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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to indicate the attitude of the American press toward the exhortations, decrees, and world policies of His Holiness Pope Pius XI during the years of his pontificate, 1922 to 1939. Selected journals of opinion having different political and social sympathies were chosen in order to give as complete a view as possible to such an extensive period. Where certain papers lacked evidence, others were used to fill in a balanced picture, or it was possible to judge from negative evidence.

The study was based mainly on six journals. The Nation and the New Republic were chosen for the liberal view, the American Mercury and the Christian Science Monitor for the opinions of the right, while the New York Times and Time represent a center position.¹ These were thought to give a reliable cross-section of opinion.

The period covered was one filled with important events for the modern world. The papacy again took its place as part of that world, and the reaction of the press to the reawakening is interesting to note. It was also

¹The New York Times was especially helpful in providing a chronology of events. Both the documents and the secondary sources used provided needed background for the study. Notes on the policies of newspapers and magazines were gathered from Edwin Emery and Henry L. Smith, The Press and America (New York, 1954); Theodore Peterson, Magazines in the Twentieth Century (Urbana, 1956); Alan P. Grimes, The Political Liberalism of the New York Nation (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1953); Roland E. Wolseley, The Magazine World (New York, 1951).
a time of social upheaval and the voice of the Church joined in the dis-
cussions concerning justice and charity between man and his neighbor. Commu-
nism and Fascism struggled for the victory of their ideology in the world.
Over such a distressed fold Pius XI was elected to rule.
CHAPTER I

HABEMUS PAPAM

On February 6, 1922, after fifteen days of intense waiting and speculation, Cardinal Bisleti appeared on the outer loggia of St. Peter's and shouted to the gathered crowds: "I announce to you a great joy. We have a Pope. It is the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Cardinal Ratti, who has taken the name of Pius XII."¹

The post-war world, enveloped in disarmament discussions, world conferences, and revisionist theories, turned its attention for a moment to the papal election. The segment of the American press which noticed the event announced it enthusiastically, it was ignored by hostile journals and all were hesitant to predict policies of the new "liberal" pope. Editors looked back upon the career of Achille Ratti to discover his qualifications for the leadership of three million Catholics. They found a scholarly priest, a learned librarian, yet an outdoor man who had won fame as a mountain climber. Newspaper biographies told that Achille Ratti was born in a weaver's household in Desio, a suburb of Milan, May 30, 1857. He was educated in the seminary in Milan, returned there after ordination to teach, entered the Ambrosian Library in Milan in 1888, and remained there for more than twenty years while continu-

ing pastoral work, eventually becoming head of the library and leaving it only
to become Prefect of the Vatican Library in Rome in 1914. Benedict XIV sent
him in 1918 as Visitor to Poland and he later became Nuncio to that country.
There he was credited with displaying "such remarkable tact and diplomatic
skill and even heroism that he played quite a leading part in the final settle-
ment of both the political and ecclesiastical difficulties which surrounded the
birth of the new republic." He was made Archbishop of Milan in April 1921 and
Cardinal two months later. Within the year he had become the two hundred and
sixty-first pope.

The incident most enlarged upon by the editorials was the significance of
the benediction from the outer balcony. Pius XI gave his first blessing, not
from inside St. Peter's where it had been given since 1870 when Pius IX had
become a voluntary prisoner of Vatican walls, but from the outer loggia to the
throne in the square. It was a breaking of precedent from which many prophe-
cies concerning the solution of the "Roman Question" could be drawn. Using
its own opinion, the Literary Digest declared: "by shattering the precedent
in his first official act, the new Pontiff seemed to press and people to be

2"Pius XI", Literary Digest LXXII (February 18, 1922), p. 11. This
journal was considered a clipping service for public opinion. Both views of
a topic were given and a high standard of unbiased news was presented. Peter-
son, p. 640. (Whenever possible, sources were sought for entire context of
Digest's article. Only when this was impossible was the Digest used as a
source.) For biographical sources of Pius XI see: Browne-OLP, L., Pius XI,
Apostle of Peace; Clonmore, Pope Pius XI and World Peace (New York 1938);
Dailey, E.V., Pius XI, Pope of the People (Chicago, 1937); Hughes, Philip,
Pope Pius XI (New York, 1938).

3Ibid.
setting the keynote of his pontificate.\textsuperscript{4} Whereas the opinion of the Independent and Weekly Review was that the act betokened "his intention to continue the late Pope Benedict's policy of discreet friendliness toward the Quirinal,"\textsuperscript{5} in March, the American Review of Reviews was able to draw the conclusion that "he and the Italian government are anxious to come to terms" but that "the details of the arrangements are still unsettled."\textsuperscript{6} The reconciliation was also discussed by Outlook\textsuperscript{7} and Living Age which noted the "profound impression" the public benediction had on the Italian people and marked it as "an event in history."\textsuperscript{8}

Discussing the personality and personal ability of the Pontiff, the papers joined in very favorable editorial comment. The New York Globe enthusiastically expressed: "The more we learn about Pius XI, recently Cardinal Achille Ratti, the better we like him. He is not only a conciliator, a holder of the middle ground who will be able to reconcile extremists, but a man of

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid. Digest's own opinion here.

\textsuperscript{5}"The New Pope", The Independent and Weekly Review CVIII (February 18, 1922), p. 172. In the beginning a paper with religious aims, it shifted to a more general scope; had small circulation, debatable influence. (Wolseley, p. 100.)

\textsuperscript{6}Maurice F. Egan, "The New Pope and the World", American Review of Reviews LXV (March 1922), pp. 258-260. This magazine had no particular policies, suffered no change in personality with various editors. (Wolseley, p. 57.)

\textsuperscript{7}"The New Pope", The Outlook CXXX (February 15, 1922), pp. 252-253. In 1893 Outlook became a regular journal of opinion rather than a family publication with a religious emphasis. Lyman Abbott was its editor at this time and its views were liberal. (Peterson, p. 114.)

\textsuperscript{8}Benedetto Cirmini, "The New Pope", The Living Age CCCXIII (April 1, 1922), pp. 17-19.
vigorous and positive temperament, whose record of achievements and abilities is surprisingly large. . . . America will be glad to see the democratic tradition again sustained by the modest Italian weaver, one whose progress in life has so obviously been due to substantial merit and untiring energy. 9

Other journals vie with one another for original adjectives. Pius is described as a "man of commanding intellect and religious zeal," 10 a man who "knows the world; though a priest not a pietist, though a trained diplomat not at all a political prelate." 11 William H. Crawford, who had occasion to meet His Holiness both before and after his election, writing for Century magazine, felt the new Pontiff was "primarily a wide awake business man, entirely in sympathy with and possessing a wide knowledge of world affairs." Crawford enlarged upon the seemingly paradoxical humility of the man, yet his unswerving demand for respect and obedience. Though he brought back the pomp and ceremony popular during the reign of Leo XIII, it was not, Crawford felt sure, because a man so simple and unaffected could change, but because the Pope felt the dignity of the office required it. He concluded: "I left the Vatican impressed with the belief that the Roman See was in thoroughly capable and efficient hands, and that the Holy Father was tremendously in earnest and


Although the New York Times hesitated to predict the course of the papacy, it considered Achille Ratti "unusually robust, young as papal age is reckoned. Talent, energy, will and comprehensive and statesmanlike mind are his. He should be a strong, and perhaps even a great, pope."13

A different type of compliment was paid to Pius XI by the Christian Century editor was was an advocate of church unity:

The election of a moderate, constructively conservative, and highly enlightened pope--crowned with imposing ceremonies as "The Rector of the World"--is the most daring challenge to Protestantism since the Reformation. Already more than twenty-five nations, including heretic France and Protestant England, are represented by ministers or ambassadors at the court of the vatican. The approachment between Italy and the papal see proceeds, which marks a new epoch in that lady land where estrangement has been so long the order of things. Without doubt a deliberate, intelligent, and strategically aggressive effort will be made to commend the new papal administration to America, by every means at command, by a pontiff who seeks to embrace the world in his fatherhood. His message to the American people was most cordial, tactful, and significant.14 Many facts in the present situation of the world will tend to further the purpose of a leader who does at least symbolize

---

12William H. Crawford, "From Vatican to Lambeth Palace", Century CVIII (July 1924), pp. 409-415. A high quality magazine, primarily interested in literature, yet paid some attention to current affairs. (Emery and Smith, p. 476.)

13New York Times, February 7, 1922, p. 16. Adolph Ochs was editor at this time. The paper was politically Democratic at that time, essentially conservative in tone, particularly in economic outlook, progressive in social viewpoint but not a crusading "peoples champion". Noted for its impersonal journalism. (Emery and Smith, p. 500.)

14When Cardinal O'Connell reached Rome, although too late for the election of Pius XI, he asked for a message for the American people. The Pope replied: "All of my life I have entertained the greatest admiration for this young and vigorous people. I have read much about America and have often wished to visit it. . . . Tell them I send them my Blessing with all my heart. The Washington
the unity of the world at a time when there seems so little to hold the world together. World history, said Lord Bryce, is becoming one history; and nothing can stand before that manifest destiny. Can a divided, bickering, Protestantism—a mere huddle of sects, each clinging to its own dialect—meet this stupendous challenge of a united, intelligent, aggressive Catholicism? Manifestly not! Either we must learn to marshal our forces, organizing the religion of freedom as the Roman church has organized the religion of authority, or the future will be dark for the faith that has made the modern world.15

Evaluating this very definite statement, it might be said that the editor was using the election of a strong progressive pope to stir his fellow Protestants out of their slumbers. He praises the Pope and admires his authority, yet holds to his religion of "freedom".

The journals which did commit themselves to predicting papal policy seemed to agree that peace with Italy, reunion of the Catholic Church with the Greek and Russian Orthodox churches, and a return of the Anglican church to Rome were possibilities.16 Although considered a liberal because he was picked for important positions by Pope Benedict XV and backed during the election by Benedict's Secretary of State, the liberal Cardinal Gasparri, all opinions

Conference has done much for the pacification of the world and my great desire is to contribute to the re-establishment of peace and harmony amongst nations. America has shown that she was not animated by selfishness during the war and after, and God will bless her for it." (William Teeling, The Pope in Politics London, 1937, pp. 146-147.)

15"The Challenge to Protestantism", The Christian Century XXXIX (March 2, 1922), pp. 259-261. The Christian Century was an undenominational journal of religion whose editor at this time was Charles Clayton Morrison. He urged a closer alliance of Catholics, Protestants and Jews to work for mutual ends.

16It is interesting to note how these predictions identify themselves with those following the election of Pope John XXIII.
agreed that the strength of mind and will of the new Pope would enable him to chart his own course in world politics rather than follow any faction whatsoever.17

As would seem natural, Pius XI was compared by many editors with his predecessors who pointed out his likeness to Benedict XIV in his interest in diplomatic affairs and his difference to Pius X. Maurice Egan, in the American Review of Reviews, gave a good example of this approach: "Pius XI was a purely ecclesiastical pope. . . . Benedict XIV saw an opportunity for the restoration of Roman diplomacy, which had for a long time failed in every respect; and Pius XI, in accepting so cordially the results of the Conference at Washington, has ranged himself on 'the side of the angels' where every pope ought to be."18

Concerning diplomatic relations with the United States, Egan did not feel that there was any indication that either the Vatican or the Catholics in the United States desired them because no religious-political question was at issue in which the United States was interested.19

In the two years that followed the election of Pope Pius XI, some journals which did not offer any opinion at the outset, began to make their views felt.

17Enrico Cardinal Gasparri (1871-1946) was bishop of Velletri, Italy and Prefect of the Sacred Tribunal of the Apostolic Signatura and sub-deacon of the College of Cardinals. In 1884, he entered the diplomatic service of the Vatican and served in South America and many European countries. Named Apostolic Delegate to Columbia in 1915, he was made Papal Nuncio to Brazil in 1920, serving there until 1925. In 1939 he visited the United States and Canada.


19Ibid.
Others, though a very few, which had spoken in the spring of 1922, reiterated their confidence in Vatican policy. Although by this time Mussolini was in power and a reconciliation between the Quirinal and the Vatican would have surprised no one, there was no criticism of the possible entente.²⁰ In June 1923 The Outlook backed its former opinions: "To transplant this stout northern mountaineer of known liberal sympathies to a Vatican imprisonment in the south for the rest of his life would seem to be a grim fate for him and, for the Church, to put a bull in a china shop. Whether the independent Achille Ratti has already broken any conventional Vatican china no one knows with certainty. What is known is that he became independent enough to have done some damage to the feelings of reactionaries." The future needs "a mountaineer pope. It needs a man who has such strength—physical, mental, spiritual—as the present pope has. It needs a man of good sense such as the present pope. . . . He numbers well-wishers all over the world. He may not have the aristocratic distinction, the shrewd astuteness, or the simple piety of some of his predecessors, yet he may be, more than they would have been, the man for the moment."²¹

More certain of the direction of the foreign policy of the Vatican after

---

²⁰The Pope had shown by the public benediction on the day of his election that he was open to some solution of the diplomatic void and both press and Italian people had recognized it as such a move. On January 6, 1923, the Commissioner of Rome paid an official call on the Cardinal Vicar. It was also the first time the head of the government could act without the approval of Parliament.

observing its course for two years, Current Opinion felt progress had been appreciable and still continued. Scoring Pius XI's intransigence on matters of faith, the same journal yet emphasized the "modernism" of the Pope. He was considered an able statesman, the proof of his ability in his amiable dealings with Russia and Ireland, his censure of France for the occupation of the Ruhr and her reparations demands, of Germany for her sabotage and passive resistance. Slowly Vatican prestige was being enhanced.22

The New York Times, which gave the Vatican more editorial space than the other journals, also praised the statesmanship of the Pope after two years and commended the modern efficiency combined with the "rigidity of the ancient faith."23 Departing from direct statements about the Pope, in March, the Times used the Pope's elevation of two Americans to the Cardinalate for an editorial on the war relief offered by Americans to Europe's poor. Criticizing America's isolationism since the war, the editor felt that this country by her cooperation with other nations, could prevent the need for charity.24 The Holy Year which opened Christmas 1924 was used as an argument for the United States to enter the World Court. "The least we as a nation can do . . . is to stand before the door of the World Court and say: 'Aperite mihi portas justitiae'."25


24 Ibid., March 26, 1924, p. 18. Archbishops Hayes and Mundelein were summoned to Rome, March 6, 1924, to be elevated to the Cardinalate.

