

# Arrests and Trials Best



## I - FIRST ARREST OF MADEMOISELLE DE CICÉ

August 23, 1799<sup>1</sup>

In order to understand the first arrest, it is necessary to recall the fluctuations of internal politics in France at that time.

On July 12, 1799, for fear of uprisings by the extreme right, a law was promulgated called the "law of hostages". This labelled the relatives of the émigrés and of the royalists as responsible for the uprisings throughout the land. From that time on, a strict surveillance was imposed on foreign mail. Thus a letter of one of M. de Cicé's brothers was intercepted. The police conducted a discreet inquest at Rue Cassette. It is interesting at this point to cite one of their reports. Its heading stated:

Champion de Cicé, sister of the former Archbishop of Bordeaux, member of the Constitutional Assembly, ex-Minister at Capet. Report of Thermidor 14, Year 7 (August 4, 1799).

Having learned that there was a house at No.11 Rue Cassette in the area of St. Germain which seemed very suspicious because of the number of women who were drawn to the place and who came and went there at all hours, I went there myself on an imaginary pretext. As I recognised one of the servants when I entered, I left at once in order not to arouse suspicions about my purpose.

I therefore asked another person to go to the residence and speak to the occupant who proved to be citizen Champion de Cicé, a former noblewoman. She had been in hiding a very long time, sending her mail through a man named Marduel, a former pastor at St. Roch's and an unconstitutional priest. In the brief period of time that I was in the courtyard, I counted seven trunks or boxes that had been emptied. I call attention to the fact that a careful search of those premises would reveal either her brothers or others of the same ilk, or even some incriminating papers. I know for certain that she has always been in correspondence with enemies of the Government but I did not know her residence.

Her room is on the first floor, left. It is possible to reach it also from the right by a narrow stair.

That discouraging report must have gone directly to the Minister's Office, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Excerpt from ROSTU-ANCEL "ADELAIDE CHAMPION DE CICÉ" pp. 120-124 (All texts have been verified with copies of official documents in the DHM Archives).

must have been the motive for the following order:

Paris, Thermidor 24, Year VII (August 14, 1799)

From the Minister of General Police Affairs to the Commissioner of the Executive Directory in the Central Paris Office.

The importance of the attached note, dear Citizen Commissioner, obliges me to recommend its contents to your particular surveillance. I believe it is not necessary to remind you that our present circumstances are difficult ones and that zealous officials would be only too ready to act forcefully and relentlessly, though with prudence, when it is a question of submitting to the sword of the law those persons who live only to tear apart the bosom of the nation.

Be kind enough to send me daily, reports of your attention to this matter and of the measures you will have already taken up to then.

It was the eve of August 15. And Providence, which watched over the little religious cell on Rue Cassette, willed that the search so insistently requested by the Minister of Police not be made until the 3rd of Fructidor, i.e., August 23.

We can imagine the emotion felt by the, inhabitants of the building: M. de Cicé was concerned for the risk to Fr. de Clorivière.

The Daughters of the Heart of Mary, when they learned of the search, must have experienced great agitation of spirit over what might happen to their Superior. Laurence and Agathe too must have feared what was before those to whom they were respectively so attached. We shall not mention the portress and other tenants of the house who had already expressed pleasure at the coming of Fr. de Clorivière to that building.

This is an excerpt from the Police report<sup>2</sup> of the search:

On Fructidor 3 (August 23) Year VII of the French Republic...6a.m...as a result of the request for an investigation No.874 of Citizen Champion living at Rue Cassette... we went up to the first floor of said house outside the apartment occupied by Citizen Champion. Having entered the apartment which faces the courtyard, we found the woman in question. We then advised her of the purpose of our visit, showed her the dated and specific summons, and she stated she was ready to comply. Consequently

---

<sup>22</sup> National Archives, F 7-6272 (Central Police Bureau of Paris. Bureau of investigations Signed, Charles Dauban).

she opened for us desks, closets and other furniture which could be closed by keys. From desks, closets etc., we took such papers as seemed to us to relate to certain letters... We also took a quantity of little scraps of fabric on which were depicted hearts surmounted by crown and cross, called scapulars.

.... By virtue of the above-mentioned order, we then went upstairs and entered each apartment and room of the house, and having made a careful examination, we found nobody who was suspect and foreign to that house.

We have done what is stated above and drawn up this report on it...

The secret room in which Fr. de Clorivière was hiding wasn't even inspected although "all the apartments and rooms" had been visited.

M. de Cicé was arrested and was "booked" at the Detention Centre. She was taken from there to undergo an interrogation. Her responses were reported in detail by Monsignor Baunard in his fascinating biography of M. de Cicé.<sup>3</sup>

She is 49 years old, a noble-woman without a specific title. She has identified as being her property the box closed in her presence during the interrogation as well as all the contents of the box. She has in her possession a triple certificate of residence in the territory of the Republic, showing uninterrupted residence from May 1792. She therefore did not emigrate. She gives the names of her father, mother, brothers and sisters. However when they asked her "Whom do you regularly see in Paris?" she replied firmly: "persons of my acquaintance, and I don't believe that I am obliged to report about them."

To the question suggested by the first investigation of Thermidor 14, (August 4th) relative to "the great quantity of suspicious luggage and packages observed in the courtyard of the house" M. de Cicé was able to respond serenely: "The reason for all those things is that there dwells in this same building a coachman who travels widely and receives here bundles and packages from all persons wishing him to deliver them".

She was further required to justify the various homes she had occupied in Paris since 1791: at Rue de Sevres, at the Hospital for Incurables, at Rue des Postes and finally at Rue Cassette. She was also asked "Have you ever been arrested?" - "Never".

---

<sup>3</sup> Monsignor Louis Baunard, *Adelaide de Cicé et es Premières Compagnes*, Roulers, 1913 p. 222

At this point the interrogation was closed and signed by the Interrogator, L. Milly. His conclusion interests us on various points:

"Having seen the interrogation undergone by Adelaide Marie Champion de Cicé, suspected of emigration,

I, administrator of the Central Bureau, considering that she has proven by bona fide residence certificates that there is no question of her ever having been on the list (of émigrés)

.... that the correspondence found in her home contains nothing to support the suspicion of which she was accused but that we note only certain fanatical ideas, and find there proof that the said Cicé is concerned with religious practises; that her health seems impaired; and finally that nothing indicates dealings or correspondence with enemies of the State, we state that she be released under surveillance of the municipality pending the decision of the Police Minister to whom these documents will be given through the Commissioner of the Directory for our administration...."

On the 16th of Fructidor (September 5), the Commissioner of the Executive Directory, Lemaire, who transmitted the file on the case to the Police Minister, said - among other things - in an accompanying letter that the letters of Mlle. de Cicé "touch only family matters", but that certain ones "bore the stamp of religious prejudices", "this woman seems to have a fanatical mind, to be a bit demented.... living a very retired life and having hardly any relationship with the other residents of the same building".<sup>4</sup>

Six days later on the 22 of Fructidor (September 11) of Year VII the Ministry ratified...." the placing of this citizen at liberty.... and asked that there be returned to her the letters and certificates which she might need".<sup>5</sup>

At the heading of the official record of the search of the 3<sup>rd</sup> of Fructidor (August 23) there was a description of the respondent, and for once, we are somewhat beholden to the police of that day!

"The above named, who seemed to us to be 1 meter and 57 Centimeters in height, brown-haired, with brown eyebrows, high forehead, a well-formed nose, brown eyes, medium-

---

<sup>4</sup> Secret Police File, 42-1324, No. 3996

<sup>5</sup> This first imprisonment of M. de Cicé, therefore, was of some three weeks' duration (and not "15 or 18 months" as stated by Abbe Casgrain in the Annals Vol 1 page 192; his error is obvious.)

sized mouth, round chin and oval, pale and slim face".<sup>6</sup>

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND PART

Access to the documents of the Trial of Mademoiselle de Cicé was obtained in 1867 at the request of Madame de Saisseval through Madame de Falaiseau. This is attested to by the following documents which are preserved in the Archives of the D.H.M. A handwritten notation of Madame de Falaiseau states:

In 1867, having obtained the advantage of the membership of Baroness de Ravignan in the Work for Abandoned Children, (her father was the First President of the Superior Court of Justice), we requested - through her to obtain the original account of the Trial, which was buried away among the records kept at the Palace of Justice.

The following letter, attached herewith, will attest to the success of this action. The sight of these original pieces will provide an emotion easier to surmise than to describe.

IMPERIAL COURT OF PARIS  
Office of the First President  
PARIS, April 4, 1867

Madam,

My father-in-law asks<sup>7</sup> me to tell you that at your request and by your applying to Monsieur de Marnas, Secretary in the Office of the Procurator General, Mademoiselle de Cicé's file will be made available to you.

At your leisure you may research it and copy from it the data of interest to you. But our Regulations forbid the removal of the file.

I would have come myself to give you this reply, but I am at the point of leaving for an extended absence.

Please pardon me for this and please accept my respectful good wishes.

G. de RAVIGNAN

- You must go to the Office of the Procurator General, at the

---

<sup>6</sup> Police Confidential, Nos. 42-1324, Volume 5, First Division, First Office No. 3996

<sup>7</sup> Translator's Note: See underlined word FATHER, yet here he becomes father-in-law.

Palace of Justice, between noon and 2p.m., at the request of the First President.

NOTE:

The prudence observed in that place, which is the site of so many emotions of great fear for those who had the misfortune of being called to appear there, is such that it was not possible to follow the steps of the procedure involved unless it was in the presence of one of the high personages of the Magistrates Corps. We dared to ask them also to be allowed the privilege of entering the same room where Mlle. de Cicé had appeared on precisely the same date 67 years earlier....

## II - SECOND ARREST OF MADEMOISELLE DE CICÉ

January 19, 1801

### a) TRIAL OF THE "INFERNAL MACHINE"<sup>8</sup>

On December 24, 1800, as Bonaparte, then First Consul of France, was on his way to the Opera, an Infernal Machine (a barrel of gunpowder mounted on a little vehicle) exploded a few seconds after he had passed through a narrow street. There resulted several deaths and several persons injured. The First Consul barely escaped death. This attempt on his life deeply aroused the emotions of all of France, especially since General Bonaparte's popularity had greatly increased by reason of his military victories, and his having newly signed a decree of amnesty for some 50,000 émigrés whose names had appeared on proscription lists.

The gravity and the repercussion of the trial to follow are understandable. Suspicion fell first on the extremists of the Left, the Jacobins, who saw in Napoleon the enemy of the liberties acquired through the Revolution. One hundred thirty persons suspected of having participated in the crime were deported to Guiana. In fact, however, the plot had been fomented by extremists of the Right, royalists, who - in the coming of Bonaparte - had seen their hopes for restoration of the monarchy fade away.

Under chief Fauché, the police soon tracked down the guilty ones Saint-Regent; Joseph de Limoelan, nephew of Father de Clorivière, indeed the son of his brother who had been guillotined in 1793 as member of a royalist plot; and a man named Carbon, one of those persons always ready for all sorts of undertakings. Joseph de Limoelan was almost crazed by the consequences of the attempted murder. Concealing the identity of his accomplices, he had pleaded with Fr. de Clorivière to go quickly to hear the confession of Saint-Regent who had been severely wounded in the explosion. He also asked his uncle to find a shelter for a few days for a former émigré whose papers were not yet in order - which was frequently the case in that period. That false emigre was none other than Carbon!

---

<sup>8</sup> The account preceding "the interrogation" is taken from A.M. Champion de Cicé by ROSTU-ANCEL pp. 127-131



Thus deceived, Fr. de Clorivière recommended Carbon, under his false identity to the always helpful M. de Cicé. Since the latter was unable to house the man at Rue Cassette, she recommended him to her friend, Madame de Gouyon who with her two daughters was visiting in Adelaide's apartment at the time. The de Gouyon ladies brought Carbon to the "pension" where they were living on Rue Notre-Dame des Champs. The "pension" was maintained by Madame Duquesne and some of her sisters, former religious of Notre Dame du Refuge known as Ladies of Saint Michael. It was at that place that Carbon was arrested. And in an attempt to save his life, he revealed the name and address of those who had done him a kindness.

Saint-Regent was soon arrested, Joseph de Limoelan escaped and set forth for America. Adelaide de Cicé was then booked at the Sainte Pelagie Prison. Her apartment at 11 Rue Cassette was searched from top to bottom. All her papers were consigned to the office of the tribunal.

M. de Cicé's trial was an extremely grave one because of the circumstances surrounding it. Her attorney, Master Bellart, was particularly disturbed by the impenetrable silence of his client whenever an attempt was made to get from her the name of the person who had recommended Carbon to her. But to deliver the name of Fr. de Clorivière was, undoubtedly, to deliver him to his death because of his being so closely related to Joseph de Limoelan, one of the instigators of the plot of the Infernal Machine, to say nothing of Fr. de Clorivière's role as founder of two religious Societies forbidden by the law.

M. de Cicé therefore was obstinately silent. Master Bellart had already exposed to her the consequences of silence on her part, but he had been unable to move her. Bellart himself relates the following:<sup>9</sup>

"One day I resolved, in order to conclude the matter, to take advantage of the fear of death which I believed I discovered in her. I asked her; I pleaded with her, I insisted that she speak. Then she asked me this question, "Very well, what will happen to me if I continue to remain silent?" I exclaimed "Death Mademoiselle!" - "Death?" she repeated, terrified. Downcast, she stared at the floor. I was deeply regretful and embarrassed.... When she returned to her normal self, she opened her eyes. Her first words were: "My God! My God, pardon my weakness. I am afraid to die. But no matter, I will die if that be necessary, but I will not give up an innocent person to the law".

---

<sup>9</sup> Monsignor Baunard, pp. 241 ff.

## b) THE INTERROGATION

April 1, 1801

The Presiding Officer: You, the accused de Cicé, did you provide asylum for Carbon in the house of the accused Duquesne?

Citizen de Cicé: Yes, Citizen<sup>10</sup>

The Presiding Officer: Didn't Limoelan come to your home to arrange to have you receive the accused Carbon?

Citizen de Cicé: I did not see that citizen. It was not on Limoelan's recommendation that I arranged for that lodging.

The Presiding Officer (at this point)<sup>11</sup> asks Carbon to repeat his deposition. Mlle. de Cicé formally denies that deposition. "It is not Limoelan who recommended that stranger (Carbon). Limoelan did not come to my home".

The Presiding Officer: Were you acquainted with Limoelan?

Citizen de Cicé: Yes Citizen President, I knew of him as I knew of other persons from my part of the country but I have never been in touch with him. I am not in any way related to him. I have only seen him.

The Presiding Officer: When was that? Was it long before the 3<sup>rd</sup> of Nivose?<sup>12</sup>

Citizen de Cicé: Yes, it was very long before that.

The Presiding Officer: Nevertheless, you did know that Limoelan had served in

---

<sup>10</sup> Citizen – After the "Revolution" the word "citizen" was used to designate respondents in Court.

<sup>11</sup> Added by the translator for clarity.

<sup>12</sup> Translator's note: "Nivose" was the fourth month of the calendar as set up by the first French Republic after the French Revolution. "Nivose" ran from the 21 or 22 of December to the 19 or 20 of January.

the Chouan army?<sup>13</sup>

Citizen de Cicé: Yes, citizen.

The Presiding Officer: Did you not receive letters from Chouan leaders? Letters which were seized in your home, letters indicating that you were in correspondence with those leaders?

Citizen de Cicé: Those letters were in no way addressed to me by Chouans, nor were those letters on the subject of insurrection.

The Presiding Officer: How then, having knowledge of the explosion on 3 Nivose and of the subsequent events, how were you able - only four days later, when police activity was so strong, how could you have received a man such as Carbon without having the least information about him?

