ingenious, Father. Because of your work, you should know better than anyone else that the Church's leaders have always been inspired by the same rules.

—And what about Jesus-Christ? I asked.

He laughed: "One must not think of Jesus-Christ", he said. "If we thought of Him, we would end up on the cross. And, today, the time has come to put others on the cross and not be hoist on it ourselves."(148)

So, as the Jesuit Ouroussof said it so well, the Vatican's politics need

martyrs, volunteers or not. It "created" millions of them during two world wars.

(148) Interview which appeared in "Il Paese" on the 2nd of October 1954.

Out of all the fictions generally accepted in this world, the spirit of peace and harmony attributed to the Holy See is probably the most difficult to root up—as this spirit seems inherent to the nature of the apostolic magister itself.

In spite of the lessons of History, not fully known or too quickly forgotten, the one who calls himself "Christ's vicar" must necessarily incarnate, in the eyes of many, the ideal of love and fraternity taught by the Gospel. Does not logic, as well as sentiment, want it to be so?

In reality, the events make us realise that this favourable presumption must be greatly abated—and we believe that it has been sufficiently demonstrated. But the Church is prudent—as we are often reminded—and it is seldom that her real actions are not surrounded by the indispensable precautions which will take care of appearances. "Bonne renommee vaut mieux que ceinture doree" (A good reputation is better than a golden belt), says the proverb. But it is even better to possess both. The Vatican—immensely rich—guides itself by this maxim. Its political lust for domination always assumes "spiritual" and humanitarian pretexts, proclaimed "urbi and orbi" by an intense propaganda which a goldplated belt provides for—and the "good reputation", thus preserved, maintains the inflow of gold to the said belt.

The Vatican does not deviate from that line of conduct and, when the stand it takes in international affairs is clearly revealed through the attitude of its hierarchy, the legend of its absolute impartiality is kept alive by those solemn and ambiguous encyclical letters and other pontifical documents. Recently, the hitlerian era multiplied such examples. But could it be otherwise of an authoritative power which is supposed to be transcendent and universal at the same time?

The instances when that mask was seen to fall are very rare. For the world to be a witness of such a spectacle, a contingency is necessary which, to the Holy See's eyes, endangers its vital interests. Only then does it throw aside all ambiguity and openly places all the credit at its disposition on one of the scales.

This is what happened in Rome, on the 7th of January 1960, concerning the "summit" conference which was to bring together heads of Eastern and Western governments, in an attempt to settle the conditions of a truly peaceful co-existence between the defenders of two opposite ideologies. Of course, the Vatican's position before such a project did not leave us in any doubt. In the United States, Cardinal Spellman demonstrated it plainly by urging Catholics to show their hostility to Mr. Khrushchev when he was the guest of the American president. For his part, and without expressing it clearly, His Holiness John XXIII had shown little enthusiasm for the "detente" in his Christmas message. The "hope" it expressed, to see peace set up in the world,

a wish which is a "must" in such a document, seemed very weak accompanied as it was with many calls to Western leaders to be prudent. But, so far, the Vatican put on a good face.

What happened, then, within less than two weeks? Did another long-cherished "hope"—to see the first one fail—prove vain? Did the decision of Mr. Gronchi, president of the Italian Republic, to go to Moscow make the cup of Roman bitterness overflow?

Whatever happened, the storm broke out suddenly on the 7th of January—and the ecclesiastical thunders burst (with unprecedented fury) upon the "Christian" Statesmen, guilty of wanting an end to the cold war. On the 8th of January, "Le Monde" printed the following:

"On the day the president of the Italian Republic was to leave to pay a minutely-prepared official visit to Moscow's leaders, Cardinal Ottaviani, successor of Cardinal Pizzardo as secretary of the Holy-Office congregation, or chief of the Church's supreme tribunal, delivered a most astonishing speech in the basilica of "Saint-Marie-Majeure", during a morning propitiatory service for "the Church of Silence".

"Never before had a prince of the Church, holding one of the Vatican's most important posts, attacked the Soviet authorities, so furiously, nor reprimanded so harshly the Western powers who dealt with them". "Le Monde" gave substantial excerpts of that violent speech which amply justified the qualificative of "most astonishing" it had just used. "Tamerlanes's times are back", affirmed Cardinal Ottaviani—and the Russian leaders were described as "new antichrists" who "condemn to deportation, imprison, massacre, and leave nothing but wasteland behind them". The orator was shocked that nobody anymore was "scared to shake hands with them", and that, "on the contrary, a race was arranged to see who would be the first to do so and exchange smiles with them". Then he reminded his listeners that Pius XII withdrew to Castelgandolfo when Hitler came to Rome—forgetting though to add that this same pontiff had concluded with the said Hitler a Concordat most advantageous for the Church.