25 Ibid., December 28, 1924, p. 4.
In summary the papal election of February 6, 1922, received, on the whole, limited attention. Daily newspaper editorials made note of the event but Pius XI was for the most part ignored. Liberal papers like the Nation and the New Republic passed over the matter in silence while the Outlook praised the new pope's liberal tendencies. Conservatives held him to be conservative, liberals praised the victory of the liberal papal faction, while those who trod the middle of the road hoped to see the Holy Father bring the two extremes together, at least in Italy, at most, in the other nations in which Communism, under its many titles and Fascism, under its many forms, struggled in post-war Europe. None criticized, all hoped. Some feared, as did the Christian Century, but they feared the strength and wisdom of the new pope.
CHAPTER II

THE RISE OF TOTALITARIANISM 1922-1929

The most publicized and most discussed individual aspect of the reign of Pius XI was the signing of the Lateran Treaty on February 11, 1929. From the taking of Rome in 1870 by the Italian troops until the death of Pius IX the relations between the Holy See and Italy continued unchanged. During the Pontificate of Leo XIII certain negotiations were carried on between the two powers but the times were not favorable and anti-clericals waged an unremitting war on the Church. In 1903 Pius X ascended the Pontifical throne and for a brief while the situation was a trifle less strained. Despite certain privileges granted to the Church, Freemasonry became rampant and Socialism of the extreme type threatened the lives of the clergy. Benedict XV made known that he wished to see the solution of the Roman Question but it was left to Pius XI to take the opportunity offered and settle the problem.¹

Together with the firm decision of Pius XI to overcome all obstacles, the way was made easier for the agreement by certain events. Before 1922 no stable government existed in Italy with which to treat, and even if negotiations had

been carried to a conclusion, any one of the precariously placed ministries of that period would certainly have been overthrown for submitting any proposals for the solution of the Roman Question to a Parliament dominated by and consisting in great part of Freemasons. None of the Italian governments prior to 1922 recognized the fact that there was a Question to be solved as everything had been finally and irrevocably settled by the Law of Guarantees. 2

Other factors also smoothed the way. Cardinal Gasparri had vast legal culture and diplomatic ability. He had drawn up a plan for the solution of the problem during the war and entered into semi-official negotiations with the two prime ministers of the Italian government, Orlando and Nitti, immediately afterward. Benedict XV had lifted the non expedit against Italian Catholics taking part in political life and the ban against receiving the heads of so-called Catholic countries in the Vatican after they had visited the Quirinal, while Pius XI's blessing from the outer balcony was accepted with great favor by public opinion. 3

Benito Mussolini had made known his ambitions to heal the breach. "If", he declared, "the Vatican finally renounces its temporal dreams" then Italy would provide all that the Church needed for the welfare of the people. 4

2 Williamson, p. 25.

3 Luigi Sturzo, Church and State (New York, 1939), pp. 488-489. Sturzo (1871- ) was the Italian Catholic priest who founded the People's Party. He fled from Italy when it was dissolved by the Fascists in 1926 and came to the United States in 1940. Author of at least 17 books, he broadcast frequently to Italy during the war and returned to his homeland in 1946.

4 Ibid.
Leo XIII had been too close to the events of 1870 to make such a renunciation but from the time of Pius X "temporal dreams" had been out of date.  

Pius XI touched upon the trouble between the Church and Italy in his first encyclical of December 23, 1922, and expressed his protestation "against such a condition of affairs, not through vain and earthly ambition, for which we should blush, but by a pure debt of conscience, for the nature of the Church demands that the Holy See should be and appear independent and free of any human authority or law, even a law proclaiming papal guarantees."  

For four years, from the "March on Rome" in October 1922, to the end of 1926, the Roman Question was dropped from public discussion. The Fascist regime was consolidating itself as a totalitarian state. Secret negotiations between the Vatican and Mussolini, through able jurists on both sides, began in 1926 and lasted almost three years. The Pope stipulated silence and the secret was so well kept that the Cardinals of the Curia and the diplomatic corps were surprised when the results were announced.  

Newspapers had advanced their opinions of Fascism, one even declared that the movement was "in reality little more than a cleverly cloaked clerical organization." The fact was to be proved, it was suggested, by the gift by

5 Ibid.  


7 Sturzo, Church and State p. 489.  

8 Christian Science Monitor (Boston), December 30, 1922, p. 24. Donovan Richard conducted the editorial page at this time; it was thoughtful but non-crusading. Noted for its ability to analyze in a long view major news developments and interpret problems and trends, (Emery and Smith, p. 639).
Mussolini to the Vatican of the Chigi Library.\textsuperscript{9} When in November 1923, King Alphonso of Spain went to Rome for the purpose of visiting the secular and religious governments, an editorial in the \textit{New York Times} marked his successful dealings and commented that he might also have advanced the good relations between his hosts.\textsuperscript{10} In April 1924 the Times drew out of the Pope's decision not to attend a dedication of the Knights of Columbus Welfare Building and the election which put Italian power entirely in Mussolini's hands, a better chance than ever to heal the breach.\textsuperscript{11}

Another article in December 1926 discussed the tension between the two powers in Italy and Pope Pius' allocution to the College of Cardinals in which he deplored the Fascisti violence against the clergy and Catholic organizations: "With Mussolini the state has taken on an absolute validity in itself. It is not a question of reconciling the claims of the individual and the state, but of taking it for granted that the state may make use of the individual for its own purposes without reference to his personal value. The striking result has been that we find the Church agreeing with radical critics of the modern state as Leviathan."\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{9}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{10}\textit{New York Times}, November 25, 1923, pt. 2, p. 6. Pius XI had decided not to attend the dedication after his presence was expected. The ceremony had become associated in the public mind with the abandonment of seclusion.

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., April 13, 1924, pt. 9, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., December 22, 1926, p. 20. Allocution took place December 20, 1926. An allocution is a solemn address given to cardinals at a secret consistory.
Two articles in 1928 referred to the situation in Rome. The first pointed out that "the Church wished to make Italians good Christians while the state sees in good Christians its best citizens,"\textsuperscript{13} and the second realized that no open fight would break out between Church and state because both were playing "for bigger stakes."\textsuperscript{14}

The actual signing of the Treaty and Concordat brought forth repercussions from almost every journal without exception. Even those conservative enough to mention nothing about the election of Pius XI or any other of his moves, whether religious or political, gave their views on this issue.

All agreed that the solution of the Roman Question marked a great historical event, but also were in accord in their suspicion of the diplomatic results of such a rapprochement. The first to comment, after the news had been announced on February 7, was the \textit{New York Times} which stated: "This peaceful adjustment of rival claims between Italy and the Vatican . . . must gratify, on one hand, the dramatic instinct of Mussolini. On the other, it falls in with the policies held by a wonderful religious organization which boasts it is 'a thousand years the same'. The world will not witness an entire reversal of 1870 but a fresh start in 1929 of the secular march of the


\textsuperscript{14}"Mussolini and the Pope Seek Vital Accord", \textit{New York Times}, April 22, 1928, pt. 10, p. 3. Feature article by Times Rome correspondent, Edwin L. James. "From the Vatican point of view the Church has centuries behind it and centuries before it and therefore its quarrels over education with this or that Italian regime pale into insignificance beside the larger question of recognition of the Holy See as over and above all earthly power."
Roman Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{15}

Although much criticism was directed toward the treaty, it was pointed at the reawakened political strength of the Vatican rather than the moral aspects of the treaty with a Fascist state. The \textit{Christian Science Monitor} remarked that although "in reality little material change" is noted, "diplomatically the event has a far-reaching importance. Whatever efforts are made to minimize the new temporal status of the Pope, it is certain that he pretends to much more than religious influence. He becomes the sovereign of a tiny state, and as such, may claim to have ambassadors everywhere and even sit among the powers at the League of Nations."\textsuperscript{16}

More outspoken in its commentary is the \textit{Nation}: "The Act of Conciliation \ldots will rank as one of the historic steps of the twentieth century. In our opinion, it is a step backward \ldots it weakens the true spiritual power of religion by injecting one important branch of Christendom into mundane politics."\textsuperscript{17} In another article by Robert Dell, the same journal stated that the treaty proved once again that "the Catholic Church is above all an international political institution with a political policy of its own \ldots the most dangerous reactionary force in the modern world. \ldots The Pope himself is the most absolute of dictators and Catholicism like Fascism is opposed to liberty on principle. It was inevitable that they should come together sooner

\textsuperscript{15}New York Times, February 8, 1929, p. 22.


\textsuperscript{17}"The Vatican Settlement", \textit{The Nation} CXXVIII (February 1929), p. 247.
or later. ... The downfall of the Fascist regime would probably now be accompanied by an anti-Catholic movement in Italy. The papacy therefore must do all in its power to preserve the Fascist regime. 18 During February the Nation assaulted the Treaty a third time under the authorship of Adam Day:

"Without doubt the prestige of the Vatican among all the powers will be lowered by this treaty and concordat. ... hundreds of thousands of Italians will not like it. The spirit of Cavour and Garibaldi and Mazzini is not dead in Italy and here Mussolini has done the very thing that Cavour— the father of Italian unification— opposed. Cavour stood for a free church in a free state. Mussolini has set up two states— a Vatican state within the Italian state. 19

The Christian Science Monitor accused Mussolini of working with the Church "to achieve his ambition of establishing a united Italy as a greater World power" 20 while the Louisville Courier-Journal predicted that "whatever effect this diplomatic agreement and concordat may have upon the future of Italy, it will hardly promote the interests of the Catholic Church in non-Catholic countries." 21 Another southern newspaper judged the relationship of church and state in Italy on the basis of the American ideal and found it wanting. The Birmingham, Alabama News printed: "A free Church in a free state— this is the ideal that has been set up and maintained in these United

---

21 Ibid.
States by Protestant, Catholic and Jew alike. Irrespective of religious faith, this is the policy to which all Americans capable of appreciating their country's laws and resolved to defend the institutions built up under those laws unreservedly subscribe."

In the New Republic Hiram Motherwell dwelt on the "double diplomacy" of the Vatican. Protestants felt that there was something wrong with the Church "playing politics" and "driving bargains" but it was simply a consequence of having existence in the material world. "This duality goes toward explaining why Pius XI and Mussolini can be in direct and open disagreement concerning essential questions dealt with in the treaty and concordat, without impairing their validity." An example of this duality, Motherwell explained, was the Pope's yielding in actuality to the incorporation of the Catholic Boy Scouts in the Fascist Balilla while theoretically he opposed it. "He was quite willing to do it because he had to, but he would never admit that he was doing it because he ought to." In conclusion the writer offered this opinion: "Both sides benefit from the bargain. Which has profited the more cannot be determined ... Mussolini is certainly obtaining present advantages. The Church can afford to wait ... the two parties can continue to debate the

---


23 Hiram Motherwell, "Mussolini and the Pope", New Republic LIX (July 24, 1929), pp. 250-251. Motherwell was writer and lecturer, European correspondent of the Chicago Daily News, one of first to oppose fascism. The New Republic, under Bruce Bliven, was sharp-spoken foe of anything fascistic in tendency.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.
theoretical questions hotly as they like without affecting the practical validity and usefulness of the agreement." 26

The New York Times was the most prolific on the issue, and if a little wary, was still the most in favor of the agreement. Asserting in an editorial that Pius and Mussolini were aided by the opportune moment for such an agreement, it pointed out that the first was unhindered by Parliamentary entanglements or political preoccupations in his position as dictator and that both men were disrespectful of human criticism, of firm mind and ready decision. "Italy", students of the situation said "owes them both a great debt." 27 A second article in April lauded the Holy Father for his acceptance of the responsibility for the treaty, for his learning, patience, and labor. 28

Two examples were apparent in which criticisms were directed at the Vatican for signing a pact with a totalitarian state. The Nation alluded to the "religious sanction" that was given to a "regime which exalts the suppression of human liberty and the perpetuation of war between nations." 29 The Christian Science Monitor felt it obvious that "the Vatican puts itself in peril of being suspected as being an instrument of Fascist imperialism." 30

---

26 Ibid.
The Times also carried articles by Gaetano Salvemini, Carleton J. H. Hayes, and Pertinax, a well-known French journalist, who gave their opinions of the agreement.\footnote{31} Salvemini criticized the treaty on Mussolini's part and believed that it showed his lack of support and his need of the Church. The intellectuals in Italy, Salvemini held, would be in an uproar over the event even though they would not speak for fear of punishment. Because the treaty was written only between the Pope and the Premier and not decided by the people of Italy, when the Fascist government would fall, Salvemini believed the treaty would no longer hold.\footnote{32}

Carleton Hayes praised the Vatican-Italian accord as a great forward step toward internationalism and the maintenance of peace. He congratulated Mussolini for being "the first Italian statesman who has had the daring and courage to depart from the traditional policy of the Italian government and to settle the Papal Question."\footnote{33} Hayes credited Mussolini's rise to power as the "expression of a great and widespread will of the Italian people."\footnote{34}

\footnote{31}Salvemini (1873 - ) was noted as an Italian historian and political writer, one of the leading anti-fascists who escaped from Italy and lectured and wrote in the United States during the war. Hayes (1882 - ) was Professor of history at Columbia University until 1950. He was appointed ambassador to Spain in 1942 by President Roosevelt and remained for the duration of the war. Pertinax (1882 - ) was a pseudonym for Andre Geraud, a French writer, who was London correspondent for the Echo de Paris (1908-1914), its foreign editor (1917-1938), editor of L'Europe Nouvelle (1938-1940), contributed to the New York Times, Baltimore Sun, Foreign Affairs (New York), and was diplomatic correspondent for the North American Newspaper Alliance.

\footnote{32}New York Times, February 24, 1929, p. 25.

\footnote{33}Ibid., March 8, 1929, p. 3.

\footnote{34}Ibid.
A very sympathetic view, and at the same time a strong defense of the Pope's negotiations was offered by Pertinax in a feature article. The following is an excerpt from his report:

It has been said abroad that the Pope and his principal advisor had really made a pact with Fascism and had been attracted all along with the prospect of joining hands with such a victorious regime. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Cardinal Gasparri was always understood to have shared in the outlook and feelings of the popular party of Don Sturzo which was dispersed and suppressed by the dictator like other opposition groups. . . . At all times the Church, which is a supernatural power, or perhaps an imperial power (in a supernatural sense) adheres to its rule not to discriminate between the various forms of government in existence, provided they do not run counter to morals and civilization.

Some critics hold that he nevertheless ought to have remained immovable in the determination not to have anything to do with the Italian power and should not have budged an inch from his predecessors' claim to the complete restitution of the old pontifical territory.

The Pope answers these accusations: "We no longer live in 1870. We must try to bring our ideas and conceptions up to date. What the future holds in store, I don't profess to know. There would be scarcely any optimism left in the world if it were given to men to foresee coming developments. As for myself, I am an optimist and I am very well pleased with the decision I have come to."35

Another hostile attack was advanced by Carlo Sforza on Pius XI and his decision. He described the Pontiff as "hostile to ideas of liberty. . . . afraid of life. He [Pius] believed that a good treaty, drawn up in the traditional form, would be better."36 When advisors pointed out that it was


36 Carlo Sforza, "The Present Pope's Attitude Toward Liberalism", Current History (March 1930), pp. 1084-1085. Sforza (1871-1952) was an Italian diplomat, statesman, and author. He fled from Italy in 1926 and came to the United States in 1940 where he wrote and lectured extensively. He returned to Italy after the armistice and entered the Badoglio-Togliatti cabinet at the urging of the Allies.
dangerous to deal with demagogues, he answered: "I know, but at least they do not believe in the fetishes of liberalism."37 Sforza accused the Pope of destroying the Popular Party in Italy and being responsible for the Catholic Center in Germany abandoning the Socialists and allying itself with the nationalistic and militaristic right. In Spain he strove against Christian democratic movements while in Belgium the Union Catholique was imposed on Catholics which sacrificed the claims of the democrats from Flanders to the conservative elements. Sforza concluded with this bitter comment: "No Freemasons, no Voltairians, ever worked so successfully for future violence in the religious field as did the Vatican in the first months of 1929."38

Although a theoretical agreement had been reached, it was inevitable that the two powers, spiritual and temporal, should clash, especially in their youth organizations. From March 1931 onwards, there were armed Fascist attacks on Catholic clubs and assaults on processions, on people coming out of church; young men were wounded, priests molested and banners torn while the press frantically demanded that the Catholic clubs be closed.39 When Quadragesimo Anno was issued May 15, 1931, proclaiming the social rights of men, the Fascists

37Ibid.