Citizen de Cicé: I did not have the least knowledge of the facts about him. I simply responded to an impulse of human kindness. It has often happened that I obliged persons unknown to me. It was charity that motivated me in that action as it does in many other actions. I did not have time to reflect on the consequences. The person who recommended Carbon to me was perfectly honest. I could not have had the least doubt of that person's word.

The Presiding Officer: Do you agree that on that day, the 7th of Nivose, a man came up to your home?

Citizen de Cicé: No, citizen, to that I will not agree.

The Presiding Officer: So you dissimulate the truth?

Citizen de Cicé: I do not dissimulate the truth in any way; but I will not name the person who spoke to me, a person who is not at all the one you indicate. (He had indicated Limoelan).

The Presiding Officer: According to Carbon's statement, Limoelan came up to your residence didn't he?

Citizen de Cicé: That is not so. And it is absolutely impossible to prove it.

The Presiding Officer: On what day did the person whom you do not wish to name speak to you about Carbon?

---

<sup>13</sup> Translator's note: A Chouan means an insurgent soldier from the French Province of Vendee or Brittany during the French Revolution on the side of the royalists, adherents to the King. The word comes from Jean Chouan, leader of the insurgents.

Citizen de Cicé: I did not hear Carbon mentioned until the very moment I saw him.

The Commissioner: Therefore Limoelan was at your home to speak to you about Carbon?

The Presiding Officer: I am asking if indeed it was on that day, (the 7th of Nivose)

that the unnamed person spoke to you about Carbon?

Citizen de Cicé: At the very same moment; the person was speaking to me only five minutes when I went downstairs and met Carbon. But the person was not Limoelan. In all of that, I acted instinctively and

in

the most innocent manner. I add that the person who spoke to

me

is as innocent as I am.

The Presiding Officer: Who then is this person who spoke to you if it was not Limoelan?

Mlle. de Cicé did not respond. Responding would be denouncing, and denouncing an innocent person. The question was put to her twenty times and it will remain that many times unanswered.

In the face of this obstinate silence, the government Commissioner tried an indirect approach. Mlle. de Cicé had described this unknown person only by the generic name "a person". The magistrate then asked, "Was this person a man or a woman?"

Again there was silence. The Presiding Officer repeated, "We are asking you whether it was a man or a woman? The President continued: "We are asking you if it was a man or a woman? The question is quite simple; and your reply cannot compromise anybody since you are not specifically naming anyone."

Citizen de Cicé: Therefore, I do not see what this vague indication could shed on the matter. Besides, what I have already declared, I declare anew. I will name nobody!

The Presiding Officer: (emphatically) "Then you do not even want to tell us if the said person was a man or a woman? (Then, trying intimidation): "Accused de Cicé, in all your responses you are demonstrating a very imprudent dissimulation. Have you carefully reflected on the fact that it is a tribunal you are facing? That it is your duty to respond in justice? That,

moreover, it is very gravely your interest in your present situation as the accused, implicated in a criminal affair?"

That was a threat. With emotion Mlle. made this explicit response:

Citizen de Cicé: "I am not dissimulating. It is the straight truth that I am telling. Citizen President, I ask you to consider, please, what happened to me. I am very distraught! I have had the misfortune of being the cause of the arrest of my friends here present, Madame Gouyon and Madame Duquesne who are innocent in the entire matter, but who had trust in me just as I had trust in the person who had spoken to me about Carbon. Therefore I do not wish to expose myself again to similar unhappiness by revealing the name of a respectable person who is as innocent as you and I in this matter. I have therefore made the resolution to respond in the future only concerning facts personal to me. Still I wish again to state the innocence of that unnamed person as well as my own innocence. I am assured of that by all sorts of proofs. That same person also had the gravest horror of the event which occurred. It is quite easy to see, Mr. President, that I have no other motive in remaining silent than to protest a person who is innocent and who acts only for the good.

The Presiding Officer: It is justice which will determine that innocence or its contrary. . . . But once more, what motive did that person give you to ask you to provide this shelter for Carbon?

Citizen de Cicé: The same motive which I myself gave to these ladies to provide shelter for him. I had been told that this man anticipating the law to re-open France to those who had emigrated, did not have his papers in good order. He was asking shelter only for a brief time. I do not even know if it was perhaps only for one night; such was the request I had received and which I passed along. I did not even know immediately whether or not he had been accepted in a shelter. Hastening to obtain shelter for him without delay, I did not take time to think it over. As it was impossible to lodge him in my home, I would have consequently had to abandon extending this service to him. And everything would have ended there if Madame Gouyon had not been visiting me at the time. The person in question asked me "Do you wish to suggest to Madame Duquesne to give lodging briefly to a man in trouble?" I considered that man a truly

needy person - that is the truth. I also asked if he was a respectable man, a dependable man. I was told he was. And I repeated that to Madame de Gouyon. But I could never have imagined that the whole matter should have some connection with the deplorable event of the 3<sup>e</sup> of Nivose.

The Presiding Officer: That is what justice will examine.

(The above is from copies of the official documents in the Archives of the Daughters of the Heart of Mary.)

c) DEFENCE OF M<sup>lle</sup>. DE CICÉ BY HERSELF

"I desire that my conduct be known. Here is my explanation.

"I have no self-reproach to make that I entered into any plot nor that I had any knowledge of it. I may have committed an imprudence in procuring for a person unknown to me, the shelter asked of me. To that I respond that I barely had time to think; that the occasion for doing this service presented itself at the time when Madame de Gouyon and her daughters were leaving my home; that I had the thought of asking the mother to have him accompany her and to ask, for me, if Madame Duquesne would be willing to house for 2 or 3 days a man whose papers were not in order, who was living quite peaceably in Paris but who feared that the increasingly frequent visits to him might give occasion to a demand to examine his papers; that he was seeking lodging only for the time being as he had to leave for the country to be with his own family.

"I did not inform myself of the name or place of birth of this man; I did not take into consideration anything but his condition as I have just presented it. I did not know his name, nor all the things which have been said about him since his arrest. He was never in any way presented to me until a person, who as I have already said - is not M. de Limoelan, asked me to find him a lodging place.

"I protest that the person was motivated in so doing only by charity, a person who is as far removed as I am from doing evil and suspecting it. I have refrained from naming that person and I am far from doing so, because the person's innocence would not shelter the person from suspicion any more than my own innocence does in my case.

That person is not guilty; I am sure of it. It is an injustice to have that person suspected of being guilty. Natural law imposes on me the duty of not doing unto others what I would not wish done to me. Religion consecrates that principle. It is not crime that I am shielding from justice. It is innocence which I protect by my silence. That person has no more knowledge than I do of the horrible plot, on which therefore that person can shed no ray of light.

I am certain that the person knew nothing about the matter, and I have no doubt of it at all. But in supposing the impossible, namely: that if misguided or deluded by natural sensitivity for a troubled human being, the person did suspect the stranger who was sent seeking help, he would never have been able to compromise me or the others in this manner.

Such would not be the conduct of an honest person, and indeed the person who spoke to me was an honest person. That man (Carbon) was no more identified to that person than he was to me. He was equally unknown to both of us. Neither of us knew his name. I attest that the request made of the person was accepted only because I learned of it at the moment when Mme. de Gouyon was leaving my house. Without this circumstance, there would have been no other means but to refuse the request. It is proof of the simplicity in which I acted, without having the time for further reflection, and following the first idea which presented itself, an idea that required no deliberation. The entire matter lasted no more than five minutes.

"I also attest that the person whom they wished me to name, experienced as much horror and indignation as I felt when I learned of the horrible scheme (the assassination attempt) after the event.

"On that occasion, as on many others, I blessed Providence that the First Consul had been spared. That Providence which watches over us spared the First Consul from the perils which threatened his days, undoubtedly to render him more than ever protector of that divine religion, the only faith capable of making our happiness, the religion of Jesus Christ, who teaches me to love my neighbours, to do for them the bit of good which depends on me, to wish greater good for them, not ever to do nor desire ill for any one, under any pretext at all.

That religion teaches me also, with a clear conscience, to be content with its witness while I await the demonstration of my innocence, the goodness of God in protecting my innocence and the justice of my cause.

I now return to the facts:

When Madame de Gouyon was leaving my room, I was told that the man was in the street awaiting my reply. I went down the stairs with Madame de Gouyon,

whom I urged to consent that the man follow her; and from the doorway of the house, I told this man, whom I did not see since it was night and the weather was very bad, that he accompany Madame to her home. I returned to my own apartment. The next day I went to see Madame Duquesne. She informed me that charity on the one hand and confidence in me on the other had resulted in making up a bed for the man since they did not wish to send him out into the frightful weather. They assured me that, as I had said, he was a very honest man. I actually saw him then for the first time, since the night before it had been dark and the weather, frightful. He repeated to me the same things that had been told me about him, above all that he would be remaining there only a bit, that he was going to the country. Those are the sum of my relations with him.

The unhappiness I feel, and what pains me more and more is to have been through my suggestion the cause of pain for the most respectable persons. This has made me very careful to avoid naming anyone in even the simplest and most ordinary relationships of life, for fear that such persons might also be disturbed by the authorities. During my interrogations, I was reproached for this. Hence, my motive.

In everything that might be discovered in my conduct, nothing culpable will be found, nor anything to render me suspect.

In my home, only the most innocent things were found.

Nevertheless, two secret drawers of my desk were opened. Their contents: what I considered my most intimate possessions, letters from my brothers. Doubtlessly, whatever might have caused me to be suspect would have been found - if anything like that had actually existed.

I also point out that it is necessary only to examine my conduct since this man's arrest to know that I have no knowledge of that horrid happening. Without such lack of knowledge, how could I have remained peaceful in my home?

On Sunday morning, on learning of Madame Duquesne's arrest, my first impulses were to present myself immediately without having been summoned, for such was the strength of my innocence, of hers, and of that of the other persons who had been involved in my request to obtain lodgings.

If I did not appear in person, as I had felt inclined to do, I nevertheless did not hesitate to render homage to the truth on the Tuesday after my arrest.

May the truth make itself known in its entirety in the heart of those listening to me. My hope is in God, protector of innocence. He will not permit the transformation of an imprudence which charity excuses into a crime which



charity abhors.

Citizen Judges, could you think evil of me and above all accuse me of complicity, when it was an act of compassion natural to me as a woman that led me to give asylum to a guilty man in whom I saw only an unfortunate person. If in that supposition - your justice, guided by your heart, makes you discern my innocence, how would you not acknowledge it for what it is!

Your justice would also discern that my respected companions whose society I am honored to have - that like me they saw only a man embarrassed by his circumstances not yet having his official papers in order. Is there anyone among you whose heart would not have agreed with ours if you had been in our place?<sup>14</sup>

### III - DEFENSE OF MARIE ADELAIDE CHAMPION DE CICÉ

#### **ACCUSED OF CONSPIRACY**

##### PART 1

Citizens Judges and Citizens Jurors,

The most atrocious of all crimes has been committed. The eloquent voice of the magistrate who, in this very painful affair, has the role of public prosecutor, has already painted that crime with colours inspired by his patriotism and his heart.

As he was speaking, a voice more eloquent than his (and that hardly seems possible) rose to add to the picture he had presented, traits still more eloquent and more terrible.

On the one hand, and in your presence, there were presented the remains of that killer-machine from which was to arise so great a disaster: accusatory remains, which one could believe were preserved by heavenly vengeance from the destruction to which they were dedicated in order to remain as incorruptible witnesses against the crime and its authors. Thus the heinous deed seemed to come to life again under your very eyes.

---

<sup>14</sup> Handwritten note of Mlle. de Cicé presenting her defense at the trial of the Infernal Machine, 1801. We do not know whether this text was handed to the judges or read in the course of the trial. (Archives D.H.M.)

On the other hand there appeared before you a still more deplorable spectacle: the unfortunate victims of this outrage, all brought here by the impartiality of the tribunal, which had the obligation of fulfilling its duty. This obligation was painful but indispensable. For it is a demanding law that is set down for the procedure of the tribunal requiring that it first put before your eyes the substance of the offense. Even though this was necessary, the tribunal in its humanity was not setting about to impair your reason. For it is not in your emotions but in your conscience that you will base the elements of your decision.

Who among us has been able to hold back our tears for these victims of such a cruel crime!

Nevertheless, Citizens of the Jury, with a heart so recently wounded by the distressing spectacle which has afflicted us for three whole days, with my eyes still bathed in tears by that spectacle as have been the eyes of all sensitive persons, at this moment I must present to you the defense entrusted to me.

Do I therefore come to belie the very legitimate compassion which these unfortunates have inspired in me and to outrage their sorrow? Do I come to trample under foot all my duties as man and as citizen; to place in opposition with the irresistible tug of my conscience, some fantastical duty attributed to the profession of defense attorney? Indeed, what would the profession of defender then be?

Would it be true that there should exist in the bosom of society a profession whose spirit would be in contradiction with the sacred principle of the conservation of society itself? Would there exist a profession whose first obligation was to gather, to protect the means of destruction threatening the social order, to preserve those means carefully, in order that they might reproduce, themselves more infallibly on another occasion? No, sworn citizens, such a murderous profession and its horrible duties does not exist. A defender who, impressed by the conviction that an accused person is capable of a great crime, would dare to become its organ in the presence of justice, such a defender - if it were I, and if I came to lend my sacrilegious efforts to a monster who would be returned to society only to bring to it once more fright and death; such a defender unless he perchance found his motive in a badly applied pity - would not be a defender. Morally, he would be an accomplice. Yes, an accomplice. That is what I needed to tell you in beginning this justification. For, above all, a defense attorney is a man and a citizen.

Defense attorney, man and citizen, I present myself thus before you. And I present myself without shame but with confidence, for I shall speak on behalf of Adelaide de Cicé. And Adelaide de Cicé is innocent.

As a defender, I owe abhorrence to the crime, just as I owe the tribute of all my means to innocence. I owe it assistance also as a man, and as a citizen. I owe both to this court which we respect and to the Government to which we are sincerely devoted, the homage of the efforts necessary to avoid an error. For, if an error should occur and if it confused the innocent with the guilty, the Government and justice would weep too late, however - tears of blood.

That is the triple duty I came to fulfill. And in approaching this defense, I am happy to have nothing else to do but to confirm the conviction which has gradually been forming in you, Citizen Jurors, from all the testimony already received. You will pardon me however, for entering into certain details. At this point, those details might already be superfluous to you for forming an opinion which all factors assure me is at present fixed. But they are an obligation of my ministry, which can neglect nothing in the defense of the immense interest confided to me.

Judgement of the morality of a defendant's action belongs entirely to the jury. Their duty is to examine not only those facts, which have a close bearing on the accusation. Their duty - and it is the principal purpose for the institution of the jury - is to go deeply into, to scrutinize scrupulously, the whole life of the accused, whose lot is in their hands, so that in some way they may become acquainted with the accused. I therefore go back now to a somewhat distant era in order to apprise you of who Adelaide de Cicé is, who she always was, and what she has done.

As we learned in the debate already presented in court, she was born in Rennes in the former Province of Brittany. She comes from a family, several of whose members, lived in the public eye, where they have been favourably judged by public opinion.

She had several brothers. It is necessary that I speak to you about them. Since they appear in the correspondence which I shall have to take up with you, I need to just call to your attention now that she shared their moral values.

One of her brothers was the former Bishop of Auxerre. His name is Jean Baptiste. I urge you, Citizens of the Jury, to fix these names which I shall have the occasion to mention. They will serve to make things clear when we take up the correspondence where you will find these names mentioned.

This former bishop of Auxerre was well known. It is in the name of his sister that I speak. And in the name of his sister, I can indeed tell you that he was held in some respect in past times, because of the manner in which he conducted himself both in his public functions and in his private life.

Her second brother was Jerome de Cicé, formerly Archbishop of Bordeaux.