Space travel was not spared either in that violent denunciation: "the new man... believes he can violate Heaven by feats in space and so demonstrates once more that God does not exist".

The Western "politicians and statesmen" who, according to the cardinal, "grow stupid with terror", were severely hauled over the coals—as were all the "Christians" who "do not react or leap with rage any more..." Finally, this virulent and significant conclusion:

"Can we declare ourselves satisfied with any kind of detente when, in the first place, there cannot be any sort of calm, within humanity, unless we observe an elementary respect for conscience, our faith, the face of Christ covered once more with spittle, crowned with thorns and struck? Could we hold out our hand to those who do this?"

These dramatic words cannot make us forget that the Vatican can hardly speak

of "respect for consciences" as it shamelessly oppresses them in countries where it dominates, such as in Franco's Spain where the Protestants are persecuted. In fact, it is most impudent—on the part of the Holy-Office's secretary especially!—to demand that others observe this elementary respect" when the Roman Church rejects it entirely. The encyclical letter "Quanta cura" and the "Syllabus" are explicit: Anathema on the one who says: every man is free to embrace or profess the religion his judgment considers to be right". ("Syllabus", article XV)

"... It is madness to think that the freedom of conscience and worship are mere rights to every man." ("Encyclical letter "Quanta cura") Judging by the way it treats "heretics", it is no wonder that the Vatican systematically condemns all attempts to come to terms between "Christian" States and those who are officially atheistic. "Non est pax impiis"—"No peace for the wicked"!

And the Jesuit Father Cavelli, like many others before him, proclaims that this "intransigence" is the Roman Church's "most imperative law". As a counterpart to this explosion of fury on the cardinal's part, we will quote another article which appeared in the same number of "Le Monde", on the 9th of January 1960:

"Humanity is approaching a situation where mutual annihilation becomes a possibility. In the world today, there is no other event which can be compared, in importance, to this... We must then strive incessantly for a just peace". So said President Eisenhower, yesterday, Thursday, before the United States Congress, at the same time as Cardinal Ottaviani, in Rome, condemned the co-existence as partaking of the crime of Cain. The contrast between two manners of thought cannot be more striking: the human and the theocratic—nor more obvious the mortal danger hovering over the world because of that nucleus of blind fanaticism we call the Vatican. Its "sacred" egoism is such that circumstances and the urgent necessity for an international accord, in order to avoid the almost total extermination threatening humanity, do not matter.

The Holy Office's secretary—this supreme tribunal whose past is too well-known—does not take into account such negligible contingencies. Do the Russians go to mass? This is the important thing, and if President Eisenhower does not understand it, it is because he "seems to have grown stupid with terror", to use the terms of the fiery "Porporato". The delirious frenzy of Cardinal Ottaviani's speech makes us smile at the same time as shocking us. And many think that this firebrand will find it difficult to persuade "Christians" that the atomic bomb must be accepted gracefully. But we must be on our guard! Behind this spokesman of the Holy See, there is all the pontifical organisation—and especially this secret army of Jesuits not made up of ordinary soldiers. All the members of that famous Company work within the corridors of power, and their action, without making a great deal of noise, can be singularly effective, that is to say evil. A rumour was spread that Cardinal Ottaviani's brutal stand was not the exact reflection of the Holy See's thought, but only that of one of the so-called "integrist" clan. The Catholic press, in France at any rate, tried to attenuate the import of that violent speech—and "La Croix", in particular, only printed a short

extract from which all violence had been omitted. Wise opportunism indeed, but it could not deceive anyone. It is just impossible that such a sharp criticism, of an exceptional political importance, could have been uttered from the pulpit of "Sainte-Marie-Majeure" by the Holy Office's secretary, without the approval of that Congregation's chief, of its "prefect", the Sovereign Pontiff himself. And, as far as we know, he never disowned his eloquent subordinate. Pope John XXIII could not throw that bomb himself, but by making one of the most important of the Curia's dignitaries take his place, he wanted to make his connivance obvious to everyone.