38Ibid.

39A number of press stories were carried by the New York Times on these anti-Catholic riots created by Fascist students, May 27, 1931, p. 1; May 28, 1931, p. 1, cover Mussolini's order for the dissolution of the Catholic Action and the closing by the police of the Catholic clubs financed by the American Knights of Columbus. Plus placed Catholic Action under direct tutelage of the bishops May 31, 1931, p. 2. Daily during June, July and August articles were carried on the problem. The final settlement was covered September 3, 1931, p. 1 and September 4, 1931, p. 9.
retaliated by closing the clubs and seizing their equipment.\footnote{Sturzo, Church and State, p. 491. For Latin text of encyclical, A.A.S. XXIII, June 1, 1931, pp. 177-208. English text, New York Times, May 31, 1931, pp. 1-3.}

During this period of tension Arnaldo Cortesi observed in \textit{Current History}:

"Probably neither the Vatican nor the Italian government is displeased that some reason of dissension has cropped up between them. It is in the interest of neither to give the world the impression that the two are too much hand in glove."\footnote{Arnaldo Cortesi, "Italy and the Vatican in Conflict over Lateran Treaties", \textit{Current History} XXX (September 1929), p. 1014.}

\textit{Non abbiamo bisagno} was issued by the Pope on June 29, 1931.\footnote{\textit{Non abbiamo bisagno}, June 29, 1931. Latin text, A.A.S. XXIII, July 6, 1931, pp. 285-312; English translation, \textit{Tablet} CLVIII (July 1931), pp. 52-59. There was no particular comment from the secular press on this encyclical.} Special messengers carried copies to be printed abroad to escape its seizure by the Fascists. In this encyclical Pius XI openly condemned the Fascist theory of the state as the end of the individual, deplored the ill treatment of the Catholic youth organizations and defended them from the charge of seeking to engage in politics; he recognized the distressing position of the faithful forced to take the Fascist oath and declared authoritatively that "such an oath can be tolerated only on condition that each individual in taking it shall do so with the intent of reserving the rights of God and conscience—a reservation that must be openly expressed if necessity arises, to remove any ambiguity of profession of faith and respect of Catholic morality."\footnote{Sturzo, Church and State, p. 491.}
The dispute was finally settled by an agreement between the two powers. The government allowed the Catholic clubs to reopen, gave back the sequestered equipment and agreed not to oppose the activity of Catholic Action in general and the youth movement in particular. The Vatican modified the national character of these organizations and accentuated their diocesan character; they would carry no banner except the national flag and processions and public demonstrations would be avoided, in order to remove any impression of wishing to compete with the Fascist youth organizations.\[^{44}\]

On this solution the editor of the *New York Times* commented:

No other than a peaceful solution was to be expected. ... For Mussolini a real war with the Church is unthinkable because his reasons for agreement with the Vatican are many. ... Mussolini has spoken out and acted against the ultra fashions in dress, speech and amusements, which have provoked the censure of the Church. Upon one salient modern question, birth-control, Fascism and the Church are in hearty accord. Mussolini's plans for a densely populated Italy are by way of being realized. On the question of labor in the modern state there is also much in common between the Church's teaching of the mutual responsibility of employer and workingman and the Fascist ideal of the Corporate State imposing its will on capital and labor. ... it is not difficult to understand why any flare-up of hostility between the two is apt to pass off without serious consequences.\[^{45}\]

The Roman Question was solved and the Pope was theoretically no longer a prisoner. The move was eyed suspiciously and criticized on all sides by those who spoke. Only the *Times* was at all in sympathy with the motives of the Vatican. The future had to prove the outcome of the historic act.

\[^{44}\text{Sturzo, Church and State, p. 491.}\]

\[^{45}\text{New York Times, September 1, 1931, p. 22.}\]
CHAPTER III

THE CARE OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH

During the seventeen long years of his pontificate Pope Pius XI took, perhaps, a greater part in political life and held a more influential position as a leader in temporal affairs than any other pope of the last centuries. But the efforts he made toward a new social order stirred more comment and marshalled more foes than all of the concordats he signed or communists he condemned. Militant Catholics like Michael Williams and Father John A. O'Brien were kept busy during these years defending the Church's pronouncements on the sanctity of marriage, the evils of birth-control and the ideals of true education, as well as her vigorous views on labor and management, censorship of movies and church unity.

An early encyclical, Mense Nostra, urged men and women to adopt a more holy way of Christian life by making an annual closed retreat.1 Even Henry L. Mencken thought this was a good idea and used it as the subject of one of his columns in the American Mercury: "The most depraved and evil man ... emerges from that retirement visibly renovated and improved. Not only is his skin pinker than it was; his soul is pinker too."2

The question of extreme nationalism and monarchism in France posed a weighty problem. In efforts to promote reconciliation after the war, Pius XI had appealed to Catholics everywhere to dispense with bitterness towards other countries and to promote works of Charity which would bring the nations into closer contact. But in France particularly, there were tendencies among certain Catholic nationalists not to heed his appeals. The condition was greatly complicated by the divisions which had run through France in pre-war years, when the champions of the Republic had been openly anti-Catholic and proclaimed the Church their implacable enemy. The older generation had been convinced that that Republic would always continue to persecute the Church as it had done since 1789 and that only a return to the monarchy would insure religious freedom. In the general reaction against parliamentary government which followed the war, the neo-royalist Action Francaise, a political movement which closely resembled fascism had greatly increased in numbers particularly among the younger people. But its methods and its doctrine involved two grave objections from the standpoint of the Vatican. In the first place, it began to exploit its religious sympathies for the purposes of party propaganda to such a degree that in many places it was directly associating with the processions in the parishes. Secondly, its leaders, Charles Maurras and Leon Daudet, were implacably committed to enmity towards Germany in direct disregard of the peaceful admonitions of the Pope. 3

The influence of Action Francaise spread rapidly in universities and semi-

naries until the clergy appealed to Rome against the use of the Church for political purposes. In spite of the fact that condemning the movement would mean alienation of both old and young, Pius XI did not hesitate. The condemnation was at first issued in an informal manner, through the Bishop of Bordeaux. However, when the leaders adopted an attitude of defiance, the Pope intervened personally.¹ The affair reached bitter heights during the next several years.⁵

On the occasion of the jubilee celebration of Cardinal Dubois of Paris in September, 1929, the Pope pronounced Action Française should henceforth be regarded as heresy. The members had been excommunicated in 1926.⁶

The Catholic World paid tribute to Pius XI for his action in condemning the French monarchists and approving the peace policy of the French government

¹ McWynn, p. 123.

⁵Action Française was a political movement bent on overthrowing by any means, the republican regime. Its leader, Charles Maurras, was an admitted agnostic but he extolled the Catholic Church because of the strong social spirit and principle of authority. Maurras' militant orthodoxy in the newspaper Action Française delighted the "integrist", the extreme anti-modernist wing who were more Catholic than the Church. Some bishops who were neither royalists or integrists noted with growing alarm the influence of the organization and the paper and it was reported to Pius X. Circumstances prevented either Pius X or Benedict XV from doing anything of a definite nature but on August 23, 1926, Cardinal Andrieu, Archbishop of Bordeaux, condemned the movement publicly and was congratulated by Pius XI. The Pope had studied the paper of Maurras for months previously. A papal decree was published December 29, 1926 condemning most of the works of Maurras and his paper, Action Française. Because many still justified the use of the journal, the Pope, on March 8, 1927, put any promoters of the movement under pain of excommunication and ordered priests to withhold absolution from those who refused to submit. (Charles L. Souvay, "The Catholic Church in Contemporary France", Catholic Historical Review XVIII, July 1932, pp. 205-228.)

⁶New York Times, September 14, 1929, p. 3.
and emphasized its deep repercussions in France and America, where many had been awakened to the dangers of the intense nationalism by the condemnation, who had not realized them before. In supporting the republicans against the extremist policies of the monarchists the Holy Father had silently contested the accusation of being a fascist sympathizer.

Failing to indicate the religious ramifications of the condemnation, Arnold Whitridge described the character of Charles Maurras: "He is always arguing for a system and never for a personality. He can champion the Catholic Church without believing in Christ and he can wax eloquent over the idea of a monarchy without stopping to consider the qualifications of the claimant to the throne... A radical reactionary, a philosopher, a poet, and the very prince of debaters. Long may he flourish—a delight of lovers of literature the world over and in France a thorn in the flesh of all those who have made up their minds that whatever is is right." 

That the action taken against the organization was laid to misinformation on the part of the Pope in the beginning, was the opinion of an article in the National Review. Afterwards the journalist felt it was due to a pro-German attitude and he praised both Maurras and Daudet as loyal Frenchmen.

Denis Gwynn remarked in the Quarterly Review on the slight attention given

---

the censure of Action Francaise "considering the very important repercussions which it had upon the international relations of France."\textsuperscript{10} He considered the condemnation to have international interest because Maurras and the extreme rightists had dominated the foreign policy of France and were chiefly responsible for urging the occupation of the Ruhr, denouncing a reconciliation with Germany, and hampering peaceful action at Locarno. Agreeing with the account in the Catholic World, Gwynn also felt the public withdrawal of the fictitious support of the Church to such a group was of considerable importance, inasmuch as it would no longer be automatically identified with such a political movement of extremist measures.\textsuperscript{11}

Declining to take a side in the quarrel, Sisley Huddleston nevertheless thought the Pope's action was too important to be passed over, calling it "somewhat surprising and extremely interesting."\textsuperscript{12} He questioned the placing of a newspaper on the Index because he felt it was merely a political organ: "French Catholics are divided. Many of them do not admit Papal authority in politics. They will continue to read the newspaper and publicly reaffirm their fidelity to the royalist organization. There are indeed signs that the Vatican has lost much ground in France and has given an impetus to the idea of a Gallic Church."\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{10}Denis Gwynn, "The Pope and the Action Francaise", Quarterly Review CCL (January 1928), pp. 96-112.

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 111.

\textsuperscript{12}Sisley Huddleston, "French Nationalism and the Vatican", The New Statesman XXVIII (February 12, 1927), pp. 529-531.

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.
Evidently then the American press paid little attention to the disturbance caused in France over the condemnation of the monarchical organization, however, those correspondents who fully understood the repercussions felt that it was a noteworthy move for the papacy with important results for France.

The encyclical on education, *Divini Illius Magistri*, issued in December, 1929, did not proclaim any new doctrines but thoroughly presented the entire Catholic view and discipline on the subject of education. At the outset, the Pope laid down the proposition that the character of education is determined by man's ultimate end. Since this end is spiritual and supernatural, the main function of education is to teach the truths and ways of religion and morals. To the Catholic Church has been committed the task of directing souls along this way of life. Hence education belongs pre-eminently to the Church. Next in importance come the parents. Neither the child nor the adult exists for the state. In this connection the Pope quoted the dictum of the Supreme Court in the Oregon private school cases: "The child is not the mere creature of the state; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with high duty, to recognize this fact and prepare him for additional obligation." This is an implicit, but a fairly clear, recognition that the educative right of the parents is superior to that of the state. The Holy Father did not condemn co-education and sex education outright in all circum-


stances. Instead he stressed the folly of assuming that mere knowledge will effectively safeguard chastity and the fallacy of ignoring differences of sex in courses of instruction. His condemnation of neutral or lay schools applied mainly to certain countries in Europe.16

Immediately opinions were made known on the subject, especially controversial for Americans.

The Pope's encyclical sounds a note that will startle Americans for it assails an institution dearest to them—the public school—without which it is hardly conceivable that democracy could long exist. As was said only yesterday by a critical authority, despite its shortcomings and mistakes the public school has "already contributed to society more than all other agencies combined." Under its tuitions not only are the elemental lessons which the race has learned taught to children of diverse traditions, racial qualities and religious beliefs but these children have been prepared to live together as citizens in a self-governing State. If the declaration of the encyclical were scrupulously obeyed by those to whom it is addressed, the public school would be emptied of all its Catholic pupils except as the bishop in his discretion, in special circumstances may permit them to remain. . . . If other churches were to make like claim—that is, that the educative mission belongs preeminently to them for their children—and were to lay like inhibitions, the very foundations of this Republic would be disturbed.

Probably the Pontiff had Italy specially in mind but his encyclical is addressed to the world and must be assumed to have the same authority here in his Church. One wonders whether he, with all his wisdom, does not know with what civic fervor Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Gentiles alike unite to support what he calls "neutral" or "mixed" schools. One outstanding illustration of the championing of the public school by a Catholic is the former Governor Smith's official and personal aggressive interest in the public schools of this State. It is a matter of common knowledge that no governor in recent times has done more in their behalf or has had a more intelligent and persistent concern for their betterment. . . . No claim is made here that the child

exists for the State: but the State for the child's sake in manhood and womanhood and for its own sake must see that every child has an opportunity to be "maximum competent" according to its gifts. As Emerson said: "To make the wise man the state exists," and that means to help make each capable of his highest wisdom, working through the family and with the spiritual agencies existing within the State.17

In an editorial the New Republic cautiously praised the encyclical, calling it "vigorous, logical, dignified" ... conveying "a compelling atmosphere of faith." The author divided the document into two parts, one, the high moral principles to which educators of the world could subscribe, and the other, arguments against the liberal idea of education, opposition to sex instruction and coeducation and the censorship of books, radio and the theatre for the young. The article felt there was nothing "to disturb the American State, ... no dangerous conflict between the Catholic Church and the American State" revealed. But with a hint of censure for any form of restraint the liberal article remarked in conclusion that beneath the ideas expressed, lies that "spirit of Catholic puritanism" which is often no less hostile than is the Calvinistic puritanism with which it sometimes cooperates.18

Heywood Broun used the proclamation on education as the subject of his column in the Nation. He felt that the Pope was not familiar enough with American school conditions and if he were, he would not have spoken so harshly against them.19 He compared coeducation in the United States with bloomers in

19 Heywood Broun, "It seems to Heywood Broun", The Nation CXXX (January 1930), p. 91. Broun was not a Catholic at this time although he joined the church not long afterward.
Italy and stated that coeducation was important and necessary. "The Pope, to be sure, is interested chiefly in the sort of education which will promote allegiance and fidelity to the Church which he leads. Yet even admitting this, it seems the Pontiff has some misconceptions and that the educational theories which he attacks constitute no danger whatsoever to the faith which he upholds."²¹

Another article in the *New York Times* again praised the Pope's ideas but then bristled at the condemnation of the public schools:

"Many of the sentiments which he expressed on this subject are admirable and lofty and would be accepted by great multitudes that are not Catholics. But the Pope's attitude toward public schools was not misrepresented in what was telegraphed a week ago. Indeed, his whole thought on the subject of education by the state appears to be even more pronounced against American ideals and practice than was indicated by the fragments of the encyclical first cabled. The Pope supports the plea that justice would require "subsidies" from the State to support parochial schools. Furthermore, he declares that "for a school to be acceptable it is necessary that the whole teaching and organization of the school, namely the teachers, the curriculum, and the books be governed by the Christian spirit under the maternal direction and vigilance of the Church." It is only necessary to add that this can never be in America, until America ceases to be what it has always been until now."²²

Having been accused of being totally at variance with the traditional system, the Catholic philosophy of education was called subversive to democratic institutions by Leo Lehmann in the *New Republic*. He particularly condemned the Church's denial of the inherent right of the state to teach.²³

²¹Ibid.
²³Lehmann, pp. 165-168.
The international situation was again touched by the Holy Father as on Christmas, 1930, the Pope uttered "a welcome and timely word" which was hailed by the Times as especially needful in the distressed world, hardly recovered from the last war and yet tottering on the verge of another. The editorial observed: "The Pope did not speak merely as a religious leader, still less as only a sentimentalist... he condemned a proud and insensate nationalism which kept a country aloof from such noble efforts to maintain peace and goodwill on earth. If this saying looks toward Italy or France, we cannot deny it also looks toward the United States." This utterance by the Pontiff was timely not only because it fell upon the natal day of the Prince of Peace. It comes as a sober correction for predictions of war which have been growing in volume.\(^2\)

When the encyclical on Christian marriage, the sanctity of family life and the evils of birth control and divorce was announced to the world, a subject which had been the basis for heated debate for a decade was even more thoroughly rekindled.\(^2\) Although upheld stoutly and defended by Catholic spokesmen everywhere, the issues were contested violently especially that of birth control. The New York Times kept itself above the struggle but justified its sacrifice of space to the publication of the complete encyclical by scoring the importance of such a letter... "even enthusiastic eugenists must admit the possibility that in a hundred years or more their theories will have proved

\(^{24}\textit{New York Times}, \text{December 26, 1930, p. 12.}\)

\(^{25}\textit{Casti connubii}. \text{December 31, 1930. Latin text, A.A.S. XXII, December 31, 1930, pp. 539-592; English translation, Catholic Mind XXIX (January 22, 1939), pp. 21-64.}\)
inadequate, so that then more plausibility and force may be seen in the views expressed today by the Holy See of Rome."