Jerome de Cicé (may it be permitted his unfortunate sister to humbly recall these consoling facts of the past) - Jerome de Cicé, the first prelate to vote for the verification of communal authorities; the first prelate who, declared himself in favour of the union of the clergy with the Third Estate; the first prelate who, on that solemn day when the bases of our liberty were falling to pieces and in the famous meeting at the Tennis Court of the first legislative body, went to swear allegiance to the rights of the people; the first prelate who, after July 14, when the signal was given for war on despotism, merited to be called to government ministry.

Adelaide de Cicé lived in great intimacy with her family.

Soon the first storms of the Revolution began to form. The political horizon became darker. Amid exaggerated ideas, some generous ideas were born - as is almost inevitable amid a time of great political turmoil. A number of men were marked out, their service forgotten. Mistrust and dis-favour pursued them. So it happened above all and first of all to the Ecclesiastics, and to the Archbishop of Bordeaux and the Bishop of Auxerre among the others. They did not dare face the turmoil. Fear seized them and they believed it best to leave France. The Archbishop of Bordeaux took refuge nearby - he withdrew to London. London at that time was not our enemy.

The former Bishop of Auxerre, after some uncertain procedures, settled in Alberstadt, a city in Prussia. Elizabeth de Cicé, his sister, followed him there; she had always lived with him.

Augustine de Cicé, Adelaide's third brother, went into exile in Hamburg. There he set up a small grocery business. He continued living there with his wife. She, in turn, resigning herself to the modesty of her new situation, followed her natural inclination and became a dressmaker. She thus was happy to contribute to the expenses of her home and the support of her daughter. In this way she was able, at the side of her husband and child, both of whom she cherished, to pay her debt to nature and to misfortune! It is not without a purpose, Sworn Citizens, that I speak to you of all the members of this family. Adelaide de Cicé was reproached for having maintained a correspondence with them. It is therefore good that, in advance, you might be able to appreciate her correspondents.

The last of this family about whom I must say a word is Binthynaie, former Councillor in the Rennes Parliament and nephew of Adelaide de Cicé. He and his wife and children moved to the Isle of Jersey, where they remained.

Meanwhile, up until this time, what had been the conduct of Adelaide de Cicé? The truth must appear unvarnished in the presence of justice. Justice would not be justice if courage were required to speak the truth in its presence. I am speaking to Magistrates who are men of sane and superior reasoning, and

philosophy itself will protect the avowals which I must make.

Adelaide de Cicé belonged to a very religious family. She was even more pious than they. At this point it is not a question of debating the measure of respect or favour which one religious denomination merits over another. I am speaking to an assembly of philosophers, who do not accuse any person of crime, because of the person's beliefs and who, faithful to the sentiments expressed by a tolerant and generous government, find all dogmas to be good provided such dogmas inspire horror of what is evil and a taste for what is good.

Adelaide de Cicé, docile to the principles of her upbringing, faithfully practiced the Christian and Catholic religion. Adelaide had a very delicate imagination. This imagination, enhanced by religious ideas, became the source of a multitude of acts of goodness, to which - from her early youth - she was happy to dedicate her life. It is true that she did not act through the sole impulse of pure morality. She did not show forth a purely philosophical benevolence. But half out of the inspiration of an excellent nature and half out of respect for religious maxims, which she had learned to obey since childhood, she knew only one way to honor her God. That was to dedicate herself to all the works of goodness and charity dictated by philosophy. Philosophy alone would not have succeeded in persuading her to this dedication. Such dedication is frequently obtained through religion which is more powerful than philosophy.

From the age of 20, surrounded by all the illusions of fortune and influence, of grandeur and privilege, she knew how to handle courageously all these seductions, in order to become close to the poor. If the poor were not her equals in the political order of her time, they certainly were, in her eyes, her equals in the realm of religion, just as they were her equals in the order of philosophy. She gave the poor her good deeds. No obstacle stopped her from doing good, and there was no place so humble that she did not deign to enter it.

In huts, in attics, in hospitals, in prisons, she went to seek out and assist the unfortunate; she brought gold to the indigent, tender care to the sick - and this was more precious than gold itself; to the afflicted she brought consolations which were sweeter than services.

Alas! The poor unfortunate woman! When without any personal concern, she so spontaneously went among the poor and misfortunate in all sorts of places, she was far from foreseeing that in her own turn, in a prison she would be needing a consoling hand tended toward her, and that one day she would be hoping for the pity which she extended to everyone.

Citizen Jurors, the following facts of her doings in Rennes were not made up by an ardent and self-serving imagination - I would not lie to you - to proclaim her innocence because of the profound esteem she has inspired in me. These facts

are the result of striking testimonies given by those who witnessed the application of her virtues.

The distance between Rennes and Paris has prevented me from producing in person the innumerable multitude of witnesses who might have given testimony. I have had to content myself with their depositions from the public record which I have here with me and which I shall submit to you, and depositions from records edited under the surveillance of the authorities at Morbihan. All such records attest:

that those summoned to court know Adelaide de Cicé very well, as a native of Rennes who during the long years that she lived in that city before moving to Paris had, from her youth, occupied herself with good works; that her greatest pleasure was to visit the prisons and hospitals; to bring help to the unfortunate; to have poor abandoned children learn trades; that she had always dedicated herself to relieving the unfortunate ones; and in all those pursuits she employed all her means, all her resources.

And such depositions were not given by some of those light and agreeable persons whose commendations are easily obtained. We owe such depositions to honorable women esteemed by the government and authorized by it to form a group, in order to dedicate themselves again to the tasks which their religion commands them to fulfill; to those women who, under the name of Sisters of Charity or other similar names, had been put in charge of the different social service centers of Rennes. All of them attest that they had no member more dedicated to their works, their zeal and their doing good than Adelaide de Cicé.

I shall read to you several other statements, all of which will only confirm that truth. In going over them, you will see that if it had been possible to bring before you all the witnesses who wished to come forward in favour of Adelaide de Cicé's innocence, this area would not be vast enough to contain them. Suffice it to say that these activities were her favorite occupations.

It was in the midst of such honorable activities that the entire portion of her life was spent at Rennes, her native city. Since her family became dispersed as I have told you, she had the quite natural idea of coming to join one of her brothers, Louis Adrian de Cicé, living in Paris. She arrived towards the end of 1791. Shortly thereafter she had the sorrow of his death.

In Paris, her manner of life was what it had been in Rennes. In Paris, as in Rennes she occupied her time with the same gentle, pious activities. In Paris, as in Rennes, she sought out all the unfortunate ones who might need her help and always, in Paris as in Rennes, she was zealous in offering her assistance to them.

This very morning, Citizens of the Jury, you heard witnesses who came to attest these things to you! Several of them even said that they were personally in the debt of Adelaide de Cicé. You cannot have forgotten these testimonies, important because of their simplicity, important because of their honesty, and also important by the detailed circumstances which they have revealed. For it is these little circumstances which reveal the secret of character. I wish to speak of the good woman of Faubourg St. Marceau who, in her simplicity, has related to you that having been tormented for a long time by a disgusting and dangerous infection in her arm, had Adelaide de Cicé pointed out to her. Mind you, in the Faubourg St. Marceau, she "was pointed out" Adelaide de Cicé!... The expression "was pointed out" will inform you what habitual activities were pursued by Adelaide de Cicé and the point to which her acts of benevolence extended, since her reputation was able to reach the poor ailing woman.

The woman therefore presented herself to Adelaide. She was welcomed I use the woman's naive expression - as if she had been known to Adelaide. From Adelaide, the woman received all sorts of help: first-aid dressings for her sores, linen, medicines. Happy to receive such assistance, the poor woman suggested that she would return next day to seek the same treatment. You have not forgotten the touching reply Adelaide de Cicé made her, a reply born of a true sentiment of equality: Adelaide de Cicé advised the woman that her state of health required that she not move about. She told the woman that she herself (Adelaide de Cicé) would come to dress her wounds. Adelaide de Cicé went to the woman's home the next day and every day thereafter for two months. Sometimes she had to go to the woman three times a day.

Thus, as you can see, everything she had done at Rennes, she continued to do in Paris. And in the most troubled times, different witnesses have told you: she submitted with perfect resignation to the different modes of government which were successively set up.

That is what we learned especially through one testimony, a testimony which leaves no reason for doubt because of the character and opinion of the one giving it. Citizen Pascal told us here that though his position in life and Adelaide de Cicé's differed so greatly as should have made it impossible for them to have lived under the same political system, he nevertheless found her a woman always disposed to render him a service - so much so, he added, that if times were to become difficult for patriots and for himself, and if he needed a place of refuge, he would not have hesitated to ask it of Adelaide de Cicé herself. This testimony has been confirmed for you by the statement of Coulon's daughter, who told you quite simply how Adelaide's conversation had always been devoid of all political ideas.

"Whenever I wished to speak of public affairs", continued Coulon's daughter, "she would reply to me, "My daughter, we do not get involved in these affairs; they should not concern women".

It is indeed true, Citizen Jurors, that certain religious ideas came to have bearing on all the actions of Adelaide de Cicé. It is quite true that in satisfying her goodness of heart, she was further pushed toward goodness by the inclinations of a higher order. I am not ignoring the fact that some superficial persons, who prefer condemning en masse to taking the trouble to make distinctions, have imagined that they see fanaticism in all conduct governed by religion. But I do not fear that, this unjust confusion of ideas will operate among you. It will be easy for me to establish, before excellent minds like yours, this truly philosophical distinction which reason indicates. When religious ideas suggest a system of harshness towards others, when religious ideas suggest persecution and intolerance towards different beliefs - that is fanaticism; that is the type of opinion that must be proscribed. When religious ideas inspire only a conduct of tenderness, of benevolent good will towards everyone, of coming to the assistance of all one's peers, of giving aid to the unfortunate ones in need - that is no longer fanaticism; it is piety. Those are the opinions which we must honor.

The philosopher is able to judge all religious beliefs but he will admire all those beliefs which direct their followers towards that social goal. Such was the pact of Adelaide de Cicé.

It is easy to understand that she had scant time left over for fulfilling the little obligations of society! Living always an almost retired life by choice and in order to carrying on more freely her system of doing good, she was little given to what are called worldly customs. But neither despite her strong piety was she so turned away from that world as to believe she had to send away those who, remembering their past associations might have come to visit her.

During the period of pacification with the Chouans, Limoelan, a man just recently back in favor with the government, presented himself at Adelaide's home. He was a man with whom, up to that time Adelaide had had no sort of association. But being from the same province and arriving in Paris, he perhaps felt - and this must be said - that he owed this type of homage to Adelaide's former position in the world. Thus he went once or twice to her home. Two visits solely of courtesy, two visits coldly received because there was no motive on either side to establish a close relationship, and those two visits were (and make note of the circumstances) the only exchange that existed between her and this man.

Do I need to insist much, Citizens of the Jury, to prove that assertion? Who cannot see that there could have been nothing in common between an already



aging single woman - the simplicity of her dress, her manners, her occupations, the obscurity of her life, the moderation of her ideas and of her use of all that contributed to pleasure and agitation; - and a young soldier devoured by activity, given over to the pursuit of his tastes, attracted by action and always on the move. He could only find ridiculous or at least boring the company of an aging religious woman.

And now one more time, and you will believe it effortlessly, Citizens of the Jury, since Adelaide de Cicé has constantly affirmed it, and no contrary proof has destroyed her affirmation: these two courtesy visits of respect made to a woman who formerly occupied a certain social standing in his province, were the beginning and the end of all her relations with Limoelan. A year passed without her ever having seen him again.

If Adelaide de Cicé had remained aloof from all worldly affairs; if she had remained absorbed in the acts of kindness and spirituality to which she had devoted her life, she still had not wrenched from her heart the affections which nature had engraved upon it. Times had improved. No longer was the cruel system followed which imposed through a severe law that relatives of émigrés break off all communication with their dear ones. It is true that correspondence with émigrés had not yet received formal authorization by the government. However, the government being generous, and knowing how to distinguish culpable exchange of information from innocent expressions of hearts far removed from politics, expressions made because relatives needed to say that they loved each other and felt deeply the long separation - all these expressions were indulgently overlooked by the government provided that correspondence did not foment unrest. The government therefore employed no means to stop such correspondence.

Under these circumstances, after a seven-year silence, her brothers and her nephew wrote finally to Adelaide giving her their news. That correspondence which seems at first glance to show a wide contact with émigrés, comes down in the end to a few letters from her three brothers her nephew and one woman who was her friend.

You will have the opportunity to evaluate that correspondence. For the moment, it is good for you to know what it consisted of. As regards correspondence with the Chouans, the most rigorous searches have been conducted in Adelaide de Cicé's home; two secret drawers were forced open in her desk; all the papers in the desk were seized. Indeed, if Adelaide de Cicé had possessed any criminal papers, it is in that desk that they would have been found. Not one letter was found which mentioned a Chouan or which even mentioned the name of one of those men who played such a deadly role in our civil troubles.

Shall I speak to you of her other correspondence with people here in this country, Citizens of the Jury? Amid the details of your deliberations and in deference to the government Commissioner's request, you will investigate the letters in Adelaide de Cicé's correspondence with your own eyes and you will soon be convinced that they are all as innocent as those she received from her brothers. In them you will find many ascetical ideas much of the spirit that dominates the conduct of Adelaide de Cicé; of a spirit which you might find extreme or inhuman - a sort of anti-philosophy for which you might reproach her until you observe all the good deeds that have come out of that spirit of piety. That spirit of piety made her adhere strongly to her religion, which inspired her to have a greater charity toward her fellow human beings.

Indeed! You will, in fact, see that those two intentions were never separated in her thinking; that those intentions have always been strongly united one to the other; finally, by a supreme alliance of religion and goodness, the religious faith which she followed demanded that she serve her God better in order to derive from her adorations new encouragement for being useful to her fellow man, and - on the other hand - to be more useful to her fellow man in order the better to serve God.

In her correspondence, to what end were her most ardent thoughts directed? There existed formerly a corporate group which today we are allowed to praise once more under this reign of reason and the presence of justice. It was a corporate body which - though consecrated by religion - had as its principal duties, not mystical occupations but rather the tender concerns of and assistance to children, to the indigent and to the ailing. The government which knows how to be suspicious of all false ideas, when it's a question of working for the good of others, has just rendered its protection and respect to the aforementioned corporate group. Everyone knows that I am speaking about the Daughters of Charity. The institution of the Daughters of Charity had been destroyed, not by the spirit of liberty - for the spirit of liberty respects everything that is good without allowing itself to be lead into error by vain declarations - but by the spirit of exaggeration. These pious recluses who rendered themselves very useful to earth in order to gain heaven, had been expelled from their retreat. Traces of their existence were in course of being lost; their spirit was going to be extinguished. May thanks be given to those who, at least this time have honored religious opinions by allowing this type of sacred fire to be preserved. May thanks be given to those who, anticipating the paternal intentions of the government, have supplied it the means of taking over this element of charity which was almost lost and who by preserving the principle of this happy religious and philosophical institution were able, at the command of that presiding spirit which directs everything that is truly liberal and generous, to reproduce themselves and restore from weakness and misfortune their most sensitive protectresses!