Moreover, and by a strange "coincidence", a more modest explosion took place at the same time, in the form of an article in the "Osservatore Romano", condemning once again socialism, even non-marxist, as "opposed to Christian truth". However, those who practice this political "mistake" are not excommunicated "ipso facto" like the communists. They still have the hope of escaping Hell—but the threat of Purgatory remains! By showing its opposition to any attempt at bringing together East and West so vehemently, was the Vatican expecting some positive results? Was it really hoping to intimidate the Statesmen who pursue these politics of peace? Or was it at least hoping to provoke a move contrary to the "detente" amongst the faithful?

As unreasonable as such a hope may seem, it may well have haunted these clerical minds. Their peculiar views are bound to produce such illusions. What's more, these soothsayers, they could not have forgotten a certain illusion used for so long to deceive those who trusted them—and which they apparently shared. We are referring to "Russia's conversion", apparently announced at Fatima by the Holy Virgin in person—in 1917—to Lucia the shepherdess, who eventually embraced holy orders and testified of it somewhat late, in 1942, in the "memoirs" she wrote at her superiors' request.

This cock and bull story may make us smile, but the fact remains that the Vatican—under Pius XII's pontificate—propagated it throughout the world with any amount of speeches, sermons, solemn declarations, a torrent of books and pamphlets, and the peregrinations of the statue of that new and very political "Notre-Dame" across every continent—where even the animals, so we were told, came to pay homage. This noisy propaganda is still clearly remembered by the faithful—as are the wild affirmations such as this one, printed on the 1st of November 1952 by "La Croix":

"Fatima has become a cross-roads... The fate of the nations can be decided better there than around tables".

Its thurifers cannot find refuge in ambiguity any more. The alternative is perfectly clear: "detente or cold war".—The Vatican chooses war— and does not hide the fact.

This choice should not surprise anyone—if past experience, even in the recent past, has been a lesson to us. And if it surprised some, we believe that it is because of its unceremonious proclamation, or without the usual camouflage."

We begin to understand the violence when we consider the importance of the

stake to the Roman pontiff. We would misjudge the Vatican by thinking it capable of renouncing a hope as old as the Eastern schism itself, the one of bringing back Orthodox believers under her obedience through a military success. Hitler's rise was due to this obstinate hope— but the final defeat of his Crusade still did not open the eyes of the Roman Curia to the folly of such an ambition.

There is another and even more pressing desire: to liberate in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia this famous "Church of Silence" which has only become such because of the unexpected turn of events—for the Holy See—in the Nazi Crusade. "Qui trop embrasse mal etreint (grasp all, lose all): a wise proverb which has never inspired fanatics. To resume its march towards the East, its clerical "Drang nach Osten", and first retrieve the lost strongholds, the Vatican still relies upon the Germanic "secular arm", its main European champion in need of new strength and vigour. At the head of Federal Germany—western section of the great Reich—it had placed a trusty man, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, the pope's secret chamberlain—and the politics he pursued for more than fifteen years clearly display the Holy See's stamp. Exhibiting at first great caution and an opportune "liberal" state of mind, the man his fellow- countrymen nicknamed "der alte Fuchs"—"The old fox" worked at rearming his country. Of course, the "moral" rearmament of the population, and of the German youth in particular, was an imperative supplement to the first.

That is why important posts in the ministries and administrations of Western Germany are held by many individuals with notorious hitlerian pasts—the list is long—and captains of industry such as von Krupp and Flick, who had not long since been condemned as war criminals, direct again their gigantic works which were restored to them. The end justifies the means. And this end is clear enough: to forge Siegfried's new sword, the arm necessary for revenge—a revenge which would be shared by the Vatican.

It is then with a perfect synchronism that the chancellor-chamberlain, during an interview given to a Dutch periodical, echoed the fulminating speech Cardinal Ottaviani had just expressed:

"...The peaceful co-existence of nations whose views are totally opposite is just an illusion which, alas, still finds too many supporters".(150) The incendiary "sermon" given on the 7th of January at "Sainte-Marie- Majeure" preceded by a few days—as by accident—the visit of Konrad Adenauer to Rome. The reports the press gave were unanimous at underlining the friendly and sympathetic atmosphere which prevailed during the private audience His Holiness John XXIII gave to the German chancellor and his Foreign Affairs minister, Mr. von Brentano. We could even read in "L'Aurore":

"This meeting provoked a rather unexpected declaration from the chancellor, when answering the pontifical address which praised the courage and faith of the German government's head: "I think that God has given the German people a special part to play in these troubled times: to be the protector of the West against the powerful influences of the East threatening us".(151)

"Combat" accurately noted: We had heard this before, but in a more condensed

manner: "Gott mit uns"—"God with us". (The motto on the belt buckle of the German soldiers in the 1914/18 war).