Father Ryan explained the moral teaching of the encyclical in the *American Ecclesiastical Review*:

Conjugal love is that disinterested supernatural affection whose object is the good of the other party, not the aggrandizement or satisfaction of self. Wives should obey their husbands but their reasonable liberty is not thereby destroyed. The wife's duties to children, husband and family come before all other considerations.

After denouncing marital unions which are temporary or companionate, His Holiness proceeds to treat the subject of birth control. The traditional doctrine that all contraceptive methods are wrong because they involve frustration of the marital act is reasserted in terms that cannot possibly be misunderstood. No consideration of consequence or circumstances can make this act morally lawful. It is wrong in itself, always and everywhere.  

Against this teaching Mencken complained in the *American Mercury* that the war was unfair and ridiculous, having been based on theological postulates that no educated man could conceivably accept. He accused the Church of grounding its case upon a dogmatism that is offensive to every intellectual decency and of denouncing its opponents as mere voluptuaries.

That the encyclical spoke out on the education of youth, the necessity of patriotism, the duties and obligations of legislators and magistrates was com-

---


pletely overlooked by the New Republic as a series of articles tossed this problem of the use of contraceptives back and forth. 29 Patrick J. Ward prepared an article for this journal before the encyclical was issued which contained the same doctrine and the same explanations that the Pope reiterated in 1931. He explained clearly and intelligently the difference between limiting the family artificially or doing so by abstinence and continence. He pointed out that social problems should be adjusted to fit the people, not the people to the problem. 30

With an editorial in the same issue, a reply was given to the "moderate", "intelligent", and "sound" statement of the case given by Mr. Ward, and wholehearted opposition by the New Republic was offered the Catholic Church as well as any other group who opposed birth control. The article used the historic argument that overpopulation and unrestricted breeding would end the human race; that abstinence and continence cause "psychic disorders." The Church was censured in the same article for having to back the admonitions of its priests with the law; the legislation against birth control literature is compared to that of prohibition, an attempt to improve peoples' morals by law, which was a policy bitterly opposed by Catholics. Now they were attempting the same means for which Protestants were criticized. 31


31 "In Reply to Mr. Ward", New Republic LIX (May 29, 1929), pp. 32-33.
In answer to the editorial Mr. Ward declared that two children apiece were not enough for the continuation of the species, that sexual abstinence was not mentally harmful but that psychiatrists could prove that contraception was, that Catholics did not put laws against birth control in the legislation as it then stood and that there was no moral comparison between prohibition and birth control.\textsuperscript{32}

Again using social consequences as a reason for placing an artificial limitation on families, Henry Pratt Fairchild criticized the Pope for having expressed "tender regard for the wife who risks health and life in unrestrained child bearing and who experiences great hardship in rearing her children in poverty," yet does not praise "those parents who avoid such extremes by the exercise of prudent self-control."\textsuperscript{33} He compared the Pope's "way of nature" to the allowing of teeth to decay and traced the evils of war, crime, disease and poverty to overpopulation.\textsuperscript{34}

In the same journal the case is discussed by Guy Irving Burch who named the problem a dilemma for Catholics and felt the dangers of rhythm to be much greater used promiscuously than those of contraceptives carefully guarded by selected doctors.\textsuperscript{35}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32}New Republic LIX (May 29, 1929), p. 235.
\item \textsuperscript{33}Henry Pratt Fairchild, "What Does the Pope Want?" New Republic (January 28, 1931), pp. 292-294.
\item \textsuperscript{34}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{35}Guy Irving Burch, "Catholics on Birth Control", New Republic LXXX (September 5, 1934), pp. 98-100.
\end{itemize}
The *American Mercury* scoffed at the "rhythm" method as an effective move dictated by the failure of its birth control policy. "Here is a clear case of an attempted compromise with birth control without yielding to 'artificial' measures of contraception." 36

"The Catholic attitude . . . had helped rather than hindered the movement. Non-Catholics have resented the Church's seeking to inflict its moral code upon them. They have resented the Catholic priesthood, itself celibate, setting up standards of sex relations in marriage for non-Catholics," stated Lehmann in the *New Republic* of December, 1939. 37

Catholic opposition to the mailing of contraceptive literature was criticized in the same article as well as in the *Nation*, which demanded the passage of the birth control bill by Congress. 38

One other newspaper was seen to praise the letter besides the *Times*. The *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* announced: "There is a tone of authority, a forthrightness, not to be found in any modern public document. . . . What the Pope has

---


The bill advocated the repeal of articles 211, 245 and 312 of the Criminal Code which forbade the sale or transportation through the mails of contraceptive information. In 1930 Senator Frederick Gillett introduced a "limited" or "doctors" bill whereby it would be legal for doctors to impart birth control information. It died, left in committee, with the 71st Congress. The same amendment was introduced with the 73rd Congress, i.e. . . . That sections 211, 245, and 312 of the Criminal Code as amended, are each amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The provisions of this section shall not be construed to apply to any book or information relating to the prevention of conception, or article, substance, drug, medicine, or thing designed, adapted, or intended for the prevention of conception for use 1) by any physician legally
to say is out of keeping with much that is being said. . . . Merely as a reminder that marriage, so far as our civilization has known it, has been in the past one of the chief concerns of the Church, the encyclical is impressive."  

A lighter note was sounded with the opening of the Vatican radio station in February, 1931. The Literary Digest voiced the consensus of opinion thusly: "It is with a kindred feeling of awe that the press generally is profoundly stirred by the voice which gave substance to the traditionally lonely and shadowy figure of the Vatican, and which speaking in the language of ancient Rome, brought a message which all could understand." On the ninth anniversary of his coronation Pius XI had inaugurated station H V J under the direction of Senator William Marconi. The message was broadcast half an hour later by Monsignor Francis Spellman in English. The Indianapolis News remarked: "Of the words addressed more particularly to his own flock there is no need to say anything further than that there is nothing in them to which even the fiercest Protestant can reasonably object. It is, in short, a message of peace and

licensed or by his direction or prescription; 2) by any medical college legally chartered; 3) by any druggist in filling any prescription of a licensed physician; 4) by any licensed hospital or clinic."

The bill had been reported back, debated, passed by the senate, but Senator McCarran (a Catholic) then asked that a unanimous vote be taken for its approval as he had not been aware that it was passed. Senator Hastings urged that the bill be passed at least in the Senate, to encourage the women who had fought so hard for its success. Because there was objection to the bill, it was passed over again. It never reached the House. (U.S. Congress, Senate bill 1842 Congressional Record, 73rd Congress, 2nd Sess., [Washington, 1934], p. 11314.


40Literary Digest CVIII (March 1931), p. 22.
good-will—of encouragement in well-doing.41 As if in echo, the Boston Post described his words as "a noble manifestation of Christian charity and good-will."42

Even the usually hostile Nation congratulated Catholicism on its eloquent speaker in glowing terms:

They heard an apostrophe to all creatures of the earth, to God on High, to believers, to the Catholic hierarchy, to missionaries, to rich and poor, to employer and employed, to the afflicted and to those outside the true faith. God was praised, the others were urged to believe in Him and His holy Agent, to do good to one another, to be just, obedient, humble, forbearing, to pray for righteousness. A message, in short, from another world to this one. ... It is the strength of the Catholic Church that it has the authority and the power to make such an address sublime rather than ridiculous. ... in an age when Protestantism is at its weakest and wateriest, there may be a cause for fears. It is evident that when the Pope, from his high place, speaks as grandly as twice lately he has spoken, when sentences roll from him so much more lofty than the sentences of any other public man, his words must carry weight. ... Shall we have a Catholic revival? We can only wait and see.43

On the fortieth anniversary of Rerum Novarum, the mighty encyclical of Leo XIII on labor problems, Pope Pius XI delivered his third radio broadcast, the first to be given outside, in the courtyard of St. Damasco. A new encyclical was delivered at this time, in three languages, Italian, French and German, to ten thousand pilgrims gathered for the occasion.44 In Washington D. C.

---


42 Ibid.


officials of the American Federation of Labor were backing up their organization's declaration that labor should strike before yielding to wage reductions. With most of the world in the throes of unemployment, depression and poverty the encyclical occurred with dramatic timeliness to set forth the rights and duties of labor and management and a reconstruction of the social system.45

Although the encyclical was criticized by opponents of the Church as containing nothing new, Quadragesimo Anno was considered by many to be far ahead of the economic thought of the day. The reconstruction the Pope recommended was both economic and moral. The economic doctrine was halfway between individualism and socialism. It repudiated economic liberalism, laissez-faire, and unlimited competition. The functions assigned the state are extensive but the limits of state control fully pointed out so that it should never exemplify even a moderate degree of real collectivism or socialism. Realistically the Pope indicated both the evils of capitalism and the dangers in extreme methods of reform and presented practical proposals. He laid down not only principles but their concrete application.46

George Cardinal Mundelein was quoted in Time expressing the "new" attitude of the Church toward labor: "The trouble with us in the past has been that we were too often allied or drawn into an alliance with the wrong side. Selfish employers of labor have flattered the Church by calling it a great conservative

45 Literary Digest CIX (May 1931), pp. 5-6. Digest's own story here.

force, and then called upon it to act as a police force while they paid but a pitance of a wage to those who work for them. I hope that day has gone by. Our place is beside the working man. These are our people; they build our churches, our priests come from their sons."

Agreeing wholeheartedly with the main premise of the encyclical—that spiritual considerations and the economic organization of society cannot be divorced—the New Republic put forth its views. In general it was called a document of "brave words" but "lame and watered-down conclusions." It was an appeal to capitalists to "be good". . . . "It is not a recognition of the right of the worker to demand something better but an admonition to the rich to exercise charity. . . . The Church has no new light to offer in the present economic crisis." The encyclical is really an appeal to workers not to become communists and socialists."

"In the United States Catholic power in the trade unions has been largely conservative," followed the commentary, "it has been a strong force to keep the unions out of independent political action because it has always tried to outlaw these socialistic influences which in every country have led labor into politics. In countries where socialism has grown more than here, it has set up rival unions and parties which have divided the labor movement and blunted its edge. The Church has, in fact, rested the fate of its economic principles on

47"Catholics for Labor", Time XXXVII (June 1941), pp. 65-67. For other Catholic comment see "Catholic Social Science", America XLVIII (February 18, 1933), pp. 469-470.

the dubious hypothesis that the change it professes to desire can be brought about by the good will of those who are economically powerful, balanced by trade-unionism "pure and simple."49

"If in the future, socialism should come into being, we shall find the Church saying that socialism—by another name—is just what it has always been preaching. We shall find it attempting to make terms with the powers that be. It will try to adapt to Christian principles the doctrine with which agreement is now 'always absolutely impossible'."50

The New York Times declared in an editorial that it felt the ideals of socialists, unlike those of communists, no longer opposed to those of the Church—that they were both working for social justice and the dignity of human labor. On the Continent, unfortunately, the article ran, socialists still had anti-religious characteristics. In Britain they had a different, even evangelical, character.51

A conservative's view of the efforts of the Church in labor reform was given in the American Mercury: ... "numerous Catholic leaders have been not at all backward in denouncing the present social order. They employ the Pope's words, in his famous labor encyclical, 'the tyrannical despotism' of capitalism. Some of the statements of these priests and lay spokesmen sound more like Union Square diatribes than utterances of the most conservative re-

49Ibid.


The article went on to harshly condemn the efforts of the Catholic Worker as well as the much-castigated Father Coughlin.

Heywood Broun, this time speaking in the Washington News, noted that liberal and even radical thinkers might find themselves "in possibly surprising agreement with the head of the Catholic Church," but in some particulars have differences of opinion. For instance, the reference to the workingman's "legitimate" wage requirements—"now over that word legitimate hundreds of strikes have been fought and hundreds more are still to come." He also believed that it would be impossible for one devout man who determined to listen to the Holy Father's words and raise his employees' pay in opposition to others who refused to do so, and still to maintain his business. All employers would have to do so.

While agreeing with the Pope that the condition of the worker should be improved, the Chicago Journal of Commerce claimed that, in speaking of the concentration of economic power, the Pontiff did not seem to realize that great productive units today are commonly owned by multitudes of stockholders and it differed with the theory that the economic system needed reconstruction.

53 Ibid.
55 Ibid.
56 Chicago Journal of Commerce in Literary Digest CIX (May 1931), pp. 5-6.
That "he has merely restated in general terms a principle which the best secular thought of the day had already arrived at without any pontifical prdding" was the cold opinion of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot.57

Lux Veritatis, the papal encyclical issued in 1931 on the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Ephesus, used this historic opportunity to beg for the reunion of all the churches.58 The letter restated the doctrine of the hypostatic union of the divine and human natures of the one Person, Jesus Christ, the Divine Motherhood of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the divine right of the Roman Pontiff to teach the whole Church in faith and morals with supreme and infallible authority. Historical arguments are taken from incidents at the Council of Ephesus. The Pope showed clearly that the Council had orders from Pope Celestine not to put the question to discussion but to consider it settled and defined by the Apostolic See. The Fathers consented and approved of the words of the Pope. Pius XI particularly appealed to the eastern churches who venerate Mary and who were one at the time of the Council of Ephesus, to return to their "ancient, common Father."59

Earlier in his reign Pius had, in the encyclical, Quas Primas, instituted the feast of Christ the King as a means of uniting all Christians under one head and carrying out the motto of his pontificate, "The Peace of Christ in the

57Virginian-Pilot (Norfolk), ibid.