Indeed, members of the jury, if you wish to know who committed this great crime, (of keeping alive what the government had mistakenly destroyed) you see before you one of the principal culprits. While the Sisters of Charity were being persecuted, and their convents closed, and a barbaric hand came to seize them in order to condemn them to an inactivity hurtful to society, who was it who took over their generous concerns? Who salvaged their principles? Who took over those generous concerns of theirs for others? Who became involved with the pious and tender ministrations of these women distinguished by their religious philanthropy? Who took over (at the beds of the sick and wounded) the Sisters? Faithful but clandestine services? It was Adelaide de Cicé. But she alone could not handle so great and so important a task. It was she who wrote to women filled with her same spirit and disposed to distinguish themselves in a devotion like her own. It was she who, in absence of a true structure for charity, did everything possible to carry on the duties of the Daughters of Charity and to gather up this patrimony of doing good, an inheritance which philosophy was not hastening to claim. To replace that religious community, it was she who had formed a congregation or confraternity which would have no external sign, for the laws forbade that, and she wished to obey the laws. In a word, Adelaide de Cicé was saving the entire substance of the institution from shipwreck. Like the Sisters of Charity, she made physical assistance spread around her and - it must be said - spiritual assistance as well.

Let us pardon - - Indeed, let us pardon the pious associates of her group for their excess of solicitude - for their visits to prisons and hospices where they went to aid the aged and the infirm. Since good deeds alone didn't know how to penetrate those places of pain, let us not complain too much that religion conducted benevolent deeds within those walls and let us not be surprised at seeing religion and benevolence there together.

Yes, Citizens of the Jury, you will find many crimes of that nature in the letters seized in Adelaide de Cicé's home. I myself denounce to you a correspondence maintained not with the Chouans, not with rebel émigrés (such conspiracies do not preoccupy the latter); but a correspondence maintained with several women who were burning with the same sacred love of humanity as Adelaide; with several women obeying, as she did, these holy laws of universal goodness; and who gathered together for religious practices through an interior promise they had taken whose object was to consecrate their own devoted action in common with Adelaide de Cicé, in a Common Spirit, receiving her instructions and spreading throughout the areas of France where they found themselves, the same works of mercy (as they called them) essentially followed by the Sisters of Charity.

Finally in this correspondence you will find much concern, much truly religious agitation to see to it that those in need received assistance and to transmit to

young women the lessons of piety and morality which they might need.

That is what composes the content of the correspondence. I will not read it to you. The government commissioner has invited you to read through it. I also invite you to do so. This will suffice to complete the justification of Adelaide de Cicé.

Adelaide de Cicé has dedicated herself to these concerns under all forms of the government even in a period when she had to use great discretions because they would have accused her of a crime. Soon she was able to dedicate herself more freely to the consoling occupations which for a long time had become habitual to her.

Finally for the good of France, a new government was set up. From its very beginnings, this government inspired confidence and demanded love. And how could anyone's feelings not have rallied to it. Those who loved glory had to adore a government whose leader had covered, with the luster of his victories, faults which in other periods of the revolution would have blighted the national honor. Those who cherished liberty could admire a system so happily combining strength for suppressing all passions, generosity for developing all liberal ideas, and for making them flourish, while preserving to citizens the just exercise of their rights and faculties. Those who had been persecuted were led both by the remembrance of the evils which they had endured and by the prospect, so long in front of them, of other evils that were still to be feared. They were led to rally around a power worthy of universal confidence; a power which disdained all the little passions to which preceding governments had acceded and which saw in these huge combines only the social interest without merging it with party spirit; this new government frankly forgot about the past and made use of anyone, without distinction, who offered loyalty, talents and a sincere desire to work for public prosperity. Finally among the apathetic beings, dead to generous thoughts but loving tranquility and eager to fall back into that tranquility, there wasn't one who did not joyfully see a protective government arising, capable of extending a strong arm impartially over everyone and of maintaining from a distance propriety and security while it imposed only one condition on those who were being protected, namely: that they respect public order.

How then, amid this general disposition of minds, can Adelaide de Cicé have hated the government? How did it happen that this woman, who, until this time, had been so resigned amid the stormy circumstances that had occurred; that this woman, who - as witnesses reported to you - had said in other times, "My children let us not be concerned about political matters; let us pray. Prayer is the only concern that God has bestowed on women", how is it that she did not feel herself drawn to that government which permitted her to exercise the

honorable activities to which she had dedicated herself.

It was not sufficient that, like all French persons, she had all these motives for blessing a government which was making amends; indeed, other motives joined these first motives, in order to strengthen that inclination and work more powerfully on her soul.

Finally, she was permitted to hope that this iron scourge, which for so long had alternately struck all parties, was going to be broken. The government had already sufficiently announced that while preserving all of its severity - as liberty and our laws ordered it to do - against those émigrés who were truly deserving of condemnation; against its sons who had plotted the murder of their native land; against those modern Coriolanuses who had gone from court to court, begging from them outrages and enemies to pour on their native land, it (the government) would nevertheless show condescension towards those banished persons who had obviously yielded to frightful circumstances, who had not voluntarily abandoned their position of citizen, and - finally - who had only been themselves the victims of violence. Ah! Amid such hopes, how hard Adelaide de Cicé would have had to try to hide her wishes for the existence of this new government, which permitted her to hope that her brothers, to whom she was so tenderly attached, would be returned to her! This was the first and biggest motive which must have converted her past resignation into a true attachment to the new government.

There was a second motive all the more powerful over her soul, because it touched a more sensitive affection and her religious feelings. The government had given religious tolerance to all cults, not merely lip-service tolerance but that genuine tolerance proclaimed by our constitutional charter, which said that each person could serve God in his or her own manner and according to his or her own faith without being obliged to render account to anyone of his or her religious beliefs.

Also, as you have learned from several witnesses, Citizen Jurors, when Adelaide de Cicé had the occasion to speak about this same government, she said that it was Providence which had moved Bonaparte to re-establish the Catholic religion.

Such was the hope that Adelaide de Cicé nourished and her hope was not injurious to the great man who had given rise to it. Perhaps, in effect was it not her point that posterity would admire in the history of this illustrious citizen the ability with which he knew how to rally to himself everywhere and even in his country too long ravaged by holy wars, all religious opinions. He would accomplish this end by honoring all religious opinions, without distinction, as social ties, and he would do so not as a sectarian person but as a statesman who would never sacrifice true philosophy to them.

Therefore Adelaide de Cicé did not have any hatred for the government. She could not hate it. I have given you an account of her sentiments. I have revealed to you her moral values. Now that you know Adelaide de Cicé as I do, I shall take up with you the accusation directed against her.

Before going through this accusation, and in order to simplify the discussion, it is necessary to begin by discussing what is evidently alien to it.

Citizens of the Jury, you have not forgotten the accusation. It is a terrible one, and it relates to an event too horrible for its elements ever to be very far from your thoughts. The object of the accusation is to convict and punish all who conspired against the security of the Republic by contemplating the murder of its First Consul.

At present, what circumstances relating to Adelaide de Cicé has the act of accusation attached this frightful wrong?

A first charge came out of a prayer book. In this very old book, amid a great number of religious objects, Catholic holy pictures, statements having no relation at all to politics, all material taken from ascetical works, there was found an old piece of ordinary paper, whose ragged old age, clear to the eye, proved that it had lain in that book a very long time. On it were the words "Conquer or die". The police officers had made a very minute search. Of course I do not reproach them for that. Beyond that, I thank them in the name of our country, for when it was a matter of research into such a great crime, zeal could not be pushed too far. Above all, I thank them in the name of innocence, for the stronger the investigation has been, the more it becomes clear that nothing escaped them.

In leafing through the book, they came upon this piece of paper; and the inscription startled them. In it they feared they found a sign - a rallying cry. . . ! First of all, the physical condition of the piece shattered all suspicion. It's very evident age militated against its having anything to do with new agitations. Besides, it was a very ordinary piece of paper containing no poetry, no emblem, only these words in block letters: "to conquer or to die". In a word, that was all an inspection revealed. And when one examined the inscription objectively, putting aside natural anxiety (natural, of course, under such circumstances, but also able to cast reason aside) everything showed that the maxim, "to conquer or to die", like some twenty others found in the book, was - like the others - merely a bookmark for prayers and not at all a password to royalists.

Besides, who ever heard tell that this was their slogan!

I vainly did research. Nowhere did I find in the historical data of recent times, that the motto of the Chouans was "to conquer or to die". This sublime cry was

often uttered by a more glorious party. More than once, our victorious republican armies made it echo as they marched with their bayonets forward. And if these words are a rallying cry, it was then not with our enemies but with our own soldiers that Adelaide de Cicé was in league.

All the same let us not give her an honor which is not due her. It was not as an expression of patriotic sentiments any more than as a slogan for rebels that this cry "to win or to die" was lost in her prayer book among so many other pictures. It was a mystical expression applying to the victory to be attained over our passions if we do not wish to run the risk of eternal death. Indeed, Citizens of the Jury, do you wish a proof of the use, in mystical language, of the expression "to conquer or to die?"

I have already told you: the zealous searchers gathered up in Adelaide de Cicé's residence every paper and every object they found there. In particular, one box was seized, a box which contained other instruments of conspiracy: rosaries, crucifixes, chaplets, images of the Blessed Virgin, scapulars, peaceful small emblems worn by religious militia as a pious memento - articles which Catholic religion honors and which Adelaide de Cicé distributed to those enrolling in the Confraternity of Charity of which I have just spoken to you.

Among these devotional objects, there were found a large quantity of other maxims. I have examined all of them. You will glance over them. You will find all of them full of love of goodness and peace. Let me take one at random:

The devil cannot regard without vexation all our efforts to convert our lives and to please God. But let us have courage and resolution. He who has called us will make straight all our paths and will give us the strength to conquer.

Note the word "conquer" and this time it cannot be pretended that it is a password.

Here is the second sentence:

To combat without ceasing in order to win new victories.

To judge by the considerable number of these things, it seems that each one of these maxims was the result of pious daily meditations. It is painful to think that any one of them was a rallying cry. I dare to believe that this so-called rallying cry has been sufficiently explained and I almost blush that I paused so long over it.

I pass now to a second accusation.

Adelaide de Cicé corresponded with certain émigrés who wrote to her in a mysterious and commercial language, at a borrowed address and using only initials to indicate the different persons recalled in the correspondence. First of all, I protest that you have not forgotten - and the loyalty of the public ministry will not refute the fact that this correspondence consists solely of several letters from her three brothers, one from her nephew and one from a woman who is a friend.

Besides, none of these letters contains one sole fact capable of disturbing the friends of the government. Indeed, I'll agree - if we still lived under those unfortunate laws which made it a crime for a sister to correspond with her brother, there would be - in the material existence of these letters, the odious pretext for another accusation. But what could there be in common between the crime of having disregarded a law which violates nature and having desired and received news from a friend, or from an unhappy brother - and the execrable crime of an attempt on the life of the First Consul?

She corresponded with her émigré brothers. Oh! I see it now. If it were a question merely of giving a counsel of prudence or of respect for laws; if it were a question of answering this request which you, Citizens of the Jury, might address to me, a relative of an emigre: "Would I do well to write to my unfortunate brother and receive his news?" And if you and I, still fearful of the cruelly made, year-long application of Draconian laws and convinced that in these difficult times, it is always better to refrain from writing, we would answer without a doubt "Wretched one, separated from all that once was dear to you, you are to be pitied without a doubt, and we pity you. You must mistrust your sensitivity. Make every effort to make your fatherland the sacrifice of your private affections; break, if you can, all the ties binding you to that fugitive; an iron wall separates you forever; nature can murmur it endlessly but society commands this: 'Do not write'".

We would hold fast to this manner of speaking. Let us have the courage to say that it would be easy for us to think only of ourselves, we who are adopted children of the revolution, who have reaped only the benefits of the revolution; who have not seen any of our family members submit to any persecution, banishment or exile. We have the joy - in the midst of a country which has emerged from bondage - of tasting both the generous joys bestowed by liberty and the very sweet pleasure of family and friendships.

But we are speaking of Adelaide de Cicé.

I do not refer to the rank which was taken away from her - she never regretted that. I do not speak of her vanished wealth - only the poor were the losers in that! But she had three beloved brothers. They were scattered in different corners of Europe, isolated from her and from each other, haunted by abject



poverty, afflicted by the weaknesses of old age. She did not see them for 8 years. Perhaps she will never see them again.

She had one sister who had been the friend and companion of her childhood. This sister followed their brother, in his seventies, into the rigorous climate of Prussia. Perhaps she will never see her sister again.

She had a sister-in-law, who though ill, is very courageous and who earns her living in Hamburg. Perhaps Adelaide will never see her again.

She had a nephew, who for 8 years has lived with his family in a fisherman's hut amid the rocky land in Jersey. Perhaps Adelaide will never see them again.

Thus, one by one, she lost all the objects of her affection and those whom it was once her duty and joy to love. They no longer are hers, for her native land has commanded her to renounce them. She has obeyed. Her native land orders her not to complain. She does not complain. Her native land forbids her above all to make impious wishes that the return of her loved ones be effected by the intervention of foreign arms. Far from her is even the mere thought of such sacrilegious ideas. Her native land forbids her to have correspondence with them, which it (the native land) deems to be a crime. She agrees from the bottom of her heart to that prohibition and has maintained no such correspondence. She has desired only to learn if those relatives are still alive. She has desired only to say once more to her oldest brother, soon to die, that he has always been enclosed deep in her heart. She has desired only to offer to her three brothers, to her sister, to her sister-in-law and to her nephew, if not help, at least some consolations. She finally received their news and sent them her own.

In the year XI, the law prohibited such contact.

Oh books of the law, be closed! Oh codes of humanity and of reason, be opened! Teach us if the virtuous Mr. Augrand was right when, walking towards the scaffold, he thus rebuked his hangman, who reproached him for violating the law by writing a letter to his children, "Could I ever have supposed that the law would have ordered me to suppress nature?"

Nor did Adelaide de Cicé suppress nature. Then, since her correspondence does not contain one letter that is not a letter of affection, how could such correspondence be made part of the atrocious accusation made against her?

Why then, is her manner of addressing those letters considered mysterious? Why is the language of those letters considered mysterious, since their subject was spiritual matters or family matters? Above all, why all the mystery of referring to people only by initials?

On reflection, Citizens of the Jury, both on Adelaide de Cicé's position and on the severity of the laws of the year XI, which laws were cast into disuse by the clemency of the new government but were never revoked by means of other, more precise laws, all the circumstances are self-explanatory.

Correspondence with persons outside of France was rather tolerated than permitted. A name little known by its address passed more easily through the controls. In a difficult moment if those who carried out the public service of police surveillance experienced either uneasiness or ill-humor, they were tempted to enforce in all their severity the laws on even innocent correspondence. Thus commercial forms were substituted in letters, for expressions of affection and friendship, thus allowing the letters greater possibility of being received by the addressees. In a word, these were not precautions taken by guilty persons in order to hatch plots and the letters that are here prove that point.

Such letters were clever means used by the brothers to be able to continue sending each other proofs of remembrance and affection.

But how about the initials?

Well. It is true. In all their letters, the correspondents did not mention by name their companions in unhappiness and in exile to whom they were referring. Indeed! Will one call it a crime on the part of those sad exiles if they kept faith with one another amid their misfortune? And why should they have used identifying names? Was it not done so that - if the letters were intercepted, they (the writers) would not be denouncing themselves and the recipients to the police - and thus be furnishing, through their letters, names which until then had eluded the list of those marked for death?

And so, even though it was innocent, that correspondence - by the very fact of its existence-could not help but be shrouded in some sort of mystery. Since it was not formally authorized correspondence, it had to travel in silence and above all, it could not attract attention to itself and cause the government to give up its system of tacit tolerance.

Finally, let us examine the correspondence itself.

Loubardemont, Cardinal Richelieu's terrible minister of revenge, used to say: "Let me see but six lines of handwriting and I promise to send the writer to the scaffold".

That is a reflection which must always be kept in mind when there is a question of censoring letters about internal family traditions and about sketchy facts, because it is futile to try to grasp the many innuendos well understood by the

correspondents. Let us rapidly examine the possible contents of Adelaide de Cicé's correspondence - not for its disturbing contents, but for its unintelligible elements. And in this regard, permit me to make an observation of great importance. In the course of the debates in behalf of Adelaide de Cicé, you - members of the Jury - will recall that I urged the government commissioner please to set up debate on the parts of this correspondence which might contain certain expressions to which there could be given a meaning analogous to the event mentioned in the act of accusation.