And that newspaper added: "Dr Adenauer's evocation of the work attributed to the German nation found its inspiration in a similar declaration from the previous pontiff. We are therefore allowed to presume that if Dr Adenauer pronounced this phrase in the present circumstances, it is because he thought his listeners were ready to hear him".(152)

In fact, one would have to be singularly naive and utterly ignorant of elementary diplomacy to think that this "unexpected" declaration was not part of the programme. We wager also that it did not cast any shadow over "the prolonged conversation Mr. Adenauer had with Cardinal Tardini, the Holy See's secretary of State, whom he entertained for luncheon at the German Embassy".(153)

(150) "ELSEVIERS WEEKBLATT", quoted by "Combat" on the 11 th of January 1960. (151) "L'Aurore", 23rd of January 1960. (152) "Combat", 23rd of January 1960. (153) "Le Figaro", 23rd of January 1960.

The spectacular intrusion of the Holy-Office in international politics, voiced by Cardinal Ottaviani, shocked even Catholics who were long accustomed to the Roman Church's encroachments in the affairs of State. Rome was aware of it. But the perpetuation of the cold war is so vitally important to the Vatican's political power, and even its financial prosperity, that it did not hesitate repeating such political views, even though the first one had been badly received.

The journey Mr. Khrushchev made to France, in March 1960, gave it another opportunity. Dijon was one of the cities the Soviet leader was to visit. Like all his colleagues in the same situation, the mayor of Dijon had to welcome courteously the guest of the French Republic. The chief city of Burgandy had an ecclesiastic as its deputy-mayor, Canon Kir.

According to the canonical law, the Holy See had expressly authorised the priest to accept this double mandate—with all the functions and duties entailed. However, his bishop forbade the mayor-canon to receive Mr. Khrushchev. On that occasion, the municipal sash had to give way to the cassock.

So, the visitor was welcomed by an assistant who stood in for the absent deputy-mayor. But the unconstrained manner in which the "hierarchy" scoffed at civil authority on that occasion aroused the sharpest comments, On the 30th of March, "Le Monde" wrote:

"Who is actually exercising authority over the mayor of Dijon: the bishop or the prefect? And above these representatives of a central power: the pope or the French government? This is the question asked In everyone..."

The answer is not doubtful: theocracy first. But, from now on, to be received by a cassock wearing mayor, will the guests of the French Republic have to be supplied with confession tickets?

In the aforementioned article, the editor of "Le Monde" also rightly says: "Beyond this French interior question, the Kir affair brings to our notice a larger problem. The Vatican's action is not concerned only with the relations between a mayor and his government. In the way it took place, it constitutes a direct and spectacular intervention in international diplomacy"

This is certainly true—and the reactions this affair provoked nearly everywhere show that its import was clearly understood by world opinion. In the United States especially, the public, which had already witnessed the hostile demonstrations organised by the cardinals Spellman and Cushing during Mr. Khrushchev's visit, started to question the real independence a Roman Catholic president could preserve with regard to the Holy See. Many feared, in that case, to see the foreign politics of the country bent in favour of the Roman Church's interests—to the prejudice of the nation's interests, no small danger in any circumstances, but above all in the present situation.

The resistance to the move for an East-West "detente" was then organised "openly", after the "bomb" thrown by Cardinal Ottaviani. A ridiculous instrument, some may say, compared with those which threatened to bury under ruins—sooner or later—nations mad enough to remain in the deadlock of a snarling antagonism. But we can see that the Vatican, compelled to use "spiritual" arms, endeavoured to make the best of them. The Jesuits, who steer its diplomacy, were doing their uttermost to ward off the worst "calamity" which ever hovered over the Holy See: an international accord which excluded resorting to war.

What would become of the Vatican's prestige, its political importance and all the advantages, pecuniary and others, which proceed from it if, because of such an accord, it could not plot anymore, use its influence, haggle over its co-operation with governments, favour some and bully others, oppose nations, create conflicts for the benefit of its own interests—and if, to serve its immoderate ambitions, it could not find any more soldiers? *No one can be deceived—and the Jesuits even less than others—a general disarmament would toll the knell of the Roman Church as a world power. And the "spiritual" head itself would totter.