The date chosen for the feast, October 31, was strongly objected to by Lutherans because it marked their break with Catholicism and they suggested that their fellow-religionists ignore the invitation to unite in prayer on that day with the Catholic Church. 61

They declared that their church refused to be "caught with the Pope's bait" and that they saw "a sinister motive" behind the fixing of the feast. Other zealots for church unity like Bishop W. T. Manning and Reverend Doctor S. Parkes Cadman refused to comment. 62

Disapproving, H. C. Offerman stated: "We may not say that the Pope is not sincere in his expressed desire to see Jesus Christ universally recognized as king over all people and things on earth, but there can be no doubt that he thinks, and perhaps sincerely, that the best way to bring this about is to counteract, as far as possible, the Reformation and the liberating truths of the gospel which it restored to men." 63

"May we not commend to the consideration of all Protestants the question whether they will not more certainly honor Christ as their Savior and King by

---

60 Quas primas. December 11, 1925. Latin text, A.A.S. XVII, December 28, 1925, pp. 593-610; English translation, Tablet CXLVII (January 2-9, 1926), pp. 7-8, 38-41.

61 "Lutherans to Fight Papal Feast Edict", New York Times, March 21, 1926, p. 12. This protest was made by the National Lutheran Council. In the same article Reverend W. P. Ladd of Berkeley Divinity School urged all Christians to observe the feast to combat laicism and secularism in the government.

62 Ibid.

63 "Assails Pope's Encyclical", New York Times, January 8, 1932, p. 13. This protest was made by the National Lutheran Council.
faithfully adhering to the truth of the Gospel and conforming their lives thereto than by joining in the celebration of a mighty festival marked by 'magnificent processions' and outward 'ceremonies'.

Cardinal Hayes replied in the *Times* to the statements of the various Protestant leaders who refused the invitation to reunion offered by the Pope on the grounds that Catholics worship the Virgin Mary, and that the Fathers of the Church did not acknowledge the Holy See, by showing the meaning of the veneration the Catholics have for Mary, and quoted Jerome, Augustine, John Chrysostom, Ambrose and Athanasius to prove their support of the primacy of Rome.

"Arise and Amend the Earth" was the title of a *Times* editorial, concerned in May, 1932, with *Caritate Christi Compulsi*, an encyclical on the causes and effects of the depression and which congratulated the pope on compassionating the whole of suffering mankind. "Even those in hardship or penury may, as the encyclical suggests, find heart to sing with St. Francis."

Perhaps the last encyclical to cause nationwide comment and some consternation in several quarters was that which contained a grave warning against unclean motion pictures. *Vigilanti Cura* struck when the movie industry was at

---

64 *New York Times*, March 21, 1926, p. 12. Bishop E. D. Mouzon was the spokesman here, he also invited Pope to join the Methodist Evangelical Church.


its greatest output; sound and color had been added to attract patrons, and its heroes and heroines were national idols.\textsuperscript{68} Strangely enough, the most violent opposition did not come from the Hollywood producers but from those "liberals" who were opposed to any form of censorship on principle.

The encyclical praised the Legion of Decency and the work of the bishops and the faithful who cooperated with them, and advocated a "permanent reviewing office" set up in every country by the bishops. It stressed that recreation had become a necessity to people who labor under the fatiguing conditions of modern industry but that it must be recreation worthy of the rational nature of man, therefore morally healthy; it must be elevated to the rank of a positive good and must seek to arouse noble sentiment.\textsuperscript{69}

The \textit{New Republic} led the forces of assault and fulminated against the "control of the chief recreation of the entire nation by such a sectarian body," reproved the code used by the censors as being absurd and inconsistent and criticized the banning of pro-Loyalist films on Spain through the action of the Holy Name Society.\textsuperscript{70}

Published the same month, another article attacked Catholic Action movements to boycott magazines, news sellers, and radio programs as immoral, while


\textsuperscript{69}"Encyclical on Motion Pictures", Catholic World CXLIII (August 1936), pp. 618-619.

\textsuperscript{70}Lehmann, "Censorship by the Church", New Republic (November 23, 1938), pp. 64-66.
through their efforts broadcasting time was denied to Jehovah Witnesses. 71

"The Church in the darkening days of the Roosevelt depression decided, as a last resort"... to rush "pell-mell into a drive on immoral movies" ran an article in the American Mercury. 72 "But in general the Church campaign has simmered down to classifying films according to their suitability for adults and children—a business that has more amused than perplexed the movie officials. ... Rarely has the Church in this country suffered a more humiliating defeat." 73

Time magazine devoted a large space to the printing of the encyclical but made no comment for or against the teachings it contained. 74

The Christian Science Monitor was in complete accord with a campaign for decency in films. However, the editorial expressed a fear that the influence of the Church and the Pope on public life might gain too great a headway:

But whether any one sect should so organize and press its opinions upon producers as to constitute a censorship of its own is a question whose answer depends on the purposes to which that censorship is directed. ... Producers might remember that other citizens besides those represented by highly organized agencies are also intensely interested in decent films. Those citizens, more quietly, perhaps, but at a similar cost to the box office, are exercising that natural sort of boycott which results simply from lack of interest in the indecent, the vulgar, or even banal in entertainment. 75

71 Lehmann, "Censorship by the Church", (November 30, 1938), pp. 94-96.
73 Ibid.
74 Time XXVIII (July 1936), p. 52.
In 1928 an editorial in the *New York Times* doubted that the censorship of movies was accomplishing any good: "If this scattered censorship accomplished what it set out to do we might approve of it but it is in most cases so weak in judgement, so prejudiced and foolish that it becomes a source of either irritation or ridicule." Sympathizing with the theatre in 1932, the same paper proclaimed (after only four plays made the Catholic white list and those four folded): "A difficult year for all the arts, this season has been particularly hard on the theatre. . . . If it has been able to keep on courageously producing several plays that many people have rated high, it deserves more praise than blame." Yet when the encyclical praising the censorship board was published, the *Times* was loud in its commendation: "The voice that has spoken is that of the one representing a world organization which has in itself attributes of immortality. It bids men to use the temporal in such a manner as not to lose the good eternal."

Opinion then, in regard to the "social" encyclicals was for the most part averse. The liberals believed in reorganizing the social order along their own lines and resented intervention. Only one source criticized the Pope's radicalism. All others rebuked his steadfastness to age-old doctrine and his con-

---


77 *Ibid.*, May 10, 1932, p. 20. Out of the fifty plays which began the season, four—"If Booth Had Missed"; "Money in the Air"; "The Round-up"; "The Truth About Blayds"—and two musical productions, "Robin Hood" and "The Laugh Parade" made the white list. All of these closed in a very short time. (*Times*, May 9, 1932, p. 17.)

servative caution in regard to social changes. Pius XI had, however, brought papal opinion to the fore on these questions as it had not been brought since the time of Leo XIII.
CHAPTER IV

CAESAR VERSUS GOD

The thirties progressed. Situations became more complex, international tension mounted, hope for lasting peace disappeared. The United States, Great Britain and France watched Adolph Hitler rise to power unable, or unwilling to register disapproval. Civil war raged in Spain and served as a proving ground for the forces of Communism and Fascism. Mussolini sated Italy's hunger for North African expansion and took Ethiopia after a pretense of struggle over legal rights. In the face of the distending swell of Fascism, Communism became less an evil to some and the Church was criticized for considering it still an enemy. Actually, however, the Vatican also seemed to be favoring the more democratic movements and condemning the extreme rightists. Bavaria's secession from Republican Germany was halted by Vatican influence and the welfare of the new Weimar government protected by papal opposition to the occupation of the Ruhr and the dismemberment of Upper Silesia. Although the Lateran Treaty had been signed, the Vatican consistently denounced the movements of Fascism which

opposed the Church both in Italy and Germany. L’Action française, which wanted Germany crushed, was distressed by the Pope’s attempts at mediation in Germany’s favor and was finally silenced by the papal bull, Inscrutabiliti Providentia, for its war-mongering and thoughts of revenge.

The struggle in Mexico between Church and State fluctuated for almost sixteen years of Pius XI’s reign. The United States, because of its proximity to the problem, debated the issue hotly. Most Catholics felt intervention should be urged while Protestants condemned any thought of helping the persecuted churchmen and blamed the trouble on their exploitation of the peons.

The promulgation in 1923 of the Mexican Constitution of 1917 which barred the Church from education, abolished religious orders, nationalized Church property and drastically controlled clerical number, garb, and activity, released new violence against the Church. Priests and nuns were murdered, churches rifled and burned. In retaliation the Church went on strike. Clergy and influential laymen organized and appealed for a change in the law. Bands of organized zealots, who called themselves cristeros, were accused of raiding government schools, killing teachers and dynamiting trains. Due to the mediation of United States Ambassador Morrow, the deadlock was finally broken in June 1929. A realistic compromise provided that the Church would accept the registration of priests in charge of church buildings, while the government would waive the rule for others. The Church confirmed the ban on religious schools but obtained permission to give instruction within church walls. The government guaranteed the Church the right to petition for constitutional
changes. 2

Taking the reactions of the press chronologically, we note various opinions of the contest. Edward Ross, in the New Republic recognized it as a struggle between the thirteenth and nineteenth centuries. The Mexican revolutionists saw in the Church the main prop of land feudalism and treated it as a political enemy. The Church-sponsored benefits undertaken for the poor he underrates as done to keep up with the infiltration of Protestant missionaries. 3

At the Vatican the desire for compromise seemed to prevail. In 1928 through the visiting Michael Williams, the Pope begged that the Mexican issue be handled editorially by the American press but Williams did not succeed in getting the mission fulfilled. 4

When the Papal Delegate was expelled for holding a service in the open the Vatican did not protest. 5 In his encyclical of February 2, 1926, Pope Pius XI


4New York Times, January 30, 1928, p. 20. (In this article Williams regrets publicly that he had been unable to do what the Pope requested of him while he was in Rome. The Pope had given Williams a special statement which asked the free press of the world to come out against the outraged Catholics in Mexico. The Times printed the statement but did not handle it editorially.)

directed the bishops to refrain from all political activity. The Apostolic Delegate announced that he would not officiate in public, wear priestly vestments and would limit his activities to the spiritual welfare of the Mexican Catholics. The Mexican clergy, however, repudiated the Constitution and caused the commencement of more hostile action.6

In 1932 the New Republic laid responsibility for the persecution with the Mexican hierarchy, praised Acerba Animi for its fatherly tone and poked fun at the politicos who begrudged the Church even the few coppers that went into the collection plates.7

The Nation served as debating floor for Father John A. Ryan and Jose Bejarano as they strove to explain the struggle from their respective sides.8 The New Republic, at the same time used the usual criticism of the enormous wealth of the clergy, their flagrant immorality and their persecution of Protestants and Jews as a cause for their troubles. The author felt that Catholicism would remain despite the action of the government and expressed the hope that the Church would forget her temporal claims and work with the

6Ibid.


8"Liberty and the Roman Catholic Church", The Nation CXXII (June 16, 1926), pp. 660-662. John A. Ryan was professor of moral theology and industrial ethics at Catholic University at Washington, D. C.; Jose Miguel Bejarano was Mexican journalist known as a writer for the liberal and radical press. He was also secretary of the Mexican Chamber of Commerce in New York City.
State for the betterment of the Mexican people. 9

Describing the terrible chaos caused by the mass of thousands of Indians trying to receive the sacraments before the priests went "on strike", Carleton Beals blamed the Church for not accepting civil or religious adjustments with good grace: "The present conflict grew out of the Church's renewed anti-government activities fomented by the bitter apostolic letter of the Holy See of February 2, 1926 and the reinforcement of a manifesto signed by the American episcopacy in 1917 attacking the religious provisions of the constitution." 10

John Dewey in the New Republic held that the distinctiveness of the anticlerical legislation in Mexico was the thoroughness with which it was carried out, 11 while Carleton Beals, again reporting from Mexico, pointed out the reasons why any popular political action which existed was on the side of the dictatorial government: "... there remain the older historical arguments. These are the monopolistic character of the Roman Catholic Church, past and present; its support of reactionary, anti-republican governments; its hold upon the fanaticism of the ignorant native populations, without any concomitant attempt to improve economic or educational standards; the preponderant influence in the hierarchy of foreign priests ... and the entrenched bureaucra-

9 "Mexico and the Catholics", New Republic XXVIII (July 1926), pp. 268-270.

10 Carleton Beals, "The Mexican Church Goes On Strike", The Nation CXXIII (August 18, 1926), pp. 145-147. Beals was a correspondent for the Nation, living in Mexico and studying social and political institutions.

One more hostile attack was leveled at the Church by Hugh Stutfield, who admitted that the natives of Mexico have owed much to the Church in the past, but that her day is past and over even though her priests and bishops were not to be blamed for refusing to accept "the view of progressives that she is an incubus which must now make room for some better, less anomalous and more up-to-date system."13

Bishop Pascual Diaz defended the Church's position in an article in 1928 and named the condemnation of Marxian principles as the basis for the struggle between Church and State.14

Considering the claim that no child be given religious instruction in Mexico to be unjust, an editorial in the New York Times compared Mexico to Germany where the individual held no rights.15 When in 1937, Pius XI spoke to the Mexican Church in a second encyclical, the Times welcomed the cessation of hostility which seemed imminent.16

When a settlement had finally been reached, through the mediation of Dwight Morrow, the clergy returned to their posts in 1929, agreeing to most of


14 Bishop Pascual Diaz, "State vs. Church in Mexico", North American Review CCXXV (April 1928), pp. 401-408. Diaz was bishop of Tabasco, Mexico.


16 Ibid., March 30, 1937, p. 22.
the conditions laid down by the Mexican government. The New Republic had to say: "With all the rejoicing over the settlement, the fact emerges that the Mexican hierarchy has accepted the governmental conditions which three years ago it declared intolerable. . . . These restrictions are understandable after a study of the persistent abuse of power of the Mexican Roman Catholic Church, its former economic and political as well as spiritual dominance over the nation, its continuous interference in affairs of state . . . its hostility to agrarian reforms . . . public school education . . . and labor unionism." 17 Noting this period of international anxiety over the disorder in Mexico, it is evident that on the whole, the criticism is of the Mexican hierarchy, not of Pope Pius XI, or even Vatican policy.

The struggle against Fascism was a constant one for Pius XI, one which he could never afford to relax. His faith in the pacts he signed with the totalitarian powers has been readily criticized but his vigorous action against their radicalism attests to his condemnation of their basic tenets and practices.

The Ethiopian war is perhaps the first time the papacy is accused of siding with the aims of Mussolini. Luigi Sturzo explained that the Pope found himself bound by the Lateran Treaty by which he agreed that "the Holy See, in regard to sovereignty even in the international field, declares that it wishes to remain and will remain extraneous to the temporal competition between other states and to the international conferences summoned for such an object, unless the contending parties agree to appeal to its mission of peace, while

reserving to itself in any case the right to make its moral and spiritual protest heard.\textsuperscript{18} The Pope, said Sturzo, took advantage of this last reservation and counseled patience, moderation and pacification. There was no moral issue mentioned either by the League of Nations or by the Pope. Most of the bishops, clergy and Catholic press of Italy took up a clear position in favor of the war and against sanctions. From abundant documentation Sturzo noted that the ethical problem raised by the war was considered by these three groups from three standpoints: that the government of a country was sole judge of the justice of its own cause and the people were obliged to obey; that the African war was a war for Christian civilization; that sanctions were immoral as seeking to impede Italy in the exercise of a right. Since no contrary voice could make itself heard in Italy, we have the right to suppose that not all the clergy nor all the Catholics held these opinions, although it was very difficult, even for them, to form an independent opinion in view of Fascist propaganda carried by

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{18}}Sturzo, Church and State, pp. 501-504. The Pope gave his opinion of the Ethiopian affair in a discourse to the International Congress of Catholic Nurses, \underline{Viola un Coup d'Oeil}, August 27, 1935: "In Italy, on the other hand, the talk is about a possible war which would be just, inasmuch as it would be a war for defense, to assure the frontiers against continual and incessant dangers, as well as a war necessitated by the expansion of a population growing larger every day, and therefore, a war justified by the defensive and material needs of a country.

