

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I.

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1921.

Nos. 8 & 9.

The Vatican and Diplomatic Relationships.

PROF. TH. GRAEBNER, St. Louis, Mo.

There are at present thirty-one countries represented by embassies and legations at the Vatican, and the *New World* (Chicago, Roman Catholic) boasts that "the diplomatic influence of the Holy See is the greatest in the history of the Church"—a statement which can only refer to the extension of these diplomatic relationships and not to the exercise of actual temporal power involved. However, it must be conceded that the Curia has scored heavily during the political upheavals consequent upon the war. When France renews relations with the Vatican, — as now seems certain, — Italy alone, of all the principal countries of Europe, will be without a representative accredited to the Papal Court. A Catholic News Service dispatch of April 1 says: —

"The Vatican is in diplomatic relations not only with all of the great Catholic countries and most of the principal Protestant states of Europe, but has established at least semiofficial intercourse with Turkey, Japan, and China. All of the states which have arisen since the war — Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and Jugo-Slavia — have exchanged diplomatic representatives with the Holy See. Every country in South America, most of the Central American republics, and Haiti and San Domingo have legations at the Vatican. Canada is represented by Great Britain, whose temporary representative has been made permanent."

The British envoy was sent to the Vatican five years ago on a mission which was intended to be "strictly temporary," its object being "to congratulate the Pope on his election [!] and to keep him informed respecting British policy during the war," as the press announcements read at the time. When no longer needed for this purpose, the representation was to come to an end. But it is two years and a half since the war ended, and the envoy is still at

the Vatican. British opinion was never favorable to this move, which was made without the authorization of Parliament, and protests have recently been heard which call for a cessation of these official relations. The *Churchman's Magazine* says that the situation is "entirely contrary to the democratic principles which are supposed to prevail in Great Britain," and continues:—

"Moreover, the Prime Minister was recently asked about the matter in the House of Commons, and he affirmed that this unconstitutional traffic with the papacy would be maintained. He also intimated that in his judgment the mission had the approval of the nation.

"To convince the Prime Minister that this is not so, the United Protestant Council is making an appeal for the signatures of loyal British subjects to a petition for the withdrawal of the envoy, and for the following, among other reasons:

"1. Because it is contrary to the Constitution of this Realm as expressed in the Bill of Rights that the Sovereign shall hold communion with the Pope of Rome.

"2. Because the envoy is himself a Roman Catholic, and is therefore bound to place the policy of the Roman Curia above the interests of Great Britain.

"3. Because he has accomplished nothing for the political welfare of this country.

"4. Because, on the contrary, during the time that this envoy has been supposed to be influencing the Pope on behalf of England, the Pope's agents—bishops, priests, and people—have been displaying hatred of Britain, and working for her injury in Ireland, Canada, Australia, and wherever else they had the power.

"5. Because at a critical period of the war the interference of the envoy caused serious trouble, which embarrassed our relations with France, put us in a false position in the eyes of Germany, and might have had fatal consequences.

"6. Because by maintaining this mission our Government recognizes the false claims and pretensions of the papacy, gives a favored position to the Romish system which it accords to no other religion, and thereby deliberately insults the loyal Protestants of the whole empire."

The five new countries to exchange diplomatic representatives with the Vatican are Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Switzerland, Roumania, and Jugo-Slavia. In addition the legations of Peru, Chili, Brazil, and Prussia were raised to the rank of embassies. The representative from Prussia has the title of German Ambassador to the Vatican. The five countries which now have diplomatic representatives at the Vatican with the rank of ambassador are Peru, Chili, Prussia, Brazil, and Spain. The other countries represented with ministers are Argentina, Austria, Bavaria, Belgium, Bolivia, Columbia, Costa Rica, Czecho-Slovakia, Ecuador, Germany, Great Britain, Haiti, Honduras, Monaco, Nicaragua,

Holland, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, San Domingo, San Salvador, Jugo-Slavia, Hungary, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Each of the appointments was heralded to the American public by special cable. The following is a characteristic dispatch of the N. C. W. C. (Roman Catholic) news services:—

“EUROPE’S DIPLOMATS GATHER AT VATICAN.