We must then expect to see the sons of Loyola opposing with all their arsenal of tricks the desire for peace of nations and governments. To ruin the edifice whose foundations are tentatively laid, they will not spare their mines and counter mines. It is a war without mercy, a holy war, sparked off by Cardinal Ottaviani's mad speech. And the Company of Jesus will pursue it with the blind obstinacy of the insect—"ad majorem papae gloriam"—without any anxiety as to the catastrophes which will result. The world must perish, rather than the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff!

***PUBLISHER'S NOTE:**

Edmond Paris was at a disadvantage in that he wasn't aware that a shift was already under way by the "Whore of Revelation" to fulfill Bible prophecy. She is prepared for all eventualities.¹⁹¹ The Jesuits evaluated World War III and decided the U.S. would lose, and the Vatican always goes with the winner. Since then she has enthusiastically thrown her support to Moscow and even

acquired a communist pope from Poland. She is secretly preparing a concordat with Russia, and currently pushing a Marxist gospel world wide. The Jesuits are currently behind the disarmament movement to subdue the U.S. Moscow will serve the Vatican as the muscle to conquer nations where Roman Catholicism will be the only religion tolerated world wide. Russia will be pushed to attack Israel, fulfilling the prophecies of the Bible (Ezekiel, chapters 38 & 39) and the antichrist of the Vatican will await his doom at the second coming of Christ. J.T.C.

We have recapitulated, in this book, the main manifestations of the multiform activity deployed by the Company of Jesus, during four centuries; we have established also that the militant, even military, character of this famous and ultramontane institution fully justifies the title often attributed to it of "secret army of the Papacy".

To the front of the action, for the glory of God—and especially of the Holy See—is the order these ecclesiastical soldiers gave themselves and of which they are proud; at the same time, they endeavour, through the book and pious press which they supervise, to disguise as much as possible and present as "apostolic" enterprises the action they exercise in their favourite field: the nations' politics.

The clever camouflage, the protestations of innocence, the railleries about the "dark schemings" attributed to them by the disordered imagination of their enemies—and which are groundless, according to them—all this is outweighed by the unanimous hostility of public opinion towards them, always and everywhere, and by the inevitable reaction to their intrigues which brought about their expulsion from every country, even from the most strongly Catholic.

These fifty-six expulsions, to quote only the main ones, provide an invincible argument! It would be sufficient to prove the evil nature of this Order.

How could it not be injurious to civil societies as it is the papacy's most efficacious instrument in imposing its law on temporal governments, and that this law—by nature—has no consideration for the various national interests? The Holy See, being essentially opportunist, does embrace these interests when they coincide with its own—we saw this happen in 1914 and 1939—but, if it brings them a substantial help then, the final result is not beneficial for all that. This was seen also in 1918 and 1945.

Terrible to its enemies, or those who oppose it, the Vatican, this amphibious clerico-political organisation, is even more deadly to its friends. By observing some vigilance, one can be forewarned of its underhand thrusts, but its embraces are deadly.

On that subject, Mr. T. Jung wrote, in 1874, the following lines which have not grown old—'The power of France is in inverse ratio to the intensity of her obedience to the Roman Curia'.(1)

And from a more recent witness: M. Joseph Hours, when studying the effects of our very relative "disobedience", he wrote: "There is no doubt about it; right through the continent (and maybe, today, all over the globe), wherever Catholicism is tempted to become political, it is also tempted to become anti-French".(2)

A just remark indeed, even though the term "tempted" is rather weak. We will nevertheless conclude that "to obey" would be more to the point. Is it not better, in fact, to expose oneself to this hostility, rather than to have to come to this conclusion, like Colonel Beck, former Foreign Affairs minister of the very Catholic Poland (2a)".

"The Vatican is one of those principally responsible for the tragedy of my country. I realised too late that we had pursued our foreign politics just to serve the sole interests of the Catholic Church".

Moreover, the fate of the very apostolic empire of the Hapsburgs was not too encouraging; as for Germany, so dear to the hearts of popes, and especially Pius XII's, she could not be pleased, finally, with the costly favours Their Holiness lavished on her.

In fact, we wonder if the Roman Church reaped any profit at all from this mad aspiration to govern the world, a pretension kept alive by the Jesuits more than anyone else. In the course of four centuries in which these firebrands spread strife and hatred, slaughter and ruins in Europe, from the Thirty Years War until the Hitler Crusade, did the Church enjoy gain or suffer loss?