Dear daughters, if it be true that the need for expansion and the need for frontier defense do, indeed exist, then We cannot forbid Ourself from hoping that the need will be met by means other than war. If any ask, "How?" it is evidently not easy to answer; but nonetheless We cannot believe that an answer is impossible. The possibility must be studied. One thing, however, seems to be clear to Us. Allowing that expansion is a need of which account must be taken, the right of defense has limits and restrictions which cannot be ignored without culpability." (H. G. Koenig, Principles for Peace, Washington, 1943, pp. 483-484.)
every means, and the absolute lack of contrary voices and possible control of information. In other countries Catholics were in the majority against the war, while the Catholic press was divided pro and contra, according to its political theories.\(^\text{19}\)

Although there were many articles concerning the Ethiopian conquest, none mentioned the attitude of Pius XI toward the affair. An article in the Nation hoped that the powers would be firm in applying the sanctions and thought that "if the present generation of Ethiopians show half the fighting skill of their fathers at Adowa, Mussolini may find that war gives neither the prestige, the riches, nor the power of which he has dreamed."\(^\text{20}\) Roger Shaw expressed his Ethiopian sympathies but said that his chief pity was for the "unfortunate Italians conscripts, torn from their farms and slums willy-nilly, at the imperious behest of a dictator."\(^\text{21}\)

World peace has long been the policy of the Vatican. Pius XI had dedicated his pontificate to the "Peace of Christ", yet suspicion and controversy had surrounded Vatican policy since the treaty with Mussolini. The Pope was charged with taking sides or taking the wrong side. In Germany the Vatican

\(^{19}\text{Ibid.}\)


also followed its avowed policy of striving to secure its position while it sought to avoid political entanglement.

When the smaller states of Germany which had established relations with the Holy See were abolished by Hitler, the Pope hesitated to make terms with the new and harsher Fascism. Pius XI held contempt for Hitler but in the end he remained true to his policy of accepting relations with all governments, as did the United States and Britain. The first step was taken by Hitler himself, who sent Franz Von Papen as his envoy to Rome and secured a hurriedly negotiated concordat in July 1933. The Pope's worst fears were soon realized but he said nothing for four years. There were individual protests to Hitler by brave clerics but there was little official resistance from the Church.22

We have Von Papen's account of the negotiations for the Concordat. In his memoirs he takes credit for planning the pact but it was strongly backed by Cardinal Pacelli and Doctor Kaas. Von Papen sees Hitler's intention of deceit today but had handled the discussions in good faith in 1933. He feels that until he left office in 1934 the Concordat was honored as much as possible. Goebbels constantly assailed Hitler for approving it.23

Few articles mentioned the Concordat itself, although many others dis-


cussed the difficulties of Catholics under the Third Reich. G. E. W. Johnson said about the agreement in the North American Review: "The most significant provision of this treaty was perhaps article 32 whereby the Vatican undertook to restrain all German ecclesiastics from joining or supporting any Catholic political party. ... Some [provisions] ... were phrased in such vague terms that they could readily become a fertile source of future discord. ... The impression left by the Concordat was that it was a stop-gap agreement regarded as definitive by neither party, but temporarily accepted by both because it afforded a breathing spell in which they could maneuver for position."²⁴

The Nation also distrusted Hitler and his agreements and criticized the Concordat as the Vatican's "second great mistake, a mistake for which it is now paying dearly. By giving up without a struggle its vehicles of political expression, the Centrist and the Bavarian People's Party, it deprived itself of its most important bulwark against the National Socialist regime."²⁵ Although the Church is praised for putting up a courageous fight, the author stoops to the suspicion that "it may take its stand in line with German fascism if and when Hitler accedes to its demands."²⁶ A later article in the same journal praised the bravery of the youth and the common Catholics while the bishops bowed to Hitler's wishes.²⁷

²⁶Ibid.
On the other hand a great deal of credit was given Cardinal Faulhauber for his outspoken criticism of the Nazi ideology. He "who can still say what others hardly dare to think" was quoted in the column as laying the basis of the struggle at the two completely different ideologies which can never be reconciled. "The Nazi conception of Nordic superiority is inimical to the very essence of ecclesiastic religion."

Noting the reported suicide of Reverend Thomas Stuhlweissenburg in a Nazi prison, an editorial paragraph in the Nation was of the opinion that: "If a German Catholic priest ends his life rather than endure longer the torments of a German prison, it is news. And one may suspect, the Catholic belief in the impropriety of suicide being what it is, that Doctor Stuhlweissenburg's death was actively hastened by his jailers."

The New York Times also picked out Cardinal Faulhauber as a man worthy of praise, and extolled his attack on the Teutonic race concept: "For hundreds of years the Germans enlisted in the Roman armies to fight their race brothers for foreign pay. A modern Marxist would hardly do worse. The attack of the Cardinal will give pain all along the line."

After recovering from the illness that nearly took his life in 1937, the Pope poured out his anguish in Mit brennender sorge which attacked the Nazi

---

29 Ibid.
practices of extolling blood and race and for interfering with education.\footnote{Mit brennender sorge. March 14, 1937. German text, A.A.S. XXIX, April 10, 1937, pp. 145-167; English translation, Catholic Mind XXXV (May 8, 1937), pp. 185-204.}
The German press heaped scorn on the author and no reconciliation with the German government ever followed although there was never a definite break with Germany.\footnote{Hayden, "Foreign Policy of the Vatican", p. 286.} The encyclical was not allowed to be published in any secular or religious paper of Germany and printers who dared make copies were imprisoned. Nevertheless, every German Catholic heard the encyclical read from the pulpit and received new courage. Although the Pope seemed to extend an invitation of reconciliation, the struggle only became fiercer. Parents were intimidated to vote against confessional schools and priests and nuns were slandered by immoral reports and accusations.\footnote{Waldemar Gurian, "In Utmost Anxiety", America XVIII (July 1937), pp. 488-494.}

The Pope's first and direct and public intervention in the German conflict was heralded by the \textit{New York Times} as another challenge to the Third Reich, and an inspiration to all faiths in Germany to stand fast. "For nothing is more certain in Germany today than that the Government must bend to a strong popular resistance."\footnote{\textit{New York Times}, March 23, 1937, p. 22.}

Four months later the \textit{Times} marked that things had not improved:

Unrest and discontent must have contributed to this whipping-up of fury with which Goebbels and Goering launched their renewed assaults. It all looks like an attempt to divert public attention...
from the actual financial and industrial difficulties with which the Germans are struggling. There is also doubtless a strain of fanaticism. When he was giving his blessing the other day to a deputation of young German Catholics, the Pope exhorted them to go back resolved to defend their faith and to prevent Germany from returning to paganism. We have not of late heard so much of the old Teutonic, or so-called Aryan gods, yet it must still have its appeal to the more extreme Nazi leaders.\footnote{Ibid., August 7, 1937, p. 18.}

Time magazine referred to the encyclical as having "a passage which liberal Catholics hoped was a rap at fascism. Since the Church now appears to get along well with fascism of the Italian variety, the rap seems to apply to Nazism."\footnote{"Numbers Twenty-nine and Thirty", \textit{Time} XXIX (March 1937), p. 40.}

Unfortunately papers like the \textit{New Republic} could find basis for their criticism of Catholic support of Fascism. As late as 1938, Judge Herbert O'Brien spoke in a commencement address defending Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany and tribute was paid to his "words of wisdom" by Bishop Malloy of Brooklyn. "Daily in our newspapers you can see stories against Catholic Italy --Italy where our Holy Father resides. And yet Mussolini saved Italy from going Communistic along with Soviet Russia. And then we're constantly picking on Germany. What harm has she done us?" In Quebec Father Pierre Gravel declared: "I favor totalitarian states. Dictators have put an end to widespread abuses and political corruption, which are common in democratic countries."\footnote{Leo H. Lehmann, "The Catholic Church in Politics--Catholicism and Fascism", \textit{New Republic} XCVII (December 14, 1938), pp. 167-168. The \textit{New Republic} does not refer to the German situation directly at all.}
The Spanish civil war caused greater suspicion of the Vatican's sympathy with Fascism because again, interested in her spiritual rights and the spiritual welfare of her children, the Church supported the side which guaranteed these rights. The Spanish Church, like the Mexican Church, was charged by most commentators with getting her just deserts for interfering in political affairs.

The revolution which displaced Alphonso XIII in Spain in the elections of 1931 was accomplished with a minimum of excitement. The Christian Science Monitor applauded the King for accepting his defeat so gracefully and urging the monarchists not to cause any violence. The terrorism which broke out shortly afterward then, was highly regretted by the journal. "There is something paradoxical in the Spanish crowds destroying convents, churches and parochial schools... There have been signs that the Church is losing its hold but even were that evidence much stronger than it is, it would hardly be sufficient to explain these attacks... Clerical interference cannot excuse rioting... Much now depends on sound leadership which no doubt will be shown."39

Unfortunately the hope of the Monitor did not see fruition. In October, a writer in the Nation declared that "the possibility of compromise seems remote, with emotion rather than reason influencing the nation."40

Assailing the Church as the cause of Spain's decline of political and economic strength, a long article in the National Review criticized the Pope, his nuncio in Spain and the Spanish Church in general:

Had Charles V been able to see the advantages of a reformed Church like the Anglican institution, retaining some of the dogmas of the Roman Church but free from the sovereignty of the Pope, the course of Spanish history might have run a different and less tragic course. Spain might never have sunk into obscurity.

A papal encyclical accused the Republic of promising liberty in name, but of refusing it in fact. The growth of anti-religious feeling in Spain was compared by the Pope to similar events in Mexico and Russia, although—as he was careful to point out with all the astute logic of the Vatican—Rome was at first anxious to remain on amicable relations with the new regime, the purely political transformation making no difference in her attitude toward her beloved Spain...

Subtlety and adaptability, concealing far-sighted ambition have always been characteristics of the Vatican, whose policy is admirably effected by Monsignor Tedeschini, the Papal Nuncio in Madrid.41

After the passing of the "Ley de Confesiones y Congregaciones Religiosas" by the Cortes and its approval by the President of the Republic in May and June of 1933, protests in all forms followed from the Church, particularly the encyclical Dilectissima Nobis.42 The Spanish people were taken by surprise

---

41Inglis, "Rome in Spain", National Review CII (February 1934), pp. 232-239.

42Dilectissima Nobis. June 3, 1933. Latin text, A.A.S. XXV, June 5, 1933, pp. 261-274. The Pope condemned the laws against religious, separation of Church and State in a Catholic country; he protested against the exclusion of God from schools, hospitals and other institutions; he deplored the fact that religious were forbidden to teach, that Jesuits were expelled from the country of their founder. The Holy Father exhorted bishops to promote Catholic teaching and Catholic Action, not for political reasons but for the preservation of the Faith. (Catholic Mind XXXI, July 8, 1933, pp. 241-251.)
because they had lived in peace since 1876. 

The revolt had three characteristics in its first stages. These characteristics gave their colour to the civil war and created the impassioned atmosphere which followed. The first was the rapid disorganization of the State after many of its adherents went over to the side of the rebels. The second was the fierce resistance of the working classes, determined not to give in, but driven by fanaticism, by lack of authority, failure of all legal restraints, without sufficient arms and in an atmosphere of anarchism. Bishops were regarded as rebels, and all the Republicans were Reds. The sudden and violent persecution of the clergy, the massacres of priests and religious, the burning of Church property while powerless or approving authorities looked on, gave a motive for the clergy to range themselves on the other side.

The Holy See protested to Madrid but received no reply. Pius XI, in receiving exiled clergy from Spain on September 14, 1936 set forth in an interesting address the characteristics of the resistance of the Church: martyrdom, where this bore witness to the persecuted faith; resistance, where this could be carried on without excesses; prayer, even for the blinded adversary.

F. Jay Taylor, in relating the direction of American press opinion during the war, discusses the varied treatment of the conflict. The United and Associated Press used the terms "Spanish Government Forces" and "Insurgents" which


44Sturzo, Church and State, pp. 505-509. For another excellent background account, see Gerald Brenan, The Spanish Labyrinth (New York, 1943), pp. 309-310.
many papers altered to read "Loyalists" or "Fascists". In the Hearst press and Catholic press the rebels were seldom, if ever, described as fascists, while the forces of the Spanish government were referred to as "Reds" or "Communists". Other papers such as the New York Times, Christian Science Monitor and Washington Post called the rebels "Fascists" and used the term "Loyalists" to describe the Republican government. There is no doubt of the influence of these titles on the conditioning of thought and feeling of the American public.\(^45\)

One writer explained the dilemma by pointing out the lack of compromise in the Spanish nature, the extreme, ill-advised anti-clerical legislature and the idea of most Spaniards that reform has meant, for hundreds of years, to fight the Church.\(^46\)

"Franco's Catholicism, not his Fascism, was the main reason for his enthusiastic support by the Church," reiterated Sherman Hayden, despite the criticism of that support by other factions.\(^47\)

A Catholic, writing in the Nation, deplored the harm done by Catholic pressure groups in politics. Using Spain as an example, she criticized the assertion that Franco's bombs had the papal blessing. The Catholic duty is

\(^{45}\)F. Jay Taylor, The United States and the Spanish Civil War (New York, 1956), pp. 117-118. Cf. T. A. Bailey, A Diplomatic History of the American People (New York, 1940). He asserts that although most Americans were neutral, some believed for the most part that the Loyalists were upholding the cause of democracy.

\(^{46}\)Hayden, "Foreign Policy of the Vatican", p. 262.

\(^{47}\)Ibid.
put forward as being the following of individual convictions and avoiding the "deathtrap of the Catholic bloc." 48

Time recorded atrocities of the Reds against priests and nuns but did not seem to be partisan. In April, 1937, the same journal noted Pius's remark that "Mexico's clergy needs sanctification" and was disinclined to believe that the Pope blamed everything that happened in Spain on the Reds. Time quoted the Catholic World as saying: "There was something wrong in Spain. What was it?" 49 With the collapse of the Spanish Loyalists came what looked like a clean-cut Christian victory. Unfortunately it was also a Fascist victory. Even as Catholic editors wrote of it, General Franco set in motion a pact with Hitler for "cultural" purposes which would ban in one country what was banned in the other (papal encyclicals included) and give "fiscal preference to each others' works" (Mein Kampf and Völkischer Beobachter). 50

Later, after the Franco regime had been organized, Spain was depicted as "a land that never applied the Rerum Novarum." Franco's "bargain" with the Church was discussed, having gained the right to nominate bishops, subject to papal ratification, in return for paying the salaries of the clergy and returning confiscated Church property. "Now," the article quips, "he will apparently receive quid for his quo." 51

48 Ruth O'Keefe, "We Catholics Have a Duty", The Nation CXLVIII (May 1939), pp. 612-614.
49 Time XXIX (April 1937), p. 43.
50 Ibid., XXXIII (February 6, 1939), p. 24.
51 Ibid.
Another journal which favored the Loyalist forces during the war was the New Republic. An article by Shaemus O'Sheel attacked the unworthy clergy of Spain who made no effort at social reform and refused to "identify Franco with St. Michael." 52

Westbrook Pegler, in the same journal, argued that the indignation of working-class Catholics should be turned, not against the government side in Spain, but against the Spanish clergy and the well-born Spaniards of the Catholic faith who neglected a duty which was placed upon them. "To them originally, rather than to the mobs which raged in the early days of the war, I would charge the blame for the slaughter of the priests and nuns. . . . A duty was put upon the church to rebuke and correct its friends who exploited the masses." 53

The Spanish conflict, on the whole, was a popular subject for the press. The Holy Father was not blamed for the excesses which caused the persecution of the clericals but only for his backing of Franco's cause. Radicals especially were sharp in their criticism of the good relations between pope and dictator.