“Rome, August 1. — Two more have been added to the long list of ministers accredited to the Vatican: Count Somszieh, the first Hungarian minister to the Holy See, recently appointed, was received Monday; and Dr. Jonescu, the new representative from Roumania, was received in formal audience on Thursday, when he presented his credentials. There was the usual ceremonial and private conversation with the Holy Father, after which Dr. Jonescu visited Cardinal Gasparri, Secretary of State, and then went to St. Peter’s to venerate the Tomb of the Apostles.

“Monsignor Natale Gabriel Moriondo, O. P., Bishop of Cuneo, has been named apostolic visitor to the new republic of Georgia, and departs about the middle of August for Tiflis, where he will reside. Monsignor Moriondo was formerly superior of the Dominican mission in Constantinople, and was consecrated in that city on July 5, 1914.”

The New World, August 13, 1920.

The successes of Vatican politics in Poland were frequently set forth in Roman Catholic cable letters, the good news culminating in a dispatch of February 6 (1921), which stated that the Polish diet had adopted on that date a resolution prescribing for the Polish president two qualifications — he must be a native of Poland, and he must be a Roman Catholic. In a letter to the *Lutheran* (Philadelphia), Rev. Dr. J. A. Morehead, commissioner of the National Lutheran Council in Europe, wrote (May 5, 1921):—

“When Poland came to adopt a constitution, articles were proposed which indicate the policy of the Vatican where it has the power. We go into details concerning the situation in order to set before our readers in specific form the present-day Roman doctrines of temporal supremacy. In America our religious liberty would not last long if an opportunity to restrict its present privileges is given.

“In the constitution of the Polish state — heretofore merely a project — the two articles referring to the Church read as follows: ‘Art. 117. The Roman Catholic Church, to which the majority of the population of Poland belongs, takes the first place. She rules by her own laws. The relation between this Church and the state is consolidated by a Concordate with the Pope. Art. 118. The question of the relation between the other confessions and the state will be settled by a statute law after hearing the suggestions of the different delegates.’

“The leader of the Roman Catholic party is a papal fanatic, who gives his views of the Protestant churches as follows: ‘The Protestant “so-called” churches are “church unions,” which are compelled to submit

their statutes to the minister for registration. The Roman Catholic Church alone is a Church in the full sense of the word, and has its own legislation.”

Dr. Morehead believes that the Protestant world should be thoroughly awake to the present activity of the Vatican's representatives among the various states. “Their success in Europe will embolden them everywhere, and Protestant America will be confronted the sooner with a class problem of unparalleled proportion, unless something is done to support the liberties of religious minorities in Europe.”

The *Lutheran* editorially, in commenting on this letter of Dr. Morehead's, points out the method consistently followed by the Roman Curia during the after-war period: “Finding certain states in the throes of revolution, where a very small help or hindrance will determine national permanency or destruction, the representatives of the Vatican make the best bargain they can — not for the individual constituencies of the people, nor for the interests and desires of the state, but for the power of Rome as a great ecclesiastical empire.”

The increase of political power which the Pope gained in Germany during the war and after is a case in point. The Vatican has had a nuncio in Munich since 1785. A second nunciature was established at Berlin last year. A clear-visioned writer in the *Reichsbote* (Dr. W. Dreising) makes this comment (June 18): —

“And what does this nuncio signify? In plain words, the nunciature means an absolute supervision (*Beaufsichtigung*) of Germany by Rome. No political measures that even remotely affect the interests of Catholics will hereafter be taken without the *placet* of the Pope. Of course, Rome is too shrewd to give and withhold publicly its opinions, but the fact remains as stated. And the worst of it is that the Roman censorship will insensibly be extended to German liberty, German law, German scholarship, while the Evangelical Church will be reduced to the *niveau* of a sect. Incredible though it may seem, I have received from Evangelical clergymen, to whom I expressed these fears, the answer: ‘The nuncio, — oh, we shall get rid of him again!’ Really? Oh, how little these people know Rome! What rivers of blood flowed during the Thirty Years' War that we might get rid of Rome, — and in vain. No, our poor fatherland will never again be delivered from the nuncio and the terrible hand of Rome. We lost the World War May 15” (the date of the nuncio's appointment to Berlin). “Everything imposed upon us by the Entente can be restored, repaired, though it take a century; but the establishment of the nunciature can never be redeemed.”