The answer is easy: the clearest and most incontestable result is a continuous diminution of the "heritage of Saint-Peter"—a sad end to so many crimes!

Did the Jesuits' influence obtain better results within the Vatican itself? It is very doubtful.

(1) T. Jung: "La France et Rome", (Charpentier, Paris 1874, p.369). (2) "L'Annee politique et economique", 19, quai Bourbon, Paris 4e, January-March 1953, pp.2 ss. (2a) Declaration made on the 6th of February 1940.

A Catholic author wrote:

"They always aim at concentrating the ecclesiastical power which they control. The pope's infallibility exasperates bishops and governments: they nevertheless ask for it at the Council of Trent and obtain it at the Vatican Council (1870)... The Company's prestige fascinates, within the Church, its adversaries as much as its friends. We have respect or, at least, we fear it; we think it can do anything, and we behave accordingly".(3) Another Catholic writer strongly stated the effects of this concentration of power in the Pontiffs hands:

"The Society of Jesus was suspicious of life, the source of heresy, and opposed authority to it.

The Council of Trent seems already to be the testament of Catholicism. It is

the last genuine Council.

“After that, there will only be the Vatican Council which consecrates the abdication of the councils.

We are well aware of the popes’ gain at the end of the councils. What a simplification—what an impoverishment also!

Roman Christianity takes possession of its character of absolute monarchy, founded now and forever on papal infallibility. The picture is beautiful but life bears its costs.

Everything comes from Rome, and Rome is left to lean only on Rome”.(4)

Further on, the author sums up what the famous Company must be credited for: “It delayed maybe the death of the Church, but by a kind of pact with death”.(5)

A kind of sclerosis, if not necrosis, is spreading and corrupting the Church, under that Loyolan ascendancy. Vigilant guardians of the dogma, whose antiquated character they accentuate with their aberrant worship of the Virgin Mary, the Jesuits, masters of the Gregorian Pontifical University which was founded by Ignatius of Loyola, check the teaching of the seminaries, supervise the Missions, reign at the Holy-Office, animate the Catholic Action, censure and direct the religious press in every country, patronize with tender love the great centres of pilgrimages: Lourdes, Lisieux, Fatima, etc. In short, they are everywhere, and we can regard as significant the fact that the pope, when ministering at the mass, is necessarily assisted by a Jesuit; his confessor is always a Jesuit, too. By working at perfecting the concentration of power in the hands of the Sovereign Pontiff, the Company is in fact working for itself and the pope, apparent beneficiary of that work, could echo these famous words: “I am their chief, so I follow them”.

So, it becomes more and more hopeless trying to distinguish the action of the Holy See from the one of the Company. But this Order, the very back bone of the Church, tends to dominate her entirely. For a long time now, the bishops have been nothing more than “civil servants”, docile executors of the orders coming from Rome, or rather from the Gesu.

(3) Andre Mater- “Les Jesuites” (Reider, Paris 1932, p. 118). (4) and (5) Henri Petit: “L’Honneur de Dieu” (Grasset, Paris 1958, p.88).

Without any doubt, Loyola’s disciples endeavour to mask from the eyes of the faithful, the harshness of a more and more totalitarian system. The Catholic press, under their direct control, assumes some variety of inspiration, to give its readers the illusion of a kind of independence, to be open to “new” ideas: the Fathers, who are all things to all men, willingly practise these juggler’s tricks which deceive only the star-gazers. But, behind these petty amusements, the everlasting Jesuit is watching, about whom an aforementioned author wrote: “Intransigence is inborn in him. Capable of being a shuffler, because of his craftiness, he only excels at being stubborn”.(6)

We find excellent examples of that stubbornness and insidious bias in the patient work of the Company's members, to conciliate, for better or worse, the "modern" and scientific spirit to which they take care to be attentive with the demands of the "doctrine" in general and, especially, with these rather idolatrous forms of devotion—the worship of Mary and wonder working—of which they remain the most zealous propagators.

To say that these efforts are crowned with success would be an exaggeration: when blending water and fire, we obtain mainly steam. But even the inconsistency of these clouds is rather pleasing to certain subtle minds, even though warned about the dangers too much precision in the thoughts brings to a sincere piety. "Vade retro, Satanas"!

As far as that is concerned, German metaphysics are most helpful; we find in them everything we need, and even the opposite. There isn't any childish superstition which, after pedantic treatment, does not acquire some appearance of seriousness and even depth. It is rather amusing to follow the game in the periodicals and bulletins of various cultural groups. There, the enquirer finds the material he needs, and especially the one who, through an inclination somewhat aberrant, enjoys reading between the lines.