In his resume, the government commissioner thought it futile to point out the sentences which might be considered accusatory. He thought it sufficient to send the entire matter to the Jurors so that in the silence of both the accuser and the accused, they (the Jurors) might decide on the opinion they had to take on the correspondence. In giving such an opinion, this magistrate undoubtedly had as his motive, the desire to simplify an already enormously complicated instruction.

Why should I deny myself the consoling thought that another motive was added to that one? I have seen the correspondence, just as the Magistrate has, I have ended with the deep conviction that the correspondence contains nothing which is reprehensible.

He has the same conviction that I have. Apparently, this conviction and the impossibility of pin-pointing in the letters one sole sentence related to the accusation, have formed the second motive for which the government Commissioner is determined not to denounce to you anything particular in the correspondence.

If it were otherwise, the accused would find herself in a most unfortunate position. A voluminous correspondence - a most voluminous one - has been produced here.

In the presence of these letters, what does one expect of Adelaide de Cicé and what is she expected to say? Is it up to her to find in them the expressions that will poison suspicion?

For her, nothing is obscure. For her, there is no suspicion because the letters contain nothing which is criminal. Is she to take word after word and explain to you at length the minute and indifferent facts? Must she take each line and give a complete demonstration proving every point which she makes to you? But this disgusting and boring task is an impossible one. Time and your patience will not be able to bear it. That is not the way an accused person can defend herself about correspondence.

She is being accused. Let her be told of what she is being accused. Her writings

are attacked. Let her be told which ones. Her words are attacked. Let her be told which ones need to be defended. Up to that point, silence should be kept. For, amid all these letters, which are innocent ones, it is impossible for her to guess which one might erroneously be considered culpable.

But you tell me: "Stop! Why do you ask that Adelaide de Cicé be interrogated when she refuses to reply?"

Oh! Citizens of the Jury, forewarn yourselves against a confusion of ideas which that vague reproach might engender. Deign to make a distinction which, in itself, will give you the key to Adelaide de Cicé's character. Yes, she has sometimes refused to reply. But on what points? On facts? Never. On persons mentioned in the correspondence? Often. Constantly she has said, "Please examine the letters. Everything, everything in them is innocent. If something in them appears suspect to you, here I am ready to reply to you on everything except the names of persons. The person& names are irrelevant to things discussed, provided - of course those things are not of a criminal nature and provided the letters do not contain reason for the least charge against me; as for the persons, I cannot name them for I do not want to inconvenience them".

I shall tell you the truth, members of the Jury, if I had been able to get rid of Adelaide de Cicé's will power, faithful to my first duty of concerning myself exclusively with the sureness of her defense, I would have obtained from her the renunciation of all reserve, even in this regard. I have told her at times, "You are being asked the full names of those indicated by initials. Tell those names, for it will not cause you any inconvenience. If there are inconveniences for the persons bearing those names, well! Let them suffer the inconvenience!"

These sentiments were not shared by her. More imprudent and more generous than I, she continued to be silent. The fact of her silence does remain. For the present, all we can do is appreciate it.

This correspondence was limited - I repeat once more - to letters between herself, her three brothers, her sister, her nephew and a friend of hers who were living abroad. The correspondence sometimes uses initials to refer to names of other persons. Who were these persons? First of all, they were persons who were absolute strangers to the frightful attempt of Nivose 3, as they were strangers also to all other kinds of plot. It is easy to convince oneself of this merely by reading the letters. They were relatives, friends and neighbours of her exiled brothers. Some of them had not yet been granted release from their exile. Others, more fortunate, thanks to government clemency - as the correspondence states were finally enjoying the air of their native land. Those are the persons whom Adelaide de Cicé refused to name while offering at the same time to explain all the facts the letters referred to.

And we must not allow ourselves to be mistaken about her motives. The government's Commissioner was mistaken in attributing this silence to Adelaide de Cicé's religious beliefs. Adelaide de Cicé did not remain silent because of her religious beliefs. She was silent only out of the respect which - in her mind - she believed she owed to the misfortunes of others.

She reasoned in a manner which all good hearts will comprehend. She said to herself "Some of those referred to by initials have finally returned to the land of their birth, the very land whose laws they now deem themselves happy to be permitted to obey. Returned now, to their native land, they wish to live an undisturbed, peaceable and submissive life."

"Others mentioned in her letters are still undergoing the pangs of exile. However, their hope has not been entirely taken away from them. They dare to flatter themselves that they will once more see their native land. Each day, some of them take advantage of public pity which no longer refuses to distinguish the unfortunate ones from the guilty".

"Is it then up to me, relative of so many unfortunate wanderers like them, to deprive them, by my denunciations, of this security and this hope which sustains them in their misery? Is it for me, sister of proscribed persons, aunt of proscribed persons, and relative of proscribed persons to give their names, when I know the government is too noble to accuse me of a crime of other people's doings since all along I have been faithful to the laws of that government? Is it for me to inscribe in judicial archives in my own handwriting, the names of all those unfortunate persons, at the risk of seeing the persecution of those who have already returned so they can find out if their status has been regularized? Could I possibly, for whatever base conditions of personal safety, and for the purpose of avoiding an unfounded accusation, could I possibly sacrifice so many sad victims? No, I shall depend on my innocence to save me, for it would be easier for me to die than to dishonor myself".

Those were Adelaide de Cicé's motivations. I owed it to the faithfulness of the defense to develop them for you. Your reason and your heart will be the judges.

Now I come to the correspondence itself. One note is presented, a note that has become suspect more for its form than its contents. It is written on gauze - and this circumstance of its having been written on a rarely used material, has caught our imagination. It would have been easy to forget our first uneasiness over this, by remembering the general system of secrecy, and - if you wish of deceit which veiled the various correspondence of people from the outside with persons within the country - even when they were writing something quite innocent.

In order to write to one's friends to say that one loved them, mystery was needed; and mysterious precautions were used; gauze was used because it was less likely to be intercepted than paper. But indeed, the use of gauze is not a crime in the eyes of reason. And what was the message of this letter written on gauze, the only one of that type which Adelaide de Cicé ever received from one of her friends? Here it is:

My dear Adelaide, our good Julie has told me of your good intentions for me. I asked her to thank you for me. . . .

I don't believe there is anything in that which is alarming as far as public safety is concerned.

Here is a sentence from that letter which has seemed obscure:

Abbé de Br. is here for the same reason as M.D. He has acquired two good companions. Nothing has been decided as yet. His superior of whom I spoke to you, is at RO at present. And I hope when I see you again I shall be able to give you details that will please you.

Who is this Abbé de Br.? Adelaide de Cicé explained: "It is Abbé de Broglie, founder or restorer of a former society which he is trying to promote throughout Europe. It has not been badly received by our own generals who often have approved of the good effects of this kind of missionary".

Here is what I read in a journal previous to the unhappy event of 3<sup>rd</sup> of Nivose, in the autumn issue of year IX of the philosophic annals, which were not specifically prepared for this cause:

We have already seen in our previous records what great zeal was shown by the French priests who were deported to Germany; how they hastened to offer to their compatriot-prisoners all the helps in their power. . . their zeal has not diminished as each day offers proofs. The Congregation set up in Germany through the efforts of Abbé de Broglie and the authority of the Pope is modeled after the Jesuits whose rule and habit they have taken. The new Congregation vows itself particularly to good works and sends priests wherever it is known that there are French prisoners who are ill. . . These priests are seen rendering the most repulsive services such as cleaning out wounds and ridding their patients of vermin.

At Augsburg and Ratisbonne, the French generals permitted these priests to visit the ailing soldiers etc. . .

Thus Abbé de Broglie founded an order destined to serve the sick. He sought proselytes everywhere. He had found two of them in the place where Adelaide de Cicé's friend lived. His chief was in RO, i.e., in Rome - and that chief was the Reverend Father Pacanari who had been named by the Holy Father as general of the budding order. We can feel how important this news was for two consecrated women, each in her own place, but dedicated to the same obligations and the same occupations.

The letter concluded in this way:

"I desire that everything accords with the old principles which you and I have embraced. I truly believe that the moral principles are excellent, but will they always be in agreement with those of R... and of the old equity."

That R. . . standing alone also stirred up some suspicious imaginations, which thought that it was intended to represent the first letter of the word Royalty. Nothing in the context of the letter led to this idea. The very meaning of the sentence rejected such an interpretation. The subject of the thought had been spirituality. It stated that the moral principles were very good, but this devout correspondent hastened to say would such principles always agree with principles. . . certainly not of royalty, but principles of religion! For one does not say "principles of royalty"; because the contrast which the writer intended to achieve was necessarily the contrast between the principles of morality and the idea of the principles of religion. These two ideas flow from one to the other naturally and effortlessly.

So much for this first letter which I thought must not appear before you without explanations. Although it did not appear in the debates, I believe it merited discussion, because it had been mentioned in the act of accusation.

A second letter was written to his sister by Augustin de Cicé.

In speaking to her of one property of his that had been sold, he said:

"Would it not be possible to obtain from the purchaser an agreement that he would give me a remittance toward the total price? We could tell him of the hope I have of recovering some of my properties".

In fact, Augustin de Cicé was hoping to be removed from the proscription list and even to return into ownership of his properties which had not been validly sold. For he had been assured that the papers had not been filled out for the sale of the property in question. He added, "For the rest, you will do with that property whatever you wish; and if you wish, do nothing at all with it".

In fact that is what Adelaide de Cicé wanted; so she did nothing. A person would

have had to be in Hamburg to believe that such an impossible proposition could be accepted. There was no follow-up to that letter.

Citizens of the Jury, you know that the debate did not result in even a shadow of proof in this regard. Therefore, Citizens of the Jury, let us discard all these first grievances, which are real parasites as regards the accusation. Even if they were true, they are irrelevant. Besides, it is time to come to the accusation itself.

I must repeat the subject of the accusation. It makes one tremble. Despite myself, I am filled with a sort of invincible horror each time I recall its terms and think that I must relate them to Adelaide de Cicé and that she must reply to them.

Is she guilty of having cooperated in the horrible plot aimed at the murder of the First Magistrate of France, the horrible plot which aimed at depriving Europe of its hero and the republic of its head?

You have heard all the debates, Citizens of the Jury. You have convinced yourselves through them that Adelaide de Cicé was in no way associated, either from afar or close by, with any of the patricidal measures which prepared and brought on this great catastrophe.

But am I really sure of the statements I make? It is true that the court debates have brought to light nothing against Adelaide de Cicé; but I still have here at hand this correspondence seized in her home. I have had to examine it; I have read it in its entirety. I have taken, before the court, the oath of using only truth in this defense, and I abhor perjury. I owe it to society not to save a guilty person by means of cunning expedients; and I want to be faithful to that obligation.

Well then! In my conscience can I affirm before you that there exists in this correspondence no terrible proof against Adelaide de Cicé; no proof that this plot was known to her; no proof that she knew the name of its perpetrators, that she is on intimate terms with several of them; and that even before the crime was committed, Adelaide de Cicé had knowledge of this infernal scheme?

No, Jurors, I cannot affirm this before you.

Already, the act of accusation reproached her for having received before Nivose 3, a letter containing signs of interest about one little Francois.

It is true that the Public Defender has not made this charge appear in his summary. But what does that matter? If he has deserted his post as the accuser, I myself shall take it over.



Adelaide de Cicé, answer me. Because it is I, your Defense Attorney, who accuse you. Answer to the most crushing charge that can be brought against you. And all of you, listen attentively.

Here is a letter seized in Adelaide de Cicé's home. It is dated October 25, 1800. This date corresponds to the new calendar's "Brumaire, Year IX". This letter antedates the crime by about ten weeks. I read this statement from it with as much surprise as fright:

You speak to me of a letter of August 3 which has moved you (this was written to her). You would be all the more moved by the response which you might have had from the most assiduous agent and principal operator of the shop, little Francis V., or from his two most intimate aides and friends, J. Christ Fr. or J.B.D. who is personally known to you. . . These three merit all friendship and confidence for general commerce.

No, members of the Jury, I could never depict for you the deep stupor mixed with horror which this reading threw me into.

On recovering from my first consternation, I vainly wished to evaluate the details of that frightful letter. Everything served only to confound my reason. I looked at the date mark; it was close to the time of the crime. The place mark was Halberstadt, a foreign land. The writer was an emigre and perhaps, an enemy. The language was mysterious - referring to a shop, a principal operator, an agent, and general commerce. The persons mentioned there - the persons! My hair stood up on my head - there was "little Francis". . . and a little Francis had prepared the infernal machine of murder. Little Francis was "the principal agent and the most assiduous one in the shop". And in effect, the little Francis had been the most active instrument of the assassination attempt. There was "little Francis and his two companions". And the court procedure claims he had two accomplices, St-Regent and Limoelan. There were two friends, the latter of whom so the letter says "was better known to Adelaide de Cicé". And in fact, she did not know St-Regent, but she had told me that she had seen Limoelan twice in her life, the year before.

And trembling I asked myself, "What means do I have for resisting this terrible knowledge?"

It was useless to exclaim in protest within me. Had all the laws of nature been upset at this point? All this undeniable virtue during 30 years - was it only a long and odious hypocrisy without motives or explanations? It was useless for me in this matter to call upon either the interior feeling which cried out within that Adelaide de Cicé could not be guilty or the very revulsion of my conscience against so monstrous an unlikelihood; and, finally there was this unconquerable

conviction of her innocence; this conviction which I feel and which penetrates my whole being; this conviction which I find impossible to transmit to you in the same degree as I am experiencing it myself because it would be necessary for you, like me, to have remained with her in her prison. It would be necessary for you, like me, to have observed the convulsions of horror which the attempted murder aroused in her. It would be necessary for you like me, to have seen the abhorrence with which this tender and pious soul recoiled before the supposition that she might be the accomplice to such a crime. It would be necessary for you, like me, to have understood the accents of her voice, the barely perceptible changes in her facial expression, the honest and touching glances, and the genuine tone of truth - all those details which cannot be feigned and which, to the eyes of the observer, always end by pointing out innocence and by unmasking villainy.

All this arousal of my feelings beat against my reason. And my reason continued to bring my eyes back to these fatal lines in the letter and to demand of me an explanation of them. Finally weary of going astray in this inextricable maze, I rejected the letter and told myself:

"No! Human goodness is not a vain word, and nature cannot falsify its own laws. All this appears to be without explanation. But I swear by virtue, that it will all be explained".

I hastened to go to interrogate Adelaide de Cicé.

At present, members of the jury, since I have come to understand it, I ask you not to tremble for innocence any longer. Tremble for the error which so frequently surrounds justice.

"Who is the writer of this letter?" I hastened to ask Adelaide de Cicé. Her answer was simple: "My brother, the Bishop of Auxerre".

Suddenly I had a first flash of light. It was already not understandable to me that Adelaide de Cicé, whose entire life was spent in gentle and peaceable and above all, virtuous ways, could be an accomplice in a horrible murder. This improbability grew even larger when I realized that contrary to all human probabilities, it concerned an old gentleman of 75 years of age, who in the past had been deemed worthy to bear the title of minister of peace; an exile - it is true, but an exile who, in his long career of constant goodness, had only one fault with which to reproach himself, the fault of having allowed himself to be too easily horrified by the troubles of his native land. How could such an old gentleman suddenly become a dastardly assassin and infect his sister with all his own fury, and from his tranquil place of exile associate himself with the most vile and most ferocious criminals to conceive, arrange and direct the most horrible contract that has ever besmirched the memory of mankind.

Nevertheless, I did not stop at this type of acceptance of people, and I continued to demand explanations.