An encyclical denouncing communism, issued by Pope Pius XI in September, 1936, brought comment from the New York Times and the New Republic. The former read criticism of Hitler as well as of Stalin in the letter and praised the


vigor and optimism of an old man who "faces the future unafraid." The latter analyzed the traditional opposition of the Church to "liberalism" which divorces religion from the state. Despite the sympathy of Pius XI for the "deplorable social and economic conditions of the poor" great care is taken in the encycличals not to offend the privileged class. The inequalities and miseries which derive from our present economic system are "the consequences of sin" and can never be banished. The article pointed to Catholics who are drifting toward radicalism and then referred to Father Coughlin's vast "anti-Semitic, anti-Roosevelt, anti-Red" following.

By rejecting progressive parties, Lowenstein asserted in the Atlantic Monthly, "the Church has already lost contact with the working classes and other progressive forces." He criticized the Pope for maintaining relations with those he condemns, Fascists and Nazis. An article in America explained the Church's action toward totalitarian states as an obligation of the Church to tolerate for a time, the lesser of two evils, not intending to mean that she tolerated the evil. With Fascism, America went on, it is possible for her to establish a temporary modus vivendi and to wait for better times. But with Communism, essentially based on atheism and committed to fostering atheism, no such arrangement is possible. Answering this article Lowenstein continued:

It seems to me that compromising with something clearly recognized as evil is always a very dubious act. The ideology of

---

"blood and race" of "State Power" and allegedly semi-divine leaders is no less atheism than the form of society practiced in Soviet Russia. On the other hand, that temporary modus vivendi to which the editorial in the Catholic paper refers has led already to serious inner conflicts for many Catholics without relieving the troubles with which the world is faced; for example, the Abyssinian War, that fatal turning point in contemporary history, when high Italian prelates donated the treasures of their churches to Mussolini's war chests.

When the League of Nations imposed economic sanctions to end international lawlessness, the defiance of Fascist Italy was hailed in Italy's most important Catholic Review, Civita Cattolica, organ of the Jesuits, as "a wonderful spectacle of abnegation, cohesion and Christian strength." Coinciding with the news about the Fascist massacre in Addis Ababa on February 19, 1937, there came a circular from the president of Catholic Action in Italy approving the colonial and international policy of Fascism.57

A long article by George Seldes, known as a leading liberal, in the New Republic might serve to summarize this chapter on the Church's relations with the forces of communism and fascism. Although Communism, with its atheistic basis was still the primary enemy of the Church, Fascism, with its militant destruction of Catholic influence became an equally stubborn foe.

The authoritarianism of the Church, its war on Communism, recognition of Franco, friendly relations with Mussolini, the Pope's continued appeal to the German concordat, his satisfaction with the corporate states of Austria and Portugal, the aid to Hitler by Cardinal Innitzer, are all used by this liberal to demonstrate the leanings of the Vatican toward totalitarianism. Seldes criticized the American Catholics particularly who do not think freely on political matters. In France Cardinal Verdier denounced Fascism; Catholics are characterized as anti-fascist in England, where the Dominican Father Drinkwater

57Ibid.
published a leaflet criticizing Catholic papers for supporting Franco; in Belgium the Catholic press defames the Spanish dictator.

Relenting a little, the writer quoted Leo XIII as pointing out that the Church has never neglected to adopt itself to the genius of nations and Pius XI who, denying that the Church hampers political reforms, repeats in Dilectissimi Nobis the policy of the Church to accommodate itself to all forms of government and civil institutions provided the rights of God and Christian conscience are left intact. This policy, he said, explained Russia, Japan, Mexico and Spain. It had paid the Church to adapt itself to the policies of Fascist nations. "It may be opportunism. It may be Machiavellianism. But it is adapting the Church to the times as it sees best. It may, of course, sub specie aeternitatis, prove to be the biggest mistake the Vatican has made in centuries. But it is a temporary—temporal—policy. In the course of time fascism will disappear but the Church, having made use of it for its own ends, will go on."58

The American press, then, in the political sphere, for the most part criticized the part taken by the Church in an avenue which they considered she did not belong. The quarrels in Mexico and Spain were given very much the same treatment, while the Concordat with Hitler received hardly any attention at all. Those who suffered in persecution were pitied in every country where disorder reigned. The encyclicals delivered by the Holy Father at this period seemed to ratify the suspicion newsmen had of the radical changes taking place in the governments of the twentieth century.

CHAPTER V

SIC TRANSIT GLORIA MUNDI

A man who had always enjoyed excellent health, Pius XI refused to admit illness until the end of his life. During the last months of 1936 and early part of 1937, over eighty years of age, he suffered such a serious illness that his death was rumored. A successor to the papal throne was discussed by two journals at this time. Reinhold Niebuhr mentioned Cardinal Pacelli as being a possible candidate, though he doubted his election because of his office of Secretary of State. Concerning the political situation he added: "There is a particular pathos in the present Catholic anti-Communist campaign with its admission that the Church does not like Fascism but prefers it to Communism because Communism tries to destroy it while Fascism merely embarrasses it."1

Leo Lehmann, in another article in his series, remarked that "the successor of the ailing Pontiff, who will instruct the bishops of America in matters of vital concern to the future of democracy will undoubtedly have to be Fascist-minded to please Mussolini," and again, in concluding his declamations on the "Catholic Church in Politics", he expressed the hope that if Catholicism here, as in France, would be "earnest in caring for the common welfare, and

1Reinhold Niebuhr, "Pius XI and His Successor", The Nation CXLIV (January 1937), pp. 120-122.
less concerned about the details of birth control, marital relations, movie and radio censorship and the like, then American Catholics may indeed rejoice, and non-Catholics relax their suspicions that the Church is not willing to cooperate in the preservation of the free institutions of American democracy.\(^2\)

Despite the predictions to the contrary the Pope lived for two years during which time he wrote the great encyclicals on conditions in Russia, Spain, and Germany. On the eve of the Munich conference he spoke on the martyrdom of St. Wenceslaus, patron saint of Czechoslovakia and begged God and man for peace. He pleaded with Mussolini not to join Hitler, as he felt that Italy's neutrality would help to localize the conflict that seemed imminent. Even he who had always been an optimist had become a pessimist. He begged God to take his life as a price for peace.\(^3\)

As his health grew worse and he suffered several heart attacks, the Holy Father determined to leave a message with the Italian bishops (presumably on fascism) and called a meeting for February 12. When the bishops met on that day it was to kneel at his bier and pray for the soul of the great man.\(^4\)

After death men spoke of him much as they had done during life. It was 1939 and all the evils of totalitarianism had been unveiled. The critics


\(^3\)Aradi, Pope Pius XI, pp. 237-247.

\(^4\)Ibid., pp. 248-249. The message of Pius XI was recently released for publication on the anniversary of the Lateran Treaty and in memory of the death of that Pontiff. Pope John XXIII, in a letter to the Italian bishops, gave the contents of the document to the world. (A.A.S. LI, March 11, 1959, pp. 129-135.)
struck out at Pius XI’s acceptance of this form of government. The world was working itself into the fear and hatred which precedes war and any suspicious policies were declaimed. As a man Achille Ratti was honored, as a statesman, his moves were regarded warily.

His friends were friends still and his foes as bitter after death as they had been in life. The New York Times which had always been friendly toward him mourned:

The Pope is dead who, of all modern popes seemed the most indomitable in body and spirit. . . . Strength was his dominant quality—strength of body, strength of will, strength of mind. . . . History will associate his name with the Lateran Treaty of 1929, which ended the impasse lasting since 1870 in the relations between the Holy See and the Italian government. Critics of the agreement argued that it was a victory for Mussolini rather than the Pope, and undoubtedly the reconciliation between church and state strengthened the Fascist regime. But events have proved the statesmanship of Pius XI in seizing the unique opportunity offered by the dictatorship to terminate without controversy the Pope’s romantic but unreal and untenable position as "Prisoner of the Vatican" in a Rome that was the inevitable capital of a united Italy. . . . In reality the Lateran Treaty was the attempt of Pius XI to stand clear of what he recognized as the new enemy of the Church, the supreme state. . . . His battle against the atheism of communism constituted one phase of this war; toward the end he was more preoccupied with the conflict with the racial religion of National Socialism. He died waging this fight. His last battle was against the policy of "racism" in Italy, vigorously condemned as wholly incompatible with the Christian conception of human equality before God.

This was the fundamental concern of the pontificate of Pius XI. His succession to the papacy in 1922 coincided roughly with the rise of communism and fascism. From his high observation post he watched the two systems develop into world powers and his last years were shadowed by the clash of their collision. . . . His successor will carry on his work, but a valiant and powerful personality, a religious leader of unflinching courage, driven to the last by a heroic sense of the terrible responsibility of his office, is lost to the world in the passing of the 261st Pope.5

Time considered that he had "revealed himself to a vigorous post-war world as a man of vigorous words and deeds, an often stubborn taker of no man's advice, a good-humored breaker of precedents, in every sense a great Pope, given to the Catholic Church at a time when she greatly needed one."6

Another article during the same month expressed the feeling that there had been a change in anti-Catholic feeling in the United States during the reign of Achille Ratti. "The country is still Protestant but among the deepening class cleavages of today, the Roman Catholic Church is recognized as the Gibraltar of conservatism, and respect for the constancy of its moral values has revived."7

The Christian Science Monitor recognized the late Pontiff as an individual who had begun life humbly and who had never lost touch with the common people, "combining in unusual degree the qualities of mental and physical vigor" and concluded that: "Officially he leaves tasks which will tax the energy and intelligence of any successor. Personally he leaves the record of a man who humbly and greatly served."8

"Not in many centuries has the passing of a Pope been as sincerely mourned in non-Catholic circles as the death of Pius XI," eulogized the Nation. "His courage in attacking Naziism in criticizing the importation of German racial theories into Italian fascism had won him wide respect and applause."9

---

6"Death of a Pope", Time XXXIII (February 20, 1939), p. 29.
7Time XXXIII (February 27, 1939), p. 9.
9"Pius XI", The Nation CXLVIII (February 1939), p. 194.
article went on, however, to object to the "optical illusion" that Pius XI was an anti-fascist, and proclaimed that history might well decide that the aid he gave the first of the Fascist dictators was the most important aspect of his pontificate. By disciplining Don Sturzo and adopting a hostile attitude toward his party the journal felt that Pius helped Il Duce immeasurably. "The concordat cost Mussolini 1,750,000,000 lire in indemnities but it gave this former anti-clerical and atheist the blessing of the Church. . . . Pius XI himself, though he opposed fascist extremism, could hardly be called a man of progressive views. . . . He always spoke in high terms of Mussolini and his famous encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno contains nothing inconsistent with the corporative state. . . . Although the Church, under Pius, was finally reconciled with the French Republic and lent support to republican Germany, the favor shown to the Austrian regime under Dollfuss and Schuschnigg and to Franco indicate the Vatican's basically anti-democratic tendencies."10

An article written a few years later, yet which pertains to the problem, was written by Sherman L. Hayden in *Foreign Policy Reports*. By 1944 he was able to summarize and analyze the foreign policy of the Vatican during the pontificate of Pius XI. Twenty-five years of Vatican foreign policy indicated certain general conclusions. Hayden was of the opinion that no possible slur could be justly cast on the character of Pius XI. He had shown himself worthy of his trust, steadfast in his faith, unremitting in the preaching of its doctrine, loyal to the principles which he professed. The view that the Pope

---

was at heart a fascist and wished to see the triumph of modern dictatorships, while a long sequence of superficial evidence could be constructed to support it, proves to be without foundation in fact. At the same time he is not a supporter of democracy, but just what he claims to be—indifferent to political forms, accepting any government which will meet the minimum demands of the Church.11

When it was hoped that His Holiness would openly condemn the Ethiopian invasion as a flagrant breach of international law, in view of the Vatican's consistent policy of taking no sides and Article 24 of the Lateran Treaty, which restrained him from political activities, he could do nothing. Hayden felt that he might at least have toned down the exhuberance of the Italian clergy over the war and the subsequent victory. The fact remains that a degree of personal preference and prejudice showed plainly enough to make a fiction of neutrality difficult. The reasons why the Vatican has shown inclination toward Fascist governments despite basic antagonism were that the full significance of fascism was not evident in its early stages; that unprincipled tyranny was mistaken for benevolent paternalism as seen in Portugal and Austria's corporate state; fascist states would protect the world against communism and Pius XI, inasmuch as he had served as Nuncio to Poland, had gained an early distaste for communism. Hayden concluded by judging that the papal record of practical statesmanship was not impressive. He realized that the Holy See is in Italy and had to adapt itself to Italian policy but he felt it could only be regret-

11 Hayden, pp. 277-287.
ted that its ties with fascism had been so close.12

A second article in the Times repeated the acclaims of the first:

The great bell of St. Peter's that tolled for the death of Pius XI rings sorrowfully today in the heart of every believer in religion, freedom and peace. As Leo I saved Rome from Attila and Genseric, as Gregory the Great struggled against the Lombards, so Pius XI resisted the forces of violence and hate, the new persecution of the Church, the pagan myth-makers, the idolaters of race. He stood violently for the City of God against the deified state, as earlier popes stood against deified Roman and Holy Roman Emperors.

He was a man of ample and various gifts. A humanist, a quiet scholar, fingering lovingly the manuscripts of the Ambrosian and the Vatican, he was a singularly able administrator. A lover of antiquity, he had the modern touch as he showed in the renovation of the Vatican Library and the installation of radio and telegraph systems connecting his little domain with its widespread spiritual dependencies. Among his larger triumphs, his settlement of the so long insoluble "Roman Question" will always be memorable. The Lateran Treaty of 1929 gave the Holy See independence and ended the long quarrel between church and state. With characteristic comment, "The Holy See wants independence, not territory," he struck out of the agreement a proposed cession of ground beyond Vatican confines. Pius XI had his little domain—larger he would not have—a center of freedom and of the defense of religion against the newer cult of worship of the state. In this defense he was as brave as he was wise. The free men and women whose battles he fought will not forget him.13

A week later another editorial contained the wish that "he had left a message to millions about the best use of holidays and vacations, and in general, of the leisure time which has come to so many."14

Dwelling on the fact that the Church regarded Marxism as a deadly enemy and was uneasy about totalitarian states, the New Republic supposed that in the

12Ibid.