(6) Andre Mater, *op.cit.*, p. 192.

However, these men full of bitterness do not live only the speculative sphere, the good Fathers made sure they gave their apostolate amongst "intellectuals" a solid temporal foundation. To the gifts of the Spirit the lavishly bestow upon their disciples are added substantial advantages. Besides, it is an ancient tradition. In Charlemagne's time, the converted Saxons received a white shirt. Nowadays, the beneficiaries of a newly-found or re-discovered Faith enjoy other favours, especially in the academic and scientific worlds: the not very clever student passes examinations without difficulties; the professor is given the professorial chair of his choice; the physician who is a "believer", in addition to rich clients, has preference when wanting to join some important society, etc.. Through a natural mechanism, these choice recruits will bring others and, as there is strength in numbers, their conjugated action will be most efficacious in what we call the leading spheres.

This can be seen in Spain, so we are told, and even elsewhere. In "Le Monde" of the 7th of May 1956, M. Henri Fesquet devoted an important article to the Spanish "Opus Dei". When defining the action of the pious and occult organisation, he wrote: "Its members... aim at helping intellectuals to reach a religious state of perfection through the exercise of their professions, and sanctify professional work".

This is no new story, and M. Fesquet knows it, for he says a little further on: "They are accused—and the fact doesn't seem deniable—of wanting to occupy the keystones of the land, to be at the core of the University, administration, government, to prevent from entering or even expel from them unbelievers and liberals".

The "Opus" apparently entered France "clandestinely" in November 1954,

"brought in" by two priests and five laymen, doctors or medical students. That may be so, but we doubt if this reinforcement coming from "tras los montes" was really necessary to the pursuit of their work which has been going on for a long time now, in France, mainly in the medical and academic worlds, as certain scandals in examinations and competitions revealed it. In any case, the French branch of this Action, supposed to be "God's work", doesn't seem to be clandestine after all, judging by what Francois Mauriac wrote about it:

"... I was the recipient of a strange confidence, so strange in fact that, if it had not been signed by a Catholic writer who is one of my friends and whom I trust, I would think it was a practical joke. He had offered an article to a periodical which accepted the offer gladly, but never acknowledged its receipt. Months go by, my friend becomes anxious, makes inquiries, and eventually receives this answer from the director of that periodical: "As you probably know, the "Opus Dei" has been checking what we publish for the past few months. And this "Opus Dei" absolutely refused to allow that text to be printed". This friend asks me the question: "What is the "Opus Dei"? And I, too, openly and candidly ask it..."(7)

(7) "Le Bloc-notes de M. Francois Mauriac", in the "Express" of the 29th of October 1959

This question—about which M. Francois Mauriac hints is not as "candid" as he says—the eminent academician could have asked it from people he knew well: writers, publishers, booksellers, men of science, lecturers, theatre and cinema people—unless he preferred to inform himself quite simply at the editing centres. As for the opposition the "Opus Dei" is supposed to meet from certain Jesuits, we see in it nothing more than group rivalry. The Company as we have said and proved—is "modernist" as easily as "integrist", according to the opportunities, as it is determined to have a foot in both camps. In fact, the same publication "Le Monde" printed an article by M. Jean Creach, ironically inviting us to admire an "Auto-da-fe of the Spanish Jesuits", fortunately limited to the works of French literature. Indeed, this Jesuit censor doesn't seem to be a "modernist", judging by what M. Jean Creach says: "If Father Garmendia had the power of Cardinal Tavera, the one whose gaze was resuscitated by Greco like lightning in a greenish mask, above the purple, Spain would be acquainted only with our literature by emasculated... or even beheaded authors".

Then, after quoting several amusing examples of the Reverend Father's purifying zeal, the author tells this pertinent reflection:

"Are the brains formed by our Jesuits so weak that they cannot confront even the smallest danger to triumph over it themselves?", whispered a mischievous tongue? "Tell me, dear friend; if they are incapable of it, what is the value of the teaching which renders them so feeble?"(8)

To this humorous critic, we can answer that the said weakness of the brains moulded by the Jesuits is, in fact, the main value of their teaching— and its danger as well.