The sentence which had chilled my senses began with these words: "You mention a letter of August 3 which moved you". What was this letter of August 3?

By one of the special chances which Providence unexpectedly reserves for innocence under suspicion, this letter was found recorded in the philosophical annals of Vendemiaire<sup>15</sup> of the year IX, three months before the attempted assassination. This journal gives the background of that letter.

A terrible hurricane during the month previous had devastated the commune of Guy l'Eveque, which formed part of the Auxerre Diocese, and several poor inhabitants of that community had been ruined as a result. The old Bishop had heard of this disaster from his place of exile and his heart was moved by the plight of his former people. From Halberstadt, he had arranged for 20 golden French "louis"<sup>16</sup> to be sent to them together with the following letter. Moved by their Shepherd's remembrance of them, these good people sent the letter to the journal.

The letter of "this counselor, this director of the plot of 3 Nivose, this protector of the brigands who engineered the plot", was as follows:

From Halberstadt, Prussia  
3 August 1800

Dear Residents,

"With deep sorrow I have learned from newspapers, the frightful ravages of the hurricane and flood of July 9 in the villages of Guy l'Eveque and Vallau. Over a long period in the past I received a portion of the revenue of the diocese from your parish, a parish which I never have ceased loving. Do not doubt that if I had been nearby, I would have promptly come to you in order to give you all the help I could possibly offer you and to try to keep in your midst the families which suffered the most.

"In my distance from you after all the losses and the various sorrows I have experienced, the small resources which are my subsistence now do not permit me to gather together more than 20 gold French "louis" to add to the other help you have received, to be distributed among you according to your losses and your needs.

---

<sup>15</sup> Translator's Note: Name of the first month of calendar of First French Republic (September 22 to October 22).

<sup>16</sup> Gold coin

"Certainly, our good inhabitants of Auxerre and its environs have hastened to come to your assistance with the zeal they have always had for relieving misfortune, a zeal which they have shown for a long time to counteract the scourge of begging. It is a consolation for me to associate myself with you in the work of charity. Soon I shall not be able to exercise any work of charity. And though my health, thanks be to God, is better than I could expect, my age - 75 years - warns me that in a little while I shall have no needs for myself except the need of prayers which will be kindly offered for my eternal repose. I recommend myself to your prayers with confidence".

Citizen Jurors, at the very instant of finishing that reading, all my doubts were cleared. I experienced the impression which all of you are undoubtedly experiencing now. I remained convinced that one would not proceed to a decision of assassination by the mention of a letter where the steps of that assassination are given. I am equally convinced that the same sentence could not contain the monstrous combination of two ideas, one of them pertaining to a very pure virtue, and the other, to the highest degree of villainy.

Nevertheless, I continued my investigation. Adelaide de Cicé's letter spoke of a reply to a letter of August 3. I wished to know that letter, the one which, amid the fullness of their honest gratitude, the country folk had sent to their former Bishop. I don't think I need place that letter before your eyes. It is also printed in the same newspaper, in the issue of Brumaire.<sup>17</sup>

In speaking of this response in his letter to Adelaide de Cicé, the bishop added: "Which you may obtain from the most hard-working agent, the principal operator of the shop, little P. Francois V".

Oh surely, I dare to believe at present, there is no need to tell you who is the principal agent of the shop, this little François V. You are as certain as I am that he is not the little Francis. It is quite evident to you that the person who wrote a letter like the one of August 3 is not capable of entering into an assassination conspiracy; that the "hard-working and principal agent of the shop" cannot himself be a man capable of involving himself in a murder, no matter what expressions are used to describe him. While I would prefer not to identify him to you, still I do not wish the least shadow of mystery to remain on this homicide passage of the letter.

The little P. Francois V - and we must make note of the initial preceding "Francois" and the one following it - does not mean "little Francois" quite

---

<sup>17</sup> Translator's Note: Brumaire was the second month of the calendar of the First French Republic, from October 22 to November 20.

simply, but little Father Francois Viard, an ecclesiastic much loved by the Bishop of Auxerre. In intimacy, the Bishop called him "little Father". He was formerly Vicar General of the diocese and even today, by tolerance of the government, administers the spiritual affairs in the area of Yonne.

Jean-Baptiste de Cicé, using the words "shop and general commerce" meant "the diocese and its administration", and by "assiduous operator and principal agent" he meant his Vicar General, indicating by these words, the type of activities he conducted so that the Catholics would not suffer too much because of the absence of their Bishop.

As to his two companions, "J. Chris and J.B.D.", these were two other ecclesiastics of the same diocese associated with the spiritual concerns as Citizen Viard was. Their initials signified Jean Christophe Frotier and Jean Baptiste Digard.

And in order that you have no doubts, I present to you - not certificates but regular formal acts, old and recent ones, and even administrative acts.

The first is an act drawn up in the presence of a notary, under date of March 26, 1774, in which there appears the name of Pierre Francois Viard, priest residing in Auxerre.

The second and third are two administrative acts, of which one in date of 28 Ventose, Year VIII - is a mandate given by the Department of Yonne to Pierre Francois Viard, ex-canon of Auxerre; the other is a certificate from the municipality of Auxerre, dated 29 Ventose, Year VIII, stating that Pierre Francois Viard receives no other income than his pension as ex-canon.

The fourth is a notarized act signed by Jean Christophe Frotier, canon of Auxerre.

Lastly, the fifth and sixth are: one, the statement of Jean Baptiste Digard in the presence of a notary and the other, a certificate of sworn fidelity to the laws of the Republic by Jean Baptiste Digard, ex-canon of Auxerre, sworn on 15 Frimaire, Year IX in the presence of the Mayor of Auxerre.

Thus, Citizens of the Jury, you have all the threads of the conspiracy suspected in that famous letter. You know all the conspirators, and finally you have recovered from the terrible impression, which you received as I did, from both the sudden appearance of Petit Francois in the correspondence of Adelaide de Cicé and from this strange pile of incidentals which gave criminal appearances to a most innocent letter. All these appearances vanished before the truth. I could have given you mathematical odds that all these co-incidents were only chance.

I could have done that!

But if I had not been able to prove that; if I had disregarded those acts which served me to prove to you the existence of those three priests, former collaborators of the last Bishop of Auxerre; if that letter of August 3 had never been printed in a period well before the crime and so - if after having written that letter to Adelaide de Cicé, those to whom the initials referred had disappeared - or if they were no longer known so well; finally, if the deeds and the men had all dropped from the memory of Adelaide de Cicé and if our research hadn't turned them up; by Jove what a frightful idea!

While no less innocent, the letter appeared to be criminal. Truth remained hidden under its pure and irreproachable veils, while these other deceitful veils offered a phantom of complicity. At the moment when I am speaking, I myself would tremble before that phantom. I would fear that I was defending a guilty person. I would consume myself - through vain efforts, in working out reasons that had no proofs for support, and perhaps I would not succeed in the face of the crushing pile of accusing coincidences!

Oh! Members of the Jury, how right the cruel Laubardemont was!

But may human intelligence profit from this mighty lesson. Proofs are needed before society can dispose of the lives of men. And if on the basis of a few phrases in a correspondence that seems mysterious (not because crimes were contemplated there but because the correspondent was writing amid difficult circumstances and writing about matters long regarded as delicate), if one hastened to pronounce guilt on such a basis, let us reflect that there is not one among us - judges, members of the jury and spectators - who would not be exposed to bring his head to the scaffold.

I will not say more about the letters. Since no one letter is particularly used in the charge against Adelaide de Cicé, I shall no longer respond to any one letter in particular. Only, and if, in going over the correspondence which will be submitted to you, you still perceive some obscurities which I did not clarify because I had not foreseen them and because they were not used in the charge, you will recall little Father Francois Viard and the cruel episode which he might have caused in this process and you will say: "Let us not judge lightly on appearances. Let us also believe in the appearances of virtue. Why should crime alone have this sad privilege?"

Let us believe that in the matter of appearances, there is nothing more certain than the witness of a whole life and the sight of thirty years of virtuous life. Let us believe that she whose life was without reproach for 30 years, who - for thirty years - did not let one day go by that was not marked by a charity towards her neighbour; that she who, from her youth, gave up all the illusions of the

world, all the joys of grandeur and opulence, even the seductions of nature in order to go to the huts and the sites of misfortune and illness to impart to the poor her tender and compassionate ministrations; indeed, that she did not suddenly become an odious monster, the lowest form of human life and a horror to posterity.

After those explanations, I shall consider the charges. I rely on the strength of the impression which I must have already transferred to you because I myself received it and persevere in it, the impression which only solemn truth can create, and certainly not any talent of mine. And therefore, I feel that I can go over the charges rapidly.

I have said it. The debates have supplied nothing which connects Adelaide de Cicé to facts previous to the crime of 3 Nivose. That crime was therefore carried out without her.

What then, is the deed that she is being reproached for?

I picked up the formal accusation and read therein:

On 7 Nivose, Limoelan was at the home of Adelaide de Cicé. That leader of the conspirators wished to place in hiding one of his accomplices. He entrusted both his secret and his accomplice, Carbon, to Adelaide de Cicé. She received this horrible assignment. She could not give asylum to Carbon. She recommended him to Madame Duquesne and requested her to accept him. That is the accusation against her.

Well! Let me blaspheme against Adelaide de Cicé's morality and against her good sense. Should anyone accuse me of audacity, I take as truth everything assumed by the act of accusation. I am supposing that knowingly, Adelaide de Cicé, on the direct recommendation of Limoelan, obtained a hiding place for one of the unfortunate persons who was implicated in the contracted murder of 3 Nivose. Members of the jury, you are not here to decide on praise or censure. You have a more terrible function entrusted to you. You can dispose of the lives of human beings. I recall your awesome power to you in order to tell you what constitutes the aim of your researches. It is not for you to examine whether the fact is blameworthy; you must concern yourselves solely with whether that fact is a crime.

Well! I am forgetting the denials made to you by Adelaide de Cicé with that tone of truth which will echo in your hearts for a long time, denials that Limoelan sent Carbon to her. I am forgetting all the likelihoods which can be gathered together and which I will present to you to show that she did not know what Carbon had done: I believe each word of the act of accusation.

It therefore remains that Adelaide de Cicé, a total stranger to the execution of the crime, had nevertheless knowingly given refuge to the criminal.

I am appealing to your reason and only to your reason. And I ask what constitutes the crime of giving asylum. Assuredly, I would be far from approving that indiscreet compassion. I would be even farther from finding it good that a woman whose entire life has been spent in the practise of the most austere virtue should have become so compassionate towards such criminal persons. I would blame her bitterly; all of society would blame her.

But it is not a question of my opinion, nor of the opinion of society, nor of your opinion, Citizen Jurors. It is a question of the quality of the deed. Compassion for a criminal whether well or poorly reasoned out, does not constitute the crime itself. To give asylum to a person who has killed his father does not constitute being an accomplice to the horrible crime of patricide which he has committed.

But I blush to lower myself to such a supposition.

Faithful to the instinct of generosity which regulated her whole life, Adelaide de Cicé - in giving refuge to Carbon - believed she was doing an innocent act of charity to a man who was not unworthy of her kindness, a man who had been presented to her as an emigre.

That is what she has consistently declared; and during the debate, nothing was presented to contradict her declaration.

Nevertheless, the prosecutor has insisted that she had known that Carbon was a conspirator. From that assumed knowledge, the consequence was drawn that, because she knew him and knowingly found him shelter, she was his accomplice.

I will not examine just how barbarous that manner of reasoning is, just how much such reasoning outrages both humanity and common sense.

I just observe this one point: since one can only be an accomplice knowingly, if I show there was no knowledge present, I show there was no complicity. This will not be difficult for me to prove.

First of all, as has been seen, no direct fact has been cited from which could be deducted that she had knowledge of Carbon's crime. We all know it is up to the accuser to gather together, around the subject of the accusation, a certain number of proofs, positive proofs capable of tearing down the jury's inner conviction.

For lack of positive proofs, a negative proof is made which says: "You refuse to



name the person who recommended Carbon to you; therefore it is Limoelan. And since it is Limoelan, you know the author of the crime. And since you know the author of the crime, you knew of the crime itself beforehand. And since the crime was known beforehand to you, you are an accomplice to the crime.

I have promised no longer to pay attention to the logic employed against Adelaide de Cicé. As worthy as she may be of inquisition, I regard her, for the moment, as a good person.

Well - how does this refusal to name the person who recommended Carbon to her, constitute proof against the sincerity of her affirmation?

Quite simply she told you that on 7 Nivose, at night, a person who was not Limoelan, a person whose innocence was as clearly proven to her as her own, told her that there stood at her door an unfortunate emigre whose papers were not in order and who needed shelter for only a few days.

The person had asked whether she could provide shelter. At that very moment there were in her home the two Gouyon women who resided with the nuns at St. Michel. She told them the request she had just received and urged them to take the man with them to St. Michel. The two Guyon women, believing - as she did - that they were assisting a simple emigre, consented. They found this man at the door, and took him with them. That is what she has unceasingly declared. And once again, no testimony has been given to contradict her statement.

But she does not name the intermediary person who came to her in Limoelan's behalf. What is her motive? She could have only one motive, so it is said, namely: the impossibility for her to name such an intermediary because he does not exist.

Now that you have met Adelaide de Cicé and that you know what she is capable of, when it is a question of doing what she believes good, I have the obligation to tell you that for her there is a more probable motive - generosity!

You recall this touching response she made: "By my great indiscretion, I have brought unhappiness to so many around me that I do not wish to add another unhappiness to reproach myself with. I do not wish included in this frightful trial an unfortunate person whose innocence I am as sure of as I am sure of my own, a person who has been deceived just as I have been".

No one could resist the ring of truth in her response! And looking upon those fatal courtroom benches, how could one not be convinced that she did not make up this excuse to serve her. Because who were those who surrounded her on those benches? Alas! It was not her accomplices.

The word "accomplice" is not suitable to describe the companions of her goodness; they were her victims! It was she herself, it was her imprudence which had disturbed the peaceful order of their days and caused them anguish. It was her imprudence which was sown around her and spread outrages, imprisonment and accusation against those who cherished her.

She had asked her unfortunate dressmaker to receive letters from her brother, Augustine de Cicé - and the dressmaker barely escaped being brought to trial. Breche her former servant, was asked by her to receive letters to her from her brother, the Bishop of Auxerre - and Breche was arrested! On her recommendation, the accused Duquesne received this man whom she believed to be an emigre, and, Duquesne this poor, respectable religious was torn from her community, and is now standing trial.

Finally, at her request the accused Madame Gouyon conducted this emigre to Madame Duquesne. Madame de Gouyon and her two daughters are undergoing, at this very moment, the humiliation of a criminal trial.

Those are the blows which have fallen on this profoundly sensitive soul. Amid this agony of sorrows, that have been consuming her for three months, those are the matters which have been more cruel for her than the suffering itself; those are the terrible circumstances which make the reasons for her silence only too believable.

The measure of her remorse, caused not by crimes which she committed, but by the wrong which she innocently did, was at its height. The burden seemed unbearable to her. Her generous soul, oppressed under this fatal weight, became indignant at the very idea of creating, once more, difficulties for one more person, for a person towards whom she might be bound by duties or sentiments, for a person whose good faith has been demonstrated to her. She cried out to herself, "There are enough unfortunate people around me who are suffering through my fault".

No, Citizen Jurors, that outcry is not the outcry of falseness. It is the cry of her heart. Your hearts have responded to it, and you are convinced of the truth of those motives.

## PART II

Citizen Judges and Citizen Jurors,

Yesterday I covered the greater part of the painful duty I must carry out.