As a matter of fact, these papal legations in Protestant countries have, since the Reformation, been termed Missionary Nun-

ciatures, their object being the restoration of Roman ascendancy. In Bohemia and Poland this work was very thoroughly done, and the establishment of the office in Munich was the reply of the Vatican to the attempts made by Bishop Hontheim of Treves and of the Congress of Ems to establish a national Catholic Church for Germany.

In the United States, the efforts of the hierarchy to worm itself into a quasi-official relation to the National Government have in recent decades been crowned with considerable success. We have had field-masses, with official representation of the military, we have had the Pan-American Mass on Thanksgiving Day, and the annual recurrence of New Year receptions of Cardinal Gibbons at Washington. To this latter affair the name "Cardinal's Day" has been quite generally applied. Some years ago the *Christian Herald* contained an article by Prof. Dau commenting on Cardinal's Day, which stated the Protestant attitude over against this institution so excellently that we cannot, in this connection, forbear quoting from it. The salient portion of this article reads:—

"Now here comes the oldest American cardinal, oldest in years and office, and sets up his own New Year reception at our capital, and is delighted to see that in a manner his claim to recognition as a sovereign, 'a prince of the blood,' is granted; for some persons of official rank are there to greet him. They may persuade themselves, but they will not persuade millions of their fellow-citizens, that they came merely to greet a kind old gentleman or a personal friend, or to honor a great man. Mr. Gibbons has come to Washington not as Mr. Gibbons, but as the leading prelate of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. He and his people have noticed the presence at their 'Cardinal's Day' not of Mr. A., but Cabinet Member A.; not of Mr. B., but Ambassador B.; not of Mr. C., but of Justice of the Supreme Court C.; not of Mr. D., but of General D.; not of Mr. E., but of Admiral E.; not of Mr. F., but of Senator F.; not of Mr. G., but of Representative G., etc. None of these gentlemen, we imagine, would have gone to Baltimore to attend Cardinal's Day; therefore the accommodating Cardinal comes to Washington. The prophet has not risked calling the mountain to him, and has discreetly elected to go to the mountain. Moreover, this is preferable, because Baltimore is not the capital, while Washington is.

"Our officials and statesmen have our sympathy if they must attend these functions. If they imagine that their presence on Cardinal's Day or at a Pan-American mass is for any other purpose than stage effect and Catholic *renommée*, and that by far the greater portion of their intelligent and fair-minded fellow-citizens view their action in any other light, they are mistaken. Nor will the hue and cry about Protestant bigotry, violation of personal liberty, unwarranted constraint, and all that sort of thing, which is raised by Catholic papers and reechoed by a servile press whenever some one criticizes these sinister acts of the Roman hierarchy, deceive

any one who has watched the trend of Roman Catholic ambition in our country. It is not the critics of these affairs that are trying to constrain any one, or else we shall have to find unwarranted constraint in our Constitution. If there is any real constraint attempted in this matter, it must come from the other side."

Now, every encroachment of the Roman hierarchy in this country upon the forbidden ground of politics has had but one ulterior aim—the recognition of the Pope as a temporal ruler. Stone has been laid upon stone in the arch, of which a papal legation at Washington is to be the keystone. And it seems as if the present is deemed the acceptable time. A "closer union" between this Government and the head of the "great body of Catholicism" is being advocated. National interests are pleaded for American representation at the Vatican. President Harding has been "sounded." Mr. Egan, ex-minister of the United States to Denmark, "may be America's first minister to the Vatican." We are quoting from Associated Press dispatches. Catholic expressions, both in the official press and from the public rostrum, pointing out the advantages which will accrue to America from such an arrangement, have multiplied of late. Much is made of England's representation at Rome, as evidence that even its "Protestant bias" could not prevent Great Britain from recognizing the fact that "the Vatican is the world's greatest religious and moral influence." (*America*, a Jesuit weekly.) The National Catholic Welfare Council has sent out a dispatch bearing on the possibility of Washington's being the meeting-place of an international congress which is to discuss an "association of nations." Accepting this report as true, the dispatch says:—

"From this point of view the position of the Pope is one of commanding importance, and his approval of an association of nations which is to direct by moral rather than military force international activities would have great weight. And if the United States is to take the lead in the formulation of the broad general principles upon which the proposed association of nations is to be founded, the assumption is that exchanges of views between the President and the Vatican would be facilitated by the appointment of an American Minister to the Holy See without in any way transgressing upon the American ideal of complete separation of Church and State. The action of France has already pointed the way."