14Ibid., February 20, 1939, p. 16.
position between two extremes of doctrine the Church would do everything in its power to strengthen constitutional democracy, under the libertarian principles of which toleration is accepted and the Church allowed freedom in the spiritual sphere. In assessing Catholic political action under Pius XI, the writer esteemed that the objective results had tended to strengthen authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. Germany was used as an example where democratic forces could have held the Nazis at bay if the Catholics within the Christian Social Party had been willing to unite with the Social Democrats in support of the republic. The Pope was called complaisant about Mussolini's defiance of the League of Nations in the conquest of Ethiopia. The article also accused Pius of favoring in part, Japan's conquest of China and of supporting Franco despite individual Catholic loyalists. The totalitarianism in Quebec which was given papal approval and "fascist-minded gentry" in the United States are derided also. "It may be said that these things do not represent the best Catholic thought and that many good Catholics are, heart and soul, supporters of liberal democracy. That is true, but it can also be said that the more democratic forces in the Church do not seem to control its official action and even have difficulty in asserting their opinions within it." It was advised that the gathering of Cardinals for the election be watched—would the outcome be a closer sympathy for totalitarianism or "will the Church, by some miracle, decide that its best policy is to accept religious toleration and liberty in good faith, even if the development of democracy must be in the direction of advanced economic and social doctrines." 15

And yet, one more commentator believed he could say: "And everywhere Pius maintained a traditional policy of dealing politically with the states of the world—negotiating concordats whenever possible—upon any terms which recognized the validity of the Church's mission on earth. That policy led the Church into some dilemmas . . . But with all its dangers the Church's policy remained, as wielded with prudence and steadfastness by Pius XI, the one international influence whose weight was on the side of peace and faith in God."16

Looking back over the seventeen years in which Pius XI was the spiritual leader of the Catholic Church and her great influence in other matters as well, it is possible to find both abundant praise and caustic bitterness. At his election the personality of the man was the spotlighted feature and his past diplomatic deeds seemed to hold much in store for the future of the Vatican. His first public act broke seventy years' precedent and was eagerly seized upon for a deeper meaning.

When the solution to the Roman Question was found, the reaction was first triumphant and then suspicious. The trouble with Mussolini in which the Holy Father found himself not so long afterward served as confirmation for the lack of trust some had displayed in the Lateran agreements.

As the "social encyclicals" flowed from the pen of the Pontiff, the journals fell usually into their three groups. The Nation and the New Republic for the most part resented any move made by the Pope in this regard. Their ideas of marriage, labor, censorship, and education were based on totally

16"Death of a Pope", Time XXXIII (February 20, 1939), p. 29.
different concepts. The Christian Science Monitor advocated the policies but chafed under the influence of the policy maker; Time seemed to shift from one side to another depending on the issue at stake, very often not counting it important enough for an opinion at all. Henry Mencken, through his American Mercury scoffed at every type of organized group, the Roman Catholic Church included, while the New York Times consistently, with very few exceptions, advocated the moves of the Papacy editorially and gave her generously of its enthusiasm and applause.

With the discussion of the Mexican and Spanish persecution, the past history of the countries had to be taken into consideration and most papers found the higher clergy had accumulated too much wealth and political power and so had little sympathy for their troubles. The Pope was not blamed so much as was the Church in the individual countries. The Concordat with Hitler was considered a mistake on the part of Pius XI but was laid to political naivete rather than lack of moral judgement.

In death the Pope's accomplishments and errors were considered in the light of what was developing for the world. Hitler and Mussolini were known for what they were. Politically Pius XI was regarded by most as a poor judge of governments and their honesty. As a man he was congratulated for a life lived unselfishly for God and the world.
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Beals, Carleton. "Calles is Gaining in Mexico," The Nation, CXXIII (October 6, 1926), 320-321. Beals is an American correspondent living in Mexico at the time and studying its economic and political aspects. His articles are hostile toward the Mexican Church.

-----. "The Mexican Church Goes on Strike," The Nation, CXXIII (August 18, 1926), 145-147.


"The Challenge to Fascism," The Christian Century, XXXIX (March 2, 1922), 259-261. Sees strength of Catholicism under Pius XI lined up against the weakness of the various Protestant sects and their inability to unite.


Cortesi, Arnaldo. "Italy and the Vatican in Conflict Over the Lateran Treaties," Current History, XXX (September 1929), 1014.


"Death of a Pope," Time, XXXIII (February 20, 1939), 29. Complimentary analysis of the whole pontificate of Pius XI.


Dewey, John. "Church and State in Mexico," The New Republic, XXV (August 1926), 9-10. Discusses situation, refuses to join one side or the other.


Hayden, Sherman S. "Foreign Policy of the Vatican," Foreign Policy Reports, XIX (January 1944), 278-287. Brief account of entire period of Pius XI's pontificate from the political viewpoint.


"Hitler and the Vatican," The Nation, CXXXVIII (April 1934), 459. Relates struggle over youth in Germany since the Concordat.

Huddleston, Sisley. "French Nationalism and the Vatican," The New Statesman, XXVIII (February 12, 1927), 529-531. Declines to take a side in the Action Francaise quarrel but emphasizes its importance for France.


"In Reply to Mr. Ward," The New Republic, LIX (May 29, 1929), 32-33. Editorial which argues against Catholic case on birth control as put by Patrick Ward in the same issue.


Lehmann, Leo H. "The Catholic Church in Politics--Catholicism and Fascism," The New Republic, XCVII (December 14, 1938), 167-168. Puts forth support that Catholics in Spain, the United States and Canada have given fascism.

------. "The Catholic Church in Politics--Catholics in a Democracy," The New Republic, XCVII (December 21, 1938), 195-198. Recommends that Catholics in the United States work for the common welfare rather than being so concerned with the details of birth control, movie censorship and marital relations.

----- "The Catholic Church in Politics--The Church and Communism," The New Republic, XC VII (December 14, 1938), 166-167. Lays Church's opposition to Communism to traditional opposition to democratic principles.


----- "The Catholic Church in Politics--The Church and State Legislation," The New Republic, XC VII (December 7, 1938), 94-96. Attacks Catholic block of Child Labor Law because of the control it would give Congress over the mind, as well as the body, of a child under eighteen years of age.


----- "The Vatican's New Friends," The New Republic, LVIII (February 27, 1929), 37-39. Condemnation of royalism in France and the recognition and friendliness toward the republic in Germany seem to the author to be a revision of traditional Vatican policy.


"Liberty and the Roman Catholic Church," The Nation, CXXII (June 16, 1926), 660-662. The Catholic position presented by Father John A. Ryan and the Mexican position by Jose Bejarano, a writer for the radical press.

Literary Digest, CVIII (March 1931), 22. Article on the Pope's first radio message.

Literary Digest, CIX (May 1931), 5-6. Comment on the encyclical Quadragesimo Anno.


"Mexico and Catholicism," The New Republic, XXVIII (July 1926), 268-270. Usual criticism of enormous wealth and flagrant immorality among clergy as cause of Mexican persecution.

"Mexico and the Catholic Church," The New Republic, LXXII (November 9, 1932), 342-343. Blames Mexican hierarchy for political action but believes government action a little too harsh and unjust.


"Mussolini’s Dream of Empire," The Nation, CXL (October 9, 1935), 402-405. Contains nothing about papal action on Ethiopia, explains the situation.


"The New Pope," The Outlook, CXXX (February 15, 1922), 252-253. Calls the Pope liberal and hopes for a rapprochement with Italy.


Pegler, Westbrook. "Fair Enough," The New Republic, XCV (May 11, 1938), 19-20. As the title suggests, the writer believes that the clergy in Spain who failed to rebuke the wealthy aristocrats as they took from the poor are getting what they deserved.


"Pius XI," Literary Digest, LXXII (February 18, 1922), 11. Dwells on background and former life of the pontiff and the hidden meaning of the public benediction.

"Pius XI," The Nation, CXLVIII (February 1939), 194. Applauds Pius XI as a great man but criticizes the aid he unwittingly gave to the fascist movements in Italy and Germany.


"The Pope and Labor," The New Republic, LXVII (May 27, 1931), 32-33. Thinks the encyclical fails to recognize the right of the worker to do something and only admonishes the rich to exercise charity.

"The Pope’s Encyclical," The New Republic, LXI (January 29, 1930), 265. Attitude toward the encyclical on education; the author feels that there is nothing to disturb the American state in the letter.

"Roman Church Elects a Pope," Christian Century, XXXIX (February 16, 1922), 220. Criticizes undemocratic method of electing pope without waiting for the American cardinals.


Speranza, Gino C. "Habemus Pontificem," The Outlook, CXXX (March 1, 1922), 335-336. Lauds the newly elected Achille Ratti.

"A Statesman in the Vatican is Pius XI," Current Opinion, LXXVI (March 1924), 285-287. Emphasizes the Italian strength if treaty would be signed.


Time, XXVI (October 1935), 17. Mussolini vexed because he was not included in the blessing the Pope sent to the King and Queen of Italy.

Time, XXVIII (July 1936), 52. Translation of encyclical on movies.
Time, XXIX (April 1937), 43. Blames trouble in Spain and Mexico on clergy.

Time, XXXIII (February 6, 1939), 24. Discusses Hitler-Franco "cultural" pact.

"The Vatican Settlement," The Nation, CXXVIII (February 1929), 247. Attacks the accord on moral and political bases.

Ward, Patrick J. "The Catholics and Birth Control," The New Republic, LIX (May 29, 1929), 35-38. An excellent explanation of the Catholic position. Social problem should be adjusted to fit the people, not the people to the problem.


Young, Stark. "Notes on Fascism Today," The New Republic, LXVII (August 5, 1931), 312-314. Praises the good done at the Vatican, criticizes the errors.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

A. BOOKS

Bailey, T. A. A Diplomatic History of the American People. New York, 1940. Commenting on the Civil War in Spain, Bailey says that the people in the United States believed for the most part that the Loyalists were upholding democracy but many were neutral.

Beyens, Napoleon. Quatro ans a Rome. Paris, 1931. Beyens was Belgian ambassador from 1921 to 1926; he covers the death of Benedict XV, the opinions of his critics and defenders, a clear picture of the early reign of Pius XI.

Binchey, Daniel A. Church and State in Fascist Italy. London, 1941. Well known and accepted source for this topic.

Cianfarra, Camille M. *The Vatican and the War*. New York, 1944. Cianfarra was Rome correspondent for the New York Times. The book contains very little more than a summary of Pius XI, almost entirely about Pius XII and his policies.

Cline, Howard F. *The United States and Mexico*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1953. Contains very little on Church-State problems and gives a great deal on Mexican history. Extensive bibliography on Mexico.

Cuddihy and Shuster, eds. *Pope Pius XI and American Public Opinion*. New York, 1939. Contains tributes culled from a great number of newspapers, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, in the United States, but are all very brief and complimentary, unreliable as far as real public opinion was concerned.

Dailey, E. V. *Pius XII: Pope of the People*. Chicago, 1937. Short study of the acts of Pius XI, with special emphasis on the encyclicals.

Dansette, Adrien. *Histoire Religieuse de la France contemporaine*. Paris, 1951. Consulted for the history of Action Francaise. Author covers the censure, the sanctions, and the important results, and believes that it breathed a healthier atmosphere for all of France, especially the youth who formed new clubs not flavored with monarchism.

DeRoux, Charles. *Charles Maurras et le nationalisme de l'Action francaise*. Paris, 1927. A defense of the organization. DeRoux maintains it was a specifically political movement, its social doctrine being that of the Catholic social school, its political doctrine recognizing expressly the primacy of religion and morality, its end the welfare of the public and the good of France.

Fischer, Louis. *Men and Politics*. New York, 1941. Fischer is a correspondent with leftist leanings—Lenin is a hero but Stalin is not. He is on Loyalist side during Spanish civil war and feels that Vatican-Italian accord brought Catholics to favor fascism, or at least not condemn it.


----- The Vatican and the War in Europe. London, n.d. Another political background account.


Hughes, H. Stuart. The United States and Italy. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1953. An attempt to make the recent history of Italy understandable to Americans, with special emphasis on post-war period, although the fascist period is touched on.

Hughes, Philip. Pope Pius the Eleventh. New York, 1938. Special note taken of the encyclicals; Hughes believes the Lateran Treaty was a chance boldly taken, from which a new Catholic Italy would emerge.


Knox, Ronald. Nazi and Nazarene. London, 1940. Monsignor Knox gives an excellent explanation of the technique of aggression used by the Nazis in various countries to conquer the Church: blandishments and threats, lying propaganda, even the Fifth Column, until the mask was removed in German-occupied territories for the eradication of Christianity altogether.

Langer, William L. and S. Everett Gleason. The Challenge to Isolation: 1937-1940. New York, 1952. The authors assert that by the autumn of 1937 no neutrality of thought was left in American public opinion of the totalitarian states. The attitude toward Fascist Italy had been rather condescending and indulgent but when Hitler’s program struck out at fundamental beliefs and traditions, feelings became more intensely against them.

Minio-Paluello, L. Education in Fascist Italy. New York, 1946. A student during the Fascist regime, the author describes the reform of education in Italy from the time of the Risorgimento, the Fascist reform carried out by Gentile, the interference with teachers under that system and finally, Bottai's School Charter of 1939. He feels that Fascism did not really penetrate the spirit of the Italian people.

Moore, Thomas Ewing. Peter's City. New York, 1930. An account of the origin, development, and solution of the Roman Question by the Secretary of the American Embassy in Rome.

Morgan, T. B. Listening Post: Eighteen Years on Vatican Hill. A correspondent for the United Press, the writer gives a personal although objective view of the great men of the Vatican. Dwells on personalities rather than events and their significance.

Nicolson, Harold. Dwight Morrow. Another book on another diplomat for whom Nicolson has great regard. Several pages deal with Morrow's successful mediation in Church-State affairs in Mexico.

Parsons, W. The Pope and Italy. New York, 1929. Discussion of the history and settlement of the Roman Question. The appendix contains the text of the treaty, the concordat, and the financial conventions, as well as the press story of the settlement which appeared in the Osservatore Romano.


Salvemini, Gaetano. Italian Fascism. London, 1938. An explanation of Italian fascism, its political and economic aspects, as well as its foreign policy, by one of its chief and most zealous opponents.

Stokes, Anson Phelps. Church and State in the United States. New York, 1950. 3 vols. Gives background for study of Church and State relations here in the United States but does not consider the policies of the Vatican in the connection in which they were needed here.

Sturzo, Luigi. Church and State. New York, 1939. One of seventeen books explaining the recent history of Italy and the Vatican, covering all the important events and giving a clear analysis of them. Remarkably unbiased, considering the events of the author's later life and his exile.

Taylor, F. Jay. The United States and the Spanish Civil War. New York, 1956. This work blends public opinion and official policy to give a broad survey of American attitudes toward the civil war in Spain. Evidence is rather heavy against France and the United States.

Von Papen, Franz. *Memoirs.* London, 1952. Translated from the German by Brian Connell. Von Papen relates the story behind the Concordat and attributes deceit to Hitler who approved the pact just to neutralize the radical elements in the Party and establish the credit of the Nazi government abroad.


Woodlock, T. F. *Catholic Pattern.* New York, 1942. The author distinguishes clearly between the Catholic authority based on reason and fascist authority based on force.

**B. ARTICLES**


"Encyclical on Motion Pictures," *Catholic World,* CXLIII (August 1936), 698-719. A catholic explanation of the encyclical.

Griffen, John J. "Pius XI: Pope of the Sacred Heart," *Ave Maria,* XLVI (November 1937), 673-676. The article shows the connection of the three encyclicals *Quas Primas,* *Miserentissimus Redemptor,* and *Caritate comsulSi* as the solution for the troubles of mankind found in the Heart of Jesus.


Haines, C. Grove. "What Future for Italy," *Foreign Policy Reports,* XIX (October 1943), 170-179. Brings out the importance of the Lateran Treaty for both the Catholic Church and Italy.


"The Latest Encyclical," Ave Maria, XXXIII (February 1931), 180-182. Commen­tary and explanation of Casti connubii, the marriage encyclical.
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