First of all, I isolated from this cause the facts extraneous to the trial. I have proved to you that the fact of this correspondence with émigrés which - when viewed from afar and in abstraction - seemed to take on a kind of relevance to the charge, in reality, turned out to be nothing but an innocent exchange of letters with her brothers and her nephew. And perhaps, while speaking to you of her brothers, I should not omit telling you that all the while this correspondence was going on, Jerome de Cicé, former Archbishop of Bordeaux, was - from his place in exile - rendering homage to the laws of his native land and was sending to the faithful of his former diocese a pastoral letter declaring that the promise of fidelity which they were required to make to the state ministers of religious affairs did not in any way contradict the principle of the faith.

I have proven to you that, on the other hand, this correspondence which was irreproachable according to all reports, had, moreover, nothing to do with the accusation involved in the conspiracy of 3 Nivose.

I have pointed out for your observation a point of extraordinary importance, the point that the very name, Adelaide de Cicé, had not been mentioned in accounts of events prior to 3 Nivose, and that - of the sixty witnesses heard; not one had involved her name in those facts.

Then I added that, taking all the grievances of the act of accusations as verified, there remained nothing but the fact of having given asylum to a very guilty person. This fact could have become the source of grave reproach in the domain of morality, but it could never constitute a crime calling for the vengeance of the laws.

Then I entered upon the refutation of the various charges which attempted to establish that she had knowingly concealed Carbon from justice. I set forth the point of fact that she believed only that she was helping an emigre who was seeking to obtain his "free-circulation" papers but who was not sufficiently sure that he had all in order before presenting himself to police investigations.

I began by rejecting the supposition that Limoelan had spoken personally to her on 7 Nivose to recommend Carbon to her.

I found the first proof that it was not so in Adelaide de Cicé's very denial, since denials of accused persons must be evidence so long as the contrary is not proven. I found the second such proof in the absolute silence of the 62 witnesses, not one of whom gave a deposition of a conversation or meeting between Limoelan and Adelaide de Cicé.

On that occasion, I was speaking of Adelaide de Cicé's refusal to name the person other than Limoelan who had recommended Carbon to her. And I explained her refusal by the very unhappy events of which she had been the innocent and involuntary cause and to which events she did not wish in any way to add.

I had reached this point in the defense when the exhaustion of the strength and attention span of all who had followed the long debate began to impose on me the necessity of putting an end to the strain of this session. I continue now discussing the fact of the recommendation of Carbon, which according to the accusation Limoelan was to have made directly to Adelaide de Cicé.

This contact between Limoelan and Adelaide de Cicé, so they challenged me, was the result of a declaration by Carbon himself. Carbon had stated that Limoelan accompanied him to the door of a house, which he later supposed was the home of Adelaide de Cicé; that Limoelan had asked him to wait outside the house, on the street; that Limoelan had entered the house; that in a short time, he came out and announced to him, Carbon, that three women would be coming out whom he, Carbon, was to follow; that, indeed, three persons did come out; he approached them and they led him to the home of the accused Duquesne.

Thus, it was added, Limoelan's entrance into the house was followed, half an hour later, by Adelaide de Cicé's recommendation of Carbon which makes it impossible not to see that the second fact is the result of the first fact and that, therefore, Limoelan spoke to Adelaide de Cicé who should not deny it.

Nevertheless, she does deny it. She denies it strongly and emphatically. She denies that she saw Limoelan that day or even for a year previously or that she even knew that he had entered into the house.

She denies it, and she does not contradict Carbon. For neither Carbon nor any other person states that they saw Limoelan speaking with Adelaide de Cicé. But he did enter the house. That is possible.

The house contains 7 or 8 apartments, that is, a population of some 30 persons. Is it outside the realm of reality and possibility that Limoelan who was trying to find asylum for his accomplice, should have appealed in the same building, to another person with whom he might have had a more personal contact though

not in any way a criminal relationship? Is it not possible that he might have asked such a person to give asylum to an emigre for several days? Is it not possible that the person was obliged to refuse Limoelan, either because his apartment was too small or because of one of a hundred other reasons, all of them easy to imagine? Is it not possible that this person, seeing Limoelan distressed by the refusal, and wanting to grant his urgent request, should have transmitted the same request to Adelaide de Cicé without naming names in order not to make unnecessary confidences?

Indeed, since the kindness of heart and the good will of Adelaide de Cicé were so universally known that people came from the St. Marceau area to implore her help, is it so extraordinary that such goodness of heart and such good will were known to an inhabitant of her own building, a person who might have thought it easy to interest her in a man in adversity?

But if all that is possible, quite as possible as a direct communication between Adelaide de Cicé and Limoelan, by what rule of justice or humanity would one assume the second to be true rather than the first? Adelaide de Cicé does not prove her position; accusers, you do not prove yours either. Since she does not prove anything against you, who are not proving anything against her, should she be condemned? Will you condemn her on a negative proof, or on no proofs at all? What a system! Indeed! Since, inside that house with all its doors closed and far from all human observation, two different facts could have occurred - one accusing and the other justifying, - listen to humanity, to conscience and to reason which cry out to you: "It is the justifying fact which must be believed; reject the accusing fact."

On the other hand, why reject the accusing fact? Why defend Adelaide de Cicé so forcefully against the supposition of all contact with Limoelan? Citizens of the Jury, it is because I must do so, out of respect for the truth which must be transmitted to you pure and unaltered; because it is just not within the power of Adelaide de Cicé to act falsely; because she cannot say she saw Limoelan when she actually did not see him.

That is why she denies personal communication with Limoelan, even though there would be no need to deny it if it did exist.

I do, in fact, suppose that Limoelan, who had had occasion to see her once or twice the year before, was advised to take advantage of her beneficent simplicity, of her universally known compassion which led her to make herself helpful to all who suffer. I am supposing that, seizing on that happy idea, he appealed to her, recalling that he was from the same area of the country as she; that he had the honor to have seen her several times ten or twelve months ago. And finally, coming to the point of his visit, he would have described for her, with great earnestness, the embarrassment of one of his friends, an émigré,

exposed to the possibility of being arrested because his status was not yet regularized; and finally, he would have convinced Adelaide de Cicé to give her recommendation to that émigré. Well then, would this agreement given to Limoelan, who was deceiving her, make her an accomplice of the criminal act with which Limoelan's frightful protégé soiled himself?

And how could she have become the accomplice of a crime of which Limoelan did not hesitate to speak to whomever it is supposed he did speak.

But what witnesses state that Limoelan did not reveal everything to the person from whom he wished to obtain asylum for Carbon?

And what witnesses state the contrary?

And why, then, always obstinately insist that everything which has not been proved for the accused might be proved against the accused?

Nevertheless, do you want witnesses? You have some unimpeachable ones.

They are not men. Men often tell falsehoods for their own interests, their own prejudices or their own passions.

Ours, on the other hand, are inflexible and never lie. They hold to the necessity that a fact be what it is. To know what Limoelan said, we must see what he was, invincibly, led to say.

Limoelan is guilty, Carbon is guilty. The police pursue them. Limoelan wants to hide Carbon, and dreams of means for causing the police to fail. He thinks of possibly "placing" his accomplice in a respectable home, where the host-person is above all suspicion because of having a character beyond reproach and because of being aloof from political affairs.

By the very virtues of the host, the plot will be all the better concealed.

Limoelan started off with that idea. And let us say, he approached Adelaide de Cicé. What will this man tell her, this man who, it appears, is supposed to possess a certain intelligence? Nobody heard what he said. We are thus reduced to conjecturing. Well, what must he have said to her? What! - that it was he who had hatched the plot of 3 Nivose, that he had a very large part in that abominable deed; that Carbon was his accomplice; that it was Carbon who prepared the horrendous explosive; and that it was Carbon, the person involved whom he (Limoelan) was suggesting that Adelaide de Cicé cover with the shield of her virtue and receive into a shelter which up to that time had not been soiled by even the thought of a crime!

What an absurdity! And where was the need for making such a confidence?

And since when do criminals shout from the rooftops the evils they commit? Was this a secret which could be confided lightly? Far from its being necessary to make such a confidence in order to obtain asylum for his dear Carbon, it was necessary - in this situation - not to make such a confidence. The real means of disgusting the person of whom Limoelan was seeking fulfillment of his request was to reveal to that person how dangerous it was to accept Carbon in such circumstances. And who would not have recoiled in horror, as Adelaide de Cicé would have done, in the face of such a confession and in the presence of the two monsters seeking hospitality in the name of such a crime?

She would indeed have recoiled in terror at the very thought of allying herself in any way with men who, the very next day, might be seized by justice which was on their trail - and which could also seize their hosts, as having become their confidants.

No matter whom he might have approached, Limoelan could not have confided anything. It would have been superfluous; it would have missed its point; it would have been contrary to his own interest. Also, we see that all the accused - Madame Duquesne, the two de Guyon women, and Mlle. de Cicé have all affirmed, in a unanimous declaration, that Carbon presented himself as an emigre. Carbon himself stated that Limoelan had strongly urged him to tell his hosts that he was an émigré. This is incontestable proof that Limoelan wished to deceive everybody. And whether he spoke to Adelaide de Cicé or to another person he would have confided only that Carbon was an émigré.

She would have, in her manner of thinking, procured asylum for an émigré. Indeed! I know very well that there was a time of odious memory when even something less than that would have been sufficient to lead a person to the scaffold.

But I also know that we are now living under the rule of the constitution of the Year VIII under the Consulate of Bonaparte.

I further know that such an offense, has nothing in common with the otherwise really grave crime which now occupies you. In present circumstances this offense would hardly be worthy of your attention. She provided asylum for an emigre! In order to judge this crime well, let us descend into our own hearts.

I dare ask this of your consciences, Citizen Jurors: in this debate you have just learned how dangerous it can be sometimes to yield to the movements of compassion. Well, if this very night an unfortunate person, whom nothing would disclose as a guilty person, were to present himself to you as a persecuted

person, as a man unjustly inscribed on the death list... I understand you, enlightened now by the distressing experience of this trial, perhaps even wary because of your respect for the laws in this struggle between legal principles and prudence against the insinuations of your sensitivity! You would be very wise men, citizens austere enough to want your heart to be silent in the presence of the laws. And certainly it would be necessary to praise you for such obedience to discipline.

But the request has been addressed to a woman, to a woman more accessible to pity than are men; to a woman less prepared by her sex, for that dry austerity of morality which belongs to the other sex; to a woman less able to apply reason to the generous movements of her heart; to a woman, finally, who had not yet had the fatal experience of all the risks she could run by being, without doubt, generous to a fault. Would you be unjust enough to make a crime of that weakness which is honorable in principle although unfortunate in its effects?

And finally that woman is Adelaide de Cicé, who has formed a long habit of good deeds. You have not forgotten the incident of the poor man from Luxemburg. It was related to you by one of the witnesses, who himself had aided Adelaide de Cicé in taking to her home an unfortunate person dying of starvation and covered with sores. She kept that man at her home for several days, during which time she gave him her best possible attention in obtaining new clothes and in helping him. Had' she informed herself about who he was? No. He was poor and abandoned by everybody. That was all she needed to know. Neither her heart nor her mind asked any more. And, after all that, if you deign, Citizen Jurors, to reconcile Adelaide de Cicé's motivation in this matter with the position of her own life, you will more easily understand how forcefully that motivation must have influenced her will.

It was an unfortunate emigre who was recommended to her. What an impact that word, emigre, must have impressed on the mind of Adelaide de Cicé. She must have said to herself, "Alas! My three brothers, my sister, my sister-in-law, my nephew and all his family are also banished persons. Perhaps at this very moment, affected by other circumstances, they also are condemned to run away and to beg asylum! How I would bless the good and compassionate person who would receive them in their misfortune! How painful it would be for me to learn that they encountered only un pitying hearts! No! My heart will not be without compassion for a misfortune like theirs! I shall treat this unfortunate person whom I have been implored to help as I would wish that everywhere my sad family would be helped. Delve again into your consciences, Citizens of the Jury; listen to its whisper, then pronounce your decision.

But it can be objected: It was only a short while since the crime of 3 Nivose had been committed. Must not Adelaide de Cicé have harboured as regards the man



recommended to her, the suspicion that he could have been one of the authors of the crime?

No, she could not conceive such a suspicion.

We must first of all agree that, for several years, too many men had been forced to hide. They were not scoundrels. Because we have been used to coming across innocent fugitives among us, we ought continually to leave it open to question whether those who flee are guilty ones.

If this suspicion had arisen in Adelaide de Cicé's thought, it would have quickly been dissipated because of the character of the person who had recommended the emigre to her.

It would necessarily have been dissipated by the recommendation of Limoelan himself if one remains obstinate in believing that Limoelan saw Adelaide de Cicé.

Citizen Jurors, you have not forgotten the first opinion which was circulated about the authors of the crime of 3 Nivose. It was an opinion skillfully disseminated, perhaps, by the true culprits. That opinion attributed the heinous crime to the Jacobins<sup>18</sup> and the action and its means were indeed worthy of them. Everybody was wrong in that opinion - the government itself has proclaimed it; all minds were imbued with that idea. Well! Amid the torrent of this opinion which prevailed among everyone, - including Adelaide de Cicé - could she for an instant have supposed that an insurgent who had received amnesty, that a royalist, that Limoelan, was interested in the cause of the guilty person, that is - the cause of a person belonging to a party so different from his own? Limoelan's intervention served only to prevent the suspicion from taking root in Adelaide de Cicé because it was difficult to conceive that Limoelan would be protecting a Jacobin.

Moreover, without a doubt the attention of the magistrates charged with public safety was incessantly directed towards that crime and the desire to discover its authors. But such was not the case with individuals. Individuals had shared the first horror of the magistrates. They continued to share with them the deep horror which the frightful event had inspired. But once the first moment of stupor had passed, - and such a moment is not of long duration in the national character - attention was allowed to be diverted.

Add to this the fact there was a quite natural manner of explaining Carbon's embarrassment by considering him an emigre so it was not necessary to go far afield to seek other terrible suppositions when close by there existed some very

---

<sup>18</sup> Translator's Note: Jacobins were the ultra-radicals in the French Revolution.

innocent ones. It was known that the crime of 3 Nivose had given - indeed must have given - a great impulsion to police surveillance. Thus, as a result of this event, some men who had nothing to do with the crime must have been exposed to being questioned. In seeking the guilty ones, the police - as was their duty - scrutinized everybody. Those who might have been in the same situation as Carbon - that is, innocent of the crime, but lacking the necessary papers and therefore unable to face scrutiny by the police - would have been obliged to keep themselves out of sight. Therefore, Carbon's conduct was self-explanatory. And his conduct could be explained with such simplicity that one would need a really morbid imagination to poison or even refute the circumstances surrounding him.

Let us conclude that it is impossible to deny the irresistible proof that Adelaide de Cicé was the first person deceived by the fable of Carbon's being an émigré. Probabilities indicate that she was deceived, just as the interests of Carbon and Limoelan had required; just as both the character and interests of Adelaide de Cicé do prove. Without surrendering her principle or compromising her position, she could well have aided an unfortunate and insignificant person. Yet, if it had not been horror and duty, it would at least have been self-interest and personal motivation that would have made her draw back in horror from the proposal of giving a hiding place to a monstrous criminal, whom she had never seen and who - as a return for her hospitality - could involve her in the most odious kind of court trial.

The government's commissioner stated that it is very difficult to believe that the measure to provide shelter for Carbon had not been made in advance.

This assertion stunned me.

Citizens of the Jury, you have religiously followed all the details of this debate. I dare to say that they left an impression on you too, quite the contrary impression.

Above all, you have observed that before going to rue Notre-Dame des Champs, where he was lodged, Carbon - according to his own testimony - had been taken by Limoelan to rue Cassette. It was eight o'clock at night and the weather was frightful.