The Apostolic Delegate himself, John Bonzano, in a speech delivered at Quigley Preparatory Seminary, Chicago, last year, said:—

"And not the multitudes only are looking to the Pope for assistance; the rulers of the earth are beginning to see that without his aid they are

powerless in face of the present situation. They are at last giving heed to the call of the Psalmist: *'Et nunc, reges, intelligite; erudimini, qui judicatis terram.'*

"The heads of the new nations — those which have come into existence through the great upheaval — are seeking to establish relations with the Holy See. For even at the birth of their national organization they are wise enough to understand that they need the influence of the Holy Father if they are to live and prosper.

"But the older nations also are coming to see the light; they have learned through the bitter experience of war what they had forgotten in the pleasant days of peace. They acknowledge that there can be no thorough restoration of order and no permanent security of peace except through the cooperation of him who represents on earth the Prince of Peace."

In this way the Catholic masses are prepared to give, when the opportune moment comes, the weight of their numbers to the demand that diplomatic relations be established between the White House and the Vatican.

While evidently ready to support a new understanding between nations, such as the Republican platform calls for, the hierarchy has by no means remitted its efforts to employ the League of Nations (of the Versailles peace) as a leverage to obtain for the papacy recognition as a sovereign state. The partiality of the Roman See for this union of *entente* nations was very evident from its first organization. When the Italian delegates withdrew from the Peace Conference while the foundations for the League were being laid, the Vatican was "deeply concerned" (press dispatch from Rome, April 24, 1919). The interest which the hierarchy has in the League was set forth in 1920 by Senator Sherman of Illinois, who gave a warning that the League of Nations may end the separation of Church and State and bring the civilized world under the dominance of the Vatican. The Senator said: —

"From an early age the occupants of the Vatican have believed in the inherent right of papal authority to administer civil government, and I fail to find recorded in the course of papal claims of later dates any renunciation or disavowal of the doctrine.

"Of the original 32 nations signatory to the proposed league, 28 are Christian; 17 are Catholic nations, and 11 are Protestant.

"The sway over these people, their implicit faith in the infallibility of the head of this great religious organization, is supreme. I cheerfully bear witness to its steady opposition to a socialistic state, disorder, and Bolshevism. But the head of the Church proclaims and teaches his infallibility.

"Shall the United States commit itself to the mercy of a power from which our ancestors delivered us?"

"The Vatican is a most earnest advocate of the covenant of the League of Nations. On March 16, 1919, President Wilson conferred with the Vatican at Rome. The Pope among other things said, referring to the League of Nations: 'President Wilson put the matter so clearly that my doubts began to melt, and before our interview closed, I agreed with him on the main outlines of his plan.'"

Then adds the Senator ironically: "Miraculous conversion of the deep traditional wisdom of the Holy See!"

As recently as March 11, 1921, the *New World* of Chicago (Catholic) brought an inspired message from Geneva, dated February 25, to this effect: —

"The *Courier de Geneve* of February 5, 1921, publishes a letter sent last December by the Nuncio at Berne to the President of the Swiss Confederation with regard to the intervention of the League of Nations in favor of the Christians of Cilicia. The paper sees in this step an act of official recognition and approval of the League of Nations by the Holy See, and believes that this attitude of Benedict XV will be an encouragement to all Catholics to give it their support.

"The paper regrets that the Holy See was not invited at the very beginning to form part of the League of Nations and that it has no representative there, and expresses the hope that the heads of the League finally will realize the error committed in excluding from the new organization an authority which enjoys such universal consideration and veneration as the Pope."