This is the place to which we always have to return. Through a special

vocation—and in spite of some honourable, even famous, exceptions— they are the sworn enemies of freedom of the mind: Brainwashed brainwashers! This is their strength, as well as their weakness and injuriousness. M. Andre Mater stated extremely well the absolute totalitarianism of their Order when he wrote: “Through the discipline which unites him, in spirit, to all his fellow-members, each one of them acts and thinks with the intensity of thirty-thousand others. This is Jesuitic fanaticism”.(9)

More terrible nowadays than ever before, this Jesuitic fanaticism, absolute master of the Roman Church, has embroiled her deeply in the competitions of world politics in which the militant and military spirit distinguishing this Company delights in. Under its care the papal organisation and the swastika launched a deadly attack on the hated liberalism and tried to bring about the “new Middle-Ages” Hitler promised Europe.(10)

(8) “Le Monde”, 31st of August 1950. (9) Andre Mater, op.cit., p. 193. (10) Frederic Hoffet, op.cit., p.172.

In spite of von Ledochowski’s prodigious plans, in spite of Himmler, “our Ignatius of Loyola”, in spite of the slow-death camps, in spite of the corrupting of minds by Catholic Action and unrestrained propaganda of the Jesuits in the United States, the “providential man’s” enterprise was a failure, and the “heritage of Saint-Peter”, instead of increasing in the East, was reduced by that much.

An undeniable fact remains: the national-socialist government, “the most Catholic Germany ever had”(10), was also and by far the most abjectly cruel—without excluding from the comparison the barbarian epochs. Painful declaration indeed for many believers, but one it would be wise meditating upon. In the Order’s “burgs”, where the training was a copy of the Jesuitic method, the master—apparent, at least—of the Third Reich formed this “SS elite” before which, according to his wishes, the world “trembled”—but also vomited with disgust. The same causes produce the same results. “There are disciplines too heavy for the human soul to bear and which would utterly break a conscience... Crime of alienation of oneself masked by heroism... No commandment can be good if, first of all, it corrupts a soul. When one has engaged oneself fully in a society, other beings lose much of their importance”.(11)

In fact, the Nazi chiefs had no consideration for the “other beings”; we can say the same as well of the Jesuits! “They made obedience their idol”.(12)

And this utter obedience was invoked by the accused of Nuremberg to excuse their awful crimes.

Finally, we borrow from the same author, who analysed Jesuitic fanaticism so well, this final judgment:

“We reproach the Company with its skill, its politics and deceit, we ascribe to it all the calculations, all the hidden motives, all the underhand blows; we reproach her even with the intelligence of its members. Yet there isn’t one country where the Society has not experienced great disappointment, where it hasn’t behaved in a scandalous manner and drawn upon itself righteous

anger.

"If their machiavellism had the depth generally attributed to it, would these grave and thoughtful men constantly throw themselves into abysses human wisdom can foresee, into catastrophes they were bound to expect as the Order experienced similar ones in all civilized States?

"The explanation is simple: a powerful genius governs the Society, a genius so powerful that it thrusts it sometimes even against stumbling- blocks, as if it could break them, *ad majorem Dei Gloriam*". "This genius is not the one of the general, of his advice, of the provincials, nor the heads of every household...

(11) and (12) Henri Petit: "L'Honneur de Dieu", pp.25, 72, 73.

"It is the living genius of this vast body, it is the inevitable strength resulting from this gathering of sacrificed consciences, bound intelligences; it is the explosive strength and domineering fury of the Order, resulting from its nature itself.

"In a great accumulation of clouds, lightning is powerful and the storm is bound to break out".(13)

Between 1939 and 1945, the storm killed 57 million souls ravaging and ruining Europe.

We must be on our guard; another and even worse catastrophe may lie hidden in these same clouds; lightning may strike again, throwing the world into "abysses human wisdom can foresee", but out of which, if it had the misfortune to let itself be thrown into, no power could rescue it. In spite of what Rome's spokesmen may say, it is not "anticlericalism" which prompted us to study carefully the Vatican's politics, or those of the Jesuits', and to denounce its motives and means, but the necessity to enlighten the public about the sly activity of fanatics who do not retreat before anything—the past has proved this too often—to reach their aims. We have seen how, during the 18th century, the European monarchies united to demand the suppression of this evil Order. Nowadays, it can concoct its intrigues in peace and the democratic governments do not seem to appear concerned.

The danger the world is exposed to because of this Company is far greater today than at the time of the "family pact", and even greater than when the two World Wars broke out.

No one can nurse any illusion as to the deadly consequences another conflict would have.

(13) Henri Petit, *op.cit*, pp.152-153.

THE END