Now, if all eventualities had been foreseen and prepared; if in advance it had been agreed that the accused Duquesne woman would give shelter to Carbon; why then, at that hour, and in that bad weather, the useless detour and procedure, when it was so simple - since everything had been arranged - to use directly the shortest way without exposing to further view a man whom it was important to hide from all eyes? It is evident that if they made a detour under such critical circumstances, it was because they did not know where to go; and

that they did not know where to go because they had made no arrangements with anyone.

But was it not also a useless risk for Madame de Gouyon and her two daughters to be there so handily to accompany Carbon.

For, first of all, if the place of shelter had been agreed upon in advance, Carbon would have gone there directly and without persons to introduce him.

Then, if it had been thought necessary to provide him with a guide, precaution would have been taken against giving him three of them. The mother alone would have been sufficient. With the mother sufficient, what necessity was there, therefore, to call the two daughters? Why these two additional confidants in a crime whose revelation was so much to be feared? Finally, why run the risk of the indiscretion of two extra witnesses who had no motive? The number three has said everything. Since the de Gouyon ladies were three in number, and since one would have been sufficient and perhaps even too much, their appearance is proof that it was not pre-arranged; it is proof that it was by chance.

Another circumstance, likewise noted in the debate, succeeds in proving that nothing had been pre-arranged, nothing had been prepared. Carbon is brought by the de Gouyon ladies to the home of the accused woman Duquesne. He arrives at this place of asylum which is supposed to have been prepared for him. Therefore, he must have been expected there; his room should have been ready for him. As far as he himself was concerned, he had nothing else to do but quickly to enter this arranged hiding-place and there to disappear from all eyes.

He arrives. The de Gouyon ladies hasten to transmit to Madame Duquesne the recommendation of Mlle. de Cicé.

Everything has been prepared: and there is no room available, nor a bed made. Everything has been prepared: and the accused woman Duquesne is not able to receive him that night. So that, without the compassion of Madame de Gouyon (moved by the frightful weather, she decided to have a bed prepared for him in the vestibule of her suite) Carbon the man who was expected and whose hideout had been prepared in advance, would have been obliged to sleep on the street.

I ask of your conscience and your reason, is it not demonstrated that Carbon was not expected; that asylum had not been prepared for him in advance; and that therefore when Adelaide de Cicé said that she had never heard anything about Carbon until the day when he was brought by the accused Gouyon women to the house of the accused woman Duquesne, she was telling the truth on this point as on all others!

Another grievance has been raised against Adelaide de Cicé. It is said that she gave Carbon a letter which it is claimed was from Limoelan; therefore she had Limoelan's confidence and she knew what crime Carbon had committed.

What a bizarre manner of reasoning that is! I can dismiss it immediately.

You have heard, Citizen Jurors, Adelaide de Cicé's statement on this point. She has never changed it. She has always formally given assurance that she did not give any letter to Carbon. Carbon has stated the contrary. It will be your task to decide who merits more confidence. Carbon or Adelaide de Cicé. It will be your task to see whether it did not matter a great deal to Carbon not to divert the attention from someone who was dearer to him.

But yet I will again suppose that this last grievance is as stated and admit that Adelaide de Cicé did hand over that letter to Carbon. What am I to induce from that?

Recall the kind of day it was when Adelaide de Cicé saw Carbon; deign to recall that she believed she was obliging not a monster of villainy, but an emigre.

From that, was it not possible after she had been led to obtain asylum for Carbon out of deference to the person who had recommended him to her, that the error into which she had been led plus her continually misguided good faith were used to pass a letter to the same Carbon? And from that, must one draw the conclusion that she knew Carbon and his crime? No, without a doubt.

In handing over that letter, she would have obeyed the same spirit motivating her when she obtained shelter for him: she would have been acting in the circle of the same error. And the shelter provided and the letter handed over would not constitute two wrongs worsening each other. They would constitute one and the same wrong explained by the same circumstances. Besides, Citizens of the Jury, you will be given this letter to examine: on looking at it materially, one point will strike you at once: it was sealed with wax. Whosoever had been the person entrusted to deliver the letter was not in the confidence of the one who gave it.

Do you wish a stronger proof? The very content of the letter will furnish it to you. You will see that the writer of the letter urges Carbon, with great insistence, to trust nobody but himself.

But if Limoelan was writing to Carbon to trust nobody but himself, and only himself, he therefore had no confidant.

If the bearer had indeed been a confidant, Limoelan would not have failed to tell Carbon "Do not trust anyone but me and the person who will give your this

letter". He told him the opposite; he didn't even believe that he had done enough in having given this advice to Carbon in the first place. He soon returned to that subject with uneasiness and he more forcefully repeated his thought by adding, "Do not trust even your friends, nor my friends nor his friends!"

But this is the testimony of the writer of the letter himself - and most certainly such testimony is not suspect; testimony: that he held nobody in his confidence; that he trembled lest Carbon commit an indiscretion; that he suggested to Carbon to use the greatest precautions in order not to be shown up by the women whose human kindness was assisting him. Ah! doubtlessly, Citizens of the Jury, he had good reason to distrust all these women, weak and credulous, but also virtuous, all these women moved by compassion, but also enemies of crime, women who believed that they had only obliged an unfortunate fellow and who were far from suspecting that they had among them such a great culprit.

I have said enough about this grievance and I pass now to the final grievance of all.

In Adelaide de Cicé's desk, a pouch was found. Unless I am mistaken it might have contained from one hundred twenty to one hundred twenty-five francs. The total varies, but it is quite close to the amount I have mentioned. The pouch bore a label which read, "Purse for the gentlemen". A person with a suspicious imagination was intrigued by that label. And since that same imagination, apparently, had recently converted the pious phrase "conquer or die" into a rallying-sign of some sort, it was easy to read "Purse for the gentlemen" as "Purse for the Chouans"; and thus that pouch with its one hundred twenty-five francs, was forthwith designated the treasury of the Chouans.

It must be admitted that such a hoard of money was not enough to pay for many crimes. It must also be admitted that the dismal translator of that fatal label was not too careful about his suppositions.

Nevertheless, if that dismal person - instead of concentrating exclusively on that treasure of one hundred twenty-five francs without any explanation, had deigned to direct his attention to the objects surrounding that treasure, he would have seen there thirteen or fourteen other similar treasures, that is - thirteen or fourteen little packets of money (as is recorded in the search-warrant) totaling eighteen hundred francs and each one bearing a different label. One particular packet was labeled "My money" it belonged to Adelaide de Cicé. One packet was labeled "money of so-and-so"; it contained a collection taken for a poor man, father of a family. Another packet, ticketed as "Marie-Anne Dolson's money" contained a small amount belonging to a poor sick woman confined to a nursing home. Adelaide de Cicé used to visit her there. On leaving for that home, the woman had wanted Adelaide de Cicé to hold her

meagre savings.

For an attentive observer, the label "Purse for the gentlemen" ceases to be so alarming, for it was among so many other peaceable and pious labels. Thus, the "Purse for the gentlemen" - far from being the hoard of brigands, of Chouans and assassins, was merely the sum total of a collection made for two priests who were distributing temporal and spiritual aid to the poor in the Salpetriere (an Asylum for aged and mentally affected women.)

That modest pouch provided by the kindness of Catholic persons therefore served for alms and for the expenses of church services at the Asylum, where Adelaide herself frequently went to bring to the sick the charity of her care and consolation.

The two priests themselves recipients of that collection, have appeared before you. Other witnesses, some of whom contributed to those purses, have also been heard by you. All testimonies agreed with Adelaide de Cicé's statements. The fact is, therefore sufficiently clarified. To insist on it any longer would, I fear, be an insult to your intelligence.

This charge was all the more absurd, since it was not backed by even the slightest clue.

Adelaide de Cicé was not seeing any Chouans.

Had she seen any, she certainly would not be any more criminal for that. And where would we be now in post-Revolution times if this odious name-calling, if these odious demonstrations persisted, demonstrations which the government has urged all our people to forget in order to unite under one banner in an inviolable and real fraternity. Such name-calling divides all the citizens, preventing renewed relationships with those who in good faith have come back to full love of their mother country. Adelaide de Cicé, therefore, could have quite innocently seen some Chouans. She might have had some renewed relations with people from her native area. But she was living a retired life. What might have happened did not happen. She saw nobody.

All her papers were seized: even the most secret ones, even those relating to matters of conscience and religion. Among those papers, not a single letter from a Chouan was found; nor in any one of them was the name of a Chouan mentioned. Sixty-two witnesses were heard: not one declared that Adelaide belonged to the Chouan party nor that she saw their chiefs and defenders.

In this total absence of proof on each of the counts constituting the accusation against Adelaide de Cicé, there was surely no need that her wholly respectable moral character be pushed to the point of suspicion.

But it was my obligation to render to you an account of Adelaide de Cicé's conduct in the different periods of her life.

You have seen that she constantly cultivated virtue, and it is because she always loved virtue that she finds herself implicated in this cruel trial. The monsters who abused her simplicity and her kindness needed a hideaway which they believed human justice would never find.

They indeed felt that the more respectable the veil behind which they would hide, the less suspicion they would attract. They needed an innocent accomplice, who by her love of good order, by her habitual practice of what is good and useful, by her overall admirable qualities would, in some way, make even the police divert their attention from her.

They acquired this virtuous accomplice by a ruse and deceit on their part; and through the kindness, the compassion and the good opinion that others had of Adelaide de Cicé. They unworthily deceived virtue, and that virtue extended its hand to crime, thinking it was stretching it out to misfortune.

But virtue - even though it was the victim of malice or of its own error - still remains virtue. Adelaide de Cicé's virtue was without blemish. The public avenger himself, despite the severity of his ministry, could not prevent himself from rendering homage to that virtue. Only - he did say that there had been examples when religious virtue had degenerated into fanaticism which was capable of the greatest excesses, or that virtue could hide a base hypocrisy capable of preparing a crime in secret.

Could it therefore be necessary that I attack one or the other of these vilifying suppositions?

Adelaide de Cicé - a fanatic!

It suffices, Citizens of the Jury, to observe her deportment in this matter in order to destroy the very germ of that idea.

When on religious principle, a fanatic has committed a grave crime, he does not hide it or disown it. He takes glory in it!

This is what the annals of history have shown.

When Jacques Clement and Ravallac had just struck the leader of a great people; when Charlotte Corday, driven by fanaticism of another order, had just taken the life of a man whose very name recalls the name of cruelty in delirium, they each proclaimed their crimes publicly and asked for the death penalty as an honor or recompense. The religious fanatics cry out, "I am the murderer of the tyrant. I have immolated him to my God. Prepare your torture. Bring on

your executioners. I long to receive the immortal palm of martyrdom. I long to go to savor the fruits of my glorious deed in the heart of the one who inspired that action in me".

That is the language of fanatics. Is it the language of Adelaide de Cicé?

She defends herself with horror at the idea that though she had not participated in the crime, she had applauded it. If she had taken some part in this hateful crime through a horrible exaggeration of religious ideas, she would be honored by her action or she would not be rational in her fanaticism.

But then is she not, at any rate, a hypocrite?

Citizen Jurors, I am not ignoring the fact that in these recent times we have seen some men who in the past - we suspected were of little piety suddenly becoming politically devout. In the case of some of them, we could easily believe that their doubtful conversion to a religion which had hardly existed for them till then was motivated less by love for that religion than hatred for the revolution which had threatened to wipe them out.

But do observe carefully the conduct of these posthumous hypocrites: they unmask themselves through the contradiction between what they say and what they do. In the temples, showing genuflections; in their homes, egotism and pride; at the foot of the altars, ashes and repentance and penitential sobs; all kinds of pleasures and sensual delights in their private haunts.

Those are the hypocrites.

But Adelaide de Cicé!

Was she a hypocrite when at twenty one years of age, surrounded by all kinds of attractions, she resisted the enchanting voice of pleasures in order to go into the most disgusting poverty-stricken areas and bring to those languishing there her assistance and her fortune; her most devoted care and her precious consolations. Why would she then be considered a hypocrite? And against whom was she preparing to conspire thirty years ago?

Was she a hypocrite when she imposed upon herself in the name of religion all the privations of the cloister, yet remained in the world - not to give herself to its pleasures but to find there more occasions for doing good? Was she a hypocrite when, far from convents whose rules she followed without joining their membership, she did not give, even as food to her noble and impartial piety, the ambition of ecclesiastical dignities which it would have been so easy for her to obtain?

Was she a hypocrite when she placed her own bed beside the bed of her ailing



chamber-maid, giving an example of that Christian equality which is not so far, as is believed, from philosophical equality? She rendered to that woman - who had become her equal by her suffering - services which must have seemed very ridiculous in the eyes of the prejudiced persons of those times.

Was she a hypocrite when, up to the time of the Revolution, she compelled herself to live in poverty with her chamber-maid in a convent at six hundred pounds annual payment for board and lodging, to enable her to use the remainder of her fortune to assist needy individuals?

Was she a hypocrite when, at the Luxemburg Gardens, she picked up a poor man covered with vermin and rags; or when with touching fraternity she welcomed into her house that good woman from the St. Marceau area, whose wounds she herself dressed for more than two months; or when she gave her most patient and delicate cares to that janitor covered with sores that even the doctors themselves had not been able to heal?

Finally, was she a hypocrite or was she obeying political fanaticism when she sent help to a defender of the country, a young recruit, as his mother and sister testified yesterday?

No, Adelaide de Cicé is not a hypocrite. She is a woman who is truly religious. She is a woman whose example would make everybody worship in the Christian faith, if all who practiced it had known how to honor it as she did.

Citizen Jurors, this is the end of the defense which I was obliged to present to you. And let me be permitted to say this from the depths of my conscience: If there was anything in this whole matter, which might have seemed surprising to me, it was this: Amid all this testimony presented by incorruptible witnesses, amid the vast amount of evidence from all sides which emerged from Adelaide de Cicé's life to proclaim her innocence - that I should have needed to defend her at all. So that this escort of virtues which have always accompanied her could wipe away even suspicion from her, it required all the horror left behind by an assassination attempt which threatened our whole country, and as well all the compassion inspired by these touching victims of the assassination on whom I am gazing now.

Ah indeed! Let them be avenged! Who is the man so unfeeling that on seeing them, would not express that wish!

But it is in the name of these deplorable victims - none of whom,

I can assure you will raise a voice to deny it - that I say to you: "Avenge them with the blood of the guilty ones". But for them it would not be a vengeance, alas! It would be a new misfortune, an additional reason for mourning if - on

their behalf - the blood of innocent ones were mixed into the blood of the guilty ones.

The crime of 3 Nivose created orphans; restore to society the person who for thirty long years was the mother of all orphans.

That same crime created widows; restore to society the one by whom widows were assisted and consoled.

That crime created paupers; restore to society the one through whom there would no longer be one single poor person if it were within her power.

That crime created the maimed; restore to society the one to whom so many infirm and wounded persons owe the relief of their pain.

Finally, this crime even struck down the life of one of our brothers in arms. Return to society the one who - in her universal charity - knew how to make useful assistance reach out even to those who defend us.

Gentlemen of the Jury, I have sworn under oath to defend Adelaide de Cicé by respecting the truth. I swear it again: I have fulfilled my duty.

You have sworn an oath not to entertain any bias, and to absolve the innocent. You will fulfill your duty.

Mademoiselle de Cicé was acquitted.<sup>19</sup>

A striking coincidence attracts our attention and arouses prayer of thanksgiving. It was on January 19, 1801, the very day on which Pope Pius VII gave verbally to Father de Clorivière's envoys the first approbation of the Societies, that Adelaide de Cicé, accused in the plot, was arrested, together with Madame de Gouyon and her daughters, and Madame Duquesne.

---

<sup>19</sup> Extract from the trial of Adelaide-Marie de Cicé, copy made by Madame de Falaiseau, April 1867, (Archives of the Daughters of the Heart of Mary.)