The Roman Curia has scored heavily since August 2, 1914. Not since pre-Reformation days has it been permitted to surround itself with so many representatives of the nations. There is, indeed, a fly in the ointment. These ambassadors and ministers represent, at least in great part, countries which have with the expenditure of much blood and treasure purchased religious freedom, but, then, the memory of men is short, and — does not the League of Nations, or some other association of nations hold out to the Curia a promise of obtaining, by a skilful balance of national hatreds, fears, and jealousies, that which cannot be gained by direct influence on peoples and governments? And is there not a possibility that even the League is a means which will only temporarily be utilized as a leverage, and that in the recesses of the palace on Mons Vaticanus plans are being laid for world-conquest through new wars and revolutions?

Dr. Jaeger of Bethel in the Bielefelder weekly *Licht und Leben* has uttered some prognostications on this point which are worthy of our attention. The Evangelical house of Hohenzollern, Dr. Jaeger reminds us, has been excluded by the League from the throne of Germany, and this exclusion is to be a permanent one.

On the other hand, nothing is said in the treaty which would prevent the Catholic house of Hapsburg from mounting that throne, or the throne of a Germany united with Austria. Dr. Jaeger then continues:—

“A Catholic Germany under Hapsburg rule would constitute a nucleus for a Europe constituted on new lines. In the East there would be the State of Greater Poland, consisting of Posen, West Prussia, East Prussia, Lithuania, White Russia, and Galicia. This Greater Poland is to be ruled by another Hapsburger, Archduke Stephen. Its actual ruler would, of course, be the (Polish) Jesuit General, Ledochowsky. There is even now a movement looking to the reestablishment of the old Austrian monarchy. The *Petrusblætter* and *Koelnische Volkszeitung* have suggested that Lower Austria with Vienna would be the economic nucleus for a union of the Danube countries, *i. e.*, of Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Roumania, and the Croat-Slovenian state. The population of this new bloc would be preponderatingly Catholic, Roumania at least under a Catholic dynasty. This Donaubund, too, is to have its Hapsburgian head, at Vienna. In France a restoration of diplomatic relations with the Vatican is hoped for. The great French generals, Foch, Joffre, Castelnau, have received their training in Jesuit schools. The house of Bourbon is closely related to Hapsburg, Empress Zita being herself a Bourbon. There is here the possibility of a Catholic monarchy of the West. Belgium is thoroughly clerical, so far as it is not socialistic. A Catholic restoration in France would inevitably result in a similar change in Italy. In Spain there is even now a Hapsburger scion on the throne. A *United States of Europe under papal dominion*, that is the possibility which the League of Nations convention in Switzerland has revealed to us. But the papal aspirations are not limited to a European league. Beyond the seas, in South and Central America, a complex of states, Spanish-Portuguese in language, Catholic in religion, is rapidly coming to the front. Through papal mediation, the leading states, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, have formed the so-called ABC union. Papal diplomacy is now endeavoring to extend this organization so as to include all South American states, and this solid bloc, the so-called Latin Union, which will extend to the southern boundaries of the North American states, will not fail to maintain some kind of organic relation to the European. From South America the threads run over to Japan, and quite recently the Vatican has greatly strengthened its relations to the Near East,—relations which may exercise a deciding influence in a coming conflict of the Catholic League with the Anglo-Saxon world. World-wide, bold schemes, maintained through every change and accident, and approaching their realization! Will the Anglo-Saxon nations succeed in opposing them? Will a world-wide revolution bring them to ruin? God knows. His will be the decision.”

The *Freikirche*, from which we have translated Dr. Jaeger's paragraph, adds the comment: “These prognostications are, it is true, based only on supposition. But, for all that, they must not be dismissed by a wave of the hand. The Pope is pursuing his

plans with iron will and unremitting persistence. And he has his obedient servants in every part of the world, — more than two hundred million.”

That world-dominion is the hope of the Vatican, who can doubt? What will be the outcome? God knows, — His will be the decision. But we would add, — He has decided. If we read Scripture and history aright, Antichrist was forever dethroned through the work of Martin Luther. Never again will he be able to crush out the light of the Gospel — for this is his aim, and temporal dominion only a means. Never again will he tyrannize over the body of the Christian Church. But what contests must be fought that our Evangelical liberties may be preserved, what rivers of blood may flow before the plottings against the Lord and His Church will be defeated — who can tell? *Das Reich muss uns doch bleiben.*
